SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 1958

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

Our Father, God, in this still moment, when all earth's strident noises are hushed and our own voices silenced, as we turn our thoughts to Thee in whom we live and move and have our being, make plain to our understanding that legislative enactments and economic adjustments in themselves cannot bring personal or collective salvation except as they clear the way for the spiritual restoration and rearmament without which we labor in vain and all else is as sinking sand.

In constant pursuit of the highest, scorning all expediency, casting aside all counsels of despair, may we press on with buoyant feet, firm in the faith that for ourselves, our Nation, and our world, the best is yet to be. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 13, 1958, was dispensed with.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, and EDWARD MARTIN, a Senator from Pennsylvania, appeared in their seats today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills, the presentation of petitions and memorials, the submission of resolutions, and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate next Monday because of my attendance at the funeral of the late Representative August H. Andresen. I expect to remain in the State on Tuesday of next week also.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 309)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the Seventh Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 15, 1958.*

REPORT ON PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 306)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the second semiannual report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1958.*

REPORT ON UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 202)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act, the 11th annual report, covering United States participation in the United Nations during the year 1956.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six was a year of great peril to world peace and thus a stringent test for the United Nations—notably because of the crises in Egypt and in Hungary.

In Egypt the United Nations caused the world to turn away from war. Through a series of resolutions, the General Assembly effectively mobilized world opinion to achieve a cease-fire, and France and the United Kingdom shortly agreed to withdraw their forces. The Assembly's moral pressure played a powerful part in securing the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Egyptian territory in March of this year.

In the case of Hungary, the Assembly succeeded by massive votes in mobilizing opinion against the Soviet Union's blatant disregard of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. Although it has so far been impossible by peaceful means to secure freedom for the people of Hungary, this mobilization did arouse a strong revulsion around the world against Soviet imperialism.

The sharp contrast between the response of France, the United Kingdom, and Israel on the one hand, and the Soviet Union on the other to the call of world opinion, is striking.

The Secretary General deserves particular commendation for his role in the United Nations actions during the Middle East crisis. As requested by the General Assembly, he developed within 48 hours a plan to set up, with the consent of the nations involved, the United Nations Emergency Force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities. The force took up its position in the Suez Canal area and later moved to other positions along the armistice demarcation lines. Today, it remains the guardian of peace in the sensitive Gaza and Sharm-el-Sheikh areas. The concept inherent in this force constitutes a potentially important development for the future of the United Nations as an increasingly effective instrument for maintaining peace.

Under a mandate from the General Assembly, the Secretary General also organized a fleet of more than 40 salvage vessels to remove the obstructions with which the Suez Canal had been blocked during the hostilities. By April 24, 1957, the canal was fully open and had resumed its role as an important artery in world commerce.

Thus the United Nations dealt effectively with a grave situation which could have caused general war. The restoration and maintenance of relative calm gives the United Nations the opportunity to work for the long-range solutions in the Middle East which alone can guarantee against the outbreak of new fighting.

Unlike the crisis in the Middle East, the situation in Hungary presented the problem of what the United Nations can do when one of its members refuses to respond to the peacemaking efforts of the General Assembly.

What began as a peaceful student demonstration in Budapest on October 23, 1956, mushroomed into a nationwide uprising of the Hungarian people aimed at national independence. It was crushed only through massive Soviet armed intervention. The United States proposed a resolution in the Security Council calling on the Soviet Union to

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

withdraw its troops. When this resolution was vetoed by the Soviet Union, a special emergency session of the General Assembly was convened under the "Uniting for Peace" procedure.

As the climax of a historic series of resolutions, the General Assembly on December 12 condemned the Soviet Union's violation of the United Nations Charter "in depriving Hungary of its liberty and independence and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental rights." It again requested the Soviet Union to halt its intervention in Hungary's internal affairs, withdraw its troops from Hungary, and permit reestablishment of Hungary's political independence. To these requests, the Soviet Union turned a deaf ear.

On January 10, 1957, the General Assembly established a Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary consisting of representatives of Australia, Ceylon, Denmark, Tunisia, and Uruguay—a committee drawn from five continents—and instructed it to investigate the Hungarian situation. Denied admission to Hungary by the Kadar regime, the Committee carried out its mandate by collecting authentic evidence elsewhere, mainly from eyewitnesses who had fled Hungary. The results of this investigation were published in the Special Committee's report. They clearly refuted on a point-by-point basis the Soviet version of events in Hungary. The report confirmed that the purpose of the Soviet intervention was the suppression of the legitimate demands of the Hungarian people for freedom and independence. It revealed the naked truth of the ruthlessness of the Soviet intervention and its utter disregard for national sovereignty and basic human rights.

It was this report which led to the reconvening of the Assembly on September 10, 1957, and to the second resolution again condemning Soviet conduct, which was adopted by 60 votes to 10.

The United Nations succeeded in stopping the fighting in the Middle East because the parties involved complied with the recommendations of the General Assembly. In the case of Hungary, United Nations action was frustrated because the Soviet Union refused to comply with its recommendations. The blame lies not with the United Nations but squarely on the shoulders of the men of the Kremlin who rely on force to keep Hungary from regaining its freedom.

The record of the United Nations clearly demonstrates that the processes of consultation, compromise, debate, and agreement are capable of relaxing tensions and resolving disputes if nations are willing to respect the opinions of mankind.

I was particularly pleased to note the progress made, under the aegis of the United Nations, in the fields of disarmament and the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee has been the center for serious negotiations which we all hope will lead to a mutually acceptable agreement. The establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency has been especially promising.

The United States welcomed the constructive work done by the United Nations over the past year toward the achievement of self-government and independence in the dependent areas and trust territories. The independence of Ghana and the termination of the United Nations trusteeship over Togoland under British administration constitute notable achievements.

By the admission of Sudan, Morocco, Tunisia, Japan, Ghana, and most recently the Federation of Malaya, the United Nations has increased its membership to 82. However, the Republic of Korea and the Republic of Vietnam are still excluded by the Soviet veto in the Security Council. The United States considers their admission necessary and desirable and will continue its efforts to bring about their entry into the Organization.

The humanitarian activities of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in providing minimum subsistence and housing for over 900,000 refugees in the Near East were continued by the General Assembly with United States support. Although the Agency is doing an excellent job under trying circumstances, we must find a permanent solution to the Palestine refugee problem.

The economic and social activities of the United Nations have become increasingly effective. Through many channels and in numerous programs, the United Nations and the specialized agencies have contributed to the economic progress of the newly developing areas of the world and, in the words of the United Nations Charter, "the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations." This report gives a full account of many of the strikingly successful battles the specialized agencies have fought and won against disease, hunger, and illiteracy in many lands.

It has been the continuing pledge of the United States to give full support to the United Nations and to seek constantly for ways to increase its strength and to develop its effectiveness as an instrument to maintain world peace. This report to the Congress contains concrete proof that we are keeping that pledge.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1958.*

REPORT ON NEW PUBLIC AIRPORT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 304)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the first paragraph under the heading "Department of Commerce" of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1958, there is submitted herewith my report recommending a site for a new public airport in the vicinity of the District of Columbia.

Such report consists of a letter to me from the special assistant to the President for aviation matters, dated January 8, 1958, together with an enclosure entitled "Site Selection Study." It proposes the site known as Chantilly, located partly in Loudoun County and partly in Fairfax County, Va., as the airport site which best meets the requirements of public safety, airport and airspace capacity, public service, and cost.

Accordingly, I recommend the selection of the Chantilly site, and at this site have directed the Civil Aeronautics Administration to proceed forthwith with the construction and development of a new public airport to serve the growing needs of the National Capital region.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1958.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. August H. Andresen, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9739) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9739) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE DURING THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate for

the remainder of the present session of Congress.

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

AUTHORIZATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO MAKE REPORTS DURING THE ADJOURNMENTS OR RECESSES OF THE SENATE DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during adjournments or recesses of the Senate during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the Committee on Appropriations be, and it is hereby, authorized to report appropriation bills, including joint resolutions, with accompanying notices of motions to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of offering certain amendments to such bills or joint resolutions, which proposed amendments shall be printed.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

INCREASE OF NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REVISION OF METHOD OF COMPUTING BASIC PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the method of computing basic pay for members of the uniformed services, to provide term retention contracts for Reserve officers, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY OF ARMY OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering flight pay of officers of that Department, for the period July 1–December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS WITH OWNERS AND LESSEES OF CERTAIN LANDS ADJOINING NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements with owners and lessees of land inside or adjoining the naval petroleum reserves for conservation in the ground of oil and gas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION (IN LIQUIDATION)

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation), for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the quarter ended September 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF AUDIT OF EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of audit of the Exchange Stabilization Fund, for the period July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROGRESS REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of liquidation of the national defense, war, and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the calendar year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON DISPOSALS OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on disposals of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF THE MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on examination of the military assistance program administered by the Department of the Army (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

FACILITATION OF PROCUREMENT OF PROPERTY AND SERVICES BY THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve opportunities for small-business concerns to obtain a fair proportion of Government purchases and contracts, to facilitate procurement of property and services by the Government, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER KLAMATH INDIAN TRIBE

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT IN MOUNT MCKINLEY NATIONAL PARK, ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF BLACKFEET AND GROS VENTRE TRIBES OF INDIANS *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, the settlement of the claim of the *Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes of Indians* v. *The United States* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STUDY OF RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE IN FEDERAL COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to empower the Judicial Conference to study and recommend changes in and additions to the rules of practice and procedure in the Federal courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that 4 positions had been filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–17 and GS–18 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROMOTION OF INTERESTS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the interests of national defense through the advancement of the aeronautical research programs of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Harold Kilmer, of Millbury, Mass., relating to the establishment of a missionary library in every nation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of C. Z. Bondy, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Free Federation of Puerto Rican Workers, San Juan, P. R., favoring the compulsory teaching of English in Puerto Rican schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted at the 61st annual convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association, at Oklahoma City, Okla.

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

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 61ST ANNUAL CONVENTION, AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, OKLAHOMA CITY, JANUARY 6–8, 1958

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Whereas the Hoover Commission Report has pointed out various ways of economizing in Government spending that would save taxpayers billions of dollars without impairing Government effectiveness; and

Whereas Congress has been loathe to adopt these economy measures, which in no way would interfere with necessary spending for defense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we again urge Congress to enact measures as suggested in the Hoover Commission Report.

TARIFFS

Whereas our import duties are among the lowest in the world; and

Whereas the Trade Agreement Act, which expires next June, has been shown to be a tool for further lowering our protective tariffs; and

Whereas our present inadequate protective tariffs would be further endangered by endorsement of the Organization for Trade Cooperation which in effect would take away the power of Congress to set tariff rates and make trade agreements: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress not to extend the trade-agreements program and to resist pressure for endorsement of the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

LABOR UNIONS

Be it resolved—

That, although we are not opposed to honest trade unions, we express our belief that no man should be denied employment solely because of membership or nonmembership in an organization;

That we deplore the ruthless and unjustified actions of some labor leaders; and

That we ask that labor unions be subjected to the same controls and regulations as are now in force for corporations and industry.

FUNDS FOR MEAT INSPECTION

Be it resolved, That the American National Cattlemen's Association in recognition of the importance of Federal meat inspection both to the producer of livestock and the consumer of meat, and in further recognition that Federal meat inspection is a service to the public and should properly be supported by public funds, requests that adequate funds be appropriated to carry on this service effectively.

AMENDMENT TO TAX LAWS

Bt it resolved, That we favor legislation similar to the Jenkins-Keogh bills which would grant voluntary retirement benefits to self-employed individuals who do not now have available to them retirement benefits available to employees of corporations, and the vast majority of stockmen are self-employers who should be entitled to similar tax-protected retirement benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor legislation providing for averaging of income for tax purposes similar to the legislation proposed by Representative CURTIS in H. R. 126 except that the association desires a 10 rather than a 5-year averaging period; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor legislation revising the involuntary conversion provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to provide greater flexibility with respect to the replacement requirements when land is condemned and when breeding cattle are sold because of drought; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor legislation similar to that proposed by Representatives BAUMHART and SIMPSON in H. R. 8523 and 8989, providing for the payment of the Federal estate taxes in installments; and be it further

Resolved, That we shall continue our support of and cooperation with the National Live Stock Tax Committee in its efforts in connection with the above mentioned legislation.

TAXING AUTHORITY

Whereas the Bureau of Indian Affairs has permitted, condoned and promoted certain forms of taxation by the tribal councils of the Pine Ridge and Rosebud areas upon non-Indian permittees and owners of business, and there have been proposals to tax personal property; and

Whereas since the non-Indian residents of the reservation are already overburdened with taxation to support the regular State and county governments: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we oppose such discriminatory double taxation by administrative action and favor legislation to limit taxing authority to regularly constituted State governments and their subdivisions.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY

Whereas the present interstate highway law calls for public hearings, for urban areas but none for rural areas: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we ask Congress to amend the public hearings procedure of the Interstate Highway Act, or require hearings in all rural areas transversed by the Interstate Highway System as well as the present hearings in urban areas.

SOIL BANK

Whereas acreage allotments, with the practice of diverting crop lands to grass, are mainly responsible for increasing the surpluses of beef which have confronted the industry in the past critical years; and

Whereas in spite of repeated promises by high officials in Government that the soil bank land would not be grazed, Congress inserted emergency clauses which allowed grazing in the very first year of soil bank operation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we firmly oppose the use of diverted acres to the production of meat; and be it further

Resolved, That all drought emergency clauses be stricken from the soil bank program.

CONDEMNATION OF LAND

Whereas there are certain agencies of the Federal Government that are attempting to acquire private land through the assumed right of condemnation; and

Whereas we, the members of the American National Cattlemen's Association, have always strongly believed in and supported the fundamental principle that the right to privately owned property is a sacred human inherent right that must never be subjected to encroachment or allowed to suffer unwarranted attack; and

Whereas we have observed the ever-present and dangerous development of an alien philosophy that the right to privately owned property is subject to the Government's authority to seize such property through the exercise of the power of condemnation for the acquisition of land for wildlife refuges and similar purposes; and

Whereas we feel that our association is an organization that should always support the principle of private ownership of property and should oppose any and all attacks, direct and indirect, on that fundamental principle: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the officers of this association be, and they are hereby instructed to keep alert to discover such unwarranted and unjustified attacks on said fundamental principle and to assist in resisting such attacks by giving moral support and such other assistance as the president and his vice president deem necessary.

TAYLOR GRAZING LAW

Whereas the Taylor grazing law was enacted in 1934 as a conservation measure to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon Federal range; and

Whereas the administration of the act by the Bureau of Land Management has more and more ignored the basic principle of stability by attempting to adjust range use to fit theoretical range survey carrying capacity figures, by ignoring established range division usage of settlers, and by circumventing certain administrative restrictions embodied in the law, through code terminology, and further by using range survey figures as an adjudication tool instead of solely as a basis upon which to charge fees: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor long-term binding cooperative agreements between the Bureau and the permittee; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the national council to give this special attention; and be it further

Resolved, That any genuine and established necessities for range-use reductions due to drought or other temporary causes be made on a nonuse basis, with a clear understanding that reestablishment of such reduced use go to the primary, qualified user upon whom such reduction was initially made.

LAND TRANSFERS

Whereas the grazing districts of the Bureau of Land Management comprise such large areas and the nature of assignment of personnel to these areas requires that the employees have a thorough knowledge of their districts: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we request the Bureau of Land Management to refrain from making too frequent transfer of range management personnel.

LAND APPLICATIONS

Whereas there is an increasing number of 5-acre tract applications; and

Whereas if this practice continues it will jeopardize stability of our range privileges: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the class of land now available for small tracts be reclassified and be limited to areas adjacent to cities and towns.

FOREST MULTIPLE USE

Whereas national legislation and regulations establishing wilderness preservation areas and recreational areas is contrary to the multiple-use principle in management of Federal lands; and

Whereas enactment of special interest legislation and regulations seriously handicap multiple-use management of Federal lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we oppose all legislation and regulations not in accord with the multiple-use principle.

APPEALS IN FOREST USE

Whereas, under rules and regulations now existing for appeals from decisions of agents of the Forest Service, the decision becomes effective pending determination of the decision on appeal; and

Whereas if the decision is reversed on appeal the appellant has no method of restitution for his loss pending the appeal: Therefore be it

Resolved, That regulation 10 (a) on appeals be amended to provide that any decision relative to reductions in numbers or time of grazing on any permit by any agent of the Forest Service or Department of Agriculture be stayed pending final decision on appeal.

GRAZING REDUCTIONS

Whereas, the Forest Service has in the past made restrictions in grazing permits or other uses of forest lands without due regard for the consequences that would result from such reductions to livestock operations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That except where the permittee objects, or in case of prior agreement, the Forest Service shall not reduce the numbers or period of use until the matter of such reduction shall have been reviewed by the local advisory board if one exists.

WITHDRAWALS OF LANDS

Whereas in almost every issue of the Federal Register there appears applications by either the Defense Department, the Fish and Wildlife Service, or some other of the various Federal agencies for withdrawal of land from the public domain; and

Whereas many of the current withdrawals are not being used to the fullest extent; and

Whereas these withdrawals are foreclosing on multiple use, to the detriment of the economy of the western public-land States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we petition Congress to enact legislation requiring all Federal agencies to obtain the approval of Congress for withdrawal of any area of land.

SECTION 15 LAND

Whereas the lessees of public lands known as section 15 lands have no preference rights in the renewal of their leases nor in the purchase of their leased lands; and

Whereas this places these lessees at a distinct disadvantage in developing a stabilized operation and discourages the lessees from practicing a longtime conservation program: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend that the regulations of the Bureau of Land Management respecting the leasing and sale of section 15 lands be so amended as to provide preference rights to lessees in the renewal of their leases or prior preference rights to all leases of land sold where such lessees are owners of contiguous lands.

IMPORTS OF CATTLE AND BEEF

Whereas cattle and dressed beef and canned and processed beef from foreign countries are attracted to our markets whenever domestic prices reach a level at which we can operate without loss; and

Whereas the present import duties are inadequate to protect our markets against importations of more cheaply produced cattle and beef from foreign countries; and

Whereas our present protective tariff was written several decades ago and is now inadequate under present conditions of greatly increased costs of production in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we ask Congress and the Tariff Commission to revise these old import duty rates and import quotas to a more realistic basis, to preserve American markets for American producers.

FEDERAL BEEF GRADING

Whereas voluntary Federal beef carcass grading is today an integral part of the beef marketing system; and

Whereas it is essential that Federal carcass grading be constantly reviewed by this producer organization to insure that it be uniformly applied and to keep in step with our dynamic meat and food economy; and

Whereas the elimination of conformation of grading would not be desirable; and

Whereas the Federal grade standards for beef combine into each grade two primary characteristics which are not necessarily related; namely, (1) quality of meat as determined by the texture, firmness, marbling, maturity, and (2) the proportion of various cuts and ratio of fat, lean, and bone which are a function of the conformation and finish of the carcass; and

Whereas there is a wide range in the value of carcasses within each grade because of the variation in yield of major retail cuts and the ratio of fat, lean, and bone; and

Whereas the present grading system does not identify these differences in cut-out yields within a given quality grade; and

Whereas it is essential that our market system identify beef carcasses that have combined high quality meat with a minimum of waste fat and bones in order to encourage production of carcasses that more nearly meet the consumer demand: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American National Cattlemen's Association hereby urges the Department of Agriculture to proceed immediately with the development and field testing of a grading system wherein present quality grades would be further divided and identified into groups differing in yield of major retail cuts, and ratio of fat, lean, and bone; be it further

Resolved, That the meatpacking, wholesaling, and retailing industry be requested to assist in every way possible with the development and perfecting of such a grading system; and be it further

Resolved, That the beef-carcass grading committee be established as a permanent committee charged with the responsibility of review of the Federal beef-carcass grading program; and be it further

Resolved, That the American National Cattlemen's Association vigorously opposes pending legislation and any future legislation that would make Federal grading of beef mandatory.

BEEF PROMOTION

Whereas cattle produced by the members of this association ultimately reach the consumer market in the form of edible beef and beef products, which fact not only justifies but requires beef cattle producers to be genuinely interested in the beef market and in all problems related to the marketing of beef and beef products; and

Whereas we know that the consumption of beef can be greatly increased by truthful and realistic dissemination of the facts about beef from the standpoints of health and nutrition; and

Whereas since the consuming public has never been fully or adequately informed about the real benefits that are derived from beef and beef products, we therefore know that an appropriate medium to conduct a widespread campaign of research, education, promotion, and merchandising of our product, beef, must be devised and put into operation for the general benefit of not only our industry but also for the particular benefit of consumers; and

Whereas the National Beef Council was brought into existence because of former recommendations of our association. It had and has for its purpose the accomplishment of those things just mentioned, all of which are essential to the general welfare; and

Whereas the American National Cattlemen's Association should continue its support of the National Beef Council and should greatly augment that support. In particular, our association should assume the leadership in the effort to assure adequate financing of the research, educational, and promotional campaign planned by the National Beef Council: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the officers of the American National Cattlemen's Association be, and they are hereby, instructed to actively assist in the effort to secure Federal legislation to authorize a voluntary checkoff program at the federally posted markets of the country for the financing of the operations of a national beef-promotion program and to give to such effort both personal and financial aid and support.

GAME LANDS PURCHASES

Whereas in most, if not all, of the western public land States the State game commissions are using funds derived from operation of the Robinson-Patman Act with which to buy land, thus removing the land from the tax rolls, which increases the burden on remaining fee lands; and

Whereas the tax loss to local communities includes not only the land tax but also the personal taxes tied to the land in the form of livestock taxes in many cases more than the land tax itself: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we petition Congress to amend the Robinson-Patman Act so that State game commission real property be placed on tax rolls, thus supporting their fair share of the tax burden; and be it further

Resolved, That no land may be purchased in these instances without obtaining the consent of the respective county commissioners serving the county in which the land proposed to be purchased lies.

FIRING AREA

Resolved, That we oppose the establishment of an impact area for the firing of missiles in the area around Fort Sill, Okla., since this project will make necessary the removal of a large number of families from their homes and the taking of a large area of good farmland out of production; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge that the facilities at Fort Sill be expanded as a preliminary training base, similar to the Navy's using inland training bases, and that long-range firing be done elsewhere, thus conserving this productive farm area and providing for the expansion of Fort Sill at the same time.

DEER REDUCTION

Whereas the Nevada and Montana Fish and Game Commissions, through extensive study and control, have reduced deer herds in order to keep them in balance with available forage and at the same time not cause an imbalance between permitted livestock and available forage: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we petition the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to cause this practice to be applied on all Federal lands under their respective management.

WATER RIGHTS

Whereas for nearly a century it has been the settled rule that western water rights are dependent on and determined by State law; and

Whereas since the 1866 Congress has recognized such sovereign rights; and

Whereas said State water rights are now in jeopardy because of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Pelton Dam case: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to pass S. 863, which would by law reaffirm the rights of the States to control, supervise, and adjudicate their water.

TRADE PRACTICES IN MEATPACKING

Be it resolved, That the American National Cattlemen's Association reaffirms its action to provide adequate enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act within the Department of Agriculture and legislation to strengthen the provisions of this act with regard to unfair trade practices; and be it further

Resolved, That the principles involved in the present Cooley-Hill bill, H. R. 9020, be endorsed.

RAIL RATES

Be it resolved, That it be the policy of the American National Cattlemen's Association to do everything possible to restore the relationship of rail rates between fresh meats and packinghouse products on one hand and livestock on the other, westbound, existing prior to August 15, 1957.

RECERTIFICATION IN BANG'S DISEASE

Be it resolved, That the American National Cattlemen's Association recommend that the

animal disease branch of the Department of Agriculture be urged to adopt in its provisions for recertification of modified certified brucellosis-free areas the following optional procedure:

A ranch shall be eligible for recertification when all cattle have been officially calfhood vaccinated and all heifer calves in the future are 100 percent officially calfhood vaccinated or spayed.

BRAND AND THEFT

Resolved, That the Federal statute be so amended, so that, in all areas where the Federal Government has jurisdiction over criminal law, the theft of any cow, calf, horse, sheep, or goat, or any other species of domestic livestock, be punishable by imprisonment in the Federal penitentiary.

FUNDS FOR RESEARCH

Whereas reliable sources have repeatedly been quoted in the press to the effect that cuts in the national budget for agriculture may be necessary to finance the defense effort; and

Whereas a healthy, independent agriculture that could exist without subsidies is dependent on more efficient production and expanded markets; and

Whereas such a situation can be developed only through intensive and well-planned research: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we vigorously recommend not only that there be no cuts in appropriations for agricultural research in any field but that such appropriations be increased, to the end that agriculture may be less dependent on subsidies.

CATTLE REPORTS

Whereas the reports of cattle-on-feed and calf-crops issued by the Department of Agriculture are of particular value as a service to the beef cattle industry, and

Whereas the Department has indicated its willingness to extend and improve the requested reports and services as indicated below, if funds are made available:

Expansion of quarterly on feed estimates to 13 additional States: Idaho, Michigan, Wisconsin, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, Washington, Montana, Wyoming, New Mexico, Utah, Nevada, and Oregon.

Expansion of the tabulation of beef steer and heifers sold out of first hands by grades and by States of origin, at seven additional markets as listed below: South St. Paul, Sioux Falls, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Indianapolis, Fort Worth, Los Angeles, and Cincinnati.

Preparation and publication of a monthly report bringing together data on marketings, in shipments, range and pasture conditions, feed prospects, current prices, etc.

Expansion of cattle on feed estimates in California and Arizona to a monthly basis for a trial period of 1 year.

Expansion of January 1 cattle on feed estimates to 6 additional States. This would include the following States: Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, and Alabama: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American National Cattlemen's Association lend its full support to actuating plans for this improved and extended livestock reporting.

WESTERN MARKET OUTLOOK

Whereas the Western Livestock Marketing Research Committee has recently conducted a successful experiment in market and outlook reporting through publication of a weekly and monthly "Western Livestock Round-Up"; and

Whereas this publication, if continued, would be of great service to cattlemen and livestock men generally; and

Whereas it does not duplicate any publication now in the field: Be it

Resolved, That this association commends the effort to report better market and outlook information in the western States and urges continuance of weekly and monthly publications, modeled on the experimental "Western Livestock Round-Up"; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; O. V. Wells, Director, Agriculture Marketing Service, Washington, D. C., and Mr. Harold Abel, of the Western Livestock Marketing Research Committee, Denver, Colo.

BEEF QUOTATIONS

Whereas wholesale dressed beef quotations are of considerable importance to those engaged in the livestock industry; and

Whereas carcass beef quotations are restricted to a limited number of markets at the present time; and

Whereas expansion of such reporting facilities would be advantageous to producers in other areas by keeping them better informed on marketing trends: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American National Cattlemen's Association makes recommendations that wholesale carcass beef quotations be expanded to include reports on the Denver and Omaha markets, and further suggest that should such a service be delayed due to the inability of obtaining funds that the Research Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service of the USDA be approached to see if such a project might be incorporated into their branch of an experimental basis.

LIVESTOCK QUESTIONNAIRES

Whereas the administration and field personnel of the United States Department of Agriculture have demonstrated unusual cooperation and dedication in securing, assimilating and disseminating livestock market information and other facts on livestock numbers, information invaluable to proper conduct of an industry in a free economy; and

Whereas the cooperation of producers and feeders is necessary to make these reports fully effective: Therefore be it

Resolved, That all stockmen be urged to give serious attention and prompt reply to all livestock questionnaires issued by the Department.

1958 ADDITIONAL BRUCELLOSIS FUNDS

Whereas this association has been informed that not all funds made available by Congress for brucellosis eradication for fiscal year 1958 have been used; and

Whereas it has come to our attention that several States need and have requested additional funds which were denied; and

Whereas the expenditure this year is at the same level as fiscal year 1957 which has proved to be inadequate to meet the urgent need for the program for fiscal year 1958; and

Whereas a sound need for additional funds to carry program now under way exists: Be it

Resolved, That this association urge the Department of Agriculture to allocate from funds made available by Congress for brucellosis eradication such funds as may be needed to adequately support the program now under way.

BRUCELLOSIS FUNDS FOR 1959

Whereas brucellosis of cattle is a disease of great economic importance to the livestock industry of this country; and

Whereas great gains in eradicating the disease in cattle have been made under the accelerated program in the last 4 years; and

Whereas there is an essential need for continuing the national program; and

Whereas the great amount of work remaining to be done and with the confidence and support of States and farm and livestock organizations: Be it

Resolved, That this Association urge Congress to appropriate sufficient funds for brucellosis eradication for each of the fiscal years 1959 and 1960, which is the same amount as was available to the Department for such purpose the last 2 years.

ACTION ON PENDING LEGISLATION BILL S. 2192 (THYE)

Whereas because of the enormous trade and travel with foreign countries where dangerous animal disease, not found in this country, abounds; and

Whereas the problem of rabies in livestock is a matter of increasing concern of livestockmen because of danger of spread from wildlife: Be it

Resolved, That this association recommend enactment of bill S. 2192, which would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to (1) protect against importation of foreign animal diseases, (2) take immediate action for the eradication of dangerous diseases, such as foot-and-mouth disease in case of an extraordinary emergency, and (3) cooperate with the States in the control and eradication of communicable diseases such as rabies of livestock.

THE PRESIDENT'S AGRICULTURE MESSAGE—SUMMARIES OF RESOLUTIONS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, today President Eisenhower's agriculture message has been presented to Congress. It is fitting that the views of Minnesota farm organizations also be brought to the attention of the Congress.

In the January issue the Minnesota Farmer presented summarized versions of resolutions which were adopted by the Minnesota Grange, the Minnesota Farmer's Union, and the Minnesota Farm Bureau in their conventions last fall. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these summaries be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks and that they be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for consideration.

There being no objection, the summaries were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MINNESOTA FARM ORGANIZATIONS RESOLVE

THE MINNESOTA GRANGE

(By William B. Pearson, master)

The grange rejects both Government-managed pricing and completely free markets as acceptable solutions to overproduction and underpricing of farm products. It asks for self-help programs to be developed to meet farm needs commodity by commodity.

It suggests that if, for the protection or convenience of consumers, it appears desirable to have ample supplies of farm products at all times to avoid the risk of shortages, then consumers should share the cost for such protection and convenience. Agriculture has neither the moral nor the economic responsibility to protect consumers against shortages when such protection entails disproportionate risk or loss on the part of producers.

Farmers have been—and are—subsidizing consumers of America. If farmers had received parity since the Korean war, consumers would have paid many billions of dollars more for food and clothing. Instead of sharing in the overall price increase prevalent throughout the economy, farmers have actually been receiving less. If farm commodity prices had gone up at the same rate as other cost-of-living items since the Korean war, food and clothing would now be about 15 percent higher.

Primary emphasis should be placed on farmer-managed self-help programs and the Government should be asked to do for farmers only those things which they cannot do equally well for themselves.

Managed marketing of farm commodities, with the help of the Government, is essential to economic survival of agriculture in the years ahead. Managed marketing to enhance producer income is greatly to be preferred to that dubious freedom whose chief characteristics could well be economic poverty and progressive loss of human dignity.

Acreage allotments have proved largely ineffective in bringing production into balance with demand. Adoption of marketing controls is urged. Unless effective ways can be devised to limit the volume of farm produce going to market, the prospect of the future is that available supply will consistently exceed effective demand. In such a situation prices would almost certainly be depressed and a progressive reduction in net farm income could scarcely be avoided.

Acreage reserve program, in its present form, is of extremely questionable value and should be considerably modified if not completely overhauled.

It favors the general principle of cross compliance which would prevent a farmer who places one farm into the soil bank or under allotments and then plants another farm without regard to any crop restrictions.

It endorses a self-help dairy program providing a base and surplus plan whereby that portion of a producer's production, moving directly into consumption, would be supported at a minimum of 90 percent of parity. A tax on all milk sold from farms plus an assessment on the surplus portion would raise funds to make the program self-supporting. This program would be run by producers through a dairy stabilization board, with its members nominated by producers.

An act by the Minnesota Legislature which shall compel the use of milkhouses by all producers of whole milk, within 4 years from date of enactment of law; said act shall include the minimum requirements for a milkhouse.

THE MINNESOTA FARMER'S UNION

(E. H. Christianson, president)

Farmers cannot achieve parity of income in the normal free market, regardless of the supply and demand situation * * * because they, individually, do not have any effective bargaining power on the prices they receive for their products.

Federal farm price supports are a means by which the Government can intervene in the market on behalf of farmers to give them some of the bargaining power which they do not have in the free market.

There are two ways in which price support measures can do this: Through establishing a price floor under farm commodities; and by giving the farmers the legal mechanism by which they can avoid the marketing of price-depressed oversupplies.

We recommend that production or marketing controls, when authorized by vote of producers, should be placed in effect in response to a price condition rather than in response to a supply condition as at present. We believe that controls should be available on a standby basis and, for example, should go into effect wherever prices on a commodity threaten to drop below 90 percent of parity.

The Government should make the support loans or direct payments to farmers conditional upon their staying within marketing quotas or acreage allotments.

We recommend that all farm programs should be contained in one comprehensive package farm bill, with various sections tailored, as necessary, to fit the separate commodities.

Congress should establish price supports on the basic commodities wheat and corn and the feed grains at not less than 100 percent of parity. Variations in the support rates should be authorized to take into account the proper feed value relationship of corn and the other feed crops.

We recommend that the soil-bank acreage reserve should be discontinued after 1958 and that the emphasis of the soil bank be placed on a permanent conservation-reserve type of program.

Payments under the soil-bank conservation reserve should not exceed $5,000 in any one year to any one individual, regardless of the number of farms in which he may have an interest.

A national minimum corn acreage allotment of 51 million acres should be established for producers in the commercial corn area.

County allotments should be made on the basis of recent crop history. Within the county, allotments should be divided on the basis of tillable acres, with a reasonable minimum allotment assured for each producer. For this purpose we suggest that 60 percent of the county allotment be divided equally among all producers who wish to raise corn, the balance of 40 percent to be divided among producers on the basis of tillable acres.

Congress should direct the Secretary of Agriculture to take action to provide full parity returns to producers of all major perishable products.

The most effective means of supporting products, which are not readily storable for long periods of time, is through direct payments to farmers. Under this method, the producer is reimbursed for the difference between the market price and the support level.

We recommend that the programs be financed in part through a processing tax and import levies, such as is the case on sugar and partly the case on wool. We do not believe that the programs should be producer-financed. So-called self-help plans are a delusion. The net return to the farmer under such a program would be even less than under present support programs.

Because of the rapid development of new phases of agriculture, we recommend that Congress investigate and, if necessary, hold public hearings in various parts of the country on the development and dangers of contract farming and vertical integration.

THE MINNESOTA FARM BUREAU

(C. W. Myers, president)

We believe in a high income for farmers.

We believe that the future of farming depends on its being a free competitive enterprise, each farm producing that which it is best suited for, and receiving the price for its products in the marketplace, regulated by supply and demand and with as few regulations as necessary to meet the sanitary and quality requirements.

Price support programs that have a tendency to encourage an increase in production without developing a corresponding increase in market demand can be of little lasting benefit to agriculture.

Programs that require acreage reduction and provide price supports on certain crops, with no restriction on the use of the retired acreage, will not result in any reduced production.

We believe efforts spent on research to expand markets and uses of farm products will be much more effective than many of the programs now in effect.

We believe a soil-bank program properly developed and properly administered will be of great help.

An overall feed-crop allotment for a farm rather than separate allotments for various food crops would have more appeal to the average producer of feed crops and, by attracting more compliance, would be more effective in reducing total feed production.

We believe Public Law 480 has aided greatly in disposing of surplus agricultural products and should be extended.

We are in favor of commodity loans at a realistic level as an aid to orderly marketing, and we favor more use of on-the-farm storage.

We urge that a study of the use of tillable acres instead of or in conjunction with crop history as a basis for setting crop allotments be made.

We are opposed to compensatory payments.

We recommend that the president of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation appoint a committee of about 10 people to study, review, and make recommendations to our next year's resolution committee as to the best way for farmers to administer their own program with the ultimate goal being to get the Government out of the farm program.

We believe that the agencies supervised by the Farm Credit Administration will adequately meet the credit needs of farmers.

Farmers throughout the State and Nation have a common interest that transcends all commodity interests. It is a dependable, understanding source of credit. Credit should be extended with prudence in times of prosperity and in sympathetic understanding in times of stress.

We urge continued support of the Farm Credit Administration and its three branches, the Federal Land Bank, Production Credit Associations, and Bank for Cooperatives.

We further recommend that Farm Home Administration be used and highly recommended to young farmers whose limited borrowing collateral makes it hard for them to start farming without an agency of this kind.

All feed is bought and sold on a hundredweight basis while grains are bought and sold on a bushel basis, resulting in unnecessary paperwork in converting one to another, an inconvenience to all concerned. We favor shifting from a bushel to a hundredweight basis of measurement in the buying and selling of corn as is now used in sorghum as a trial the first year and, if the result is favorable, the rest of the grains follow the second year.

We are in favor of strengthening pure seed and feed laws. Regulation governing marketing grains could be stricter to keep export grains free of trash; therefore our grains would be better able to meet the competition of foreign grains.

We urge support and passage of a National Milk Sanitation Act which will set up Federal grades for milk that will allow all milk meeting Federal standards to move interstate.

RESOLUTION OF SUFFOLK COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION ENDORSING SENATE BILL 1165

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the Suffolk County Bar Association of New York, which resolution endorses Senate bill 1165, to provide additional pay and promotion for members of the legal profession serving with the armed services.

The resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE SUFFOLK COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States Senate bill 1165, which provides for additional pay and promotion for members of the legal profession serving with the armed services in a legal capacity, bringing the pay and promotion status of military lawyers to a level commensurate with the special professional pay and promotion schedule now available

to members of the medical and other learned professions serving with the military; and

Whereas it is the sense of this association that lawyers should receive such commensurate compensation and rank for their professional training and skill are certainly as valuable to the Armed Forces as those of the other learned professions; that the armed services are having great difficulty in procuring and retaining even a minimum of military lawyers, and that if they are unable to do so, it will be impossible to administer properly the present Uniform Code of Military Justice; that said code was made the basis of military justice largely through the efforts of civilian lawyers, and that we therefore have a responsibility to insure its successful operation; and that, finally, this bar has a peculiar interest in and knowledge of the needs and problems of the armed services: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this bar association endorses Senate bill 1165, and urges upon the Congress of the United States its passage, and the secretary be and he is directed to send copies of this resolution to the Members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate from this State, and to the American Bar Association.

RESOLUTION OF AMERICANISM COMMITTEE, THE AMERICAN LEGION, NASSAU COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Americanism committee, the American Legion, of Nassau County, N. Y., renewing its appreciation to the Un-American Activities Committee and its individual members, and commending the committee for its devotion to the duty it has undertaken.

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

RESOLUTION OF AMERICANISM COMMITTEE, THE AMERICAN LEGION OF NASSAU COUNTY

Whereas the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress since its inception has rendered incalculable patriotic service in exposing and recommending legislation against Nazi, Fascist, and Communist activities in the United States; and

Whereas this dedicated committee, and its individual members, have long been subjected to incessant scandalous and scurrilous attacks from sources closely affiliated or connected with groups opposed to our form of government; and

Whereas this said committee continues to serve diligently protecting our country from internal and foreign enemies and their dangerous ideologies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion of Nassau County is desirous of renewing its appreciation to the Un-American Activities Committee and its individual members and commends its devotion to the duty it has undertaken; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Congressmen and that the resolution be forwarded to the executive committee of the Department of New York, the American Legion, and if the same be favorably received, that the resolution be forwarded to the national executive committee, the American Legion, for its consideration and further action.

RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MANDAN, N. DAK.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of adverse publicity concerning many public works projects, particularly those which have been such a big help in our Western States and have contributed so immensely to the overall wealth and opportunity in our Nation. The Chamber of Commerce in Mandan, N. Dak., a very fine organization, has taken exception to an article, entitled "The Case Against Reclamation" which appeared in a recent issue of the Nation's Business.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Mandan Chamber of Commerce be printed in the RECORD. I believe it will be of great interest to Members of Congress.

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

Whereas a recent issue of the Nation's Business carried an article, entitled "The Case Against Reclamation," which can be detrimental to the construction of future reclamation projects in 17 Western States; and

Whereas we in North Dakota are dependent on the future development of the Garrison Diversion project to maintain and stabilize our production; and

Whereas we know that reclamation projects in the 17 western reclamation States will repay to the Government the full costs of reclamation projects already in operation; and

Whereas we in North Dakota have every reason to believe that our people will repay to the Government the total cost of the project in the same manner that other projects are repaid: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Chamber of Commerce of Mandan, N. Dak., That the Nation's Business examine the repayment record of the existing reclamation projects and publish an article entitled "The Case for Reclamation"; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to our Congressional delegation and to Mr. Richard W. Smith, manager, Natural Resources Department, United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

SEVENTH-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I submit a resolution on behalf of myself, the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and ask for its immediate consideration.

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

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 220), as follows:

Whereas Thursday, January 16, 1958, will mark the 75th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Service Act which signaled an end to the "spoils system" and marked the beginning of the competitive civil service that today embraces a career work force of more than 2 million employees; and

Whereas a competent career service is a foundation of good government, an informed citizenry, the lifeblood of our democracy; and

Whereas the Government's ability to attract and retain well-qualified people for the Federal work force depends upon an informed public opinion—upon public knowledge and understanding of the career civil service and its place in our democracy; and

Whereas it is advisable to focus public attention on the Federal service and on the achievements of career civil servants in behalf of the people they serve; and

Whereas the position of world leadership assumed by the United States underscores the need for public understanding of the responsibilities of the Government and of the career service through which vital programs authorized by the Congress are carried out: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate reaffirms its belief in the merit system principle for Government employment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on proceeding to the consideration of the resolution. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, do I understand the resolution is being submitted by the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator from Kansas agree to a slight change of one word? During the reading of it I heard the words "the lifeblood of our democracy." I suggest that the word "democracy" should be changed to "republic," because we are not a democracy.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Kansas wishes to state that the resolution was presented on behalf of the majority leader, the minority leader, and the chairman of the Civil Service and Post Office Committee. I sincerely hope the resolution will be approved as read. I have no objection to the suggestion made.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator from South Carolina object to changing the word "democracy" to "republic"?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I see no reason——

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe the resolution is needed, but I am getting tired of hearing our Republic called a democracy. I should like to hear it called what our basic Constitution calls it. Will the Senator agree to the change I have suggested?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it would be nice if the language read "democratic republic."

Mr. GOLDWATER. All I am asking is whether the Senator will agree to changing the word to that contained in the Constitution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have no objection if the Senator from Kansas has none.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not see why the Senator from Arizona should take umbrage at the fact that the United States is called a democracy, and not a republic. I think the suggestion offered by the Senator from South Carolina is appropriate, that the reference should be to a democratic republic,

and I am willing that the word "democratic" be spelled with a small "d" rather than a capital "d."

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona has no objection to the term used by the Senator from Illinois, because the Senator believes we are a democratic republic; but I think we ought to use the language of the Constitution, and the words "democratic" or "democracy" appear nowhere in that cherished document. I should like to see the Members of this body use the constitutional language as often as we can. I think the word used should be "republic" rather than the word "democracy," which has been in use only since the time of Woodrow Wilson in 1917.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from Arizona has modified his amendment so that the resolution would read "a democratic republic," with "democratic" spelled with a small "d"?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona would be very happy to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois. I have no objection to the word "democratic" appearing, so long as the words of the Constitution are in the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think if the resolution were worded "democratic republic" it would carry out exactly what the United States is, for we are not a democratic nation, and we all realize that. Not everything is left entirely to the people. The republic comes into consideration also. That being so, I think the two words would signify and make known to the people exactly what this Nation is at the present time under our present Constitution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as modified.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; without amendment:

S. Res. 208. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate certain specific matters under its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1176); and

S. Res. 210. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ a temporary additional clerical assistant (Rept. No. 1177) to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

S. Res. 212. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the common defense (Rept. No. 1174).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration (with an amendment):

S. Res. 209. Resolution to investigate the problems of American Small and Independent Business (Rept. No. 1173); and

S. Res. 213. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to make certain expenditures and employ additional assistants and consultants (Rept. No. 1175).

ELEANOR J. KEEFER

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 226), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eleanor J. Keefer, widow of John A. Keefer, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 7 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HESTER SCOTT WAILES AND MARY SCOTT GLASS

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 227), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Hester Scott Wailes and Mary Scott Glass, sisters of Louise S. Joubert, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to 5¾ months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LUSANNAH CLARK RICHARDS

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 228), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Lusannah Clark Richards, mother of Harriet C. Richards, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 229), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Minerals, materials, and fuels;

(2) Irrigation, reclamation, and power development;

(3) Public lands;

(4) Indians;

(5) Territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select 1 person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $180,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 230), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res.

231), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of the antitrust and antimonopoly laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) Clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) Improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws;

(3) Supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $365,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

FURTHER STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT AND THE WAR CLAIMS ACT

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 232), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and also the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider bills affecting said acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAW AND MATTERS RELATING TO ESPIONAGE

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 233), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $209,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4 Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATON

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 235), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, informa-

tion, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 236), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $135,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 237), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMPROVEMENT OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 238), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the improvement and strengthening of the Federal Criminal Code, including ways and means of improving Federal law enforcement and administration of justice in United States courts through changes in and additions to existing laws and procedures.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $45,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS ARISING BY ESCAPE OF CERTAIN REFUGEES

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 239), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems in certain Western European nations, and in certain Near Eastern, Middle Eastern, and Far Eastern countries, created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $35,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBERS AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 240), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, to employ two additional professional staff members and two additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (a), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS — INCREASED EXPENDITURES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original

resolution (S. Res. 241), and submitted a report (No. 1179) thereon, which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations (authorized by S. Res. 93 of the 84th Cong., 1st sess., agreed to July 25, 1955, and extended from time to time) is hereby authorized, under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to continue the functions authorized by Senate Resolution 93, agreed to July 25, 1955, only through July 31, 1958, at which time its records, duties, and functions shall be assumed by the Committee on Foreign Relations which shall give special attention to the subject of disarmament in such manner as the committee may determine.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the Committee on Foreign Relations, from February 1, 1958, through July 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the Committee on Foreign Relations under this resolution, which shall not exceed $34,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1172)

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Joint Committee on Defense Production, submitted the annual report on the activities of that joint committee, together with materials on national defense production, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTY PROGRAM"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT NO. 1178)

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted a report entitled "Informational Media Guaranty Program," which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Robert M. McKinney, of New Mexico, to be representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

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

Edson O. Sessions, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Finance:

Julian B. Baird, of Minnesota, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs;

Tom B. Coughran, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury;

A. Gilmore Flues, of Ohio, to be an Assistant of the Treasury; and

Sumner G. Whittier, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. CHURCH):

S. 2998. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 2999. A bill to amend the act of August 5, 1953, creating the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 3000. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide for an accelerated atomic-power program, to accelerate the development of controlled thermonuclear processes, to accelerate the development of nuclear propulsion for rockets, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 3001. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, for the purpose of prohibiting compulsory unionism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3002. A bill to extend the special milk program for an additional 2 year period; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3003. A bill for the relief of Clara V. Samec; and

S. 3004. A bill for the relief of Joanna Strutynska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3005. A bill to provide benefits established by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to persons who graduated from Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps training in 1954 and served on active duty for training in the Air National Guard before February 1, 1955; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the first and last above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 3006. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat of imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3007. A bill for the relief of Katina Leckas and Argery Leckas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3008. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit, under certain conditions, the extension of coverage by the insurance system established by such title to policemen and firemen of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 3009. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to accord Korean war veterans equal naturalization privileges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 3010. A bill for the relief of Jose Mararac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3011. A bill to provide for an effective system of personnel administration for the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 3012. A bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees of navy yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 3013. A bill to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3014. A bill for the relief of St. John's McNamara Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3015. A bill to permit the payment of dependency allotments authorized by the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to certain persons performing active duty for training with the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3016. A bill to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates; and

S. 3017. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities at the request of public or private parties at the expense of the requesting party and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 3018. A bill for the relief of Kurt Weydemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3019. A bill for the relief of Herta Wilmersdoerfer;

S. 3020. A bill for the relief of Ramon Escarra y Vasquez;

S. 3021. A bill for the relief of Stanislawa Wojczul;

S. 3022. A bill for the relief of Pilar Diez Castello; and

S. 3023. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3024. A bill for the relief of Federico Luss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3025. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 632), relating to the rehabilitation and preservation of historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; and

S. 3026. A bill to repeal the Federal Explosives Act (55 Stat. 863); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3027. A bill for the relief of the late Richard A. Steinacker; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3028. A bill for the relief of Laszlo Cseri;

S. 3029. A bill for the relief of Peter E. Dietrich; and

S. 3030. A bill for the relief of Mineard Stolz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3031. A bill for the relief of Joseph Daniel Maeda Betterley (Toshikazu Maeda); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 3032. A bill to extend the Federal Tort Claims Act to members of the National Guard when engaged in training or duty under Federal law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3033. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Highway Act to permit the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse the States for the United States pro rata share of the value of materials stockpiled in the vicinity of Federal-aid highway projects for use in the construction or reconstruction work involved in such projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3034. A bill to authorize the training of employees of the United States Department of the Interior at public or private facilities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 3035. A bill to amend section 1231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to property used in the trade or business and involuntary conversions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 3036. A bill to amend that part of the act of June 9, 1896 (20 Stat. 313), relating to the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices, so as to permit them to be established within 10 miles of the boundary of the adjoining city;

S. 3037. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raymond A. Vonderlehr; and

S. 3038. A bill to make the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act applicable to certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. THYE):

S. 3039. A bill amending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3040. A bill to permit certain alien spouses of members of the Armed Forces to reenter the United States without payment of visa fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 3041. A bill to provide for assisting the States in the improvement and control of certain areas adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

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

S. 3042. A bill for the relief of Miss Allegra Azouz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 3043. A bill to provide certain benefits for Government employees employed as firefighters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3044. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide certain safeguards against the misuse of the funds of labor organizations;

S. 3045. A bill to strengthen democratic processes and procedures in elections of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes;

S. 3046. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to deny the benefits of such act to labor organizations having officers who have been convicted of certain offenses; and

S. 3047. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make it an unfair-labor practice to engage in picketing unless authorized by a certain percentage of the employees of the employer whose premises are being picketed; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3048. A bill to deny income-tax exemption to labor organizations which participate in, or intervene in, political campaigns on behalf of candidates for public office; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. BRICKER):

S. 3049. A bill to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE):

S. 3050. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER (by request):

S. 3051. A bill to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3052. A bill to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

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

S. 3053. A bill for the relief of Nettie L. Richard, Florence L. Morris, Tessie L. Marx, and Helen L. Levi; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 3054. A bill for the relief of Kraemer Mills, Inc.; and

S. 3055. A bill for the relief of Ronald H. Denison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3056. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for Mr. NEELY) (by request):

S. 3057. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955;

S. 3058. A bill to amend the act regulating the bringing of actions for damages against the District of Columbia, approved February 28, 1933; and

S. 3059. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3060. A bill for the relief of Romulo A. Manriquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution requiring that the design for the United States Air Force Academy chapel be approved by the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services before appropriated funds are expended for the construction of such chapel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income to a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the power of the States and their political subdivisions to tax the salaries and wages of persons who are not domiciliaries or residents thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ISRAEL'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution. A similar concurrent resolution will be submitted in the other body today, commending and congratulating the new State of Israel on its 10th anniversary of independence.

On its 10th anniversary Israel has reached a historic point in its development as a free, democratic nation. From infancy and danger, it has grown to strong, stalwart independence—a showcase of the free world in the vital Near

East area. Friendship and close ties between Israel and the United States are built upon a parallel history of pioneer development in which both peoples showed much heroism together with a common dedication to the principles of democracy, the dignity of the individual and lasting peace with honor.

The Congress since 1922 has supported the creation of the Jewish national home and now the United States and Israel are both working for social and economic development in the Middle East and the promotion of peace. It is therefore most fitting that Congress take the initiative in recognizing the friendly and long-standing ties of our country with Israel by adopting the commemorative resolution I am today introducing.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56), submitted by Mr. JAVITS, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas it is the high tradition of the United States to encourage the establishment and maintenance of independent, self-governing, free nations in the world; and

Whereas the State of Israel was created as an independent nation by declaration of the United Nations; and

Whereas the United States was the first of the family of nations to extend diplomatic recognition to the State of Israel; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States since 1922 has supported the creation of a Jewish homeland, now the State of Israel; and

Whereas, the United States and Israel are working together for economic development and the promotion of peace in a vital and strategic area of the free world; and

Whereas the State of Israel will mark the 10th anniversary of its independence on April 24, 1958: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States extend its most cordial greetings to the people of Israel and their Government on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of their national independence in recognition of the democratic ideals held in common by the United States and Israel and in reaffirmation of the friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Israel; and be it further

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to appoint a United States delegation at the appropriate time to represent the United States at ceremonies marking the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ON WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution pertaining to the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems as authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 172, agreed to August 29, 1957, is hereby authorized to make expenditures from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, which shall not exceed $80,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

CONTINUATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT FIELD—INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 221), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the select committee, authorized and directed to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of the interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities, established by Senate Resolution 74, 85th Congress, 1st session, agreed to January 30, 1957, as amended by Senate Resolution 88 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, agreed to February 7, 1957, is hereby continued. Any vacancy in the select committee so continued shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments were made under section 2 of Senate Resolution 74, 85th Congress, 1st session, as amended.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the select committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized, as it may deem necessary and appropriate to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and further with the consent of other committees or subcommittees, to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the select committee.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of Senate Resolution, 85th Congress, as amended, the select committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959, on which date the select committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of Senate Resolution 74, 85th Congress, as amended, expenses of the select committee, under this resolution, shall not exceed $500,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the committee.

INCREASED EXPENDITURES BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 222), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the amount authorized in Senate Resolution 74, agreed to January 30, 1957, and Senate Resolution 186, agreed to August 26, 1957, 85th Congress (authorizing and directing the committee to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers to the detriment of the interests of the public, employers or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities), is hereby increased by the additional amount of $20,000.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES AND PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN ACTS BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 223), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $200,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN MATTERS UNDER ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 224), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Interstate commerce generally;
(2) Foreign commerce generally;
(3) Maritime matters;

(4) Interoceanic canals;
(5) Transportation policy;
(6) Domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
(7) Communications;
(8) Federal power matters;
(9) Civil aeronautics; and
(10) Fisheries and wildlife.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed , shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF CRITICAL AND STRATEGIC RAW MATERIALS AND RESOURCES OF EASTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 225), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That S. Res. 78, 85th Congress, agreed to May 20, 1957 (authorizing and directing a study of critical and strategic raw materials and resources of the Eastern Hemisphere), is amended by striking out "January 31, 1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1959".

(See additional resolutions printed in full which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the special milk program for an additional 2 years.

Mr. President, this is the legislation in which milk is provided for children in our schools and nonprofit institutions and nonprofit summer camps. It expires at the end of this fiscal year, unless extended. I should like to see this valuable program made permanent, but feel the very minimum we should do is to continue it another 2 years. I understand the administration will concur in the 2-year extension.

Mr President, this is a program created by Congress itself—not by the Department of Agriculture. In 1954, after Secretary Benson pulled the rug out from under dairy farmers by drastically lowering support levels, we authorized use of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to increase milk consumption by children in schools. In 1956, we extended the school milk program and, under legislation I introduced, broadened the program to provide as well for children in nonprofit child-care institutions and summer camps. The language now authorizes the program for children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under—not restricting it to public schools—and also covers children in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children.

It has meant a great deal to better nutrition for youngsters, and a great deal for the dairy industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement issued by the Department of Agriculture explaining how the special milk program is used for summer camps and similar child-care institutions, with which some of our colleagues may not be as familiar as they are with the school program.

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

THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR SUMMER CAMPS AND SIMILAR CHILD-CARE INSTITUTIONS

THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

The United States Department of Agriculture is interested in making more milk available to more children.

As a part of this effort, in 1954 the Congress authorized the Department to use funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to increase milk consumption by children in schools. In July 1956, the Congress expanded the program to include nonprofit child-care institutions and nonprofit summer camps for children.

This pamphlet tells how the program operates in summer camps and child-care institutions. If you sponsor a nonprofit camp or child-care institution, or if you are interested in one, it will be well worth your while to read this pamphlet carefully. If you can increase the quantity of fluid milk served to children in your institution or camp, you can receive assistance to help you finance the cost of the extra milk served.

SUMMER CAMPS AND INSTITUTIONS

A wide variety of organizations are now included in the special milk program—nonprofit institutions that serve preschool children or children that are not able to attend regular schools. And, of course, it includes institutions, such as neighborhood houses or summer camps, that serve children of school age when schools are not in session.

Summer camps include almost all types of organized activity conducted for children during the summertime. They include nonprofit camps run by boys' and girls' clubs, civic or church groups, and by organizations such as the Boy and Girl Scouts, 4-H Clubs, Campfire Girls, etc. They include the fresh-air camps some organizations sponsor to give underprivileged city youngsters a vacation in the country. They also include organized recreational programs conducted at community playgrounds and parks—whether they are sponsored by the local government, some civic organization, or some other nonprofit sponsor.

WHAT IT MEANS TO YOUR ORGANIZATION

If your organization is eligible to take part in the program, you can receive assistance to help finance the cost of additional milk served to children.

Note carefully that the purpose of the program is to increase milk consumption by children.

Therefore, before you apply for participation, review the kind of milk service you have been providing children and what steps you can take to serve more fluid milk to them.

HERE'S HOW THE PROGRAM WORKS FOR YOU

Because of the wide variety of types of summer camps and institutions operated, there is a correspondingly wide variety of ways in which they can serve milk to children. Therefore, the opportunities to increase milk consumption vary widely. Some camps and institutions sell milk to the children at a specific price per half pint. Others—and this is the more general practice in camps and institutions—charge the children a certain amount by the day, or week, or month, and provide the milk, meals, and all other services as part of that one charge.

How your camp operates determines how the program can help you.

1. If you sell milk as a separately priced item:

The most direct way to increase milk consumption by children—the aim of the special milk program—is to lower the price of milk to them. Therefore, the Department has established a system of reimbursement payments to enable camps and institutions to sell milk to children at a reduced price. They may receive up to 3 cents reimbursement for each half pint of milk they serve to children.

This is the maximum rate. If you sell milk as a separately priced item, the exact amount of reimbursement paid to you depends on the price you pay for the milk, the price at which you sell it to the children, and the cost of handling the milk in your camp or institution. Generally, that handling cost should be 1 cent or less per half pint.

Suppose, for example, milk costs you 6½ cents a half pint. All the costs that are involved in your handling it add up to one-half cent a half pint. If you plan to sell milk to children at 4 cents a half pint, you would be eligible for the maximum reimbursement rate of 3 cents for each half pint sold to children.

At the end of the month, you will file a claim for reimbursement which will report the number of half pints you have sold to children at the reduced price, and the amount of reimbursement that is due you.

2. If milk is provided as part of a complete service:

Many summer camps and institutions do not charge children separately for each half pint they drink. Instead, they find it more practical to combine all services provided, and to charge a set rate per day, or per week, or per month.

If that's your form of operation, here's how the program will work for you.

When you apply for participation, you must show the specific method or plan you will inaugurate to provide your children with more fluid milk. Then a reimbursement rate will be assigned, within the 3-cent maximum, that will reimburse you for the approximate cost of the extra milk served—that is, the milk you serve in addition to what you previously or normally served. However, if you have not previously served any fluid milk to children, you cannot receive more than 3 cents for each half pint served.

Suppose, for example, that you have been serving 2 half pints of milk to each child each day. When you apply for participation, you state that you plan to serve another half pint to each child, making a total of 3 half pints each day. If the milk costs you 6 cents a half pint, it will cost you an additional 6 cents for each child in attendance to serve that extra half pint each day. The reimbursement rate assigned to you will be designed to cover this additional cost.

At the end of each month, you will file your monthly claim for reimbursement. That claim will show how much milk you actually served to children—and how that total compares with what you showed in your application that you planned to serve. If you did not substantially serve as much extra milk as you had planned, your rate of reimbursement will be reduced. You should, however, have little difficulty achieving the increase you plan, if your original planning is done with care.

HOW YOU CAN USE MORE MILK IN YOUR CAMP OR INSTITUTION

The special milk program thus makes it possible to do what you have always wanted to do—to serve more fluid milk to children.

This program is completely flexible and can be adapted to a variety of local uses. It is up to you to decide when and how the extra milk is to be offered to the children. Here are a few suggestions:

You can start serving milk to children, if you have not been doing so. City playgrounds and recreational programs, especially, have an opportunity to increase the use of milk by children in this way.

You can serve fluid whole milk to children at an additional meal—a third meal, for example, if you have been serving it only at two.

You can serve an afternoon or evening pickup snack, with milk.

You can serve extra fluid whole milk at meals—many children can drink more than the usual half pint of milk.

You can (even if you operate on a total-cost system) offer the children opportunity to buy milk at a reduced price, whenever they choose.

You can use fluid whole milk, in place of other beverages you have been offering to children.

HOW TO APPLY TO TAKE PART IN THE PROGRAM

Nationally, the special milk program is administered by the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. In most of the States, the program is administered in summer camps and other child-care institutions by the State's educational agency.

Interested sponsors in the following States should make application directly to their State educational agency, at their State capital: California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wyoming, Alaska.

In a few States, the program is handled for summer camps and child-care institutions by some other State agency. Interested sponsors in the following States should apply to the agency listed:

New York: State Division of Standards and Purchase, Albany, N. Y.

Ohio: State Department of Public Welfare, Columbus, Ohio.

Utah: State of Utah Department of Public Welfare, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Delaware: Delaware State Hospital, Farnhurst, Del.

Tennessee: State Department of Agriculture, Nashville, Tenn.

In other States, the program is handled for summer camps and child-care institutions directly by the United States Department of Agriculture. Interested sponsors in the following States should apply to the Department office listed:

Northeast (Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, West Virginia): Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 139 Centre Street, New York 13, N. Y.

Southeast (Alabama, Florida, South Carolina, Virginia): Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 50 Seventh Street NE., Atlanta 23, Ga.

Midwest (Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin): Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 431 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 5, Ill.

Southwest (Arkansas): Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 500 South Ervay Street, Dallas 1, Tex.

Western (Arizona, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, Oregon, Hawaii): Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 630 Sansome Street, San Francisco, Calif.

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

The bill (S. 3002) to extend the special milk program for an additional 2-year period, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXTENSION OF BENEFITS OF VETERANS' ASSISTANCE ACT TO CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide a remedy for an injustice to a group of young Reserve officers who served on active duty prior to February 1, 1955, but who are precluded by the wording of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 from receiving the same GI bill benefits earned by other young men and women serving in the armed services prior to that date.

About 1,500 young men, graduates of the Air Force ROTC class of 1954, are prevented by a technical error on the part of the Air Force from receiving their just benefits under the GI bill. Because these young men must be given eligibility soon if they are to receive any GI benefits at all, I urge my colleagues to act favorably on this legislation during the present session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from 1st Lt. John T. Mayo, which sets forth the case very well.

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

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 28, 1957.*

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am writing to you in regards to a problem concerning veterans. Because of your interest in fair play I hope that you can help.

The men of the 1954 AF ROTC class signed a contract with the Air Force in the beginning of their junior year. This contract stated that in turn for satisfactory completion of the ROTC program, they would be given Reserve commissions in the Air Force. However, in the middle of the senior year the Air Force discovered that there were too many potential officers and decided that only those who elected to enter flight training would be given the commission. The others were "allowed" to spend 2 years on active duty as an airman third class, one step above a basic airman. I applied for flight training but was found physically ineligible. Before graduation a change was made in which we could go on active duty with the National Guard as an alternative. If we went on duty with the National Guard, we were not eligible for the GI bill. Thus I find myself in the position where I was on duty in time for the veterans' benefits (Nov. 15, 1954) but unable to receive the benefits because the Air Force broke their contract. The ones who elected the airman third class were awarded their commissions while on active duty, but the National Guard officers weren't given the GI bill. Not all of the National Guard officers were in service in time to get the bill and this may explain why few people are aware of the injustice.

General Kelly stated that the Air Force overprogramed and were forced to make that change. Why should a group of people who gave 2 years of service be hurt because of an Air Force error? Certainly a large company could not operate like that. This is one of the reasons that qualified people are not staying in the service. One has to have faith in an organization to work there.

I sincerely hope that you will be able to help in this problem as I am sure you can see the injustice in it. The serviceman looks toward the Congress for help as his voice is too small to be heard against the mass of the Air Force. I hope you will be able to do something before the opening of the fall semester at college in order that those eligible, myself included, shall be able to receive their benefits. Thanking you for your trouble, I am,

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. MAYO.

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

The bill (S. 3005) to provide benefits established by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to persons who graduated from Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps training in 1954 and served on active duty for training in the Air National Guard before February 1, 1955, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO THE EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN GAINS FROM GROSS INCOME

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat of imminence of condemnation.

Identical bills are being introduced today in the House of Representatives by Representatives ALBERT, EDMONDSON, JARMAN, MORRIS, and STEED. The proposed action would be a long-delayed correction of a gross injustice by the United States Government against certain private property owners.

Mr. President, the need for this legislation has been recently brought home to us by conversations with numerous people in Oklahoma who are facing the possibility of condemnation of farmlands which they have owned, in many cases, since statehood or before. Except for its condemnation for a public pur-

pose, this land would not be for sale at any price, but would remain in these families for generations to come. Much of this land was homesteaded, and the gain for tax purposes will be almost the total value. They will be paid its present value by the Government, but under present law, this fair compensation will then be reduced by a 25-percent tax on the gain—so that the Government will pay them with one hand and take away with the other.

While under present law, a displaced owner can avoid tax on the capital gain by reinvesting in another farm, other farms are difficult, if not impossible, to buy without leaving the area where these people have spent their whole lives. Also, many of these people are getting along in years, and should be permitted to retire, rather than starting over, on the proceeds of the forced sale of their homesteads.

Simple justice requires that the present inequities be corrected by excluding the compensation which they receive from income.

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

The bill (S. 3006) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat of imminence of condemnation, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Minnesota Police and Peace Officers Association and the Fire Fighters Association of Minneapolis have contacted me with a proposal to amend the Social Security Act. I have had this proposal drafted and offer for introduction a bill which would have the effect of setting Minnesota apart insofar as police and firemen retirement systems are concerned and would enable members of these associations to adopt social security coverage by a two-thirds vote of the respective funds requesting such a change.

This proposal has had the unanimous endorsement of the Minnesota Police Pension Council and several firemen's retirement organizations in Minnesota. They have been assured of bipartisan support of the Minnesota Congressional delegation and it pleases me that my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], joins with me in offering this proposal at this time for proper reference.

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

The bill (S. 3008) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit, under certain conditions, the extension of coverage by the insurance system established by such title to policemen and firemen of the State of Minnesota, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED CITIZENSHIP LEGISLATION FOR VETERANS OF KOREAN WAR

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, under section 329 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, any person who, while an alien or a noncitizen national of the United States has served honorably in an active-duty status in the Armed Forces of the United States during either World War I or World War II, and who, if separated from such service under honorable conditions, may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States.

This same privilege of naturalization is denied to veterans of the Korean war who served in our Armed Forces under honorable conditions. This I think is most unfair and discriminates against veterans of the Korean war. It is only simple justice that veterans of the Korean war receive the same naturalization privileges accorded veterans of World War I and World War II.

Mr. President, I, therefore, introduce proposed legislation to accord Korean war veterans the same naturalization privileges accorded our other war veterans. The only change I propose in the existing statute is to add the following phrase, "or during a period beginning June 25, 1950, and ending July 1, 1955."

I believe that this change will be noncontroversial and I hope that my bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration from the Senate Immigration Subcommittee and the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to grant Korean veterans who served honorably in the Armed Forces equal naturalization privileges. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks the text of the bill, together with a letter I recently received from Comdr. Robert K. Fong, of the American Legion, Cathay Post, No. 384, 1524 Powell Street, San Francisco, Calif., in support of this legislation.

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

The bill (S. 3009) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to accord Korean war veterans equal naturalization privileges, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 329 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended to read as follows: "Any person who, while an alien or a noncitizen national of the United States, has served honorably in an active-duty status in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States during either World War I or during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 21, 1946, or during a period beginning June 25, 1950, and ending July 1, 1955, and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized as provided in this section if (1) at the time of enlistment or induction such person shall have been in the United States, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, or Swains Island, whether or not he has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or (2) at any time subsequent to enlistment or induction such person shall have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. The executive department under which such person served shall determine whether persons have served honorably in an active-duty status, and whether separation from such service was under honorable conditions: *Provided, however,* That no person who is or has been separated from such service on account of alienage, or who was a conscientious objector who performed no military, air, or naval duty whatever, or refused to wear the uniform, shall be regarded as having served honorably or having been separated under honorable conditions for the purposes of this section. No period of service in the Armed Forces shall be made the basis of a petition for naturalization under this section if the applicant has previously been naturalized on the basis of the same period of service."

The letter presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

CATHAY POST NO. 384,
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, Calif., January 4, 1958.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Best wishes from Cathay Post for a happy new year.

Just a few lines to let you know that the enclosed resolution unanimously passed Cathay Post at its regular meeting on December 3, 1957, and was forwarded to the seventh district, which represents roughly half of the Legion posts in San Francisco. The resolution, in its identical form, also unanimously passed the seventh district, and is being forwarded to the department State convention for its approval in June 1958. If passed at that time, it will be forwarded to the national convention to be held at Chicago, Ill., in September of this year.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars National Commander Houdebush also approved the resolution when he was in San Francisco on December 6, 1957. He forwarded it to Omar Ketchum, VFW legislative director in Washington, D. C., for action.

We have many members who are vitally affected by the subject matter of this resolution. We would like to express our heartfelt thanks to you for your desire to assist us by bringing forth the legislation in question. We have given wide publicity to your proposed action and you have gained the undying friendship of the Chinese communities over the entire Nation.

If there is anything which we can do to assist you in your endeavors, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT K. FONG,
Commander.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND SECTION 329 (A) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT TO ACCORD KOREAN WAR VETERANS EQUAL NATURALIZATION PRIVILEGES

Whereas under section 329 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, any person who, while an alien or a noncitizen national of the United States, has served honorably in an active-duty status in the Armed Forces of the United States during either World War I or World War II, and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized; and

Whereas any person who has served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United

States during the Korean war is not accorded the same rights and privileges of naturalization as given to the veterans of World War I or World War II; and

Whereas simple justice requires that Korean war veterans be treated alike, for they fought and died in the same manner as the veterans of World War I or World War II, in the service of their country, in its hour of need; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration treats all veterans alike in passing on their service-incurred disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (insert your organization's name) exert its wholehearted efforts to enlist support of all for the purpose of amending section 329 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to read as follows:

"Any person who, while an alien or a noncitizen national of the United States, has served honorably in an active-duty status in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States during either World War I or during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946, or during a period beginning June 25, 1950, and ending July 1, 1955, and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized as provided in this section."

SYSTEM OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for an effective system of personnel administration for the executive branch of the Government, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator may proceed.

The bill (S. 3011) to provide for an effective system of personnel administration for the executive branch of the Government, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, 75 years ago today, President Chester A. Arthur signed "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States." This bill had been sponsored by Senator George Pendleton of Ohio. The purpose of the Pendleton Act was to bring integrity and prestige into a governmental service ridden with the chaos of a rampant spoils system that had culminated in the tragedy of the assassination of President Garfield by a disappointed jobseeker.

For three-quarters of a century, the Pendleton Act has been the foundation upon which we have built the great civil service of today. In 1883, 14,000 men and women were covered by civil service. Now, 2 million are covered. They include some of the most skilled and talented people, doing some of the most important and difficult tasks in the world. And, I might add, they are no more adequately appreciated by our people than are our teachers.

The efficiency of the Federal civil service has a direct bearing on the well-being of every American citizen, and on the successful operation of every business. And whether we are able to attract outstanding people into Government service, whether they are inspired to remain and do their best work, will have a great bearing on whether, in a world of danger, America survives.

And so, it is fitting today that while we pay our respects to the Pendleton Act and to the great civil service tradition on their 75th anniversary, we also look to the future and ask whether that act—which is still basically unchanged after 75 years—can be improved.

I think it can. I think it should. I believe that like quite a few other aspects of our Government, the Pendleton Act has become obsolete. I, therefore, introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will repeal that act and substitute for it a modern charter for our civil service which incorporates into law some of what has been learned about personnel administration in 75 years of governmental and business experience, since 1883.

We must remember that the Pendleton Act was, in its conception, an act intended to prevent certain things from happening. It was an act to prevent political favoritism. It was an act to eliminate the spoils system. Accordingly, it was, and is, couched in somewhat negative terms; and it has been administered, almost of necessity, largely in negative terms.

Since 1883, we have learned that personnel management is not merely the prevention of abuses, but the positive accomplishment of certain ends. Every competent executive has not only negative but positive personnel programs—positive programs of recruitment, assignment, training, promotion, and career development, in order to build an organization of high competence and of high morale.

This is one purpose of my bill—to right the balance between the negative and the positive in the basic directive laid down by the Congress for the management of the career service of the Federal Government.

The second purpose of my bill is to recast the structure of personnel management in the Government to make possible the greater emphasis upon positive ideas and positive leadership.

The President, under the Constitution, is responsible for the faithful execution of the laws. He is the chief executive. An integral part of any executive's job is the formulation and establishment of wise personnel policies and programs. To carry out this responsibility in the Federal Government—comprising 2¼ million public servants—the President obviously needs assistance of the highest caliber.

Yet, the agency set up by law as the principal personnel management agency of the Government—the Civil Service Commission—is designed not as an agent and assistant to the President, but as a policeman watching over the President and his subordinates.

A modern corporation has one vice president for personnel responsible to the president, not a three-man directorate independent of him.

The Civil Service Commission has seen the need for positive leadership as well as for policing, and has tried to fill it. But the Commission cannot be 2 agencies, with 2 points of view, at the same time. Meanwhile, of necessity, a unit in the White House dealing with personnel problems has developed, but without benefit of statutory recognition or charter.

The bill which I have introduced would recognize that two kinds of jobs exist by clearly separating these jobs and defining each. It places upon a Director of an Office of Personnel Management, responsible to the President, the duty of assisting the President in establishing personnel programs and providing personnel leadership for the entire career service. At the same time, my bill reaffirms the independence of the Civil Service Commission as a policing agency and directs it to set up a working appeals system that will assure that employees or applicants for employment, in jobs covered by the merit system, will have a hearing on grievances of any kind, including political or personal favoritism. Under this clearly defined responsibility, the Civil Service Commission will carry out more effectively the original basic purpose of the Pendleton Act to protect the merit principle against a reversion to the old spoils system.

The bill I have introduced is based upon a report last year by a special consultant, Mr. James R. Watson, to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I had the honor to serve last year as Chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of that committee and so had occasion to discuss the report with authorities in personnel management, both within and outside the Government. I found that the basic philosophy of the report met with widespread acceptance. The bill draws also upon the ideas of some of these authorities as well as of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee staff, although I do not contend that any of these gentlemen are necessarily in agreement with all of its provisions.

The executive committee of the National Civil Service League, of which Mr. Watson is the executive director, has given general endorsement to this bill. It is interesting to note that this is the same organization that worked with Senator Pendleton 75 years ago in the drafting of his bill. One of its officers, Dorman B. Eaton, became the first president of the United States Civil Service Commission.

We could have no more significant support today than that of this organization, which has been a constant partner to the Government throughout 75 years of civil-service development.

In short, the purpose of the bill is to place in the office of the president, at a top salary, a director of personnel management who shall have the authority to deal with all positive matters of personnel, administration, and procedure, which are the work of the executive vice president in charge of personnel in every well-regulated large corporation, and leaving to the Civil Service Commission the quasi-judicial functions which it now exercises.

WAGE RATES FOR EMPLOYEES OF NAVY YARDS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees of Navy yards. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared 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. 3012) relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees of Navy yards, introduced by Mr. PAYNE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. PAYNE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

The bill I am introducing today would amend the 1862 statute under which the Navy makes wage rate determinations for civilian employees in the naval shipyard so that there would be more flexibility in this determination.

The fact that a certain method of wage determination was equitable some 96 years ago is no indication that the same policy is either equitable or in the public interest today. The need to change the method of wage determination for civilian employees in our shipyards is a pressing one, for the present method is antiquated and downright unjust.

The situation at the Kittery-Portsmouth Navy Yard has brought this problem to my attention. This yard is situated at Kittery, Maine, about 60 miles from the Boston Navy Yard. The employees at this yard, although a relatively short distance away from their fellow workers in Boston, are paid considerably less. For example, under the latest pay rates a laborer at the Kittery yard is paid $1.59 while a laborer doing the same work at the Boston yard is paid $1.83. There is no need to cite further figures, for the percentage difference remains about the same for all blue-collar workers in these yards.

When asked to explain the reason for this differential, the Navy replies that it is required to conform its wages to those prevailing in local private industry. Yet there is no similar private industry in the Kittery area. The closest similar industry would be found in the Boston area. It is in this manner that the "immediate vicinity" criteria fails to operate as it was intended to operate. Is it just and is it in the public interest that men doing the same job less than 60 miles apart are paid at different wage rates?

I have no doubt that when Congress established the present method it was a most equitable system. But this was a policy created in the days of the horse and buggy and it does not apply in the days of rapid transit. The present method punishes men who live a few minutes travel time from fellow shipyard workers, but work in less fortunate yards. The classified services have standardized wage rates throughout government and most civilians employed by the Armed Services have the benefits of civil service, yet the shipyard workers seem to have been forgotten.

The bill which I am introducing today would give to the Secretary of the Navy the power to adjust wage rates is "consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates for persons employed on similar work in private establishments within such geographical area or areas as the Secretary deems appropriate." In eliminating the "immediately vicinity" clause of the 1862 statute we will be bringing it up to date. With the changes that have come about in our modes and convenience of transportation the consideration of "immediate vicinity" has become meaningless.

There is no good reason why the Navy's civilian wage scale should be shackled by restrictive statutory requirements. The elimination of the "immediate vicinity" criteria of the existing statute would give the Navy a more meaningful method of wage determination—one that would be truly in the interests of the workers, the economy, and the public as a whole.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 605 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO INTERCEPTION OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, for myself, and on behalf of Senators IVES, ERVIN, MUNDT, GOLDWATER, and CURTIS, I am introducing a bill amending section 605 of the Federal Communications Act to clarify the rights of State law-enforcement agencies to use wiretaps to uncover evidence of the commission of serious crimes. When it is referred to the Judiciary Committee I will press for its early approval.

The Supreme Court in its recent decision in the Benanti case ruled that wiretap evidence obtained by State officers under authority of State law was inadmissible in the Federal courts. The language of the decision has left a cloud on the right of the States to legally authorize law-enforcement agencies to obtain court warrants to intercept communications in cases where there are reasonable grounds to believe that these agencies would uncover evidence of serious criminal activity.

The Court did not rule on the constitutional questions. Its decision was based solely on an interpretation of the intention of Congress when it passed section 605 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, which declares:

No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person.

This Court decision has given me much concern over the effect it would have on law enforcement and prosecution of serious crimes.

It is my belief that the Congress never intended to cripple and hamper law-enforcement agencies in their efforts to stamp out crime and punish criminals.

As chairman of the Senate select committee investigating into improper activities in the field of labor and management, and as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am cognizant of the problems facing prosecutions and enforcement agencies in their conscientious efforts to eliminate crime and to punish the criminals, particularly the organized criminal syndicate rings engaged in widespread criminal rackets, such as labor racketeering, narcotics, bribery, and extortion rings.

The detection, investigation, and prosecution of crime, particularly organized crime, will be seriously handicapped and weakened. In many cases, prosecution and investigation of crimes would be completely thwarted and would collapse were wiretapping to be denied to the law-enforcement agencies.

When the select committee launched its investigation into the labor situation in the New York area, it did so, unaware of the extent racketeers had penetrated the teamsters union and certain other branches of organized labor in the Nation's largest city. The committee and I believe, the public was shocked at its revelations.

What was portrayed was a picture of ruthless gangsters led by Johnny Dio and Anthony "Ducks" Corallo joining in an alliance with Jimmy Hoffa to seize control of the transportation industry in the Nation's largest and richest city. The control of this strategic economic area by unscrupulous gangsters presented, and continues to present, a threat to the economic security of this country. For the past 23 years, since the enactment of section 605, there was no question of the right of State authorities to authorize wiretapping to obtain evidence of serious crimes. This conspiracy could not have been presented in such clarity without the use of intercepted telephonic messages which were made available to this committee through permission of the New York State Supreme Court and the offices of the New York County district attorney.

Congress has never intended to permit the criminal to use the means of modern communication with impunity by enjoining law enforcement agencies from intercepting his communications. To accept such interpretation would mean that Congress intended to give criminals free license and encouragement to use communications without fear or handicap and, as pointed out in an editorial in the Evening Star, January 5, 1958, grant these criminals a privileged sanctuary. It is an interpretation that I cannot accept.

In the field of criminal detection and prosecution, the law enforcement agencies are constantly waging a war against criminals who attack society. To do so effectively, it is necessary and essential to intercept their communications.

Many States, such as New York State, have enacted laws to enable their enforcement agencies to intercept communications under proper safeguards and to eliminate the dangers of promiscuous and improper use. In New York, for example, the enforcement agencies must apply to the court of highest original jurisdiction for a warrant to permit the interceptions. This warrant is only granted when the court is satisfied that reasonable grounds exist that evidence of crimes will be obtained as a result of the wiretap.

This bill, sponsored by myself and Senators IVES, ERVIN, MUNDT, GOLDWATER, and CURTIS, is to clarify the effect of section 605 and to assist State law enforcement agencies to give back to the States the right, under proper statutory provisions, to investigate and prosecute criminals.

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

The bill (S. 3013) to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State

law, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PAYMENT OF DEPENDENCY ALLOTMENTS TO ENLISTED RESERVISTS PERFORMING ACTIVE DUTY FOR TRAINING WITH THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit the payment of dependency allotments authorized by the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to certain persons performing active duty for training with the Armed Forces.

As Members of the Senate may know, certain members of the Reserve Forces, going into the active forces for training only, are not eligible for the customary dependency allowances for their families at home. These are the dependency allotments in which a portion is contributed by the Government and a portion by the serviceman.

It seems to me grossly unfair that enlisted reservists, who are put on active duty for training, are not allowed to arrange dependency allotments such as are granted to others on active duty in the various services. The Department of the Army in a letter dated November 22, 1957, has said to me that—

> The Department of Defense has recognized that it is inequitable to deny Class Q allotments to the dependents of Reserve and National Guard personnel who are called to active duty for training. Therefore, it has recommended a change in the law to permit such payments.

No change has been made in the law thus far and I am most anxious to see that such a change is made in the interest of fairness to all enlisted persons who go into the Armed Forces.

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

The bill (S. 2015) to permit the payment of dependency allotments authorized by the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to certain persons performing active duty for training with the Armed Forces, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

DEALERS' AIRCRAFT REGISTRATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, requesting this proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3016) to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is requested that the enclosed proposed bill to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates be introduced in the Senate.

This proposed legislation is in the nature of a perfecting amendment to title V of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. 521 et seq.), under which this Department provides for the registration of civil aircraft owned by United States citizens and the recordation of documents affecting title to such aircraft.

For over 8 years, this Department has been issuing special purpose dealers' aircraft registration certificates under general authority contained in title V. These certificates, similar to the more familiar automobile dealers' license plates, are issued to aircraft manufacturers, distributors and dealers for 1 year. A dealer's certificate may be used by the holder to operate aircraft for production flight tests, in ordinary trade channels, and for demonstration purposes. This makes it unnecessary for the holder to register each aircraft that he owns in the course of his business during the year. It greatly facilitates the dealers' operations and simplifies the Government's work by eliminating the need for a large number of applications for individual registration of the aircraft held in normal trade channels. The regulations presently governing the issuance and use of dealers' aircraft registration certificates are published as Part 502 of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

A special problem has arisen because of certain language contained in section 503 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. 523). Under that section, this Department is directed to establish and maintain a system for the recording of title documents affecting civil aircraft of the United States. The term "civil aircraft of the United States" is defined in section 1 (15) of the act to mean "aircraft registered under this act." Our authority to record title documents might thus be considered limited to those affecting registered aircraft.

Where a dealer holds an aircraft under a dealers' aircraft registration certificate, the aircraft itself may not be considered to be registered under the act even though the dealer has been issued a certificate or registration valid for special use of the aircraft under our regulations. Accordingly, although we now place in our records documents received from the public which affect title to aircraft held under dealers' certificates, but not otherwise registered, some doubt exists that the persons who file them are afforded the full benefit of the priority provided in this section for recorded documents. (See footnote 3, 14 C. F. R. 503.3 (a) (4).)

It is important that this priority for recorded liens against aircraft held by manufacturers, distributors, and dealers under dealers' certificates be assured. This industry, like many others involving the sale of relatively high cost articles, requires credit for its operations. Lending institutions are reluctant to advance money against this equipment unless the security of their liens is assured.

The amendment which we propose in the enclosed bill would give specific statutory authority for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates, and would provide that aircraft held under such certificates would be (to the extent provided in regulations of this Department) "deemed registered under" the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. This would make it possible to insure the validity of liens recorded against such aircraft.

We believe that this bill is highly desirable to facilitate the financing of the operations of aircraft manufacturers, distributors and dealers, and we recommend it to the Congress for early enactment.

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

Sincerely yours,

WALTER WILLIAMS,
Secretary of Commerce.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO UNDERTAKE CERTAIN ACTIVITIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities at the request of public or private parties at the expense of the requesting party and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by the Department of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3017) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities at the request of public or private parties at the expense of the requesting party and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The Department of Commerce is presently authorized under several statutes to undertake certain activities for private or public organizations or persons and to charge the expense thereof to those requesting the service. Depending upon the type of activity performed and the statute under which performed, this authority may result in the reimbursement of appropriations or the covering of amounts received into the Treasury. Increasing difficulty has been encountered in the administration of these activities under present laws. In those cases where the activity may appropriately be performed under a statute permitting appropriations to be reimbursed, the only problem encountered is in making absolutely certain that the same service cannot be performed by private activities. However, in those cases where the activity can only be performed under a statute which requires that funds received in payment be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury or where receipt of payment is not authorized, the activity can be performed only if it is of a priority which justifies its accomplishment at Government expense. No matter how important the activity may be to the requesting party, it will not be performed unless it is of sufficient value to the public at large to justify its performance in lieu of other authorized activities.

Where the project requested is of critical importance to those affected but cannot be justified for performance with appropriated

funds in view of its relatively low priority, interests desiring the project are often willing to underwrite its cost. Even in those cases, however, the Department cannot undertake the task when the payment could not be used to reimburse the appropriation bearing the expense of the project but would be deposited in miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury. An example of difficulty which arises because the Department is unable to perform such services because it may not receive and use payment therefor is the meteorological work of the Weather Bureau of this Department.

By law the Weather Bureau is directed to take such meteorological observations as may be necessary to establish and record the climatic conditions of the United States. There are many State and local requirements for greater detail and density of observations. When another Federal agency such as the Corps of Engineers, Soil Conservation Service, Bureau of Reclamation, Atomic Energy Commission, etc., requests the observation, it can transfer funds to the Weather Bureau which already has the facilities and know-how for the job. When a State, local or private agency has the requirement, it cannot secure performance directly by the Weather Bureau even though that organization wants to perform.

As a result of this situation, the executive subcommittee of the Pacific Southwest interagency committee at a meeting on January 10, 1956, drafted the following resolution for consideration at the PSIAC meeting on February 29, 1956:

"Whereas at the present time the Department of Commerce has no authority to accept funds from State and private agencies for Weather Bureau activities, and whereas there is a demand for those activities beyond the present ability of the Weather Bureau under funds available through its appropriations, and whereas State and private agencies are at times ready to advance funds to the Weather Bureau for specific purposes; therefore the PSIAC, representing 7 Federal agencies and 8 States, urges in the interests of further cooperation among Federal and State agencies in the field of water resource development, that the IACWR recommend through appropriate channels legislation authorizing the Weather Bureau to accept funds from State and private agencies for work outside the regularly scheduled program of the Weather Bureau."

There is attached a letter from the chairman of the Interagency Committee on Water Resources also urging the enactment of legislation to meet this problem.

Another example of the need for this legislation is found in the services of the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department. In the performance of these services, the ability to negotiate with business for mutual participation has become increasingly important.

Economic research concerning spread of costs from producer to consumer, the study of water supply, technical studies concerning substitutes for critically short materials, are examples of areas in which Business and Defense Services Administration staff can provide service to one or several fields of industry, and for which the industry benefited should and would pay.

The proposed legislation would authorize the Department to undertake such activities at the request and expense of others without sacrificing programs more important to the general welfare.

As a matter of administrative convenience, the legislation repeals certain authorities which would be duplicative of the proposed legislation.

The Department urges early enactment of this legislation which would occasion no increase in budgetary requirements.

REENTRANCE OF CERTAIN ALIENS WITHOUT PAYMENT OF VISA FEES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit certain alien spouses of members of the Armed Forces to reenter the United States without payment of visa fees when they have left the country in order to accompany those to whom they are married when engaged on official business of our country, under official orders.

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

The bill (S. 3040) to permit certain alien spouses of members of the Armed Forces to reenter the United States without payment of visa fees, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN IMPROVEMENT OF CERTAIN AREAS ADJACENT TO NATIONAL SYSTEM OF DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for assisting the States in the improvement and control of certain areas adjacent to the national system of interstate and defense highways and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be left open for additional sponsors for a period of 48 hours.

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

The bill (S. 3041) to provide for assisting the States in the improvement and control of certain areas adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to say, Mr. President, that we face the unpleasant prospect of coast-to-coast billboard alleys defacing our highways, unless this Congress takes action. The bill is intended to focus the attention of the Senate Committee on Public Works and of the Senate itself upon this problem early in the present session. It is a proposal to assist the States, rather than to coerce them, and would make travel on our interstate highway system a pleasure instead of a nightmare of neon bulbs and garish sounds.

CORRECTION OF IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR AND MANAGEMENT FIELD—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, out of the investigation made by the Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in the Labor and Management Field, of which I am a member, there have come several salutary actions up to now. There has been court action to punish some of the guilty labor officials. There has been disciplinary action by the unions themselves, in certain areas of activity. There has been disciplinary action by the Ethical Practices Committee of the AFL–CIO against certain erring unions.

I believe the time has come however, for legislative action to be taken by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. It is now time for Congress itself to act. One of the functions of Congress is to investigate such matters, in order to expose evildoing and to bring about punishment; but it is also a function of the Congress to legislate so as to prevent the recurrence of things of the kind which has been exposed by our committee.

We are confronted with the question of what can we do and what we should do to prevent improper activities of these types from happening again and again. It must be remembered that all the improper activities with which we are concerned in this investigation have occurred in the face of existing legislation, now on the statute books. Obviously, something new is needed to prevent them in the future.

So, Mr. President, after talking with a great many persons in this county, in over 20 States; after conferring with the witnesses who have been before our committee; after conferring with some of the most important labor leaders in the county, and with persons both in and out of the Senate, I have prepared a package of five bills which I think should be enacted into law during the current session and which I sincerely believe are vitally needed to correct the types of improper activities thus far called to our attention.

The first of these bills deals with the matter of protecting the integrity of union funds and safeguarding the money a union member has to pay into pension and welfare funds and the money he has to pay in order to remain a member of a union.

In that connection, I make what seems to me to be an appropriate analogy. I think we should treat a union leader with no more or no less suspicion than that with which we treat the president of a national bank. In my opinion we should make it no more difficult or no easier for a union leader to steal or misuse the money of a union than money can be stolen or misused from a national bank by its president.

So I have included in the provisions of the bill the corresponding provisions of the National Banking Act, in order to safeguard the money paid by the union members for their welfare and pension accounts. As an enforcement measure, I include in the bill a provision that unions which fail to follow the provisions of the act shall lose their tax-exempt status.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred, and printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3044) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide certain safeguards against the

misuse of the funds of labor organizations, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(14) The term 'welfare or benefit plan' means any plan, fund, or program administered or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a labor organization, either alone or jointly with one or more other labor organizations or with one or more employers or other persons, for the purpose of paying or providing, for the benefit of members of such labor organization who are employed by an employer in an industry affecting commerce, for medical or hospital care, pensions or annuities on retirement or death of beneficiaries, compensation for injuries or illness, or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance; but shall not include any plan, fund, or program established by statute to provide benefits established by statute."

SEC. 2. Section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(i) (1) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor organization under subsection (c) of this section, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, after the expiration of 6 months following the date of enactment of this subsection, unless there is on file with the Board a certification by the Comptroller of the Currency that the books and records of such labor organization, the books and records of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit, and the books and records of any welfare or benefit plan administered or controlled by such labor organization (or national or international labor organization), directly or indirectly, either alone or jointly with one or more other labor organizations or one or more employers or other persons, have been examined within the 6-month period preceding the raising of such question or the making of such charge in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection, and that none of the assets of any welfare or benefit plan administered or controlled by such labor organization (or national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit), directly or indirectly, either alone or jointly with one or more other labor organizations or one or more employers or other persons, were found to be invested in any securities acquired subsequent to the date of enactment of this paragraph which a national banking association would be prohibited from purchasing for its own account under the provisions of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (12 U. S. C. 24) and regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency promulgated thereunder.

"(2) Upon request of any labor organization and the making available by it of all its books and records, and the books and records of any welfare or benefit plan administered or controlled by it, directly or indirectly, either alone or jointly with one or more other labor organizations or one or more employers or other persons, the Comptroller of the Currency shall conduct a full and complete examination of the books and records of such labor organization and of any such welfare or benefit plan. If, as a result of such examination, the Comptroller of the Currency is of the opinion that the assets of such labor organization or plan have been or are being handled, used, or administered in an unsafe or unwise manner, or, in the case of funds collected from members, are not being devoted to the purposes for which they were collected, he shall notify the officers of such labor organization or other persons responsible. Unless the practices with respect to which such notification is given are promptly discontinued, the Comptroller of the Currency is authorized to publish a report of such practices. If the Comptroller of the Currency is of the opinion that any such practices are in violation of the laws of the United States or of any State, he shall make available to the appropriate law enforcement officers the facts concerning such practices. The Comptroller of the Currency is authorized to utilize the services of any national bank examiner in making the examinations authorized by this paragraph. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to reimburse the Comptroller of the Currency for expenses incurred in making such examinations."

SEC. 3. (a) Chapter 31 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding a new section as follows:

"§ 664. (a) Embezzlement and false entry with respect to labor organizations or employee welfare and benefit plans

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of a labor organization or engaged directly or indirectly in or connected in any capacity with the administration, management, or control of any welfare or benefit plan—

"(1) embezzles, steals, or unlawfully takes or converts to his own use or the use of another, any moneys, credits, funds, securities, property, or other assets or things of value of any such labor organization or such welfare or benefit plan, or

"(2) makes any false entry in or wilfully destroys any book or record, kept or made for any such labor organization or welfare or benefit plan, with intent to injure or defraud such labor organization or plan or any beneficiary thereunder, or to deceive any one authorized or entitled to examine the affairs of such labor organization or plan, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'welfare or benefit plan' shall have the same meaning as when used in the National Labor Relations Act, as amended."

(b) The analysis preceding Chapter 31 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"664. Embezzlement and false entry with respect to labor organizations or employee welfare and benefit plans."

SEC. 4. No labor organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any taxable year which begins more than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act unless there has been filed with the National Labor Relations Board by the Comptroller of the Currency a certificate with respect to such labor organization under paragraph (1) of section 9 (i) of the National Labor Relations Act after an examination conducted during such taxable year in accordance with paragraph (2) of such section. In any case in which more than one examination under paragraph (2) of such section is conducted with respect to a labor organization during such taxable year, only the last such examination shall be considered for purposes of this section.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the second bill deals with the democratic procedures which should be followed by labor unions. Union member after union member has testified—with considerable validity, I am sure—that if the union members themselves had control of their unions; if they could provide for secret ballots and secret decisions; if they were able to determine whether and when to strike; and what assessments to make, and how nominations should be made; and if there were other guaranties for democratic processes, most of the excesses by labor unions would be eliminated. So my second bill deals with that subject; it provides procedures for the nomination of union officials by democratic processes and for their election by secret ballot, to be counted by neutral counters; and the bill provides for secret ballots in connection with strikes and union assessments.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred, and printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3045) to strengthen democratic processes and procedures in elections of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be is enacted, etc., That section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(i) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor organization under subsection (c) of this section, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, unless such labor organization shows to the satisfaction of the Board, that the constitution or bylaws of such labor organization and of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit—

"(1) provide for the election of their respective officers by the members under a system or systems which include (A) procedures for nominating opposing candidates for each office under a party or other system which will afford members of the labor organization an opportunity to participate in the selection of candidates, (B) use of the secret ballot for all voting in any such election, and (C) the counting and tabulation of the votes in such election and the certification of the results thereof by one or more officers or employees of the Board;

"(2) provide for the authorization of strikes, the fixing of the amounts of dues, the levying of assessments, the imposition of fines, the authorization for disbursements of union funds in amounts exceeding $ ———, and the determination of all other matters directly affecting the economic well-being of the members, only by majority vote of the members taken by secret ballot; and

"(3) provide, in any case in which provision is made for the suspension or modification of the rights of self-government of any constituent unit for disciplinary or other reasons, for the restitution of such rights within 90 days following a request therefor by such constituent unit authorized by majority vote of the members thereof taken by secret ballot;

and that such provisions of the constitution and bylaws were complied with during the

preceding 12-month period. Upon request by a labor organization the board shall assign one or more officers or employees of the board to count and tabulate the votes cast in any election of officers held by such labor organization and to certify the results thereof."

SEC. 2. No labor organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any taxable year which begins after the date of the enactment of this act unless such labor organization shows to the satisfaction of the National Labor Relations Board that, during such taxable year, the constitution or bylaws of such labor organization and of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit contained the provisions described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 9 (i) of the National Labor Relations Act, and that such provisions were complied with during such taxable year.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the third bill deals with the problem of racketeers in unionism. Earlier this afternoon the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], introduced a bill, on behalf of some of us—I am one of its sponsors—dealing with one aspect of that subject, from the standpoint of wiretapping. But much more needs to be done. Mr. President, it seems to me that by means of the bill I am now introducing we shall establish very appropriate criteria for eliminating racketeers from labor unions, because my bill provides that Americans who are convicted after being charged with the commission of any offense against the laws of the United States or the laws of any State of the United States, and who are consequently denied the right to vote in elections held under the laws of the States of their legal residence; that criminals of that character shall be denied the right to hold office in the labor unions of this country; and that violation of that provision—as in the case of the other two bills I have previously introduced—shall cause the union concerned to lose its tax-exempt status.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be received for appropriate reference and that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3046) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to deny the benefits of such act to labor organizations having officers who have been convicted of certain offenses, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(i) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor oragnization under subsection (c) of this section, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by each officer of such labor organization and each officer of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit that he is not ineligible, by reason of conviction of any offense against the laws of the United States or of any State, to vote in elections held under the laws of the State of his legal residence."

SEC. 2. No labor organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any taxable year which begins after the date of the enactment of this act unless there has been filed with the National Labor Relations Board during such taxable year an affidavit executed by each officer of such labor organization and each officer of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit that he is not ineligible, by reason of conviction of any offense against the laws of the United States or of any State, to vote in elections held under the laws of the State of his legal residence.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the fourth bill deals with the subject of illegal picketing. It came about primarily out of the evidence before our investigating committee coming out of Flint, Mich., in which any Member of the House or Senate can find harrowing reports of businessmen who are beleaguered and belabored by picket lines which were not made up or supported by a single member of the plant. Something must be done to safeguard such employers as well as the employees in cases of this type. Something must be done to avoid the situation that occurred in Flint, Mich., and which brought about the shocking evidence we received at the hearings involving the related activities of Nathan Shefferman and his associates.

My bill provides that at least 33⅓ percent of the employees of a plant must be involved or must have expressed their support of a picketing project in it before a picket line can be declared legal, and that sponsorship of illegal picket lines will withdraw the organization from a tax-exempt status.

I ask that the bill be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3047) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make it an unfair labor practice to engage in picketing unless authorized by a certain percentage of the employees of the employer whose premises are being picketed, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (5), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and," and by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"(7) to engage in picketing on or about the premises of any employer for the purpose of organizing any of the employees of such employer or for the purpose of forcing or requiring such employer to recognize such labor organization as the representative of his employees, unless prior thereto such labor organization shall have obtained the approval in writing of at least 33⅓ percent of the employees of such employer of the class or classes which such labor organization is attempting to organize or represent."

SEC. 2. No organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any taxable year which begins after the date of the enactment of this act if the National Labor Relations Board determines that such organization engaged, at any time during such taxable year, in an unfair labor practice under section 8 (b) (7) of the National Labor Relations Act. This section shall not apply if such determination is set aside under the provisions of section 10 (e) or (f) of such act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the fifth bill in this package of bills deals with the very difficult problem of the use by labor unions, for political purposes, of money collected by compulsion or coercion. This is a field with which Congress has endeavored to wrestle but without adequate safeguards or results. This is a field now being considered by the Federal courts and in which confusion and contradictions are growing steadily worse and worse. This is a field in which Congress should not fail to act because of timidity or partisan concern. This particular problem was brought out last year in a dispute betwen the Santa Fe Railroad and the nonoperating unions.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release put out by the Santa Fe Railroad on September 26, 1957, in which it points out the controversy existing between the employees and the company was whether or not the company should be required to collect dues to be used for political purposes.

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

THE ATCHISON, TOPEKA & SANTA FE RAILWAY CO.,
Chicago, Ill., September 26, 1957.

The single point of disagreement between the Santa Fe and the nonoperating unions is whether the company should discharge employees for the failure to pay money to the unions which would be used for political purposes.

This point is obscured in the statement made by the unions today. The Santa Fe offered to sign an agreement which would require each employee, as a condition of employment, to pay the unions initiation fees, dues, and assessments subject to a single condition. This condition was that the money so required to be paid would not be used for the support of political candidates, parties, or committees or for the advancement of political ideologies. The unions flatly refused this proposal and indeed refused to permit any limitations on the political use of funds collected by compulsion from employees. The company feels it would be wrong to discharge any employee from his job for failure to make political contributions. The unions insist that no limitations be placed on the use of money they can exact from employees as a condition of holding their jobs.

It is idle to say that the condition asked for by the Santa Fe to protect the rights of employees would in any way weaken the bargaining position of the unions or have

anything to do with the power of management over wages or working conditions. It is equally farfetched to say that this protective condition would give the management control over the unions.

The condition that the Santa Fe has suggested is in conformity with recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the Supreme Courts of Texas and Georgia, defining what may be done under a union-shop agreement. These decisions were handed down after the union-shop agreement had been made on the large majority of American railroads and naturally enough were not reflected in those agreements. What the unions are asking the Santa Fe to do is to go contrary to what the courts decided in those cases.

It is surprising that a strike vote is being spread at this time while the case is still in mediation under the auspices of Chairman Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of the National Mediation Board.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should say, in all fairness, that since I have used this matter in talks at home and elsewhere an official of the nonoperating union has written me and said it did not intend to strike, and that the indicated matter was not the point at issue. I have put in the RECORD the statement from the Santa Fe Railroad. If the letter received by me from the union official is correct, it demonstrates the confusion which exists and the need for legislation. If the letter is inaccurate, it makes even more important the necessity for enacting appropriate legislation to protect the American trade union member against this second attempt at taxation without representation on our North American Continent.

The bill provides one simple enforcement provision, which I shall read:

Labor organizations which do not—

I repeat the word "not"—

Labor organizations which do not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office—

Shall continue to enjoy their tax-exempt status. Those found guilty of engaging in such practices shall lose their tax-exempt status, because that exemption is denied to other organizations around the country who engage in similar political practices.

I point out that in this bill Congress would deal much more gently with labor unions involving themselves in political campaigns in using money collected by compulsion than it does with corporations, because we make it a crime for corporations to do that. The bill simply provides that labor unions may do it, but they may not do it and at the same time enjoy the tax-exempt privileges Congress has conferred upon them.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill for appropriate reference and ask that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3048) to deny income tax exemption to labor organizations which participate in, or intervene in, political campaigns on behalf of candidates for public office, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 501 (c) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exempt organizations) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) (A) Labor organizations which do not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office.

"(B) Agricultural or horticultural organizations."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall apply only to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in conclusion, these bills have been introduced on my own responsibility. I do not want the silence of other Senators on my committee to indicate that they are either in opposition or favorable to them, because I have not asked for or solicited cosponsorship from any other Member of the Senate. I have conferred with many Senators. I have advised with many Senators. I have discussed these matters with other members of our investigating committee but I have asked no Senator on or off of the committee to become a cosponsor. I think each Member should express himself as he desires to on the bills. I wish to say that, because the bills have been introduced by a single member of the committee, this does not imply other members of the committee either oppose or approve them.

Mr. President, may I point out, finally, that none of these bills can remotely be described as being punitive in nature—or an effort to cripple honest unionism in America. In fact, each of these bills moves in the direction of providing greater dignity, greater safeguards, greater freedom, and greater opportunities for the individual dues-paying members of our labor unions. Approximately 80 percent of all of the complaints which our committee has been investigating have come from these individual dues-paying members of the labor unions involved. These five bills, once enacted into law, will, I am completely confident, eliminate most of the abuses of which these labor union members have so frequently and vigorously complained.

Some labor union leaders have expressed themselves as being favorable to some of these bills. Other labor union leaders, in their own personal interests, may well oppose them all.

However, Mr. President, Congress has asked our investigating committee to explore these problems, to expose the facts, and to enumerate the steps required to solve the unsavory situations brought to light. I hope the appropriate legislative committees of Congress will now hold hearings on the suggested and needed correctives and that the country, generally, will rally behind a movement to get action on these urgent matters early in this session of Congress. Otherwise the money and time expended by our investigating committee will have come to naught.

INCREASE OF NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a summary 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 summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3049) to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. BRICKER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Farm Food and Fiber Act."

INCREASE OF NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 2. Section 371 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d), and by adding subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) The Secretary may increase by not more than 50 percent any national marketing quota or acreage allotment for any year or crop for any basic agricultural commodity under this title if he determines after investigation that such increase is necessary in the interests of the welfare of the agricultural economy (1) to avoid hardships to producers of the commodity, (2) to meet potential market demands for the commodity, (3) to avoid undue restrictions on marketings, (4) to prevent disruption in the orderly marketing of the commodity, (5) to insure adequate farm income, or (6) to make allowance for statistics of the Federal Government more recent than those used in the original determination of the marketing quota or acreage allotment, or (7) because of any combination of the factors above. The determination of any national marketing quota or acreage allotment shall be made by the Secretary after consultation with the Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board."

DISCONTINUANCE OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS ON CORN

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, acreage allotments shall not be in effect for the 1959 and subsequent crops of corn.

LEVEL OF PRICE SUPPORT FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

SEC. 4. (a) Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended:

(1) by striking out "nor less than the level provided in subsections (a), (b), and (c) as follows:" and substituting therefor "nor less than 60 percent of the parity price therefor determined after considera-

tion of the factors specified in section 401 (b).";

(2) by striking out subsections (a), (b), (c), (d) (4), and (e);

(3) by striking from subsection (d) (3) the words "except tobacco" and the words "and no price support shall be made available for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers;";

(4) by changing the comma in subsection (f) immediately preceding the words "except that" to a period and striking out the balance of subsection (f).

(b) Section 2 of the act of July 28, 1945, Public Law 163, 79th Congress, is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 3 (a) of the act of August 29, 1949, Public Law 272, 81st Congress, and the last sentence of section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby repealed.

LEVEL OF PRICE SUPPORT FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at such level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply."

CONTINUANCE OF SPECIAL DAIRY PRODUCTS PROGRAM

SEC. 6. (a) The last sentence of section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "for each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1958, not to exceed $75 million," and substituting therefor "for each of the 4 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1960, not to exceed $75 million."

(b) Section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "December 31, 1958" wherever it appears and substituting therefor "December 31, 1960."

CCC ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 7. (a) Section 9 (b) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to the Board of Directors, there shall be an Advisory Board reflecting broad agricultural and business experience in its membership. The Board shall consist of seven members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall serve for a period of 3 years, except that two members of the first Board shall serve for a period of 2 years and two members of the first Board shall serve for a period of 1 year. Not more than four of such members shall belong to the same political party. The Advisory Board shall meet at the call of the Secretary, who shall require it to meet not less often than once each 90 days; shall consult with and make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to the level at which price support shall be made available for any commodity and the establishment of national marketing quotas and acreage allotments; shall survey the general policies of the Corporation, including its policies in connection with purchase, storage, and sale of commodities and the operation of lending and price-support programs; and shall advise the Secretary with respect thereto. Members of the Advisory Board shall receive for their services as members compensation of not to exceed $50 per diem when actually engaged in the performance of their duties as such, together with their necessary traveling expenses while going to and coming from meetings."

(b) Section 401 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The determination of the level of price support for any commodity shall be made by the Secretary after consultation with the Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board."

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

SEC. 8. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) Sections 109 and 204 of such act are amended by striking out "1958" and substituting in lieu thereof "1959."

(b) Section 103 (b) of such act is amended by striking out "$4,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,500,000,000."

The summary presented by Mr. HICKENLOOPER is as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED FARM FOOD AND FIBER ACT

Section 1: The act may be cited as the Farm Food and Fiber Act.

Section 2: Amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to authorize the Secretary to increase, up to 50 percent, the national marketing quota or acreage allotment for any basic agricultural commodity where in the interests of the welfare of the agricultural economy he determines such action is necessary for specified reasons. The Secretary would be required to consult with the CCC Advisory Board in establishing national marketing quotas and acreage allotments.

Section 3: Discontinues acreage allotments on corn.

Section 4: (1) Removes the present requirements for supporting basic commodities at minimum levels ranging between 75 percent and 90 percent of parity, depending on the supply, and for tobacco, at 90 percent of parity; and substitutes authority for supports at a level not less than 60 percent or more than 90 percent of parity, determined after considering the 8 guidelines specified in the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (sec. 401 (b)); (2) provides for price support for tobacco at 50 percent of parity if marketing quotas are disapproved, as is provided for the other basic commodities; (3) repeals section 2 of the act of July 28, 1945, requiring supports on fire-cured tobacco at 75 percent of the loan rate for burley tobacco, and on dark air-cured and Virginia sun-cured tobacco at 66⅔ percent of the loan rate for burley tobacco, but not to exceed the higher of the 1957 level or 90 percent of parity; (4) repeals those provisions of law requiring that middling ⅞-inch cotton be the standard grade for purposes of parity and price support.

Section 5: Changes the minimum support level on dairy products from 75 percent to 60 percent of parity.

Section 6: Extends the special milk program for children for 2 years, i. e., until June 30, 1960, at the present level of $75 million a year, and extends for 2 years, i. e., until December 31, 1960, the special program for making dairy products available to the military agencies and veterans' hospitals.

Section 7: (1) Amends the law relating to the CCC Advisory Board to provide that a specific duty of the Board shall be to make recommendations to the Secretary as to price support levels and the establishment of national marketing quotas and acreage allotments, and to require the Secretary to consult with the Board in establishing price support levels and national marketing quotas and acreage allotments; (2) increases the membership of the Advisory Board from 5 to 7; requires that members be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation; and provides for staggered terms of office.

Section 8: Extends titles I and II of Public Law 480 for 1 year, i. e., until June 30, 1959, and increases the amount authorized under title I from $4 billion to $5,500,000,000.

INCREASED MILEAGE ALLOWANCE FOR RURAL MAIL CARRIERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the mileage allowance for the rural mail carriers.

There are approximately 32,000 rural letter carriers in the United States, and each day they drive the equivalent of 60 times around the earth. The history of the great service these workers have given the people living in rural areas is well known. Although this service has been generally good despite bad weather and other factors, all is not well with our men who carry the mail to the out-of-town areas. With cost of living advances over the past several years, most rural letter carriers have found that they are having to bear part of the costs of transportation for their routes. Their present allowance was set in 1951.

For example, statistics show that the price of tires has gone up 30 percent; the price of gas and oil is up 18 percent; the price of tools and parts is up 70 percent; taxes are up 42 percent; and insurance costs have climbed 27 percent.

To help meet this need, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the basic equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers from 9 cents per mile to 11 cents per mile, and to provide for a minimum allowance of $4.50 per day.

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. 3050) to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YARBOROUGH

The bill was to increase the basic equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers from 9 cents per mile to 11 cents per mile, and provide for a minimum allowance of $4.50 per day.

In practice, this would mean that a carrier with a route of 41 miles or less would receive the minimum allowance of $4.50, whereas carriers with routes of over 41 miles would receive 11 cents per mile.

Present law provides that an additional allowance may be paid to carriers serving heavily patronized routes of not to exceed a total of $3 per day when combined with the regular 9-cent-per-mile allowance. In other words, a carrier serving a route of 33 miles or less deemed to be a heavily patronized route, receives 9 cents per mile and may be given an additional allowance which will not exceed a total of $3 per day. Carriers having routes of over 33 miles can receive

nothing extra because the 9 cents per mile gives them in excess of $3 per day.

The proposed bill provides that the Postmaster General may give carriers an additional allowance of not to exceed $2.50 per day for serving heavily patronized routes, in addition to their basic mileage or minimum daily allowance, without regard to the length of their route.

CLASSIFICATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1958

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the first session of the 85th Congress a pay bill was passed in both Houses of Congress and was submitted to the President. In his Memorandum of Disapproval, the President stated that an inquiry would be made into the need for adjustments in the structure of executive branch pay systems and that in the event this inquiry demonstrated the need for adjustments, recommendations would be made early in the next session of Congress. After many studies by the executive branch of the Government, agreement has been reached on pay proposals that would cost the Government $1,052,000,000, and I can definitely advise the Senate that this legislation has the approval of the President of the United States. Today I am introducing bills for pay increases for both postal and classified employees.

I am introducing for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended and for other purposes. The objectives of this bill are:

First. To relieve pay inequities among the various grades under the Classification Act by realining the various pay levels.

Second. To provide increases in pay rates as are required to place the Government in a reasonably competitive position in the labor market.

Third. To provide flexibility and greater monetary incentive for the reward of unusual talent, high proficiency and higher degrees of skills and training.

Fourth. To adjust upward the entrance pay level for professional, scientific and managerial personnel.

Fifth. To remove the numerical limitations on the so-called supergrade positions, and

Sixth. To remove the numerical limitations on the number of positions authorized in the scientific and professional categories and receiving pay at levels authorized under Public Law 313, and to provide for a possible wider use of this authority.

It has now become abundantly clear that there is need for equitable adjustments along the lines of the proposals contained in this bill. Along with others who have studied this problem, the Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation, chaired by Ralph J. Cordiner, has reported a very considerable gap between Federal and non-Federal salaries, especially in the upper level pay brackets. The Cordiner Committee recommended to the President that corrective action be taken. The findings of this and other study groups have formed the basis for the recommendations we are now making for the consideration of the Congress. I believe you will find the bill to be a realistic and reasonable approach to what is rapidly becoming a very serious problem in the administration of our defense and other essential Government programs.

Under this bill, which the President has approved and supports fully, adjustments will be made to provide an increase of at least 6 percent to all grades of employees. However, its primary objective is to provide more adequate compensation to those whose present salaries are shown to be substantially less than salaries for non-Federal employment, when compared with positions of similar responsibility. The proposed realinement of the Classification Act pay schedule would particularly affect the middle and top bracket levels, which include the thousands of employees in the scientific, engineering, managerial, and other professional categories. This realinement will establish greater intergrade differentials in the upper grades, thus eliminating as much as possible the compression which has occurred in these grades in recent years. In order to do this, employees in grades GS–11 through GS–14 would get an approximate 7½ percent increase, while those from GS–15 through GS–18 would be increased proportionately so as to permit the GS–18 to receive a salary of $18,000 per year.

Also, as I have said previously, the entrance level for college recruitment and the intermediate salary rates for scientific, professional, and managerial positions would be adjusted upward. In addition, pay incentives would be provided for those who demonstrate marked proficiency in doing their work.

The proposed bill would remove altogether the numerical limitations on the three highest grades. There are now only 1,226 employees of a total of nearly 1 million under the Classification Act who can receive from $12,900 to $16,000 per year. Of these 1,226, only 130 can receive $16,000 per year under the Classification Act.

The elimination of this ceiling is regarded as essential to permit more reasonable salaries for those key scientists and executives carrying the heavy burdens of leadership and decision. The bill would also remove the statutory limitation on the number of scientific and professional positions that can be established under pay rates as now provided in Public Law 313, and would provide that the President can authorize these positions for any agency and in any number he deems appropriate under the proposed statutory language.

The administration believes that the removal of the numerical limitation on the higher grades, the increase in the pay ceiling, the higher entrance level for college graduates and the incentive payment for high proficiency will make the pay structure for Government service more equitable to scientific and managerial personnel and will attract more able young people to the Government service.

I urge that this bill be given prompt and careful attention. This Congress is faced with the consideration of vital Government programs. In the last analysis, it is the individual civil servant—the scientists in the Government laboratory, the technical expert in the military department, the career official representing us abroad—on whom we all must reply to make these programs effective. Increasingly in these times our citizens are properly demanding from these Federal employees nothing less than outstanding competence and superior performance and leadership. I think it behooves us to consider their conditions of employment carefully not only from the standpoint of equity to the employee, but also as a matter vitally affecting our Government's ability to carry out its functions properly.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill and its explanation be incorporated in my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3052) to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as "The Classification Act Amendments of 1958."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (b) of section 603 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1113 (b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
GS–1	$2,855	$2,945	$3,035	$3,125	$3,215	$3,305	$3,395
GS–2	3,140	3,230	3,320	3,410	3,500	3,590	3,680
GS–3	3,370	3,460	3,550	3,640	3,730	3,820	3,910
GS–4	3,625	3,715	3,805	3,895	3,985	4,075	4,165
GS–5	3,895	4,040	4,185	4,330	4,475	4,620	4,765
GS–6	4,325	4,470	4,615	4,760	4,905	5,050	5,195
GS–7	4,800	4,945	5,090	5,235	5,380	5,525	5,670
GS–8	5,270	5,415	5,560	5,705	5,850	5,995	6,140
GS–9	5,770	5,915	6,060	6,205	6,350	6,495	6,640
GS–10	6,270	6,415	6,560	6,705	6,850	6,995	7,140
GS–11	6,880	7,110	7,340	7,570	7,800	8,030	
GS–12	8,150	8,380	8,610	8,840	9,070	9,300	
GS–13	9,675	9,905	10,135	10,365	10,595	10,825	
GS–14	11,105	11,335	11,565	11,795	12,025	12,255	
GS–15	13,000	13,425	13,850	14,275	14,700		
GS–16	14,500	15,000	15,500	16,000	16,500		
GS–17	16,000	16,500	17,000	17,500	18,000		
GS–18	18,000	18,500	19,000	19,500"			

(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph 4 of this subsection) is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates of a grade in the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph 4 of this subsection) is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two scheduled or two longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the general schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph 4 of this subsection) is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive basic compensation at the maximum longevity rate or the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, of his grade in effect on and after such date.

(4) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate established as a result of the operation of section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1133), he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the scheduled rate in effect on the effective date of this section to which he would have been entitled under the provisions of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 1121) had said section 803 not been enacted.

(5) Officers and employees receiving a rate of basic compensation authorized by law, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, which is in excess of the appropriate rate of basic compensation as determined under paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection shall continue to receive such rates, until they leave such position or are entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 179, as amended by 70 Stat. 762) is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 505. No positions shall be placed in grade 16, 17, or 18 of the general schedule except by action of, or after prior approval by, a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners."

(b) The following parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 104 of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 234; Public Law 121, 84th Cong.);

(2) That part of the paragraph under the heading "Federal Prison System" and under the subheading "Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Prisons" contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 273; title II of Public Law 133, 84th Cong.); which reads as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the Attorney General hereafter is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, to place three positions in grade GS–16 in the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949";

(3) Section 206 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 360; Public Law 163, 84th Cong.);

(4) The second paragraph under the heading "Civil Functions, Department of the Army" and under the subheading "Administrative Provisions" contained in title III of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 364; Public Law 163, 84th Cong.);

(5) The heading "Commodity Credit Corporation" and the paragraph thereunder contained in chapter I of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 451; Public Law 219, 84th Cong.);

(6) That part of section 205 (a) of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended by an act entitled "An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953" (69 Stat. 547; Public Law 268, 84th Cong.), which reads as follows:

"Subject to the standards and procedures under section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, not to exceed 15 positions in the Small Business Administration may be placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule established by that act, and any such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by such section."

(7) The last paragraph under the heading "General Services Administration" contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 345; Public Law 623, 84th Cong.);

(8) Section 302 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes" (70 Stat. 743; Public Law 854, 84th Cong.);

(9) Section 503 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes" (70 Stat. 762; Public Law 854, 84th Cong.);

(10) That part of section 3 (a) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1120; Public Law 1024, 84th Cong.) which reads as follows: "at grades GS–17 each";

(11) Subsection 2 (d) (5) of the Airways Modernization Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 350; Public Law 85–133);

(12) That part of section 205 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 423, Public Law 85–167) which reads as follows: "the position of Administrator of the Southeastern Power Administration shall be in grade GS–18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but without regard to the numerical limitation contained in section 505 of said act;".

(c) Positions in grades 16, 17, or 18, as the case may be, of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, immediately prior to the effective date of this act, shall remain, on and after such effective date, in their respective grades, until other action is taken under the provisions of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 as in effect on and after such effective date.

(d) Section 1102 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 971, 5 U. S. C. 1073), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1102. The Commission shall prepare and submit to the President an annual report with respect to the rates of compensation under, and the administration of, this act. This report shall include a statement of the total number of positions placed in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 under section 505 of this act during the year, the number of positions placed in each of such grades during the year, the total number of positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 in existence at the close of the year, the number of positions in existence in each of such grades at the close of the year, and such other information as the Commission may deem appropriate. The President shall submit an annual report to the Congress which shall contain, among other matters, such recommendations, based upon the report of the Commission, as he may deem advisable."

SEC. 4. (a) (1) Clause (2) of that paragraph of section 602 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1112) which defines the level of difficulty and responsibility of work in grade 5 of the General Schedule (GS–5) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to perform, under immediate supervision, and with little opportunity for the exercise of independent judgment, simple and elementary work requiring professional, scientific, or technical training; or".

(2) Clause (2) of that paragraph of the same section which defines the level of difficulty and responsibility of work in grade 7 of the General Schedule (GS–7) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) under immediate or general supervision, to perform somewhat difficult work requiring (A) professional, scientific, or technical training, and (B) to a limited extent, the exercise of independent technical judgment; or".

(b) The Civil Service Commission shall exercise its authority to issue such standards or regulations as may be necessary for the administration of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 5. The Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by inserting after section 701 thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 702. (a) The head of any department or agency may grant within-grade advancements in compensation in recognition of continuing performance substantially above that ordinarily required in the type of position concerned. An advancement under this section shall be in addition to those under section 701 and shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of subsection (a) of section 701.

"(b) No advancement under this section shall exceed one step increase and no employee shall be eligible for more than one advancement under this section within each of the time periods specified in section 701."

SEC. 6. Section 704 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 7. Section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 801. All new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade, except that the head of any department or agency may (a) in accordance with standards prescribed or approved by the Civil Service Commission, appoint eligible individuals who have qualifications clearly above the average expected of qualified eligibles for the position concerned at such higher rate or rates of a grade as the Civil Service Commission may designate for this purpose, and (b) make new appointments at rates above the minimum when this will make it possible to match the appointee's salary immediately prior to appointment, but no such appointment shall be made at a rate higher than the lowest rate which equals or exceeds an appointee's salary rate immediately prior to appointment."

SEC. 8. Subsection (b) of section 802 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1132), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any officer or employee who is promoted or transferred to a position in a higher grade shall receive basic compensation at the lowest scheduled or longevity rate of such higher grade which exceeds his existing rate of basic compensation by not less than two step increases of the grade from which he is promoted or transferred. If, in the case of any officer or employee so promoted or transferred who is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate for his grade or the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade under section 604, section 1105 (b), or any other provision of law, there is no scheduled or longevity rate in such higher grade which is at least two step increases above his existing rate of basic compensation, he shall receive (A) the maximum longevity rate of such higher grade or the maximum scheduled rate of such higher grade if there is no longevity rate for such grade, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation, if such existing rate is higher."

SEC. 9. (a) as used in this section the term "department" means the executive departments and the independent establishments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The President may authorize the head of any department to establish civilian positions within the department, in such numbers as the President considers necessary to carry out the research and development functions of the department that require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel.

(c) Subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission as to rates, the head of a department may fix the compensation for positions established in his department under subsection (b). However, the compensation may not be less than $12,500 or more than $19,000 a year.

(d) Positions established under subsection (b) are in the classified civil service of the United States. However, if the Civil Service Commission or a person designated by it approves a proposed appointee's qualifications, no competitive examination may be required.

(e) The head of each department shall report to Congress, not later than February 1 of each year, on the number of positions established under subsection (b) in his department during the preceding calendar year. The report shall list the name, rate of compensation, functions, and qualifications of each incumbent. However, the head of a department may omit any item if he considers that a full public report on it would be detrimental to the national security. In such a case, he shall present the information, in executive session, to such committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives as are designated by the presiding officers of those bodies.

(f) The following laws and parts of laws are repealed:

(1) The second sentence of section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, as amended (21 U. S. C. 113a);

(2) Section 208 (g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 210 (g));

(3) The act of August 1, 1947, as amended (5 U. S. C. 153);

(4) Sections 1531, 1532, 4021, 7471, and 9021 of title 10, United States Code; and

(5) Subsection 2 (d) (6) of the Airways Modernization Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 350; Public Law 85-133).

(g) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The analysis of chapter 81 is amended by striking out the following items:

"1581. Appointment: professional and scientific services."; and

"1582. Professional and scientific services: reports to Congress on appointments.";

(2) The analysis of chapter 373 is amended by striking out the following item:

"4021. Appointment: professional and scientific services."

(3) The analysis of chapter 873 is amended by striking out the following item:

"9021. Appointment: professional and scientific services."

(h) The enactment of this section does not affect any position existing, on the day before the effective date of this section, under authority of the laws or parts of laws repealed by this section, the compensation attached to any such position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his right to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken under subsection (c) of this section.

SEC. 10. Any appropriation required to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, may be apportioned on a basis indicating the need for a supplemental or deficiency estimate of appropriation to the extent necessary to permit payment of such increases as may be granted officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law (except those rates applying to wage board employees, which are adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates), but only to the extent that such increases do not exceed the increases provided in section 2 of this act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period after enactment into law.

INCREASED COMPENSATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill that will give a uniform pay increase to all of more than 500,000 postal field service employees, including postal clerks, city mail carriers, rural carriers, supervisors, and postmasters.

This bill will provide for an upward adjustment of 6 percent in the salaries established in the Postal Field Compensation Act of 1955.

The bill gives additional authority to the Postmaster General to approve increased starting salaries in areas where it is difficult to obtain a sufficient number of qualified eligibles because of higher pay schedules in similar work.

It is estimated the cost of this bill will be $160 million for the first year and $185 million for the next fiscal year.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and the explanation of the provisions be made a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3056) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 301 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 118; 39 U. S. C. 971) is amended by striking out the postal field service schedule contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following new schedule:

Postal field service schedule

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$3,053	$3,159	$3,265	$3,371	$3,477	$3,583	$3,689
2	3,276	3,387	3,498	3,609	3,720	3,831	3,942
3	3,530	3,652	3,774	3,896	4,018	4,140	4,262
4	3,879	4,012	4,145	4,278	4,411	4,544	4,677
5	4,113	4,246	4,379	4,512	4,645	4,778	4,911
6	4,442	4,590	4,738	4,886	5,034	5,182	5,330
7	4,802	4,966	5,130	5,294	5,458	5,622	5,786
8	5,184	5,364	5,544	5,724	5,904	6,084	6,264
9	5,597	5,793	5,989	6,185	6,381	6,577	6,773
10	6,148	6,360	6,572	6,784	6,996	7,208	7,420
11	6,763	6,996	7,229	7,462	7,695	7,928	8,161
12	7,442	7,696	7,950	8,204	8,458	8,712	8,966
13	8,193	8,469	8,745	9,021	9,297	9,573	9,849
14	9,010	9,307	9,604	9,901	10,198	10,495	10,792
15	9,911	10,229	10,547	10,865	11,183	11,501	11,819
16	10,918	11,236	11,554	11,872	12,190	12,508	12,826
17	12,084	12,402	12,720	13,038	13,356	13,674	13,992
18	13,568	13,886	14,204	14,522	14,840	15,158	15,476
19	14,840	15,158	15,476	15,794	16,112		
20	16,960						

Whenever the Postmaster General finds that a sufficient number of qualified eligibles for employment in positions in the Postal Field Service Schedule of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 cannot be obtained in one or more areas or locations at the existing minimum rates for such positions and that there is a possibility that a sufficient number of such eligibles can be obtained by increasing the minimum rate for such positions in such areas or locations to one of the higher rates of the salary level in which such position is placed, the Postmaster General may establish such higher rate, not in excess of the rate for the fourth per annum rate and step of such salary level, as the minimum rate for that position in the area or location concerned.

(b) (1) The rural carrier schedule contained in section 302 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 119; 39 U. S. C. 972 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

Rural carrier schedule

	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum	$1,646.00	$1,697.00	$1,748.00	$1,799.00	$1,850.00	$1,901.00	$1,952.00
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	69.50	71.50	73.50	75.50	77.50	79.50	81.50
For each mile of route over 30 miles	23.30	23.30	23.30	23.30	23.30	23.30	23.30
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum	1,646.00						
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	69.50						
For each mile of route over 30 miles	23.30						
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier.

(2) Section 302 (c) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 119; 39 U. S. C. 972 (c)), relating to additional compensation for rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes, is amended by striking out "$4,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,980".

(c) The fourth-class office schedule contained in section 303 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 120; 39 U. S. C. 973 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

4th-class office schedule

Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$1,300 to $1,499.99	$2,665	$2,754	$2,843	$2,932	$3,021	$3,110	$3,199
$900 to $1,299.99	2,442	2,524	2,606	2,688	2,770	2,852	2,934
$600 to $899.99	1,999	2,066	2,133	2,200	2,267	2,334	2,401
$350 to $599.99	1,555	1,607	1,659	1,711	1,763	1,815	1,867
$250 to $349.99	1,111	1,148	1,185	1,222	1,259	1,296	1,333
$200 to $249.99	888	918	948	978	1,008	1,038	1,068
$100 to $199.99	668	690	712	734	756	778	800
Under $100	444	459	474	489	504	519	534

(d) Section 401 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 122; 39 U. S. C. 981), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Any increase in basic salary granted by law on or after the effective date of this amendatory subsection shall not be deemed to be an equivalent increase in basic salary within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 201 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 89; 39 U. S. C. 961 (c)), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which begins after its enactment into law.

The explanation presented by Mr. CARLSON is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF POSTAL PAY BILL

This bill provides an upward adjustment of 6 percent in the salaries established by the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955. It will give a uniform pay increase to all of the more than 500,000 postal field service employees, including postal clerks, city letter carriers, rural carriers, supervisors and postmasters. It will thereby maintain an equitable pay relationship among the various positions and employees in the postal service.

In addition, the bill authorizes the Postmaster General to make appointments under the Postal Field Service Schedule, in certain circumstances, at other than the initial step of the salary level of the position to which appointed, but not in excess of the rate of the fourth step in such level. This authority would be available for use in the larger metropolitan centers whenever the Postmaster General finds that a sufficient number of qualified eligibles for employment cannot be obtained in the area at the existing minimum rates for the positions and that there is a possibility of obtaining a sufficient number of qualified eligibles by increasing the minimum rate. To the extent that the minimum rates are increased in any area or areas under this authority, employees already on the rolls in such area in the positions and levels affected would be advanced to the new minimum rate unless they were already at or above the new minimum rate.

It will be noted that the authority to increase the hiring rate under those circumstances is similar to the authority already available to the Civil Service Commission under section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

The bill further provides for the repeal of section 201 (c) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955. That section places rigid numerical limitations on the positions which may be assigned to salary levels 17, 18, 19 and 20 of the Postal Field Service Schedule. These limitations have had the effect of nullifying the very principle of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, namely, equal pay for equal work. The act establishes and defines certain key positions and commands the Postmaster General to pay to the incumbents of those positions the salary provided in the Postal Field Service Schedule. In a few cases the limitations in section 201 (c) have prevented the Postmaster General from making the advancement in salary to which employees are entitled under the other provisions of the law, particularly in postmaster positions. With the rapidly increasing mail volume and the consequent increase in the number of employees, postmasters at some additional offices are progressing rapidly toward higher level key positions. If the limitations in the act are not removed, the Department will be unable to advance postmasters in such cases, even though they meet the definitions of the key positions for higher levels.

The bill provides an effective date of enactment into law.

Based on current budget estimated for the year 1959, the cost of this bill will be approximately $160 million, including hiring above the initial step and the effect on fringe benefits. After the first fiscal year, this cost could increase to approximately $185 million.

APPROVAL OF DESIGN OF UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY CHAPEL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution which, if passed by the Congress, will require the Secretary of the Air Force to obtain approval of the design of a chapel for the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs from the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate before public funds can be spent for its construction.

When I and several other Members of Congress made a trip to Colorado in the spring of 1955 to see the site selected for the Air Force Academy and to review building plans prepared by a Chicago firm of architects, so much dissatisfaction was expressed with the proposed design for the chapel that the then Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott, promised that the design would be revised.

It was on the basis of this assurance that $3 million to build the chapel was included in the supplemental appropriation bill passed by the Congress last August.

Since then the revised plans have been disclosed; and, in my opinion, the new ones are worse than the old ones. Some Senators may have noticed the comparative pictures which were published this week in U. S. News & World Report.

It is variously referred to as a series of wigwams, accordions, or something of the kind. There never has been anything like it in this country or anywhere else. It is supposed to be an expression in art of a new concept of religion. Before we spend $3 million, we had better look into the matter, and that is the purpose of the resolution.

Some distinguished architects and a few clergymen have approved the selected design, but the fact remains that this chapel, which will be perhaps the only religious influence in a very secular setting, is different from the design of any cathedral, church or chapel in the history of the world. The designing architects claim that structures heretofore built as houses of worship are outmoded and that the Academy boys should have a chapel reflecting a new concept of religion in keeping with modern thought, science, and modern art.

I confess to being old-fashioned in my views on modern art. When I look at a painting I want to see something I can identify, instead of merely a splash of colors. I also am old-fashioned in my religious views, and would not donate my personal funds for a house of worship which might just as well be a museum of modern art or a skating rink.

Therefore, I am reluctant to spend the hard-earned tax dollars of constituents who may share my old-fashioned views, and before the Air Force undertakes the proposed construction I feel that there should be a positive expression of sentiment on the part of a substantial number of Members of Congress.

The Armed Services and Appropriations Committees are senior committees of both branches of Congress and the House Appropriations Committee is the largest committee. Action by these committees, therefore, would give a fair indication of Congressional attitude.

I have no desire to unduly delay construction of a chapel for the Air Force Academy and I hope that the appropriate committees will act promptly on this resolution so that designs can be submitted and approved and the work can proceed.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That no funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated shall be available for expenditure for the construction of a chapel at the United States Air Force Academy unless the design for such chapel is approved by the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and the Secretary of the Air Force is advised in writing by the chairman of each such committee that such design is approved by the committee of which he is chairman.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 137) requiring that the design for the United States Air Force Academy chapel be approved by the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services before appropriated funds are expended for the construction of such chapel, introduced

by Mr. ROBERTSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. AIKEN:

Address entitled "What Is Government's Responsibility to American Agriculture?" delivered by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND at the annual meeting of the Illinois Agricultural Association, November 13, 1957.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Address by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON before the 26th annual convention of the National Reclamation Association, Phoenix, Ariz., November 7, 1957.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Addresses delivered by him, Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, and Fred C. Scribner, Jr., Under Secretary of the Treasury, delivered at ceremonies in connection with the designation of Alexander Hamilton Place, in Washington, D. C.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him, with exhibits, relating to the role of educational television and of station WHA-TV.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Message from Adlai E. Stevenson and message from him to Cordell Hull award for leadership in building United State foreign economic policy, presented to Hon. Clare Boothe Luce December 10, 1957, by Committee on Foreign Trade Education.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

Article entitled "Ordeal by Hunger," written by Senator HUMPHREY, and published in the Fall Co-op Grain Quarterly.

AMENDMENT OF CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE GOVERNMENTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive A, 85th Congress, 2d session, a Supplementary Protocol between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington on August 19, 1957, amending the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income signed at Washington on April 16, 1945, as modified by the supplementary protocol signed at Washington on June 6, 1946, and the supplementary protocol signed at Washington on May 25, 1954, and that the supplementary protocol, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the supplementary protocol between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington on August 19, 1957, amending the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income signed at Washington on April 16, 1945, as modified by the supplementary protocol signed at Washington on June 6, 1946, and the supplementary protocol signed at Washington on May 25, 1954.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the supplementary protocol of August 19, 1957. That protocol has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1958.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Secretary of State. 2. Supplementary protocol with the United Kingdom amending the income-tax convention of April 16, 1945, as modified by supplementary protocols of June 6, 1946, and May 25, 1954.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

REPORT ON STATUS OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS (S. DOC. NO. 77)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, under date of December 30, 1957, the Secretary of the Interior transmitted to the Vice President the first annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects as required by section 6 of the authorizing act of April 11, 1956—70th United States Statutes at Large, page 105. The document was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I request unanimous consent that the letter and accompanying report, including a copy of the statement Hydrologic Bases for Financial Studies—Colorado River Storage Project be printed as a Senate document.

I suggest that in the future the Secretary of the Interior could improve the value of the annual reports by showing the allocations of appropriations by years to each of the several units as well as investigations and comparable expenditures or obligations. Data of this character are submitted to the Appropriations Committees each year, but it would be historically informative to have all of the information in one place each year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SCIENCE AND EDUCATION FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to announce that on next Tuesday, January 21, the committee will begin public hearings on the subject of science and education for national defense.

The committee will consider these matters in two phases, the first general and the second legislative. The first part will be devoted to receiving testimony from eminent scientists, educators, and others, on the need, in the light of recent Russian scientific and educational achievements, for Federal action to strengthen American education. The second part of the hearings will be legislative in character and will have as its purpose to receive testimony on pending legislative proposals in this field.

When the committee begins the second part of the hearings on bills, we will welcome testimony from all Members of the Senate who are sponsors of legislation in this field or who wish to give us the benefit of their views. Following the testimony of Members of the Senate, the committee will invite witnesses from the administration and from all interested scientific, educational, and other public organizations or associations, as well as individual witnesses whose knowledge and experience would be of benefit to the committee.

Requests to appear before the committee should be directed to the chief clerk of the committee as soon as possible.

CURRENT DEPRESSION IN MONTANA'S NONFERROUS METAL INDUSTRY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today, under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], there has been introduced a bill to bring some relief to the copper-mining industry.

As the Senate well knows, since 1934, special legislation in this field has been on the statute books, because of the peculiar and difficult situation which copper enjoys —and I use advisedly the word "enjoys." There is need for serious consideration of the new bill, and there is great need that it be passed and enacted into law.

I hold in my hand a clipping from the Smeltermen's Voice, published at Anaconda, Mont., and dated January 1958. The clipping indicates just how the depression in the copper industry has affected employment in the Montana area. For example, the Butte Miners Union, No. 1, had, as of January 1957, 5,109 dues-paying members. As of October 1957—the date of the latest figures I have—the total number of dues-paying miners there was 2,251, which, if my calculation is correct, indicates a decline in employment approximating 60 percent.

In Great Falls, Mont., the high for the Great Falls Mill and Smeltermen's Union, No. 16, was 1,419 in January 1957; the reduction which has occurred since

then has been 335, making a total, as of October 1957, of 1,084. The clipping I hold in my hand provides other figures which indicate just how badly hit Montana is because of the copper situation. I ask unanimous consent that these figures, taken from the Smeltermen's Voice, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Current depression in Montana's nonferrous metal industry results in reduction in number of employed members in Montana's mine-mill local unions

	Date of recent high	Number of employed members	Date of latest report	Number of employed members	Reduction
Butte Miners Union No. 1	January 1957	5,109	October 1957	2,251	2,858
Great Falls Mill & Smeltermen's Union, No. 16	do	1,419	do	1,084	335
Phillipsburg Mine & Mill Workers Union, No. 24	February 1957	182	September 1957	124	58
East Helena Mill & Smeltermen's Union, No. 72	July 1956	299	October 1957	275	24
Anaconda Mill & Smeltermen's Union, No. 117	July 1957	2,690	do	2,359	331
Deer Lodge Miners Union, No. 834	August 1957	154	do	148	6
Phosphate Mine, Mill & Smeltermen's Union, No. 904, Melrose	May 1957	150	September 1957	82	8
Total		10,003		6,323	3,680

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me observe, further, that earlier this week the price of copper dropped from 27 cents a pound to 25 cents a pound. The copper industry needs help; so do the lead, zinc, tungsten, and manganese interests. I am hopeful that at this session we shall be able to do something of assistance to this vital industry.

JOHN V. RIFFE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to pay a tribute to a distinguished American who recently passed away.

At a time like this, when our country and, in fact, the world have been shocked by the abuses by some labor leadership and the misuse of union and welfare funds to such an extent that the enactment of some sort of legislation seems required, in order to protect the workers in our industries, it is gratifying and inspiring to have called to our attention really outstanding labor leaders of unimpeachable integrity, dedicated to the highest moral standards.

One of these outstanding leaders, whom it was my personal privilege to know well over a period of years, was John V. Riffe, who died in Washington on Tuesday, January 7, after a long illness. John Riffe was the last executive vice president of the CIO before its merger with the AFL–CIO, in 1955. He was one of the principal leaders of the CIO in bringing about the move toward unity in the labor movement. He had worked for it tirelessly. But beyond that, during the last years of his life John had dedicated himself to the Moral Re-Armament Movement and its emphasis on human relationships based on the highest moral standards, both in the home and in our public relationships.

George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, in a message to Mrs. Riffe after John's death, said:

> Throughout his lifetime John Riffe served the cause of trade unionism with devotion and understanding. He was a true humanitarian. We shall miss his warm friendship.

Recently, I requested from the AFL–CIO headquarters a biography of John Riffe. In that biography I find a compilation of the years of successful effort during which he had devoted his energies in bringing about a better feeling between workers and between unions. His big emphasis was on God-guided unity, not division, in the union movement.

My own personal relations with John began when I was chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at the beginning of President Eisenhower's first administration. I conferred with various labor leaders at the time, and John was one of them. I was particularly impressed by the fact that his approach to human relations was based on deep spiritual convictions. We soon became warm friends.

John Riffe was born in Jenkins, Ky., in 1904. At the age of 14, he started work in the Kentucky coal mines. He early plunged into active responsibility in the United Mine Workers of America, and later took part in the formation of the United Steel Workers, CIO. For the rest of his life, he occupied responsible positions with that organization.

At the funeral services held for John Riffe at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, on last Friday, many moving tributes were paid to his memory. Because of my close friendship with him, I had the great privilege to serve, together with colleagues of his in the labor world, as one of his pallbearers. Many messages have been received by Mrs. Riffe from leaders and trade-union workers in foreign countries who knew of his outstanding leadership. Tributes came from representatives of business, industry, and Government in this and many other countries. Among the tributes from labor leadership in this country, in addition to that from George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, were messages from Walter Reuther, president of the industrial union department, AFL–CIO, and former president of the CIO; James Carey, secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO; David J. McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers of America, and vice president, AFL–CIO; John L. Lewis, president, United Mine Workers of America; and many others.

I have mentioned these widespread tributes because of the universal recognition of this great, spiritual statesman in the labor movement. I am personally happy to pay him this profound and sincere tribute through these few remarks.

Mrs. Smith joins me in sending to Mrs. Riffe and all of her children our expression of sympathy and also our deep appreciation of the great personal inspiration that John Riffe has given to us and to all others with whom he came in contact.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a moving tribute which was given to John Riffe by the international officers and delegates at the 10th biennial convention, in New York, of the Transport Workers of America, AFL–CIO, during the period of John's recent, critical illness. At the time, John was attending the Assembly of Nations for Moral Re-Armament, on Mackinac Island, Mich. The tribute which I have asked to be printed is signed by Michael J. Quill, international president, Transport Workers Union of America, and William Grogan, international vice president.

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

> It is with real warmth in our hearts that the international officers and delegates of the tenth biennial convention of the Transport Workers Union of America AFL–CIO extend to our brother John Riffe, the last executive vice president of the CIO, our sincere fraternal greetings.
>
> We hail his sterling contributions to the building of the labor movement in the United States both as a former member and official of the United Mine Workers Union, as an official of the great Steelworkers Union and as the director of the CIO southern organizing drive and many other notable organizing efforts. We recognize the great part he played in bringing the 30,000 members of the railroad divisions into our union.
>
> Your credo in the labor movement will always live in our hearts because you have stood for the finer things in life. We recognize and pay tribute to your steadfast fight for sound ethical practices both within the labor movement and within industry and your example in living and applying sound moral principles in your work in the labor movement.
>
> The test was that you practiced what you preached. The entire labor movement is forever indebted for your untiring efforts to eventually consummate the historic merger between the AFL and the CIO. All our officers and delegates join in prayers that you have a speedy recovery so that you may again take your rightful place in the fight to make our labor movement a greater one in years to come and the world a better place to live in.
>
> Sincerely and fraternally yours,
> MICHAEL J. QUILL,
> *International President,*
> *Transport Workers Union of America.*
> WILLIAM GROGAN,
> *International Vice President.*

ISSUANCE OF PASSPORTS BY DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the ramifications of the cold war have heightened and brought into sharp focus many aspects of modern life. Among them have been international

travel and the issuance of passports. Particularly during the past year the subject of passports has been a controversial one here in the United States. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee held several hearings on the question last summer, and its study is still being carried on.

Mr. Roderic L. O'Connor, Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State, has recently written an article entitled "The State Department Defends," which appeared in the January 11 issue of Saturday Review. In this article Mr. O'Connor explains the bases for authority of the Department of State for issuing or refusing to issue passports and reviews the procedures of appeal.

We recognize—

He states—

that passport facilities can only be denied with scrupulous regard to the requirements of due process of law.

Well reasoned presentations which enable us to gain further insight into the matter are always welcome, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE STATE DEPARTMENT DEFENDS

(By Roderic L. O'Connor)

Out of more than half a million passport applications made to the State Department last year, only about 450 were denied on substantive grounds. Only 13 final denials were turndowns on the ground of Communist activities.

Yet today the Department's role in the issuance of passports has become an issue of increasing controversy. The Department's traditional right to deny passports, either to certain individuals, or to all individuals for certain areas, has lately been challenged with growing frequency in the courts, and criticized in the press. In view of this controversy, I am glad to have the opportunity to explain briefly the Department of State's position with respect to passports, and the reasons behind that position.

The passport is a document which has long been in use among most of the countries of the world. It was originally a letter of introduction from a chief of state requesting the authorities of one state to give due consideration to the citizen traveling from another state. The first mention of a passport in this sense occurs, in fact, in the Bible.

"Moreover, I said unto the King (of Persia), if it please the King, let letters be given me to the Governors beyond the river, that they may let me pass through 'til I come into Judah," Nehemiah, chapter 2, verse 7.

Today the passport is regarded as a document of identity and nationality. It has become in recent years under our laws a necessary document to allow the United States citizen to depart from the United States for travel outside the Western Hemisphere. It is also necessary under the laws of most foreign countries to have a passport in order to gain admittance to them. Thus, as a consequence of either the internal restrictions of our own laws on exit from or entry into the United States, or the restrictions imposed by foreign governments on travel across their borders, it is now a virtual impossibility for an American citizen to travel outside of the Western Hemisphere without a passport.

Because of its origin, the right of any government to grant, or withhold, a passport is recognized internationally. Our Secretary of State has had, since the early days of our Republic, the authority to issue passports or to restrict them. In fact, Congress enacted legislation in 1803 and in 1815 which dealt with the Secretary's issuance of passports. The basis of the present passport laws stems back to 1868. Most Secretaries of State have, at one time or another, exercised this right. It was not until recently that the Secretary's rights in this respect have been challenged in the courts.

The question now being debated is centered on the issue of the extent to which the Secretary of State has discretionary authority to deny passports to United States citizens who wish to travel abroad, or to issue passports which are restricted for travel in certain areas. I should like to clarify the Department's position on this issue.

The Secretary's authority both to deny or restrict passports stems from his basic constitutional powers in the conduct of foreign relations as well as from precedent and certain statutory authority. In denying passports to United States citizens, for reasons of national interest, the Secretary can base his denial on two general grounds. The first of these grounds is that the applicant is a member of the Communist Party; under Communist Party discipline, domination, or control; or that his travel abroad is to assist knowingly the cause of international communism. A recent decision in the Circuit Court of Appeals stated that, "to that end the Secretary may refuse to permit an adherent of the Communist movement, clothed with American citizenship, from being present in places where he may readily create incidents or may assert statutory rights to activity on the part of this Government in his behalf. The Secretary may preclude potential matches from the international tinderbox."

The second of the general grounds on which the Secretary may deny passports is that the applicant's travel, usually to a specific country or countries, is inimical to United States foreign policy or detrimental to the orderly conduct of United States foreign relations. This ground of refusal can be, but it is not necessarily, related to the first. It is related in the sense that anyone who can be shown to be a member of the Communist conspiracy or to be traveling abroad in connection with that conspiracy is likely to be engaging in activities inimical to our foreign policy. However, a traveler who has nothing to do with communism may still be subject to restriction for reasons of foreign policy.

When the Secretary issues a passport restricted for travel to certain areas, he is, in our view, making a determination that it is contrary to the foreign policy objectives of the United States to have American citizens traveling within those areas. That foreign policy determination does not in and of itself constitute a ban or prohibition which prevents Americans from going to these areas.

It is the practice of the Department of State, however, to refuse passport facilities to those American citizens who indicate an intention to travel into such areas contrary to the policy of their Government. As a practical matter, the refusal of passport facilities may, but does not necessarily, prevent the citizen from traveling abroad.

Since the denial of passport facilities may have this serious practical effect, the Department recognizes that such denial cannot be made arbitrarily or capriciously. The Department recognizes that such denials can be, in practice, a limitation upon any natural right the citizen may have to travel.

However, we believe that any such right, like all other rights, is subject to reasonable limitation in the national interest. We recognize that passport facilities can only be denied with scrupulous regard to the requirements of due process of law. Moreover, the citizen's right to appeal must equally be protected. We believe that our present procedures meet this test.

The State Department has for many years issued passports which have had stamped in them various restrictions as to their validity for travel to certain areas. Traditionally we have not issued passports for travel to countries in which we do not maintain diplomatic representation. We have of course, made exceptions to this general rule, as in the case of the Soviet Union in the 1920's and, in the last few weeks, Bulgaria. The State Department has also traditionally refused to validate passports for travel in areas where armed hostilities or national disasters make the presence of United States citizens hazardous.

Generally speaking, such restrictions have not in the past been challenged. We believe the authority to impose such restrictions is an important part of the Secretary's power in the field of foreign policy which should not be impaired. Moreover, experience indicates that if this authority is used on grounds which are clearly based on foreign policy that the courts will not substitute their judgment for that of the Secretary of State. When it comes to exercising a judgment on what constitutes interference with our foreign relations, the courts have long recognized that under the Constitution that right and responsibility rests with the Secretary of State. We believe it is important that this position should be understood and upheld by the citizens of America.

It was for the very reason of foreign policy that the United States Government placed its ban upon travel of American citizens to Communist China. Not only past and current events are involved in this policy but also the avowed future plans of a regime which has dealt in war, torture, deceit, and skulduggery. The Chinese Communists brazenly defied the United Nations in a war which cost more American casualties than World War I and they have never shown the slightest sign of repentence or made peace. Red China has violated an armistice agreement not only with respect to Korea but also Vietnam, and has built up huge military forces poised for action in both areas. It has repeatedly declared its intention of seizing Formosa, by force if necessary, and has adamantly refused to renounce force.

More than 157 American civilians have been unjustly imprisoned by Red China since 1949. At least five Americans have died as a result of their imprisonment. Many have been tortured. Six of these remain in prison today despite a public commitment to release them.

It is our view that on this record of demonstrated inhumanity, American citizens face abnormal risks in Red China. Moreover, it is our belief that our foreign policy objective throughout the Far East and Southeast Asia would be made more difficult to attain if American citizens were allowed to travel freely and to engage in trade and cultural relations with a regime which is an avowed enemy and has never shown the slightest inclination to follow the practices of civilized nations.

There have been, however, some cases where people have ignored these restrictions and traveled to restricted areas. This has caused a great deal of difficulty for the Department. The sole penalty provided by law for misuse of the passport is a criminal penalty which subjects the offender to as much as $2,000 fine or 5 years in prison. However, this penalty is a harsh one. Except in the most flagrant cases, the punishment would not seem to fit the crime.

Moreover, the problem is not met simply by refusing to issue passports to all applicants who have previously violated the restrictions. The Secretary of State's power to withdraw or withhold a citizen's passport

is not designed to be a punishment. It is designed as an instrument of foreign policy. The language of our regulations makes it clear that it is primarily our estimate of future action which is controlling in reaching a decision on the withholding of a passport, not the record of past action. Thus, the fact that a citizen has violated the restrictions in the past may be some evidence that he will do so in the future and thus interfere with the orderly conduct of United States foreign relations. However, we have never felt that such past action was the only factor in reaching a decision as to whether the passport should be withdrawn or not.

Under these general principles, the Department has made every effort to follow a uniform practice in handling the cases of citizens who have violated our restrictions. Regrettably, there have recently been a good many of these. Only this fall, a group of 42 American citizens traveled en masse to Communist China in direct violation of our restrictions. In each of these cases the Department made every reasonable effort to notify the citizen at his first point of exit from Communist China that his passport has been tentatively restricted for direct return to the United States. In each case where he would accept such notification, the citizen was advised of his rights to a hearing and of the applicable regulations under which this action has been taken. Moreover, because of possible hardships involved, the Department did not insist that any individual return at once to the United States. Instead, we announced that we would allow 60 days from the time of notification for the citizen to appeal our decision to endorse his passport for return home only. Only one citizen took advantage of this offer and, on December 18, 60 days after all members of the group had been notified, we announced that the period of grace had terminated.

Under these circumstances, the Department feels it has no alternative but to notify appropriate foreign governments that the passports of the 24 citizens who remain abroad are valid only for direct and immediate return to the United States. We have instructed our consuls so to endorse their passports when, and if, they turn up in their jurisdictions.

Some of these citizens have already refused to receive notification. Some have already refused to turn over their passports to our consuls for endorsement and may continue to so refuse. This will enter into the consideration of whether a passport should be granted them in the future.

When each citizen returns to the United States, his passport will be taken up. In each case, of course, the individual may appeal our decision. If and when he does so, we will judge each case on its merits. We shall inquire what the individual's intention is regarding future travel were he again to receive passport facilities. We shall specifically ask whether, if he were granted a new passport, he intends to abide by the restrictions in the passport. On the basis of the answers to these questions, and on the basis of all other pertinent information available to us, we will reach a decision in each case.

These decisions will be reached fairly and expeditiously. They will be reached with due regard to the rights of the individual. I am confident, however, that all Americans will agree that these individual rights must be weighed against the demands of our national interest. In reaching these judgments, I believe we have a responsibility to see to it that individual Americans are not allowed capriciously to disturb the delicate international situation by breaking restrictions which have been imposed for sound foreign policy reasons. If this factor is borne in mind, I am confident that the State Department's actions on this question will receive a full measure of public understanding and support.

ONE-MAN MILK CZAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, farmers are not the only ones concerned about Secretary Benson's crackdown on the dairy industry.

Consumers are beginning to get worried, too. Most housewives know that abundance is their best assurance of fair prices. Despite Secretary Benson's public bid for consumer support by telling them he is trying to bring milk prices down, more enlightened consumers are looking at the fine print behind Benson's promises and note that he is also telling farmers that his aim is to reduce production. If he succeeds in curtailing production—and I for one do not believe his price slash will do it—it can only mean higher prices for the consumer, not lower prices.

Mr. Benson had better make up his mind. He cannot have it both ways. He cannot tell the farmer he is going to get him better prices in the market place by cutting production, and out of the other side of his mouth tell the consumer he is going to give him lower prices.

A letter from an Illinois citizen raises the challenging point whether the Secretary of Agriculture alone should be allowed to set the price of milk in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD, and suggest that our city friends think over the points raised.

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

SHOULD THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ALONE BE ALLOWED TO SET THE PRICE OF MILK IN THE UNITED STATES?

Recently the Secretary of Agriculture has been guaranteeing the dairy farmer 83 percent of what the Government says is a fair price for the farmer's milk. On December 19, 1957, however, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that he would cut this guaranty to 75 percent of a fair price. He announced this cut in price to the farmer would result in a saving to the housewife of one-half cent per quart for milk.

The dairy farmer has been producing about 5 percent more milk than the market has been able to absorb at today's retail prices. It is the Secretary's often stated idea that if he can just get the farmer's selling price for milk low enough, then enough farmers will quit milking cows so that there will be no "surplus" of milk. In this event then (if there is no surplus) presumably the farmer's selling price would raise to "parity." To use the Secretary's line of reasoning when this happy event for the farmer would come about, it would mean the cost of milk to the housewife would be raised by 1½ cents per quart.

Six months before Secretary Benson announced his lowered prices to the American farmer Khrushchev boasted on a nationwide American telecast that Russia would soon surpass the United States in the per capita production of milk.

Thus we have the American Secretary of Agriculture using every means at his command to curtail the production of milk in the United States while, at the same time, the Russian dictator is striving to increase the supply of milk for the Russian people.

Under these circumstances there can be no doubt but that Russia will sometime surpass the United States in the per capita production of milk. When this happens it will be a bigger propaganda victory than sputnik in many of the depressed areas of the world where cow's milk for children is such a precious commodity.

But then comes up a most natural question, "Are we really producing more milk than we need?" If we are, of course we should quit producing so much milk.

Few men in America work as hard as the dairy farmer. He starts to milk his cows at 4 o'clock in the morning and again at 4 o'clock in afternoon—365 days in the year. He works hard, long hours to produce the world's most nearly perfect food. But if he is to be paid 25 percent less than he ought to be paid for his work, of course all of us would advise many dairy farmers to quit milking cows and to look for some more remunerative kind of work.

In the week ending December 14, 1957, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that if nobody would trust him alone to set the price at which corn, cotton, and wheat would be supported by the Government then he would consent to having these prices set by a bipartisan committee of the Congress.

This then brings up another natural question, "If, as the Secretary admits, nobody will trust him alone to set the prices at which corn, cotton, and wheat are supported—then why should we trust him alone to set the price at which milk is supported?" The supply and the price of milk is of much more importance to the housewives and children of the United States than is the price and acreage allotments of corn, cotton, and wheat.

I have two suggestions to make. (1) Let us accept the Secretary's offer with respect to crops, but transfer it to the matter of milk. Let us have a bipartisan committee of the Congress set the Government support price for milk but let Congress also set up a committee of agricultural economists, representatives of housewives, dairy executives, and dairy farmers to advise with the Congressional committee in the setting of the milk price to the farmer. They would do a more enlightened job than would the Secretary of Agriculture alone (any Secretary of Agriculture alone). We are putting too much power in the hands of one man when we let the Secretary of Agriculture alone set the price of milk for the people of the United States.

There are relatively few dairy farmers in the United States. They are "little people". They work hard but they have no organization of consequence, they don't represent many votes, and they have no powerful lobby in Washington—they just about have to take what Government rulings and prices are handed them, or quit milking cows.

Do we want a lot of dairy farmers in the United States to quit milking cows?

The housewives of the United States will be listened to by the Congress on any such important subject as milk. My second suggestion is that the P. T. A.'s of America, and the Leagues of Women Voters, and all groups of women, carefully consider this matter of our milk supply and price. Then let your Congressman and your Senator know what you think of this "one man control" of our milk supply and price.

L. W. COOK.

DECATUR, ILL.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many of us had hoped that the administration would summon the courage to propose a separate appropriation for economic assistance to India. Instead, the decision has apparently been made to include a modest amount for Indian aid in the new mutual-security bill, which, combined with possible loans from other sources and some Public Law

480 assistance, can be added together in a minimal package.

Frankly, I do not think that this is the dramatic program which the situation really requires. Several disturbed statesmen and commentators have brought the facts of the matter to our attention recently. In each case the facts have seemed to spell out a real challenge for the future of democracy in Asia, should India's second 5-year plan fail.

One of the best of these articles was written by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. It is entitled "If India Falls" and appears in the January 1958 issue of the Progressive magazine. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

IF INDIA FALLS

(By Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY)

In the wide span of American responsibilities in foreign policy none has been more perplexing than the formulation of a policy toward the new and uncommitted nations running from Casablanca to Djakarta. Over the past few years we have begun to appreciate that tested formulae we have applied to events in Western Europe and NATO have only limited application to the broad medley of changes occurring in an uncommitted world. Though we have learned that we must come to terms with the new nationalisms, we have tended to interpret their meanings too much against the backdrop of our own historic experience.

Easy as it is to proclaim a position of "anticolonialism," many sympathetic observers in the West have not fully realized that some of the new states have set their courses in an environment empty of positive democratic or liberal aim; that their attainment of political independence was but a prologue to the harsh realities of political and economic growth.

We have begun to learn that a purely military response to the tides in the Middle East and Asia is an illusory breakwater. For military pacts and arms shipments are themselves new divisive forces in areas shot through with national rivalries, often without historic boundaries and allegiances. We are beginning to see, too, the special attraction and emotional appeal which the Soviet Union has in the fluid pattern of events in the uncommitted world, to people full of social resentment and accustomed to authoritarian rule. Communism to them is the alternative, with the glamour of novelty, of breaking fresh ground, and of seeming to offer disciplined, coherent, and irresistible answers to the overwhelming problems of economic management and progress. Indeed, it has been one of Marxism's cruelest ironies that it has gained special force not in advanced industrial societies, but in areas of stagnation, peasant economy, or petrified authoritarianism.

Can the underdeveloped countries achieve economic modernization in freedom? The outlook in many countries is not hopeful. Some of these countries provide barren soil for any real economic progress to take root—they cannot productively absorb investment capital, they do not possess the skills or plans or social outlook which derive genuine benefit from economic assistance, their rapid gains in population seem certain to outpace any attempted increase in living standards. There are, of course, exceptions—and we dare not give any up as lost.

But one country in particular, India, has successfully pointed the way to progressive economic development; it has achieved a steady rate of growth, established the firm beginning of an industrial base, maintained an economy in which the private sector plays a large role, and avoided an excess of governmental regimentation and controls. In India democracy has prevailed in the face of heavy obstacles, the national and per capita incomes have risen despite the continuing rise in population, and education has spread. Two national elections have been held on the basis of universal suffrage. The parliamentary framework is no mirage and is sustained by capable political leadership and a first-rate civil service.

In 1956 India completed its first 5-year plan. During that time national income rose by nearly 18 percent, at least 5 percent more than expected. Quite apart from its intrinsic economic achievements, this plan, with its emphasis on agriculture, helped to generate a mood of national confidence, to divert national energies away from sterile colonial grievances and into the task of national self-development. Moreover, the plan was favored by good harvests and benign weather. During the period of this plan (1951–56) the United States aided India with nearly $300 million as well as a wheat loan of $190 million and a share in World Bank loans running to $40 million. Few assistance contributions we have made have been better used for real economic development.

India's second 5-year plan is now in its second year. In contrast to the first plan it stands in great peril. It may soon collapse. In part this danger is the handmaiden of success—the fact that the Indian economy is expanding, that the government has not imposed a rigid series of controls, that it has permitted a considerable sector of private enterprise. This plan, moreover, is ambitious—two-and-a-half times as large as the first plan. It is seeking to cross the most difficult threshold of economic growth—the establishment of capital-generative basic industries such as steel. It is trying to double Indian national income in real terms in the next 10 or 12 years. It seeks to mobilize India's rich resources in hydropower, iron ore, manganese, coal. The essential features of the plan include three steel mills, which absorb the largest fraction of the investment and which would expand crude steel output to 6 million tons; railway and transport improvements costing over $2½ billion; machine moulding shops and a step-up in hydroelectric and coal output, as well as critical but less expansive plans for agriculture and irrigation, service industries, housing, and education.

Clearly this plan, which is developing at a time of poor harvests and growing unemployment, and which requires the importation of machinery from abroad, is dependent upon international credit. But this is a time of high prices in foreign capital. The World Bank's interest rate is more than 5½ percent. The road ahead for India's plan seems extremely difficult indeed.

It is easy to dismiss India's needs with the assertion that she has launched a grandiose and impossibly large scheme calling for a scale of efforts and cumulative capital infusion wholly beyond her capacity. Yet this is hardly the fact. The investment represented is less than $7 per head per year. Until 1961 it seeks only a total increase in income of 5 percent per year, or about 3½ percent per capita—by no means an extravagant goal when set beside the parallel effort of totalitarian planning by China. If the plan succeeds, India's rate of investment will still be less than 10 percent of total national income, compared with nearly 20 percent in Russia and 15 percent in prewar Japan. In a country with twice the population of all Western Europe, the scale of financing will only equal Sweden's (with a population of 7 million).

India, moreover, has taken stern measures of economic self-discipline. Austerity characterizes the current economic program of the Indian Government. Taxes are high, especially after the recent addition of wealth and expenditure taxes; stiff import controls and licensing have been imposed to ease the drain on India's foreign exchange reserves. Foreign travel has been almost prohibited. Though few persons have an income level that contributes much taxation in a nation whose per capita income is under $60, persons of measurable income are taxed more heavily than anywhere in the world. In fact, the real question is whether these austerity measures may not have reached the point of becoming self-defeating—drying up too much private capital, debilitating the private sector by the rigidity of import controls, sapping the incentives on which much of the plan was predicated.

Unfortunately, a serious foreign exchange crisis has forced India to prune its plan to the core. Her balance of payments gap may be as much as $3 billion over the next 3½ years. Her foreign reserves have already been almost halved in the past year. Import restrictions on consumer goods have been tightened and some expenditures under the plan curtailed, extend in time, or canceled. Railroad stations, office buildings, foreign cultural missions, radio transmitters, and health centers have been the victims of the cutback. But these measures have only closed the gap a little; the heavy expenditures lie in the heart of the plan—steel, transport, irrigation, machine plants, power.

Can the Indian Government cut further into the plan without deflating all its vital energies? It is quite clear that it cannot; for a genuine program of economic development is a seamless web which cannot be pulled apart and rewoven from cheaper materials. The Indian economy has reached a level of maturity and complexity in which the various elements of the plan are interwoven—steel and transport and coal and machine tools are part of a single complex and must grow together. Moreover, electric power and education are the muscle for a developmental effort. Without them there will be a husk without the kernel.

Further serious cuts in the plan, in short, would not save money. They would only veil and compound even greater costs in the future—or decree the death sentence of the plan and India's democratic experiment in Asia. There may be some stretchout which can be made, a few frills to be cut and a few postponements which are possible, but they little affect the overall scale of the plan or the size of India's loan and aid requirements.

If the second 5-year plan collapses, so may India. If India collapses, so may all of Asia. If all of Asia collapses, so does the security of the United States of America. However sharply one may reject the concept of American ideals impelling us to help others in need, however blind one may be to the dependence of our own economic well-being upon our closing the prosperity gap between ourselves and the have-not nations, no thoughtful citizen can fail to see our direct stake in the survival of free government in India. If India—the showcase of the democratic experiment in Asia, the only real contender with Peking for the faith and following of that continent's millions of questioning citizens—should fall prey to internal disorder, agitation, or disillusionment, or if she should join China (with a population of nearly 1 billion between them) in the Communist camp, the free world would never be the same.

Though the Indian Government has consistently been reluctant to ask for outside help, neither that Government nor our own can avoid the fact that the second 5-year plan is fully dependent upon outside capital. The Communist world need not supply

it—their purposes would be even better suited by the Nehru Government's failure. It is the free world—basically its wealthiest leader, the United States—that holds the key to India's future; and India's future may well be the key to the free world.

The central issue is not India's neutrality, or the statements of Nehru and Krishna Menon, or India's relations with Pakistan, or the existence of nationalized industries, or competition with or restrictions on American products. We may talk about these and other problems—we may assert they require further study or negotiation or delay—but they cannot obscure the central issue: the survival of India, of Asia, of the free world. No discussion can avoid the harsh facts of India's real needs, of her dependence upon the second plan's success, of that plan's dependence upon American funds, and of our dependence upon a free and independent India.

It is not as though the Indian Government has warned: "Help us or we shall go to Moscow." They have attempted no such intimidation. But they know and we know what the alternatives are to economic and political stability in Asia—and what happened in the Indian state of Kerala, where well-educated but despairing citizens freely elected a Communist government.

The necessity for American action is so apparent that the real question now, I would hope, is not whether we respond but how. There is some indication that the administration is unwilling to take the matter directly to Congress, but may prefer instead to piece together an aid program from existing laws, much as they did in the case of Poland last spring. Would this be enough?

At the present time the United States is furnishing India about $70 million in hard currency assistance, most of it on a loan basis. About $60 million is for economic development purposes—such as machinery and steel plates—and the remainder in technical assistance. In addition, India will receive about $360 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities—largely wheat and rice—over a 3-year period, with a substantial portion of the local currencies resulting from the sale of these commodities also loaned back to India for economic development purposes. Although the total is thus already a larger level of assistance than we were providing under the first plan, it falls far short of her requirements, even after the assistance likely to come from other nations and the World Bank.

There are, of course, avenues of increased assistance under present legislation which the administration is exploring:

First, the law on agricultural surpluses may be capitalized by another half billion or more dollars, with some of this going to India—but there are many other claimants, including close allies such as Greece and Turkey.

Second, the Export-Import Bank might reshape its policies so as to include India. But its current requirements for early repayment and for the purchase of American goods make it of little help to India's program—and a half a billion of its current credit has already been committed to Great Britain.

Third, India might receive a larger loan from the new ICA (International Development Fund). But the Congress capitalized this fund at only $300 million; and even if a sharp increase were voted at this coming session, it also must serve many "customers" without committing an exaggeratedly large percentage of its funds to any one country.

Perhaps these laws could all be used; perhaps we could adapt the proposals for increasing India's credit suggested by Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, our able former ambassador to New Delhi, who urged that we sell an additional $160 million of agricultural surpluses against rupees, and convert the $190 million wheat loans of 1951 to a rupee basis. But these steps do not seem to me to come to terms with India's real needs over the full span of the second plan. That effort requires something more than merely small injections of adrenalin.

Too often in the past our aid to India has been marked by reluctance, vacillation, and excessive redtape. It seems to me that, rather than relying year by year on a series of expedients, holding the Indians in perpetual suspense, and giving aid short of the minimum required, the time has come to meet the problem head on with special legislation, to act generously according to our ability in full recognition that the success of the Indian development scheme is in our own best interest.

Because of the shortage of time, it may be necessary in the coming year to pass an emergency-type program for India to last until there has been a full assessment of needs—as Congress did in the fall of 1957 for the start of the Marshall plan. But it would be no service to ourselves or to India to hope that a final solution can be found by squeezing small items from all existing laws and hoping that they can do the job with a little belt tightening in India. If our actions are to have the maximum economic and psychological impact, it is essential that we meet this challenge boldly and with courage.

This is not to say that the $600 million loan figure informally suggested to our Government by Indian Finance Minister Krishnamachari represents a magic number as either a floor or a ceiling. Our stake in the plan is vital enough for us to make certain that we grant neither too little nor too much. The Indian planners themselves seem uncertain about their "built-in deficit," about what further cuts or postponements are plausible, or what their real needs will be for dollar loan support through 1961. The serious plight of the plan is obvious in India's talks with American, British, and German leaders—but the exact nature of its needs need to be spelled out more fully.

The parallel here with the problems of European recovery just 10 years ago is striking. Like that of postwar Europe, the Indian economy has reached the crucial and precarious point of success or failure, with much the same political dangers. Secretary George C. Marshall in 1947 urged the European countries to make a reckoning of their primary requirements. After such a review and a candid presentation of needs, it was possible for Congress to commit itself to the Marshall program of European recovery. Today, if we are to become effective contributors to India's economic survival and health, it is essential that India present us with a searching and wholly realistic accounting of its plans and needs.

As long as her precise requirements are shrouded in uncertainty, we are likely to continue purely stopgap and patchwork remedies which will satisfy neither India nor potential lenders. It is far better if a frank exchange exists between both countries, both in terms of generating support and securing a level of aid which rests on more than false expectations or cloudy hopes. There exists in the United States a large reservoir of good will toward India and a genuine concern that its economic growth be unimpaired. But a fund of good will becomes a source of support only if there is assurance that India herself knows her destination and goals and is aware of the means necessary to reach them. It would be an important step forward if the United States would begin at once to undertake the kind of bipartisan surveys which were made in Europe in 1947–48, both through Congressional committees and executive study groups.

It is not suggested, of course, that the United States Treasury be the sole source of support to sustain the Indian plan. On the contrary, the occasion provides a splendid opportunity for the kind of real multilateral assistance and joint effort many of us have long urged. It is likely that Germany will make a significant contribution, that Canada and Great Britain and the Colombo plan countries can make modest ones, and that in the improved climate of relations even Japan may be a contributory state in textile machinery. Moreover, the International Bank has already made loans for railroad development and to the Tata Steel Co., and will probably make more beyond the $360 million already committed.

The Soviet Union, too, may well be a contributor—and some will say that American aid is thus futile or misguided. The Soviet Union has, to be sure, loaned India much of the money to build the Bhelai steel mill on a 12-year 2½ percent loan and has recently negotiated another $126 million loan at low interest. But here seems to be an extraordinary opportunity to match systems with the Soviet Union on favorable terms, to show our true concern for economic development, and to push India well ahead in its competition with the Chinese economy (which is also on its second plan phase and experiencing serious trouble, especially in the agricultural sector).

Finally, some help can be expected from private investment, which has already entered India in some quantity and will continue to do so on an expanded basis. But private investment cannot cover the gap. There is little question that dollar for dollar private investment is both the most durable and most resilient form of assistance; and varied foreign concerns and banks have made investments in India. (Krupps of Germany is building a steel mill; the World Bank has repeatedly shown confidence in the private sector of the Indian economy.) But it is equally true that we are in a period of investment capital starvation, with an overabundance of capital outlets and a depletion of available sources. The United States channeled over $4 billion into private foreign investment last year, but less than 10 percent of this was venture capital in underdeveloped states. Well over three-quarters is attributable to investment in Canada, in Latin America, and Middle East oil.

There is no visible political glory for either party in coming to the aid of India, particularly at this time of high taxes and pressing defense needs. The task of selling such a program to the American people is far more difficult than that of a decade ago—for we were more familiar with the people and problems of Europe, our ties were closer, their economies were more directly alined with our own and held out more certain promise of success. But the need and the danger are as great now as then—India today represents as great a hope and challenge to the future of liberal democracy as Western Europe did in 1947—and our people are still, I am confident, equal to the effort.

I realize that it is difficult to give resonance to such words and proposals in the mood which has governed our approach to foreign aid and economic policy in the past sessions of Congress. But this mood has in part been induced by the persistent counsel of caution, by the lack of vision and purposefulness with which we have approached the problems of the underdeveloped world. If we are to break the aimless drift and deadlocks in policy, if we are to regain the initiative in world affairs, if we are to rouse the decent emotions of Americans, it is time again that we seek projects with the power of stirring and rallying our hopes and energies.

In the Indian loan appeal the United States can both demonstrate our creative magnanimity and serve well our national interest in Asia.

UNION DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of this body to an outstanding example of union democracy in action, which has been taking place for the last 2 weeks here in Washington. I know our distinguished Presiding Officer, the Vice President, is aware of this, because he addressed the distinguished assembly of delegates.

I am referring, Mr. President, to a series of working conferences that are being held here by one of America's great unions, the United Steel Workers of America. These conferences were addressed by the Vice President and by the Senate majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas].

During these 2 weeks 4,000 rank and file leaders of this great union, representing 1¼ million members from nearly every State in America, have been holding workshop meetings here. They have been discussing not only how to best serve the people they represent in their unions, but also their communities, their States, and the Nation.

These leaders come from the working heart of America—from the iron ranges of my own State of Minnesota, from the lead and zinc mines of the Rocky Mountains, from the great industrial centers, from the giant steel centers of Gary, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Chicago, and elsewhere, and from the fabricating mills and plants which produce not only the weapons of national defense but the instruments of peaceful living in the home.

In addition to their many industry problems, they are faced with a common problem—the specter of growing unemployment and recession. They are deeply concerned, not only for themselves, but for the entire Nation and the Free World.

Mr. President, I am proud to say it has always been my privilege to have the support of this great democratic union membership. It represents industrial democracy at its best. Within the framework of its democratic constitution, the rank-and-file members elect their own officers, from the local union to the international level. Their election structure is similar to the democratic election structure of our Nation.

Their elected president, David J. McDonald, one of the truly able and distinguished labor statesmen, has brilliantly presented an analysis to these conferences of the problems facing the economy in this uneasy and troubled world. I know Mr. McDonald to be one of the true labor statesmen of America, Mr. President, and a great public servant of our country.

Mr. President, I commend this analysis to every Member of this body, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STEELWORKERS AND THE ECONOMY: WHAT IS HAPPENING AND WHAT MUST BE DONE

(An address by David J. McDonald, President, United Steelworkers of America, January 6, 1958)

As America enters a new year of crisis, it is necessary to speak forthrightly about the state of our national economy.

Another periodic business downturn has overtaken us, and it shows evidence of becoming as severe as, or perhaps worse than, the recessions of 1949 and 1954. Because of recent production cutbacks, the living standards of millions of our families have already begun to deteriorate, our security is being weakened, and our prestige overseas is undermined.

As spokesman for over 1,250,000 steelworkers who are deeply affected by these events, and as an American, I cannot refrain from expressing my candid views about what is happening and what must be done.

Even before the first sputnik flashed across the sky and dramatized the rapid rise of Soviet scientific, industrial and military might, our own unmatched productive system—the inspiration and defensive bulwark of the entire Free World—had entered a dangerous downward drift.

Manufacturing and mining output in the United States has dropped 7 percent between December 1956 and December 1957. Moreover, the fall-off has been accelerating rapidly during the last 4 months.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, reports that its industrial production went up 10 percent during the year just ended.

Our output, moreover, continues to decline and most economists foresee no upturn before the second half of 1958, if by then, unless vigorous corrective action is taken immediately.

By mid-November, 3.2 million Americans were already unemployed. This was the highest jobless count for any November since 1949. Since then—although official figures are not yet available—we all know that unemployment has gone up still more.

Workers in manufacturing are particularly hard hit. By mid-November, factory jobs had already been slashed by 654,000 since December 1956. In the same period, the workweek in manufacturing fell off from 41.0 hours to 39.2. Furthermore, employment in major nonmanufacturing categories has also leveled off or declined.

Unemployment and underemployment inevitably overtake the economy when the output of one great American industry after another stagnates or declines.

Today, the aluminum industry is turning out about 12 percent less than its rapidly expanding capacity could provide; 20 percent less major electrical appliances are being manufactured than could be produced; 25 percent less automobiles; 40 percent less freight cars; 50 percent less machine tools.

And, today over a third of the production capacity of the great basic steel industry of the United States stands idle. Blast furnaces, open hearths, and rolling mills capable of turning out an additional 50 million tons of steel ingots a year to meet our civilian and defense requirements, are now shut down.

Meanwhile, 125,000 members of the United Steelworkers of America in basic steel, ferrous and nonferrous metal mining, and in metal fabricating establishments are unemployed and 200,000 additional members are working short time.

The loss of purchasing power suffered by our membership alone, due to unemployment and the reduced workweek, now approximates a rate of $850 million a year.

Steel industry forecasters express only a hope that production may rise sufficiently in the last part of 1958 to achieve an average operating rate of about 75 percent of capacity for the year. But even if this goal is reached, the United States will have lost—and irretrievably—about 35 million tons of steel that could have been produced. This is in addition to the loss of 15 million tons that we could have turned out in the last 6 months of 1957, but did not.

In 1957–58—as in 1949 and 1954—our constantly rising capacity to produce has again outpaced the ability of 55 million American families to buy the wealth our national economy is able to turn out.

For 2 years our soaring investment in new plants and in more efficient equipment sparked the boom which ended last year. In 1956, capital investment skyrocketed to a record $35 billion, more than $6 billion higher than the year before. In 1957 it rose still higher, to $37 billion. This tremendous expansion of production capacity has created the possibility of an unprecedented growth in the output of goods of all sorts.

Unfortunately, however, demands from all sources have lagged far behind our rising ability to produce. In fact, in many important categories 1957 sales were lagging behind the levels of a year or even 2 years before.

For example:

In the first 11 months of 1957, the sale of new automobiles came to 5½ million, a shade less than the year before. During the same period in 1955, however, over 7 million new cars were sold.

Last year, new housing starts fell to less than a million for the first time since 1948. In 1956, we started to build over 1.1 million new dwelling units and more than 1.3 million in the course of the year before.

Shipments of major electrical appliances also lagged in 1957—freezers were down 5 percent from the year before, refrigerators down 9½ percent, ranges down 14 percent.

Furniture sales also fell off about 10 percent last year.

Freight carloadings are running about 15 percent below a year ago.

Waning optimism about the health of the economy was finally reflected on Wall Street and set in motion the stock-market slump that began last July. As production schedules leveled off or moved downward, the decline gradually spread, like a chain reaction, from one industry to another.

For 3 successive months the personal income of the American people has been going down, although most of the drop so far is in "labor" income, and reflects the wage losses from unemployment and the shorter workweek.

Retail sales have likewise shown a downward trend in recent months. As more and more families find their income falling, and millions become apprehensive about their jobs and debts (consumer debt is now at a record high) a lag in sales is not surprising.

Meanwhile, manufacturing and trade inventories are near an alltime peak. As could be anticipated under these circumstances, incoming orders and the unfilled backlogs of many manufacturing concerns, are now declining.

Thus, the immediate outlook is not good.

During the 1949 recession, rapidly rising Federal, State, and local expenditures and rising automobile sales helped to cushion the decline. During the 1954 slump, booming home construction and rising consumer purchases did the same. Unfortunately, no comparable upward movement in any major area is immediately in sight on the basis of production forecasts.

Housing starts now show no sign of rising appreciably above the level of 1957.

Automobile production—with 800,000 new 1958 models reported to be in dealers' showrooms and overflowing the lots—hardly looks promising for 1958. In fact, industry sources now predict lower sales than a year ago.

Since midsummer, exports also have been falling.

Furthermore, in the face of idle production capacity, businessmen are revising their plans for new plant and equipment downward. An overall drop of at least $2 billion—or about 7 percent—is forecast for 1958. Outlays by manufacturers are already expected to fall 16 percent. If demand fails to rise very quickly, these totals may well be cut still more. (At the same time, our capacity to produce with more efficient machines and with fewer employees will still be rising

rapidly as expansion programs for this year as well as for previous years are finally completed.)

Although total Government outlays will go up in 1958, there is no indication that the increase now planned will be sufficient to restore full employment and production in the months immediately ahead. The national administration, although belatedly accelerating defense procurement contracts, apparently will propose an overall Federal budget rise of only two to three billion dollars. At the State and local level, where tax collections are beginning to level off, public assistance costs are rising, and the debt burden is now at an alltime high, we cannot be too certain that public works outlays will continue to rise substantially.

As steelworkers, we have no desire to make political capital out of the deteriorating economic situation and the absence of an adequate effort to change it. However, events are becoming increasingly critical for hundreds of thousands of our members, and for the Nation.

Instead of vainly waiting to see if the situation gets worse, in 3 months or in 6—and facing the possibility of having to cope with a much more difficult problem later on—action must be taken now to reverse the downward trend.

The great American productive system can be, and must be, immediately restored to full operation to meet the daily needs of our expanding population and the defense requirements of the imperiled free world. Our economy must, in fact, move constantly forward to higher levels of production and efficiency.

By the last 3 months of 1958, it is possible to achieve a record production rate at least $25 billion higher than our output level during the last quarter of 1957.

We are completely confident this production goal can be achieved. These are our views about why we must achieve it, and how:

1. THE DEFENSE OF THE FREE WORLD MUST BE MADE SECURE

Many argue that until a worldwide disarmament agreement can become a reality, only our own overwhelming retaliatory power will effectively deter aggression.

As steelworkers, we do not deem ourselves experts who can advise precisely what must be done, how much, and how fast.

But this we certainly do know. No other nation on the face of the globe can match our physical and manpower resources available to do any job. Given the facts and the leadership, Americans will support, and will accomplish, whatever must be done.

Is it not time to be getting on with the job?

From mid-1957 to the end of this year, about 50 million tons of steel that America could and should have been producing to remain strong and prosperous, will likely be lost if we keep on drifting. This tragic waste is actually equivalent to over 80 percent of the entire 60 million ton steel production goal the Russians have set for themselves in 1958.

Furthermore, the present recession is already causing a mountainous production loss of other vital materials and equipment.

We recognize, of course, that many factors other than the amount of money spent and materials used up determine the effectiveness of our defense preparedness. Scientific research, military production planning, and the training of technical personnel are increasingly vital too. We are not apostles of frenzied defense spending for its own sake, alone.

American educational leadership—on which our scientific and technical advances, our public welfare and our defense all irrevocably depend—must be restored. Far more facilities for scientific research and training must be established. Competent teachers must be attracted to the schools, and kept there, by the payment of adequate salaries. Furthermore, a vast extension of higher education in all fields must be achieved through scholarships and by other means.

Is it not a national scandal that today only 4 out of every 11 high school graduates who are qualified, actually enter college? The rest either lack the necessary motivation to continue their education, or are financially unable to pay for it.

In addition, we must further extend our effort to aid underdeveloped free nations, for humanitarian and security reasons alike. Stronger economies, as well as military aid, are essential everywhere to strengthen freedom. Unfortunately, the gap between the poor nations and the wealthy ones is getting wider, rather than diminishing.

We should be helping more, by increasing mutually beneficial trade, by increasing technical assistance, and by increasing our grants and loans—particularly at a time when demands on our industry are slack and our farmers are capable of producing an abundance we cannot ourselves consume.

2. THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES OF AMERICAN COMMUNITIES MUST BE EXPANDED TO MEET OUR GROWING NEEDS

There is much to be done at home that could keep America's mammoth productive system continuously and fully employed.

For example, at the present time we could be producing more steel, cement, aluminum, and glass to help end the critical classroom shortage across the Nation.

American schools and colleges are already filled to overflowing. Yet, enrollments are now increasing by over a million a year. By 1965, elementary, high school and college attendance is expected to be 15 million higher than it was in 1955.

Already the classroom shortage exceeds 150,000. In the next 5 years, according to responsible estimates, America should build at least half a million new schoolrooms. A total of about 15,000 new schools should be constructed throughout the Nation.

Passage of the Federal School Construction Act will give needed aid in this area. More than Federal-aid at the college level and for scientific and technical research is now needed; we must strengthen our entire school system from the bottom up. Passage of this act is essential to help build schools in communities where they are now most critically needed. At the same time, it will put idle men and machines back to work. Most important, it will show that Americans mean it when we say that our education must once again lead the world.

In addition, a tremendous backlog of unmet public facility needs—besides our school requirements—has been gradually building up.

In 1940, we were a Nation of 132 million people. There are 172 million Americans today. Ten years from now there will be 200 million.

Naturally, this astronomical population rise is increasing the demand for every type of public facility. Moreover, the construction lag during the depression and two wars has intensified the crisis we now face.

Despite our record postwar state and local construction of streets and highways, water, sewerage and industrial waste facilities, airports, parks and recreational centers, hospitals and other institutional buildings, the need keeps mounting, particularly in the congested metropolitan areas where most of the population growth is now occurring.

According to Government studies, even the present peak rate of State and local public works construction is less than half of our current need.

On the Federal level, we are also lagging in harbor improvement, flood control, the expansion of power facilities, the strengthening of our merchant marine, the improvement of our national parks and forests, and the construction of Federal buildings.

All of these public facilities—Federal, State and local—are essential and urgently needed public improvements.

By accelerating this kind of construction now, we could stimulate employment and utilize industrial capacity we are presently wasting. Furthermore, the wealth of the entire Nation could be greatly and permanently increased.

Prompt Federal leadership could rapidly increase home construction and slum clearance in cities across the country. Only last month Fortune magazine pointed out—"Today some 17 million Americans live in dwellings that are beyond rehabilitation—decayed, dirty, rat infested, without decent heat or light or plumbing. This problem affects all our metropolitan cities * * * but it is most severe in the biggest, richest, and most industrialized. The number of people crowded into slums is growing faster than the cities as a whole."

Responsible public groups report that a national housing goal of two million new units a year is now required if the dream of an adequate home for every American family is ultimately to be fulfilled. Surely, we can at least achieve the 1.5 million annual housing starts long ago proposed by the late Senator Taft. It can be done with proper Federal leadership.

In the first instance, public policies must support the construction of well built and reasonably priced homes for the middle-income market, by allowing low initial payments and long-term mortgages at low interest rates, geared to ability to pay.

To meet the needs of families who cannot afford to undertake home ownership, public housing also must be substantially increased.

Is not now the time—particularly when idle plants and manpower are available—to move faster toward the goal of decent homes in decent neighborhoods for all Americans, regardless of their economic status?

3. WE MUST RAISE THE LIVING STANDARDS OF ALL AMERICAN FAMILIES, AND PARTICULARLY THE NEEDIEST

Millions of our fellow citizens still live in poverty despite the unequaled American economic gains of the last 20 years. And, poverty continues to breed upon misfortunes which still abound in these United States. These include: Substandard wages; unemployment and underemployment; old age without adequate resources; the impact of accidents, ill health, and death upon the unprotected family; educational deficiencies; discrimination because of color, race, or creed.

Uncounted millions of our fellow Americans still work for less than $1 an hour. The protection intended by the fair labor standards laws has just passed them by.

For the unemployed, our State compensation system barely provides an average of $28 a week. Only in 2 States do even these meager benefits continue beyond 26 weeks; in 13 States, they end after 20 weeks, or less.

For the aged, our Federal social-security system is providing an average of only $24.50 weekly for a married couple, and only $16.10 for a primary beneficiary alone.

Under our State workmen's compensation laws, payments for work-incurred injury, and for death, continue to be scandalously low. Besides, we still have no adequate system that insures the American family against income loss due to non-work-incurred disability and the soaring medical cost of catastrophic illness.

It should come as no surprise that a Congressional inquiry, 2 years ago, found 31 million Americans in families with cash income of less than $2,000 a year. Even in prosperous 1956, 29 percent of our families had incomes of under $3,000 before taxes, according to the Federal Reserve Board. Furthermore, 53 percent of our families had less than $500 in liquid savings with which

to face emergencies; 23 percent had none at all.

Surely, there is no moral and no economic justification for unused factory and farm capacity when so many American families still are in need of so much.

America must set about raising family incomes fast enough to keep pace with its constantly rising ability to produce. And it must move fastest where the need is clearly most urgent.

We should raise the standards and coverage of minimum wage laws immediately.

We should expand the benefits and the coverage of our social-security laws so that the unemployed, the aged, the sick, widows and orphans, and the victims of industrial accidents can begin to live in dignity and decency.

We must oppose the increasing use of sales taxes and wage taxes that already bear so heavily on our lowest income families. Exemptions for dependents under the Federal income tax law must also be raised to a level that more realistically reflects the cost of raising a child.

Furthermore, all wage and salary earners must fairly share in benefits from productivity gains that they constantly are helping to bring about.

Steelworkers can claim a measure of achievement in this regard. Yet, in the basic steel industry productivity—the real output rise per manhour—has actually gone up far faster than the real wage gains of the workers. Between 1939 and 1957, real hourly straight time wages went up 53 percent. Steel productivity, on the other hand, rose 71 percent.

The determination of many industrial leaders to profiteer on every wage increase—while making labor the scapegoat for the higher prices they impose—is a major reason why real family incomes have not kept pace with our rising capacity to produce, and, in fact, why for millions real income has been falling.

The steel industry is a classic example of the way this inflation-making process operates.

Although steel prices had already been raised $13.50 a ton in less than 1 year, only last July they were hiked $6 more. Yet, prices could have been cut by $6 and profits still would have compared favorably with profits earned by the industry in most any prior year.

Is it any wonder that in 1957, despite drastically reduced production, steel profits were higher than at any time before?

This effort by the steel and other industries to wring ever higher profits from ever higher prices has triggered the inflation that has plagued us all through the postwar years. A stable relationship between costs and profits is never long established. While a few profiteer, the many suffer. Ultimately, the process becomes self-defeating even for those who start it, because prices move so high that full production cannot be maintained. This is a major reason for the recessions which occur every 3 or 4 years.

4. MOST IMPORTANT, WE MUST BE DETERMINED TO UTILIZE FULLY AMERICA'S UNMATCHED RESOURCES AND OUR LEADERS MUST GUIDE THE WAY. THIS IS A TIME FOR ACTION

Twelve years ago, when Congress passed the Employment Act of 1946, it pledged to the American people that:

"It is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government * * * with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all of its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining * * * maximum employment."

There is no need to tell steelworkers—with thousands of our members now unemployed or working part-time, and facing uncertainty and distress—that this pledge to the Nation has not been fulfilled.

Yet, in the hands of the Federal Government there are, and have been, the means to prevent this unnecessary economic downturn.

By working cooperatively with State and local governments, and with private groups, and by using the economic know-how and vast monetary, fiscal, and procurement powers at its command much could have been done.

While an increase in family spending should have been a major tax policy objective at the end of the Korean war, the Federal Revenue Code Amendments of 1954 conveyed billions in tax savings to wealthy individuals and corporations instead. Practically no relief has been granted, on the other hand, to the 28 million Federal taxpayers with incomes of $5,000 or less.

In the name of fighting inflation, brought on largely by profiteering and the capital expansion boom—a blunderbuss hard money, high-interest rate policy has been pursued without adequate thought of its consequences. Unfortunately, it has hindered critically needed public construction. Besides, high interest rates have added billions to the carrying charges of family purchases of appliances, automobiles, and homes, and to the public cost of meeting the charges on Federal, State, and local debts.

In the name of economy, rising public service needs have been ignored and existing programs have been cut.

But this, I trust, is all behind us.

Let us now look to our defenses.

Let us accelerate the construction of the public facilities our expanding population so critically needs.

And, let us now—management, labor, and Government together—pursue those enlightened policies that are necessary to build up family purchasing power to match our rising capacity to produce.

If we but use our unmatched physical and human resources wisely, we can have adequate schools for all our children, decent homes and neighborhoods for all our families, and banish poverty forever from this land.

This unwarranted business downturn can be ended practically overnight. It must be. Americans are in no mood to tolerate the fatal doctrine of a balanced budget while their country keeps drifting down.

In April 1954, at another grave time for the steelworkers, the executive board of this great union said:

"The United Steelworkers of America neither view the present nor the future with hysteria. Our faith in this Nation and its capacity to meet its problems is unlimited."

We hold true to this view today. But it is time to get on with the job.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, much of the press has given quite a distorted version of the issues involved in Secretary Benson's announced plans to further slash dairy supports. By and large, his propaganda claims have been taken at face value without many alert correspondents taking the trouble to check into the facts—and compare what Secretary Benson is saying now to what he promised then, and what happened to the past promises.

At least one newspaper took a more objective look—and came up with the conclusion that Mr. Benson is just pulling the wool over the public's eye.

The Springfield Leader Press of Springfield, Mo., carried an editorial on Thursday, January 9, which put the issue in true perspective. It concluded with this observation:

Mr. Benson should be guided by one of two objectives: to save Uncle Sam money or to improve the dairymen's market. We maintain—and history supports us—that he will fail in both.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

UNDOING OF THE FARMER

By cutting dairy price supports to 90 percent of parity, Agriculture Secretary Benson said yesterday he anticipates a decline of at least 40 percent in Federal dairy products purchases in the next year.

On what basis does he make such a prediction? Surely not on the basis of experience. Mr. Benson, when he announced the price prop cut a few weeks ago, admitted that it would probably stimulate farmers to produce more milk, but he hoped that lower prices would also stimulate consumption accordingly.

At that time, Newsweek, a magazine not noted for its support of farm subsidies, dryly observed that past experience showed an increase in production could be expected, all right, but that this had always resulted in larger surpluses.

Turn back the clock to the last dairy subsidy reduction. In 1952, Uncle Sam was buying only three-tenths of 1 percent of our dairy output, when he was supporting prices at 90 percent of parity. Late that year, Mr. Benson rolled back the support level to 83 percent on milk used in manufacturing and 80 percent on butter.

Farmers immediately began to produce more milk and in 1953, United States dairy surplus purchases jumped from a mere .3 percent to 8.2 percent of the Nation's dairy output. Did he save money—better the market?

In the years since, the dairy farmer has slowly brought his output nearer to balance. Benson, yesterday, indicated the surplus would run to about 3 percent. However, United States Department of Agriculture estimates at mid-fall were well below this. The 1956 surplus was only about 3 percent and 1957's production was running behind its anticipated level, which hinted that 2 percent would be nearer right.

The United States dairy cow population fell 600,000 in 1956, as much as it did in the preceding 5 years. Butter production, for the first time in years, declined in 1957—which meant less Federal purchases. And across the Nation, milk markets were closer to complete balance than they'd been in years. In other words, the dairyman was digging out of his own depression.

If history repeats itself, production will soar again in 1958 and the same market morass, the same heavy purchases of surpluses will be suffered again.

Mr. Benson should be guided by one of two objectives; to save Uncle Sam money or to improve the dairymen's market. We maintain—and history supports us—that he will fail in both.

THE REPLY OF DEAN ACHESON TO THE PROPOSALS OF GEORGE F. KENNAN

Mr. DOUGLAS. The former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, has made a very convincing refutation of some of the proposals recently advanced by Mr. George F. Kennan in his recent Reith lectures which were broadcast in Great

Britain over the facilities of the British Broadcasting Corp.

No one can question Mr. Kennan's ability, and no one should question his patriotism. In 1947, he helped to formulate the doctrine of containing communism, and by his writings aided in winning acceptance for this principle.

In his Reith lectures, Mr. Kennan in effect proposed that there should be a nuclear free zone in central Europe consisting of West Germany on the one hand and the Communist satellites of East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary on the other. He also advocated the mutual withdrawal of troops from this area, and indeed expressed the belief that all British and American troops should be withdrawn from the Continent if Russia would similarly withdraw her troops from her satellites.

I was in England—and later on the Continent—during and after Mr. Kennan's broadcasts, and I can testify from personal knowledge of the deep impression which they made upon public opinion throughout Europe. When joined with the successful launching by the Soviets of their two satellites, and our unfortunate failure in the same line, they served to increase the drift toward neutralism.

Mr. Kennan had every right to make his statements, and reasonable men should consider them. But Mr. Acheson has, I believe, made a convincing refutation of them. I would merely amplify his excellent general arguments by two specific illustrations of how Russian intimidation would inevitably operate were Mr. Kennan's proposals to be carried out.

First, with Russia's superiority in the field of the intermediate missiles, she could threaten West Germany with bombardment from Russian launching bases while we would need forward launching bases in West Germany as a deterrent against Russian attack. If these were given up, as Mr. Kennan advocates, the Russians would then be free to bully West Germany into doing its will. It would be difficult for the West Germans to resist.

Second, if our forces are withdrawn from the Continent of Europe or even from West Germany, it will then be infinitely easier for Russian troops subsequently to reenter the supposedly neutral zone than for British and American forces to do so. This would be true both militarily and psychologically. Mr. Kennan's full suggestion would, therefore, largely break up the Western Alliance and enable the Russians to take over the Continent of Europe. This would ultimately be almost fatal to our own security. Mr. Acheson has again performed a distinct public service, and I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the body of the RECORD. I am happy to add that former President Truman has expressed himself similarly to Mr. Acheson.

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

REPLY TO KENNAN BY DEAN ACHESON

I am told that the impression exists in Europe that the views expressed by Mr. George Kennan in his Reith lectures, particularly that a proposal should be made for the withdrawal of American, British, and Russian troops from Europe, represent the views of the Democratic Party in the United States. Most categorically they do not, as Mr. Kennan would, I am sure, agree. The opinions stated in the Reith lectures are not now made by Mr. Kennan for the first time. They were expounded by him within the Democratic administration early in 1949, and rejected. They are, today contrary to the expressed opinion of Democratic leaders in the Congress and outside of it.

Mr. Kennan can speak with authority in the field he knows—and a broad one it is—the field of Russian history and culture, and the attitudes of mind induced by the practice of Marxist-Leninist ideology. Mr. Kennan has never, in my judgment, grasped the realities of power relationships, but takes a rather mystical attitude toward them. To Mr. Kennan there is no Soviet military threat in Europe. "If," he says, "the armed forces of the United States and Britain were not present on the Continent the problem of defense for the continental nations would be primarily one of the internal health and discipline of the respective national societies, and of the manner in which they were organized to prevent the conquest and subjugation of their national life by unscrupulous and foreign-inspired minorities in their midst." A desirable state of health and discipline would enable them to say to the Soviet Union that while it had the power to overrun them, "not a single Communist or other person likely to perform your political business will become available to you for this purpose." Then follows this almost Messianic statement:

"I think I can give personal assurance that any country which is in a position to say this to Moscow, not in so many words, but in that language of military posture and political behavior which the Russian Communists understand best of all, will have little need of foreign garrisons to assure its immunity from Soviet attack."

How can any man speak of a "personal assurance" to any such effect? On what does the guaranty rest, unless divine revelation? But, even in its terms, the assurance seems to contain its own refutatiton. In the present state of the distribution of power in this world, and in the light of the use made by the Russian Communist regime of its power to extend its authority, can one doubt that were it not for the American connection there would be no more independent national life in Western Europe than there is in Eastern Europe?

Mr. Kennan's prescription for salvation by internal health and discipline within the national societies of Europe calls for a degree of wholesome purity which does not exist within any state I can think of. Not only that, but the normal and natural consequences of leaving Russian military power unopposable on the Continent would seem to mean a vast increase in the number of those Communists and other persons likely to perform Russian political business available to supplant those who ventured to oppose that business. The very withdrawal from the Continent of the Allies, whose presence alone permits Western Europe to withstand Soviet pressure, will make impossible the development of that national health and discipline which is supposed to make their presence unnecessary.

To speak, as Mr. Kennan did, of the alternative to American and British power in Europe, as being "Soviet attack" is misleading. In many, perhaps in most, cases an attack by Soviet forces, faced with only token resistance, would not be necessary, as it was not in Czechoslovakia in 1948, or in Poland today. Soviet purposes could be accomplished by intimidation, with the lesson of Hungary in everyone's mind. Poland, by the way, might be the country which could come nearer than any in Europe to making the defiant declaration Mr. Kennan advocates. They know the Russians even better than Mr. Kennan does. But that does not free the Poles from Russian domination. It is idle to suppose that they would be more free if the power capable of opposing the Soviet Union withdrew from the Continent.

In a recent book I have stated my view of the matter in this way:

"When we say that the Western European nations can survive as independent states 'only with the active support of America,' what exactly do we mean? We mean something very specific. We mean that the only deterrent to the imposition of Russian will in Western Europe is the belief that from the outset of any such attempt, American power would be employed in stopping it, and if necessary, would inflict on the Soviet Union injury which the Moscow regime would not wish to suffer. The regime will not believe that this will happen if the United States and Western Europe are separated and stand alone. The problem of coalititon policy on both sides of the Atlantic is for leaders and people to understand this truth, act upon it, and with steady nerves run whatever risks are necessary."

There, too, I discuss, as there is not space to do here, why this course seems to me to offer the best way to a solution of Europe's problems. It recognizes the inescapable factor of power and the adjustment between two positions of power. But Mr. Kennan thinks otherwise. Let me quote him again:

"It cannot be stressed too often that NATO's real strength does not lie in the paper undertakings which underpin it; it lies—and will continue in any circumstances to lie—in the appreciation of the Western spiritual and cultural community. If this appreciation is there, NATO will not be weaker as a political reality, because it may be supplemented or replaced by other arrangements so far as Germany is concerned."

There are many things one might say about this. One is that the "other arrangements so far as Germany is concerned" would leave the military protection of Europe to massive nuclear retaliation, which is just where Mr. Kennan and all the rest of us do not want it to be. A second is that it indefinitely delays the day when nuclear weapons of all sorts might be canceled out and the guaranty of European security placed on allied conventional forces. But perhaps the most pertinent statement for our present purpose is that, so long as we are giving personal assurances, I think I can give mine that Mr. Kennan's opinion is not shared by any responsible leader in the Democratic Party in the United States.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed order, and ask for immediate action upon it by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed order will be read.

The proposed order was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Government Operations and that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] be appointed to fill the vacancy thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the proposed order.

The order was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by way of explanation, I should like to make a brief statement.

On behalf of the Senate majority steering committee, I wish to express deep appreciation to the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] for their generosity.

We in the majority were confronted with a difficult situation in terms of committee assignments when the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] was elected last year. The situation was solved when the junior Senator from Ohio unselfishly volunteered to resign from the Banking and Currency Committee.

Although this solved one problem, it opened another—a second assignment for the junior Senator from Ohio, which is required by law.

That situation has now been resolved by the resignation of the junior Senator from Texas from the Government Operations Committee.

Mr. President, this situation has been adjusted in a spirit of harmony and cooperation. I congratulate the two Senators and express the hope that the Senate will not forget what they have done.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, yesterday the Democratic policy committee met and cleared the following bills, which are presently on the Senate Calendar and have been there since last year. I should like to mention their order numbers so that all Senators will be alerted to the fact that they may be taken up in the Senate at any time during the next few weeks.

I emphasize that the listing I am about to make does not in any way indicate the order in which it is expected the measures will come before the Senate.

I shall try to keep in constant communication with the minority leader and keep him informed at all times of the plans of the majority before any motions are made.

The policy committee has cleared the following measures:

First. Order Nos. 11, a concurrent resolution 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, and 441, a concurrent resolution to print a compilation of materials relating to the development of the water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries, which are to be acted upon today.

Second. Order No. 716, S. 27, increasing rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

Third. Order No. 722, S. 1168, amending Securities and Exchange Act, as amended.

Fourth. Order No. 727, S. 72, to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from civil-service retirement and disability fund.

Fifth. Order No. 740, S. 734, to revise basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Sixth. Order No. 861, 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 territorial waters of foreign countries.

Seventh. Order No. 1074, S. 984, conferring jurisdiction on Court of Claims in re compensation for uranium furnished the United States.

Eighth. Order No. 1178, H. R. 5822, amending section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

Ninth. Order No. 1183, Senate Joint Resolution 80, amending the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

Tenth. Order No. 1188, Senate Resolution 148, prescribing procedures and contents for reports to Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources.

PROPOSED INCREASED IMPORT TAX ON COPPER

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to join the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and other colleagues in the sponsorship of a bill to provide for an increased import tax on copper.

Until a few months ago, we have had a world undersupply of copper and the domestic price has been significantly above the basic price of 24 cents, established in 1951 as the level at which an excise tax of 2 cents per pound would apply. In fact, the price level was so favorable from 1951 to 1956 that we passed a series of bills suspending the present import tax. Under ordinary circumstances, such a suspension bill would have come up this month, in view of the pending expiration of the present suspension on June 30 of this year. However, we have seen a demonstration the past 6 months that, as in lead and zinc, production of copper is catching up with international demand, and the domestic price has been falling steadily, resulting in unemployment in copper mining in Utah, Montana, and other copper-producing centers. During 1957, roughly 800 copper workers lost their jobs in Utah.

We have taken the position that now is the proper time to examine and improve the basic copper import tax legislation which was passed by the Congress in 1951, and that is the purpose of this bill introduced today.

When the 24-cent base price was established in 1951, the average domestic copper marketing price was 24.2 cents per pound. Between 1951 and 1957, the Utah Mining Association informed me, the increase in labor, power, steel, freight, and other major factors determining cost of production, ranged from 20 percent to as high as 33 percent. These increased costs, we feel, justify the proposed increase in the base or peril point from its present level of 24 cents to a more realistic level of 30 cents.

The bill also proposes that the 2-cent per pound import tax also be increased to a more realistic level of 4 cents.

Copper is Utah's largest mineral industry, employing roughly 8,000 persons in mining, milling, and refining. Nearly a third of the Nation's copper production is produced at one mine, Kennecott Copper Corp.'s Utah copper mine at Bingham Canyon, Utah. This is the world's largest open-pit nonferrous metal mine, second only to Chile's Chuquicamata mine in estimated reserves.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of the copper industry to the economic stability and to the military security of this country. Congress must act now to prevent the same degree of stagnation and demoralization that has occurred within our vital domestic competition of foreign minerals.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles on this subject, published in the Salt Lake Tribune, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of January 11, 1958]

UMA CAUTIONS CONGRESS ON PRICE, JOB DECLINES

(By Robert W. Bernick)

Utah Mining Association has advised the State's Congressional delegation that some 1,500 Utah employees of the nonferrous metals industry lost their jobs during 1957 and the first days of 1958 as a result of the tragic drop in metals prices.

For most part, these price declines have been a result of huge and growing imports of foreign-produced metals—particularly lead and zinc.

"Mining unemployment is but a portion of Utah's total under present adverse economic circumstances, but it is a substanial portion," Mr. Romney wrote United States Senators ARTHUR V. WATKINS and WALLACE F. BENNETT and Congressmen WILLIAM A. DAWSON and HENRY ALDOUS DIXON.

Mr. Romney said that the "50 to 60 men who will be laid off with announced curtailment of operations at Tooele smelter (of International Smelting & Refining Co.) must be added to the total of some 650 from lead-zinc mining and 800 more or less from copper mining during the year 1957."

Included in the Tooele curtailments "are many technical, staff, and skilled men, who, aside from the economic loss related to their unemployment, pose a possibility of their loss to the industry through ultimate reemployment elsewhere."

His figures on unemployment are based on statistics gathered by the Utah State Department of Employment Security.

"At year's end, conditions affecting mining employment and related industries in Utah's economy showed a continuing downward trend," Mr. Romney reported to the Congressional group.

He picked zinc, where figures are finally available for the year, to disclose what has been happening.

"In December 1957 domestic zinc smelters produced 86,270 tons of slab zinc from both domestic and foreign ores and concentrates. Of this total, 62,730 tons were shipped to domestic consumers, 210 tons were exported, and 9,188 tons were acquired by the Government in stockpile purchasing. This left 14,142 tons of zinc in stock in hands of processors—adding already to excessive supplies at smelters," Mr. Romney said.

If we do not count Government stockpiles, which cannot long continue, the industry produced some 23,330 tons of slab zinc in United States last month which did not find a market with domestic consumers or in exports, Mr. Romney said.

During all of 1957, the domestic zinc industry, in processing American and foreign ores and concentrates, turned out a surplus of 267,169 tons of slab zinc—for an average monthly surplus production of 22,264 tons.

To this, of course, must be added the huge flood of slab zinc from foreign smelters and refineries which has taken away a large part of the American market from American processors and miners.

Despite Government stockpile purchasing in 1957, which at least took 179,466 tons of zinc off the market, there was left 87,703 tons of zinc in surplus. And this must be added to the surplus of 78,974 which existed when 1957 started.

As a result, stocks of surplus zinc in hands of processors in the United States totaled 166,673 tons.

This level of surplus is exceeded only by the 180,843 tons which over-rung the market in 1953. The latter figure was largest surplusage of zinc since World War II.

Mr. Romney said that the data submitted to the Congressional delegation does not include imports of slab zinc which are sold directly to domestic consumers and are not, therefore, a part of domestic smelter slab zinc statistics.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of January 9, 1958]

SHORTAGE OF ORE TO CLOSE BLAST FURNACE AT TOOELE

TOOELE.—International Smelting & Refining Co. will curtail operations within the next few weeks because of shortage of ores for the reduction plant here, W. J. McKenna, manager, confirmed Wednesday.

Mr. McKenna said the plant lead blast furnace would be shut down and that between 50 and 60 men would be furloughed, for several months.

The ore shortage results from crippling of the domestic mining industry through record high flood of foreign produced lead and zinc into the United States. Independent mine operations which ship their ores to the Tooele plant have been forced to close or reduce operations under impact of price declines.

Mr. McKenna said that slag treatment and custom mill would continue operations until a large enough stockpile of lead concentrates is built up to warrant relighting of the blast furnace.

The curtailments at the Tooele reduction center would not affect operations of United Park City Mine Co., lead-zinc producer at Park City, which ships to the Tooele plant, Mr. McKenna said.

In all, some 250 mill and smeltermen are employed at Tooele.

ISSUE OF FAIR PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES STILL FACES THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when President Eisenhower vetoed H. R. 2474 after the adjournment of the last session of Congress, the question of fair and proper salaries for postal employees remained very much alive as an obligation of the 2d session of the 85th Congress. We cannot shirk or avoid this responsibility. Families of postal employees today are not enjoying a decent standard of living, because their paychecks are insufficient to cope with the rising prices of recent years.

One of the most thorough and sound analyses I yet have seen of the President's veto message appeared in the October 1957 issue of the Portland Poker, which is the monthly periodical of the Portland chapter of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks. This is chapter No. 128. Author of the analysis is John Almeter, vice president of local No. 128 and one of its outstanding leaders.

Mr. Almeter's statement is particularly pertinent where he points out that the administration seems far more alarmed over $279 million added to the budget to provide fair pay to postal workers than over some $3 billion added to the budget because of higher interest rates going to banks and other lenders of money. The New York Times has just reported that the profits of banks rose 10 to 15 percent in 1957.

In view of the fact that our Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has just voted to present another postal pay bill to the Senate—if some of us prevail in its deliberations—I believe Mr. Almeter's article entitled "The Veto Message" should be printed in full in the body of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose, Mr. President.

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

THE VETO MESSAGE

(By John Almeter)

As was expected, the President vetoed our much needed pay raise. This means that for another year we shall have to tighten our belts, cut down a little more on necessities (the luxuries went by the board months ago), keep our wives working and begin the long road back toward getting an equitable increase which is long overdue.

In all fairness we should not put all the blame on the Chief Executive. While we in Oregon were extremely fortunate in having a delegation in both the House and Senate who worked diligently in our behalf, it was the stalling and delaying tactics of a few Members of Congress which held our bill up so that by the time it reached the President's desk there was no chance for recourse on the veto which everyone knew was probable.

In looking over the veto message we are left with the feeling that the writer did a magnificient job. The wording and double-talk was excellent; however, the reasons given to justify the veto were about as weak as cambric tea.

We are told that the increase is not justified as the cost of living since 1951 has increased only 8.9 percent. As we received an 8 percent increase in 1955, another pay raise at this time would not be justified. In the past 28 months prices have increased 1½ times more than the 42 preceding months. Therefore if an 8 percent raise was approved in 1955, we see no reason why a 12 percent was not feasible at this time. For the 12th month in a row, prices have risen. Food prices alone have risen 4.2 percent during the past year. Add to this the increase in the cost of medical and dental care, bus fare, gasoline, two increases in fuel oil, clothing, etc., and we feel sure that we can arrive at a figure which is much larger than the 8.9 percent increase since 1951 as quoted by the author of this veto message.

It is pointed out that fringe benefits have grown substantially. While this is true, they certainly have not kept pace with the fringe benefits given private industry since 1951. We appreciate the benefits we have received, such as low-cost life insurance, unemployment compensation and liberalized retirement and survivor's benefits. We must remind the author, however, that we are paying more for the liberalized retirement and although we are receiving the insurance at a very low figure and it certainly is nice to have, it took money out of our check—did not augment it.

We are told that Federal employees have the right to expect fair wage treatment in relation to each other and in relation to employees in private business. In this we heartily concur. Our only question is, "When are we going to get it?" In this veto message there seemed to be concern that because of the across-the-board increase, executives would get less percentagewise then lower paid employees. While this is true, it seems that top-level employees were pretty well taken care of in 1955 with the passage of Public Law 68 and that top executives received rather large increases in 1956 with the passing of the executive pay bill.

Government employees whose salaries are tied to the Wage Labor Board have received a 25.8 percent increase since 1951 while workers in private industry have averaged better than 20 percent during that time. Comparing our paltry 8 percent increase it seems that at least a 12 percent increase should be voted immediately if we are to receive fair treatment.

The statement was made in the veto message that this raise would cost the Government approximately $850 million—about $279 million for postal employees and the rest for other Government workers. It is true that this would add a considerable amount to the Federal budget but why so much concern over $850 million when the hard-money policy instituted to stem inflation is costing the Government over $3 billion more per year just in interest on the national debt. There seems to be very little concern when steel prices are raised. Year after year these increases have added to the national debt in increased prices for guns, tanks, and instruments of war. There seemed to be very little worry over the fact that last year we had 2 gasoline and oil raises within a period of 3 months. While we do not argue pro or con as to the merits of the raise in interest rates, steel, gas, and oil or other prices, we do resent being made the scapegoat. We alone are supposed to keep down costs and the debt ceiling in this inflated economy while prices and wages in industry run rampant.

It is noted that the Government's salary position must support recruitment and retention of able employees. We, also, are in complete agreement with this statement with the exception that we feel adequate salaries should be paid so that recruitment of able employees is possible in the lower grades as well as in the higher. While the large turnover in personnel which is costing the Government millions is not in the top executive or supervisory branch but in the lower pay brackets, the concern with wages seems to center around the top brass. It should be remembered that it is just as important to pay an adequate wage to get good young men in the Government service who will make the Government service their career as it is to pay top wages for executives.

We understand an inquiry is to be made into the pay structure. What ever happened to the Cordiner report? Wasn't this a committee set up by the administration to make a study of pay for certain Federal employees? It is our impression that this report was suppressed as it was far too liberal and pointed out many facts that the administration refuses to admit. We cannot help but feel that any committee set up will be used to get as many facts and figures as possible to oppose an adequate pay increase for postal employees in the next session of Congress. We sincerely hope that we are wrong in our assumption but after 3 vetoes on 4 pay bills, who can blame us for having very little faith in the present administration as far as salary legislation is concerned?

THE NATO REPORT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND SECRETARY DULLES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I believe the body of the RECORD should contain a frank and candid editorial from the Oregonian of December 25,

1957, analyzing the weak and futile performance of the President and his Secretary of State in their addresses to the Nation following the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Conference in Paris. Title of the editorial is "Impression of Weakness."

Although this Portland newspaper vigorously backed the Republican ticket in 1952 and again in 1956, it expresses both alarm and disgust over the impact upon our allies of the type of presentation made by Messrs. Eisenhower and Dulles in their respective speeches.

The future of the free world is at stake in the future of NATO. That is why the indecisive showing of the President and Secretary of State is so disturbing at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Oregonian, which is published in my home city of Portland, Oreg., appear in the body of the RECORD.

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

IMPRESSION OF WEAKNESS

The NATO report by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles to the people of America by television Monday night misfired so badly that there must be consternation in Washington and other NATO capitals on this Christmas Day.

The contrived format of the "show"; the spectacle of two tired, aging men talking about the gravely compromised half-measures, which both bind and separate America from its European allies, in falsely casual tones, without any air of great conviction, and with the President permitting Dulles to monopolize the program with a long monologue, then summarizing by reading a statement of generalities—all of these added up to the worst public relations job in memory on issues of such importance to the United States and survival of non-Communist nations.

The sense of what they were trying to say—and most of it was sound enough—was lost to TV viewers dismayed by the physical appearance of the President, his face in profile for most of the time as Dulles droned on; the seeming vigor he displayed in public appearances in Paris entirely absent; the power and confidence he can convey to an audience coming through only at fleeting intervals. Ike's profile showed the toll of illness and bone weariness. At a time when the Western World desperately desires the President to take full and vigorous leadership, he sat and listened to a Secretary of State whose tireless capabilities have been frustrated, diminished by the rigidity of his crusader's mind.

Instead of the President's springing back into command, thus to assure free people that the NATO conference really was more fruitful than it appeared on the surface, Mr. Eisenhower sat back and allowed Secretary Dulles—whom, in effect, he had overruled in accepting the Paris compromises—to interpret, even to dissemble a bit, to repeat the tired theme of Soviet faithlessness, to make it appear that the NATO nations are in full accord, when, in fact, they have settled almost none of their deep disagreements.

Neither the President nor the Secretary even hinted at the economic sacrifices, the social and political readjustments, which the American people must accept if this Nation is to meet the Soviet challenge either by strengthening NATO or by perilous and far more costly withdrawal accompanied by massive, unilateral armament.

In rejecting the banal Soviet proposal for unlimited, all-nations U. N. debate, after Soviet scoffing of NATO's suggestion of a foreign ministers' meeting on disarmament, neither Eisenhower nor Dulles gave any hope for an alternative to massive armament.

But still, it was not so much what was said about NATO unity—though this remains to be proved in the year ahead—and the nastiness of the Russians, as it was the method of saying it that caused this report to the American people to raise apprehension rather than hope.

It seems obvious that President Eisenhower, well aware of the deep distrust of Secretary Dulles in some governments of Europe who are our allies, loyal as always to his appointees and hopeful of rebuilding his Secretary's prestige, deliberately cast Dulles in the major role. But in deferring to him, sitting nervously, casting occasional birdlike glances at the Secretary, who was having trouble with his dentures as well as his justification of his pre-NATO and post-NATO statements, the President became the victim of a grave image of weakness. As the NATO Conference itself showed again, the President is not weak in spirit, flexibility of mind, and ability to lead. But an impression of weakness is as fatal a defect in this crisis of world affairs as weakness itself.

This is no time for contrived performances, for glossing over the fundamental differences among North Atlantic allies, for dissembling or concealing of grim facts the people must know. It is a time for face-forward, straight-talking explanation, no matter who may be hurt.

In a single broadcast, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles lost a great deal of the confidence the President, at least, sought so assiduously—and successfully—to rebuild in Paris. We hope the damage can be undone.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK AT CLATSOP, OREG., WINTER HEADQUARTERS OF THE GREAT LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two thoughtful editorials on the proposed national memorial park at Fort Clatsop, near Astoria, Oreg., on the historic Oregon seacoast.

These editorials appeared in the Astorian Daily Budget of January 9, 1958, and in the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland on January 11, 1958.

I take particular pride and satisfaction in presenting the editorials for inclusion in the RECORD because, on July 12, 1955, I introduced in the Senate the first bill ever offered to establish Fort Clatsop as an integral part of our national park and national monument commemorative system. The editorials generously give me some of the credit for what has been accomplished.

In turn, I should like particularly to commend the Oregon Historical Society and its Clatsop County chapter. They are the groups which truly have kept the flame of Oregon history alive, and which have nurtured continuing and enduring interest in the great Lewis and Clark Expedition that made Fort Clatsop its winter quarters in 1804 and 1805. To the officers and members of the Oregon Historical Society and to that of Clatsop County, I give my warm salute and congratulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials appear in the body of the RECORD, because the Senate must act on the authorization implementing the current recommendation for a national memorial park at Fort Clatsop, first headquarters of Americans on the great Pacific seaboard.

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

[From the Astoria (Oreg.) Daily Budget of January 9, 1958]

FORT CLATSOP RECOGNITION

Establishment of a national memorial park of about 100 acres at the Fort Clatsop site will mark successful culmination of a long effort by this community, with the help of the Oregon Historical Society, Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER and Representative WALTER NORBLAD

The campaign has been for establishment of a national monument. We get instead a national memorial park, which is something few folks around here have heard of, but which seems to amount to about the same thing as a national monument. It provides Federal control and Federal maintenance and care of an important national shrine, and that's what we wanted.

The campaign isn't over yet. Congress must appropriate the money to establish and maintain the site, but with administration approval already given, we can hope that Congressional approval won't be too hard to get.

Fort Clatsop lay neglected for many years. National attention was called to this neglect some years ago when Bernard de Voto of Harper's magazine, a nationally known writer on historical subjects, visited the spot. He wrote in the magazine a savage indictment of the people who had permitted rubbish and brush to blight a location of transcendent historical importance.

De Voto's needling stimulated local historians to activity. Efforts to improve and care for the site began. The local community bore the original burden, even though a site of such importance ought to be more than of community importance and responsibility. Eventually the sesquicentennial observance of the Lewis and Clark expedition brought new public interest in Fort Clatsop. It stimulated not only local efforts to improve and care for the site, but the effort to have a national monument established.

Now comes the administration approval of a national memorial park, the next-to-last step in a successful campaign.

Establishment of this park will be of immeasurable value to the Sunset Empire in promoting tourist interest in the area's history.

[From the Oregon Journal of January 11, 1958]

FORT CLATSOP RECOGNITION

The recommendation by Hatfield Chilson, Under Secretary of Interior, that Congress designate Fort Clatsop, near Astoria, as a national memorial under the National Park Service is the major step toward the realization of such a goal. Fort Clatsop is the site where Lewis and Clark wintered in 1805–6.

The prospect that Congress will act favorably on the Interior Department's recommendation is heightened by the fact that the National Park Service's investigation was directed by an act of Congress, which had been sponsored by Oregon's Senators RICHARD L. NEUBERGER and WAYNE MORSE and Idaho's Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK. Senator DWORSHAK's interest stems from the fact that Fort Clatsop is the "end of the trail" for the Lewis and Clark (Lolo Pass) highway across Idaho, the completion of which is now being vigorously sought. Senator NEUBERGER in particular has worked diligently on the Fort Clatsop project since 1955, using the Lewis and Clark sesquicentennial of that year as a springboard.

The competition for this recognition has been especially keen. Many other States have historic sites which they are constantly pressing upon the Park Service for such recommendation. This action not only ranks Fort Clatsop as one of the most important spots along the whole Lewis and Clark trail but puts it in company with places of primary historic interest in the whole country.

Earlier news stories reported that national monument status had been sought for Fort Clatsop. The recommendation that it be a national memorial instead does not imply an inferior status. It's simply that the criteria are different. Monuments are "landmarks, structures, objects, or areas of scientific or prehistoric interest * * *." National memorials are "structures or areas devoted to the commemoration of ideas, events, or personages of national significance."

Among such places are the Lincoln Memorial, Washington Monument (the word having a different meaning here), Thomas Jefferson Memorial, all in Washington, D. C., and the Lee Mansion, Arlington, Va.

The recommendation appears to have disposed of earlier doubts expressed by a Government archeologist about existence of conclusive physical evidence that Fort Clatsop is in fact the spot where Lewis and Clark wintered. The Oregon Historical Society, which has owned the site for 50 years and which has worked hard to win for it national status, has long been positive that this is the place. The historical society, along with Clatsop County community interests, deserves particular credit not only for preserving the site, which includes a replica of the expedition's log fort, but for efforts to win national recognition.

REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday was an unfortunate day in the history of our country.

Only 1 week ago, in his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower listed first in his proposals for our security and prosperity the importance of reorganizing the Defense Department.

In doing this, the President not only reaffirmed the position he took on this subject over 10 years ago, but also recognized the vast technological changes which have occurred since that time.

Apparently he realized that if this Nation was to remain solvent, its defenses would now have to be organized on the basis of progress instead of tradition.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD what the President said on this subject in his state of the Union message of last January 9.

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

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 10, 1958]

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

I. DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

The first need is to assure ourselves that military organization facilitates rather than hinders the functioning of the Military Establishment in maintaining the security of the Nation.

Since World War II, the purpose of achieving maximum organizational efficiency in a modern Defense Establishment has several times occasioned action by the Congress and by the Executive.

The advent of revolutionary new devices, bringing with them the problem of overall continental defense, creates new difficulties, reminiscent of those attending the advent of the airplane half a century ago.

Some of the important new weapons which technology has produced do not fit into any existing service pattern. They cut across all services, involve all services, and transcend all services, at every stage from development to operation. In some instances they defy classification according to branch of service.

Unfortunately, the uncertainties resulting from such a situation, and the jurisdictional disputes attending upon it, tend to bewilder and confuse the public and create the impression that service differences are damaging the national interest.

Let us proudly remember that the members of the Armed Forces give their basic allegiance solely to the United States. Of that fact all of us are certain. But pride of service and mistaken zeal in promoting particular doctrine has more than once occasioned the kind of difficulty of which I have just spoken.

I am not attempting today to pass judgment on the charge of harmful service rivalries. But one thing is sure. Whatever they are, America wants them stopped.

Recently I have had under special study, with the intimate association of Secretary McElroy, the never-ending problem of efficient organization, complicated as it is by new weapons. Soon my own conclusions will be finalized. I shall promptly take such executive action as is necessary and, in a separate message, I shall present appropriate recommendations to Congress.

Meanwhile, without anticipating the detailed form that a reorganization should take, I can state its main lines in terms of objectives:

A major purpose of military organization is to achieve real unity in the Defense Establishment in all the principal features of military activity. Of all these one of the most important to our Nation's security is strategic planning and control. This work must be done under unified direction.

The Defense Establishment must therefore plan for a better integration of its defense resources, particularly with respect to the newer weapons now building and under development. These obviously require full coordination in their development, production, and use. Good organization can help assure this coordination.

In recognition of the need for single control in some of our most advanced development projects, the Secretary of Defense has already decided to concentrate into one organization all the antimissile and satellite technology undertaken within the Department of Defense.

Another requirement of military organization is a clear subordination of the military service to duly constituted civilian authority. This control must be real; not merely on the surface.

Next there must be assurance that an excessive number of compartments in organization will not create costly and confusing compartments in our scientific and industrial effort.

Finally, to end interservice disputes requires clear organization and decisive central direction, supported by the unstinted cooperation of every individual in the Defense Establishment, civilian and military.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The recent Rockefeller report supports without reservation the position the President took on this matter in his state of the Union message.

Later, however, there was opposition expressed by prominent Congressional leaders—who I am certain are just as sincere in their position as I am in mine.

One week later the President was asked the following question:

Could you expand somewhat on your state of the Union message in that part on the military and tell us how you think unification, in reality, in the Pentagon, can move from the discussion to the actual stage?

The President replied in part:

Now my personal convictions, no matter how strong, cannot be the final answer. There must be a consensus reached with the CAB—with the Congress, with the people that have the job of operating the services to get the very finest kind of organization we can; and I am certainly hopeful that it goes in the direction of what I believe, but I would be the last to ask for a detailed organization in which I believe, because, I think, say, organization has got to be effective after there has passed from the scene a man who happens to have particularly strong convictions in the matter.

How can one have "particularly strong convictions" in a matter if within a week the position on that matter is withdrawn?

I ask unanimous consent that what the President said in his press conference yesterday with reference to unification be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the President's Press Conference, Wednesday, January 15, 1958]

EDWARD P. MORGAN, the American Broadcasting Co. "Mr. President, perhaps there is no area of Government in which you need less to draw on your advisers and can draw more from your personal experience than the military. * * * Could you expand somewhat on your state of the Union message in that part on the military, and tell us how you think unification, in reality, in the Pentagon, can move from the discussion to the actual stage?"

Answer. "I don't mind discussing it at all. * * * It is perfectly clear, it certainly must be clear to most of you people that my own convictions about the proper organization of the Defense Department are rather fixed.

"Since 1947, I have given many, many active hours to this kind of study. I have reviewed the whole military record as I have known it for 45 years and, therefore, I think my views are completely objective, and with nothing whatsoever of personal bias in them.

"But I have this: I am the Commander in Chief for a fixed period, and at least we know that I am not going to be in this job more than 3 years.

"Now, my personal convictions, no matter how strong, cannot be the final answer. There must be a consensus reached with the CAB—with the Congress, with the people that have the job of operating the services to get the very finest kind of organization we can; and I am certainly hopeful that it goes in the direction of what I believe, but I would be the last to ask for a detailed organization in which I believe, because, I think, say, organization has got to be effective after there has passed from the scene a man who happens to have particular strong convictions in the matter."

Question. "You are not saying, sir, or are you, that you will not fight for unification of the services?"

Answer. "Well, now, just a minute. I don't know who you are fighting. I am trying to put before the Congress a plan which I think will be effective, and certainly in the discussions and many conferences that will go on in the formulation of the plan that I have in mind, there will be a good deal of argument, no question about it, and my views will certainly be expressed to the very best I can; and, as I say, if the trend and tendency is not in that direction, then I couldn't possibly have anything to do with it."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if the President does not intend to try to implement his convictions, that may well mean nothing will be done to really modernize our defense structure, in which case the taxpayer will continue to pour millions of dollars down the drain in order to maintain the unbusinesslike status quo now characteristic of our Defense Department.

As a result of this waste, even though in recent years we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on our security, it is now universally recognized that neither our Army, Navy, nor Air Force is in the right condition to resist an attack, either directly against ourself or against any ally to whom we are irrevocably committed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PURCHASES OF FOREIGN PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one subject near and dear to the hearts of most Americans is the practice of buying at a bargain. It is a custom that has played a part in the development of the great free-enterprise system which we enjoy today. Virtually all Americans, from the small boy with a penny to buy bubble gum to a millionaire investor looking for gilt-edge securities, hunt for bargains.

But we have learned that bargains are not always what they seem to be. For the past several years the Department of Defense has been taking advantage of what I consider to be a very, very doubtful bargain. I refer to the purchases of tax-free foreign petroleum products in competition with our domestic products which pay taxes to help run this Government.

At the present time, the Department of Defense is in process of considering bids which may lead to Government purchase of 24 million barrels of foreign jet fuel. This foreign fuel, according to a Defense Department officer, has been purchased over several years, periodically, at what looks to be a cheaper price than that of domestically produced fuel. It has been said that the Defense Department operates on a budget, and that the matter is a simple one of economics; that with the same number of dollars, the Department can buy more barrels of foreign fuel than it can of American produced fuel. At first blush, this looks like a bargain. But when one stops to consider, it is doubtful that America is getting a bargain from these foreign purchases. Let us remember that these are American tax dollars that are being spent outside this Nation; that every dollar spent is money which can never find its way into the pockets of the oil worker, the royalty owner, the refinery worker, the American company employee, or into the firm treasury, or into taxes from, or business with, anyone along the way. This tax, wage, or income money is totally lost to America.

In some periods of history, notably World War II, it was wise to purchase foreign oil. But oil products in America are not in short supply today. On the contrary, there is a tremendous surplus. Production allowables in my State of Texas are at a low ebb. Oil tax revenues are down; rigs are idle; lease and royalty payments are slow; oil field unemployment in many areas is serious. Is this a time to spend our tax dollars abroad on products we have in surplus supply? In this time of mounting unemployment, business recession, and hard money, hard times, is it wise to add to that business recession and labor unemployment by buying foreign oil and turning our backs on our domestic producers?

Certainly, no one can deny that the Department of Defense can purchase jet fuel and other petroleum products from foreign low-wage, no-tax areas cheaper than it can buy them in America. But let me ask this question: Do those foreign countries pay the wages and have the standard of living that Americans enjoy? What is more, do the citizens and the firms involved furnish any of the tax dollars for such defense expenditures?

Mr. President, I will be the first to admit that herein lies a complex problem. But it is one which urgently requires study and solution. I urge that an appropriate committee, possibly the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, make a thorough investigation of these purchases. The policy of our Defense Department of purchasing large quantities of foreign oil products needs careful reappraisal.

I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert at this point in the RECORD a series of telegrams from my State, including reports by R. B. Kahle, of Houston, president of Eastern States Petroleum & Chemical Corp.; and F. L. Martin, of Corpus Christi, president of the Suntide Refining Co. They sharply oppose such purchases by the Department of Defense, and they point out that oil refineries in the gulf-coast area are closing as the Defense Department is purchasing, or considering the purchase of, the 24 million barrels of jet fuel.

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

HOUSTON, TEX., *January 9, 1958.*

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have just sent the following telegram to the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Neil H. McElroy:

"Hon. NEIL H. MCELROY,
"Secretary of Defense,
"Washington, D. C.:

"Over the last 2 years the Defense Department's purchasing of petroleum products in the Caribbean area has increased at an alarming rate and has, as of now, substantially eliminated the gulf coast and east coast American refiner from the sale to the Government of jet fuel and Navy special fuel oil and is taking a substantial portion of military gasoline procurement from these areas.

"The purchases of jet fuel in the Caribbean over this present winter season has been a substantial factor in causing a distress market for distillates, gasoline, kerosene, heating oil, and so forth, and is one of the most important factors tending toward a probable cut in the posted price of domestic crude.

"In a great part the layoff of employees in American refineries on the east and gulf coasts in the last few months is due to this Defense Department purchasing policy and further reduction of employment is inevitable if these policies continue. It is difficult for us to see how this is helpful to national defense and national prosperity.

"American refiners located on the east and gulf coasts can adequately supply these motor gasolines, jet fuels, and Navy special fuel oil and it is obvious that every barrel of these products purchased from the Caribbean refiner means a reduction in the production of crude oil in this country of at least a like number of barrels.

"It has been alleged and the President's Cabinet Committee has reported that a voluntary reduction of imports of foreign crude oil to this country is essential for the national security, yet the Defense Department, the one Department of the Government specifically charged with national security, has continued to increase its purchases in the Caribbean area to the detriment of domestic production of crude oil and to the detriment of the refining industry on the gulf and east coasts of the United States.

"It is obvious that the offshore purchase of these products by the military (the largest single buying agency in the world) reduces employment of American labor, the employment of American capital in refining facilities, and the amount of crude which American producers can sell through American refiners to the market.

"If the present policy of the Defense Department is continued and maintained at the rate of expansion of the last 2 years there will be no purchases by the military from United States refiners. No American refiner can compete with the wages, working conditions, and tax situation of the Caribbean refiners. These refiners pay no school, city, county, State, or Federal taxes, including Federal income taxes. They are exempt by specific conditions of their contracts with the Defense Department from living up to the provisions of the 8-hour law, the Walsh-Healey Act and the nondiscrimination clauses set up by Congress or the executive department as a protection to American labor and to the American way of life.

"There is no emergency now requiring that because of shortage of products in the United States these products should be purchased outside of the United States.

"In reply to a telegram which we sent to the Defense Department in July of last year, your Department replied that 'the bids are being carefully analyzed in accordance with existing regulations and many factors of consideration enter into such an analysis. Awards will be made on the basis as determined above with the primary procurement objective being one that will be most advantageous to Government, price, and all other factors considered.'

"The Defense Department also stated that 'its foreign purchases are not precluded by law' and therefore the policy would be continued.

"In December, Admiral Lattu, Executive Director of the Military Petroleum Supply Administration, at a meeting of the Western Petroleum Refiners Association as reported by Oilgram, called for continued purchases in the Caribbean area, and urged that Caribbean refiners supply up to 90 percent of Navy special fuel oil. Every barrel of these purchases reduces the amount of oil produced in the United States and manufactured by American refiners.

"It must be obvious to everyone that an American refiner acting under American laws, including the 8-hour law, the Walsh-Healey Act, paying American wages, paying American taxes, cannot compete with Caribbean refiners operating under more favorable conditions. In a realistic sense, even though perhaps not in a legal sense, these products are dumped on the American market and should be precluded by the theory that has produced the Antidumping Act as applying to foreign-produced products.

"The question is not academic and actually is not a legal one. We urge that you take action to require the Defense Department to buy products manufactured by American refiners and reduce the purchases of Caribbean finished products if such products are available under conditions and prices which cost the American taxpayer no more than purchases in the Caribbean area.

"Purchases in the Caribbean area at apparent lower prices are not made at a lower cost to the American taxpayer when American wages and American taxes, including school, city, county, State and United States Government taxes are considered.

"We urge that you order your Defense Department purchasing agency to discontinue this policy of Caribbean purchases and buy products when available under proper circumstances from American refiners.

"It is our opinion that these purchases are made at a lower apparent price solely because the charges against the Defense Department budget are thereby reduced, even though the true cost to the American taxpayer is substantially greater.

"It is, of course, facetious, specious and dishonest to argue that the American defense is jeopardized by the importation of crude oil limited now by the cartel-like application of a voluntary oil import program while the Defense Department is purchasing large volumes of finished products from foreign sources.

"The Defense Department has requested bids returnable on January 14 for 24 million barrels of jet fuel and other products from the gulf coast and the east coast and the Caribbean area for delivery over the next few months. This amount of finished products taken from American refiners and purchased in the Caribbean will certain have an adverse effect on the national economy, a reduction in employment and will continue to contribute to the so-called recession period which seems to be on the horizon and in our opinion probably will produce a nationwide cut in the posted price of American crude."

We think this offshore buying program of the Defense Department is harmful to the American economy and if continued is certain to produce a cut in the posted price of American crude, a reduction of employment in American refineries, and contribute largely to a possible recession in American business. We thank you for your past interest in this situation and we urge your continued efforts toward the elimination of this un-American policy.

R. B. KAHLE,
President, Eastern States Petroleum & Chemical Corp.

HOUSTON, TEX., *January 11, 1958.*

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Because the policy of the Government in buying petroleum products in foreign areas, when such products are not only available but in critical surplus supply in this country, transcends the issue involved in the projected purchase of 24 million barrels of jet fuel in the Caribbean on January 14 as it represents a theory that the Government benefits when American tax dollars are expended in foreign countries rather than in the United States, we have today sent the following wire to each Member of Congress:

"Should the Defense Department under its announced policies purchase 24 million barrels of refined petroleum products, largely jet fuel, from Caribbean area suppliers under bids to be opened January 14, the economy of United States will be deprived of $100 million paid to these foreign refiners and $100 million less will be paid to American refiners, producers, suppliers, and labor in the United States. Layoffs of labor are occurring daily in American refineries because of excessive product inventories and depressed prices resulting from Government's policy of decreasing American petroleum product purchases while increasing foreign purchases. Not only is there no emergency and no shortage of supplies in this country making such a purchasing policy necessary but there is a critical oversupply of petroleum products in the United States. Would you please investigate this urgent matter affecting the whole of the United States economy."

We think the Defense Department and perhaps the executive branch of the Government has forgotten the fundamental fact that when a tax dollar is expended in the United States, it goes to the people of the United States. Even though the same product could be purchased at 10 percent lower price when produced by foreign labor and foreign capital, expenditure in the United States goes solely to American citizens, and is spent over and over again in our American economy. Incidentally, in relation to this foreign purchase, we calculate that the purchase of this 24 million barrels of jet fuel in the United States, rather than in the Caribbean area, would mean one more allowable day of production under Texas proration practice. We solicit your active interest in this problem.

R. B. KAHLE,
President, Eastern States Petroleum & Chemical Corp.

HOUSTON, TEX., *January 14, 1958.*

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

At the opening of the bids for jet fuel today Shell Oil Co., a foreign owned company, was the low bidder in the Caribbean with a price of 7.32 cents per gallon, or approximately $3.07 per barrel for 145 million gallons, 75 million gallons at 7.75 cents and 63 million gallons at 7.97 cents. Standard of New Jersey subsidiary bid 7.97 cents or $3.345 per barrel for 252 million gallons. ESSO's bid at the gulf was reported to be 8.79 cents per gallon or 34½ cents per barrel more than their Caribbean bid. Shell's bid at the gulf is reported to be 9.4 cents or almost 80 cents per barrel higher than their bid from the Caribbean. These differences in bids indicate that even these companies recognize that American operated refineries cannot compete with the favorable tax position and un-American labor situation of their Caribbean associates. Seven and ninety-seven hundredths cents bid price per gallon, that is, $3,345 per barrel, is only 14 cents over the price of a barrel of west Texas crude delivered at the gulf coast and is 9 cents lower than a barrel of east Texas crude at the gulf coast. It is obvious that the posted price of Texas crude must be reduced if this tremendous Government purchasing is to be let at the prices brought out in this letting; namely, 14 cents over the price of west Texas crude and 9 cents under the price of east Texas crude with no allowance for manufacturing cost.

R. B. KAHLE,
President, Eastern States Petroleum & Chemical Corp.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.,
January 11, 1958.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Bids will be opened January 14 for 42 million barrels of jet fuel. We are gravely concerned with the Defense Department's purchasing oil products in the Caribbean and other foreign areas which adversely affects our national economy as a whole. As you know, in the past substantial amounts have been purchased by the Defense Department from the Caribbean and other foreign sources and shipped into this country on the eastern gulf and west coasts, and these foreign purchases are in direct competition with the domestic crude oil production which we as an independent refiner have to purchase and refine to meet this competition. The low prices in the past from the Caribbean have placed the domestic refiner at an unfair disadvantage. Our company is bidding on a substantial amount of products manufactured from domestic crude and there will be serious repercussions for the independent refiner and producer if this practice of foreign purchases is continued. It is practically impossible for the independent oil refiner and producer to compete with the wages, working conditions and tax structures of the domestic price, of Caribbean refineries and other foreign areas shipping into this country. It will only lower all domestic price structures and at the same time vitally affect the American tax revenue by reducing the earnings of the oil industry in this country as well as add to the surplus of crude and refined products we have with us and at the same time will destroy all incentive for future exploration by the independent oil companies.

Crude prices have already been reduced in many midwest and southwest areas and no doubt further reductions will be made due to the Armed Forces foreign purchases. We are especially anxious to see that the Armed Forces purchase throughout the eastern, gulf, and west coast areas which would have a beneficial effect on the domestic crude oil refiner and producer, as there is a tremendous amount of other refined products imported into this country which we have to compete.

We have a 750,000-barrel-per-day refinery which is the most modern on the gulf coast and were encouraged to build it by the Petroleum Administration for defense. We recently completed a $9.5 million petrochemical expansion and these products would be very valuable in case of emergency. Our daily crude runs, consisting of domestic crude only, have been reduced to 40,000 barrels per day due to a great extent to the increased rate of foreign competition over the past 5 years.

If this practice by the Defense Department is continued, further reductions will be necessary, not only by our refinery but by other eastern gulf and west coast refineries. The Advisory Committee on Fuels Policy determined that voluntary reduction of imports of foreign crude is essential for our national security, but the Defense Department who is in charge of our national security, is continuing to increase its purchases in the Caribbean area to the detriment of the domestic oil producer and refiner.

We ask that you use your best efforts to require the Defense Department to purchase domestic products first and eliminate the practice of foreign purchases.

F. L. MARTIN,
President, Suntide Refining Co.

THE PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the language of the President of the United States in his special farm message today is extremely unfortunate. He says his recommendations constitute a "program that can make a substantial contribution to the well-being of America's farm families." The substance of his message flatly contradict this objective in many respects, especially for the Nation's dairy farmers.

Wisconsin dairy farmers today are suffering from a severe depression under prices for milk of $3.25 a hundred pounds. The Secretary of Agriculture has ordered a cut in milk prices down to only $3 per hundred pounds, to take effect on April 1.

The University of Wisconsin's agricultural economics department has estimated that this will result in a loss in net income of Wisconsin dairy farmers of between $43 million and $46 million. This is a terrible blow to Wisconsin—not only to her farmers, but to her entire economy.

And now, in his message, he proposes that the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to cut the price of average test milk as low as $2.40 a hundred pounds.

Milk prices at that level will simply destroy Wisconsin's farm families. It is a cruel insult added to injury to say this would be a substantial contribution to the well-being of America's farm families.

What the President is proposing is almost unbelievably shocking. Most Wisconsin farmers are paid on the basis of 3½-percent test milk. The President is advocating that Ezra Taft Benson be given the power to cut milk prices for 3½-percent test milk to $2.13 a hundred pounds. This, Mr. President, spells depression at the worst level that history has ever seen. Farmers cost's are today at the highest record in history. Farm families cannot survive for long with $3 milk; they will be destroyed immediately with $2.13 milk.

Mr. President, the American people, if they only understood the facts, would be outraged by the injustice of the President's proposal.

Dairy farmers in eastern Wisconsin, according to studies made and published by the United States Department of Agriculture, earned only 43 cents per hour for their labor in 1956. These figures are not based on the returns of small, inefficient, submarginal farmers—these are the figures that apply to farmers who are among the world's most efficient dairy producers. The average capital investment of these farms is $34,000—according to official United States Department of Agriculture figures. Mr. President, a $34,000 investment such as the average Wisconsin farmer has made in his farming operations should enable the owner to earn a return of more than 43 cents per hour.

Yet what the President proposes will not help to bolster this terribly unjust and inadequate return: It will eliminate it completely. The dairy price levels contemplated by Secretary Benson's recent action, and the further devastating cuts that would be authorized by the President's recommendation, will simply wipe out all the returns on their labor that farmers are able to get at present; it will destroy the economic foundations of Wisconsin, and it will cruelly punish farm people for having outproduced all other segments of our own economy, and all other agricultural systems anywhere in the world.

A LETTER OF THANKS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I received a letter the other day that I should like to share with my colleagues. In fact, the young man who wrote this letter has asked me to express his thanks to the Congress and the country that made his education possible. Too often, I am afraid, we all take for granted the benefits that our democratic system has given us. But now and then we are reminded how fortunate we are. This reminder comes from John Dimanin, whose home is in Dearborn, Mich., but who was born in Greece. This is what John Dimanin has written me:

KIRKSVILLE, MO., *January 9, 1958.*

DEAR SENATOR MCNAMARA: I have just completed 4 years of schooling under the GI bill, and I would like to have you thank the Members of Congress and all the persons who made the GI bill possible for the Korean veterans.

Since I was discharged in December of 1953, I have completed over 2 years at Wayne University and am in my second year at the Kirksville School of Osteopathy and Surgery, Kirksville, Mo. So you can see I have taken advantage of the benefits offered.

I served as both an officer and enlisted man, and believe me, it was a pleasure and honor to have served in the Army.

I can honestly say that if it had not been for the GI bill, I doubt if I would have gone on to complete my schooling. So you can see I've benefited from my service and from the GI bill. And having been born in Greece, I am doubly thankful to this country.

The Veterans' Administration in Detroit under Col. Lloyd Jameson has been wonderful with all the assistance they've given me. They've solved many problems for me.

Senator, I would like you to find a way to inform all those connected with the Veterans' Administration, Congress, and anyone connected with the GI bill that I am grateful for the future they have made for me by providing my education.

JOHN DIMANIN.

Mr. President, all that I can say to John Dimanin for this letter of thanks is: "You're welcome."

COMMENDATION OF AMBASSADOR JOHN DAVIS LODGE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to comment upon the remarks made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on the opening day this week, when he spoke of Ambassador John Davis Lodge, the American Ambassador to Spain, and the accusation that Mr. Lodge had been in any way derelict in his duty because he had been absent from his post so many times.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on the splendid analysis of these charges, and his complete refutation of the charges.

I wish to state that I myself visited Spain, and spent 2 weeks in Spain during the month of October. I know from my own personal knowledge that we have never had, in the opinion of the Spanish people, an Ambassador who was a harder worker or more devoted to his duty than the former Governor of Connecticut, Mr. John Davis Lodge.

I very gladly join with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and with my own distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] in trying to make clear the fact that, far from being derelict in his duty, former Governor Lodge, now Ambassador Lodge, has been a very active, hard-working, and effective Ambassador of the United States.

RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT IN COMMUNIST NATIONS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, shortly before the Congress reconvened, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee issued as a committee print a report on resources development in the Communist nations of the world.

The report established authoritatively that our country is rapidly losing out in river and resources development, which are prerequisites to economic, industrial, military, and national strength. If any Members have not seen this report, I hope they will call the Interior Committee for a copy.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has advised me that in the current year appropriations requests for reclamation, flood control, and rivers and harbors items were cut to 1.12 percent of the budget, in line with administration policy. I am further advised that resources development work is a target for economy, instead of expansion, in the budget draft being prepared to send to the Congress later this month.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article by Thomas P. Whitney, the Associated Press foreign news analyst, reporting Russia's 15-year plan to pass the United States current production in electricity, iron, steel, coal, petroleum, cement, and other items.

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

[From the Oregon Journal of December 29, 1957]

REDS PUSH INDUSTRY

(By Thomas P. Whitney)

The Soviet Government is preparing a grandiose new 15-year plan to build the industrial might which the United States possesses today.

This longer range plan running to 1972 will apparently embrace shorter term economic development plans within itself, including the current 5-year plan ending in 1960.

Preliminary Soviet targets for the 15-year industrial buildup have been announced by Nikita Khrushchev. Here are the figures on Russian goals for 1972, compared with Soviet production in 1957 and United States output in 1956 as presented by the Kremlin chieftain:

	U.S.S.R. 1957	U.S.S.R. 1972	U.S.A. 1956
Pig iron	37.0	75–85	69.0
Steel	51.0	100–120	104.5
Coal	462.0	650–750	400.0
Petroleum	98.0	350–400	354.0
Electricity	210.0	800–900	684.0
Cement	29.0	90–110	54.0
Sugar	4.5	9–10	2.1
Wool cloth	280.0	550–650	299.0
Shoes	315.0	600–700	568.0

NOTE.—Figures are in millions of metric tons, except for electricity (in billion kilowatt-hours), wool cloth (in million meters) and shoes (million pairs).

Khrushchev said of the plan:

"This is a preliminary prognosis, which may be corrected by the facts of life in one direction or another: It's more likely it may be corrected on the side of reduction in the time period for carrying out these plans.

"Even with our rich experience in running a planned economy it is difficult to foresee with absolute exactitude the growth of pro-

duction in various fields, particularly if one takes into consideration the stormy development of contemporary science and techniques and the further growth of our corps of trained personnel, which can give additional sources of acceleration of growth of production."

Experts in the United States are inclined to take the new Soviet economic plan seriously. Experience has shown that the Kremlin's postwar economic plans, though they contain certain propaganda elements, are serious programs for development. Basic goals are generally realized despite some readjustments.

Mr. MURRAY. This body must give a great deal of attention to our military situation, to sputniks and missiles and keeping up with the Communists in military power.

We cannot possibly win the race with Russia and the Communist nations in the long run if we neglect basic resources development. We cannot outproduce them if we have less energy available with which to run industrial plants, if we have inadequate mass transportation, or if great industrial areas are periodically inundated by floods.

Just as this Nation must invest more in basic research, so must we also increase our expenditures for basic resource development and our determination to get maximum benefits from our resources.

This Nation cannot afford the colossal waste of energy, and flood control and navigation benefits, which will occur if the giant Hells Canyon Dam is not authorized and built. I know of nothing more symbolic of the present administration's inability to grasp our situation in world affairs than the situation in the Middle Snake River.

The administration has obstructed construction of a great hydroelectric project at Hells Canyon by the Bureau of Reclamation and given the green light instead to private power company development. The private project will develop less than half the potential benefits of the resource. There will be a loss of power in the magnitude of a half-million kilowatts. Two-thirds of potential flood-control benefit—flood control that is urgently needed by the industrialized lower Columbia River Basin—will be wasted, as will the potential aid to navigation.

Some of us have for years warned that the United States must husband and develop her resources—that we cannot maintain our position of world leadership unless we do. But studies and reports like the great Paley Commission report on Resources for Freedom have gone virtually unheeded.

This Nation is not going to win either the race for military power, nor the race for the minds of men, if we continue to let our resource development program fall behind, our energy resources to be wasted, our river valleys to be subject to unnecessary devastating floods, waterways to deteriorate, and waste to run rampant.

It is as essential for this Nation to speed river and resources development programs as sputnik or missile programs.

We could do no more significant thing than to stop the resource-wasting, low-dam projects in the Middle Snake River and start full development of the Middle Snake River without delay. By passing the bill which this body has already approved, the House of Representatives could tell the world that this Nation is determined to do more than shoot 1 or 2 sputniks in the air; that we are reversing old, wasteful, resource policies to match and better, in the next 15 years, 50 years or 500 years, all the increase in national strength and productive capacity which our Russian competitors have initiated.

FRAUD, GRAFT, AND FOLLY IN THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from Look magazine, which is published by the Cowles brothers, once ardent supporters of President Eisenhower.

The article was published in the October 1, 1957, issue of Look, and is entitled "Fraud, Graft, and Folly in the Farm Program." It is a shocking indictment of the Eisenhower-Benson administration of the Department of Agriculture.

I also ask consent to include after the article a statement in reply issued by Secretary Benson which is even more shocking. Mr. Benson defends himself by saying:

> It is impossible to handle multi-billion-dollar programs without some abuse.

Mr. President, this statement leaves the inevitable impression that the Secretary of Agriculture, who had been away from his desk all summer vacationing and riding through national forests, is a man resigned to abuses rather than a man who stays on the job and works diligently to minimize them.

When President Dwight D. Eisenhower was running for office he told the people of America:

> I pledge you that—whatever my future personal status—I shall not rest until the peddlers of privilege and the destroyers of decency are banished from the Nation's house.

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

FRAUD, GRAFT, AND FOLLY IN THE FARM PROGRAM

After almost 5 years of the Eisenhower team's farm efforts, there is shocking news for the American taxpayer in the vast domain of surpluses, storehouses and subsidies operated by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson. The man who came to clean up the mess on the world's largest plantation has seen his good intentions eroded by widespread fraud, graft and folly. Not only is the mess still there; it may even have grown.

Congressional investigators have discovered scandal in almost every farm program—in the soil bank, in cotton subsidies, in the grain trade, in storage bins, on the export market, in cheese making, in transportation, in warehouses, in administration and even in the school-lunch program.

Benson's Department is the welfare state in miniature, if anything costing almost $30 billion since 1933 can be called miniature. It inspects the meat you buy, gives you groceries when you're hard up, passes advice to grocers, makes movies, tells pants makers what the public wants, devises sudsier soaps, better insect repellents, finer frozen juices and crunchier pickles. It tells you how to wash a rug or remove a spot from a dress, provides campgrounds for city hikers and hundreds of other services—as well as doling out advice, comfort, and cold cash to farmers. Yet, behind this benevolent facade, something is radically wrong.

Consider the soil bank. It was set up to funnel $1,200 million annually into farmers' pockets and to slash piled up Government surpluses. To do this, the Government pays people not to grow things.

Last summer, Representative STEWART L. UDALL (Democrat, of Arizona) revealed to Congress that individual payments—ranging from $56,000 to $209,701—had been made to 11 Arizona cotton farmers, all for not growing cotton. The largest Government check went to Jack A. Harris for not growing cotton on 1,666 acres in Pima County. Harris then leased 4,500 acres in another county, trucked his gear to the new site and planted cotton—thereby tripling production.

UDALL invented a new term, "boonswoggling," to describe this deal. Yet Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse defended the payment as tending "to obtain a reduction in production" and said there was nothing unorthodox about the fact that Harris was growing three times as much cotton somewhere else. Harris declared that his maneuver was intended to show "how ridiculous the soil bank is," and added, "What I've done is all within the law and it's being done by others in the industry. I don't understand UDALL's singling me out."

Many farmers don't like the mess any more than the taxpayers. (As if in frustrated reprisal against a system nobody really understands, an enraged Georgia farmer recently bit the left ear off a Government credit agent who had come to talk about the farmer's loan.) But while the system exists, people will take advantage of it.

Two years ago, a man walked into a west Texas supply store and made a series of purchases against deposited credit. The purchases included a $127 saddle, a polo mallet, a polo-mallet head, dog food, horse goggles, stirrup buckles and two Navaho blankets.

Not long ago, this shopping list stunned a group of United States Senators seated around a conference table in Washington. Reason: The purchases were made from emergency aid extended by the Nation's taxpayers to help needy farmers feed drought-stricken herds. Ranchers needing help were required to sign this statement: "Without the assistance applied for under the emergency feed program, I will be unable to maintain my basic foundation herd and to continue livestock operation which I have been conducting for (blank) years."

In return, the rancher got a drought-relief certificate, approved by the county farm committee, good for feed orders at a local store. In practice, the certificates became scrip, used for general credit at dollar face value. An Agriculture Department auditor visited the rancher early this year on a routine check. The man's drought-needy herd, he testified before a Senate agriculture subcommittee, "comprised a horse and a dog."

Through 4 days of hearings on similar cases, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, hammered at reluctant agriculture officials. At first, they estimated that $2 million of the big drought-feed program had vanished in unwise or illegal payments. Gradually, the figures increased as more cheating was revealed. It was admitted that 163 cases had been sent to the Justice Department for prosecution. Finally, the Agriculture Department prodded by Senators, ordered a complete audit of the drought program. It is still in progress.

Rumblings of funny business in drought relief came as early as 1954, when Senator WILLIAMS questioned a $32,585 subsidy to the rich million-acre King Ranch in Texas. The

ranch had applied for and received drought-relief aid. In June 1954, when WILLIAMS revealed the handout, a King Ranch racehorse, High Gun, won $89,000 by capturing the Belmont Stakes and $27,500 by taking the Peter Pan Handicap. WILLIAMS promptly proclaimed on the Senate floor that High Gun was the first horse "on relief" to win rich stake races.

No one denies that drought has been a harsh, baking reality, and that farmers have seen life savings wither to dust. But some of the $658 million spent by the Government in 4 years to ease the burden has taken strange paths.

Agriculture officials admitted to the Senate subcommittee that $4,500 in emergency feed subsidy went in 1956 to the huge Robbins ranches, covering almost 60,000 Kansas acres. After exposure by the subcommittee, the Department made formal demand for repayment on the ground that the Robbins ranches were not in financial need.

In Upton County, Tex., the subcommittee reported, two members of a local farm committee approved large subsidies for themselves, but used only a fraction for drought feed. Another Upton County farmer who got $3,620 in drought-relief credit used some of it to buy a bridle, a man's hat, 50 dressed fryers, bolts, washers, fly bait, horse goggles, nipples, horseshoes, cement, and fly spray.

On the west coast, testimony disclosed mutually profitable deals between farmers and dealers. With drought subsidies averaging about half the going price of grain, farmers with ample feed in hand were getting drought allotments anyway. Thus a farmer could buy $60 worth of feed from a dealer, using $30 of his own money and $30 of the Government's, and then resell the grain to the dealer for $50. His profit was $20, and the dealer's, $10. No grain changed hands and everybody made money but the taxpayers.

In another probe, a House Appropriations Subcommittee, headed by Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, reported a soil-bank chamber of horrors that outraged commonsense:

In Ellsworth County, Kans., one man leased 420 acres of Government-owned land from the Corps of Engineers and then announced he was not growing wheat on it. He paid $1,475 in rent and collected $2,500 for not growing wheat.

In Saline County, Kans., a man rented 160 acres of the Smoky Hill Air Force Base from the Government at $621 a year. For not growing wheat on part of it, the Government gave him $1,015.

SOIL-BANK SHENANIGANS

In Butler County, Ky., a man applied to put his acreage in the soil bank and collect money for not growing corn. An agent who measured the land found the "cornfield" was covered with 6-foot-high brush. Agriculture officials ruled he could qualify as a subsidized corn nongrower if he cleared off the brush.

Also, in Kentucky, investigators found that farmland owners with jobs in town had no intention of planting anything. When the soil bank arrived, they got paid for their lack of intentions. (By the same logic, a suburbanite ought to be able to collect Government money by promising not to grow corn on his lawn.)

Operation of two conflicting bounty laws made North Dakota an Alice-in-Wonderland. The Soil Bank Act paid farmers to cut wheat production. But the Durum Wheat Act gave an acreage bonus to farmers who shifted to the durum type of wheat. Thus a farmer in Grand Forks County, N. Dak., legally collected $10,366 for not growing wheat, although he actually increased wheat production by 538 acres. He had simply shifted from spring wheat to the bonus durum type.

In a South Dakota county, where the wheat crop was almost a total failure, and land prices nevertheless soared. Speculators were buying land in hopes of putting tenants off the farms and collecting Government money for not growing grain.

Traders as well as farmers are in a position to turn a fast buck. From the Government's bulging cotton holdings, merchants buy under competitive sealed bids. Last year, the Justice Department charged that there was a conspiracy to violate antitrust laws by allocating bids and fixing prices on buying Government cotton.

Eight large cotton firms and four individuals were indicted in New Orleans. Justice officials charged that the firms had purchased 60 percent of the $40 million worth of Government cotton sold in 1954–55, in a conspiracy to hold down prices. Ironically, presidents of three of the firms were unpaid members of Benson's cotton advisory committee. All denied the charges.

Investigations disclose highjinks in grain storage too.

Over the years, the Agriculture Department had bought 193,000 bins in which to store the Nation's surpluses, at a cost of $177 million. The Senate investigations subcommittee reported that thousands of the bins bought in 1954 were defective—with holes big enough for rats to crawl through. The bins had been inspected by the Navy under contract to the Agriculture Department. The committee accused both agencies of confusion, gross carelessness, and a lack of coordination.

Testimony before a House Government operations subcommittee revealed another storage angle. Cries for more storage space in 1954 brought Jack P. Burrus to the Department of Agriculture with a new gimmick. He signed to store 37 million bushels in tents at an annual fee of $6,600,000. This canvas granary turned into a colossal flop. Starlings pecked holes in the tents: water seeped in; insects moved in; the huge piles at Fort Worth, Tex., and St. Joseph, Mo., started to rot.

After a prolonged hassle, the Department gave Burrus an export subsidy to get rid of some of the grain. Burrus estimates that he lost $15 million on the deal. The Agriculture Department thinks it lost $8 million. Chairman L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, North Carolina, of this House subcommittee declares both sides goofed. Cost to taxpayers: large but undetermined.

Government grains trading heaps more losses on the taxpayer. The Agriculture Department hires fobbers, or forwarding agents, to handle bookwork on grain exports and port storage. But investigators for the House Appropriations Committee reported a conflict of interest among fobbers, some of whom trade grain on their own account while handling the Government's. As a result, the Government ships high-quality grain to embarkation points and permits the trade to blend off its own inferrior stocks, in the words of the House committee. Uncle Sam is forced to take a lower price abroad. Grain operators profit. Taxpayers lose.

The Agriculture Department sometimes doesn't even wait to be asked to hand out money. Once, in a weird transaction, it bestowed over $2 million on some of the Nation's leading cheese companies. Here's how it worked:

Early in 1954, Secretary Benson said he would lower dairy price supports on April 1. The Department of Agriculture then told cheese companies they could sell their products to the Government in March at the prevailing high rate with a guaranty they could buy them back in April at the lower price.

This was strictly a paper transaction. The cheese never left the owners' warehouses. They merely signed papers giving the Government title until April, held onto the cheese and in April got checks totaling $2,096,401.64 from Uncle Sam.

It's easy to take advantage of a prodigal Government. In the 1953 drought, the Agriculture Department contracted with processors to sack cottonseed pellets for emergency animal feed. But, in many instances, short weights averaging 7½ pounds to the 100-pound sack left taxpayers holding the bag for $500,000. More expensive was the Department's decision, in 1954, to sell large stocks of surplus dried milk for animal feed. The consequences were bewildering:

First, the Government lost money on the sale. Second, feed processors made about $10 million without reducing feed prices to farmers. Third, since dried milk for human consumption was selling at a much higher price, some operators diverted the low-cost animal feed. In New York, a court convicted two men of reselling 330,000 pounds of dried milk for human use at a profit of $26,000. Fourth, whey dealers yelped. Whey, the product that is left when milk is made into cheese, had been mixed in animal feed. Now the cheaper dried milk replaced it and the whey men were going broke.

THE SLIPPERY MILKY WAY

The Agriculture Department had an easy answer. It announced a new price-support program for whey and bought 41 million pounds of it. Instead of being up to his ears in dried milk, Benson was up to his ears in whey. Loss to taxpayers: about $73 million on dried milk and $1,500,000 on whey.

Some Federal farm funds wind up in the school-lunch program, both in surplus commodities and in money to deliver the goods to the States. Thereafter, the States assume the cost of distributing the food within their borders. Investigation by Chairman Fountain's subcommittee—prompted by a Chicago Sun-Times exposure—turned up this story in Illinois:

James W. Dunbar, Republican probate clerk of Sangamon County, also headed a trucking firm, Dunbar & Co. He got an exclusive contract from his good friend Vernon L. Nickell, Illinois superintendent of public instruction, to distribute Government surplus commodities to schools and State institutions.

Dunbar's trucking outfit, which had been losing money, suddenly prospered. By its own reckoning, it made $396,000 in 29 months of distributing school-lunch supplies, but the subcommittee said profits "greatly exceeded" that amount because of questionable items charged off as business expenses.

Travel charges against school-lunch distribution totaled $66,707, said the committee, including $555.90 for rail tickets and a chartered plane for a fishing trip by Dunbar, Nickell, and Harold A. Wolfe, Illinois school-lunch director. Dunbar explained: "It was about the only time we could sit down and talk about the school-lunch program and get their different versions of it."

Other expenses included two round-trip air tickets to Florida, $1,344 for football tickets, and other sums for liquor.

"Inordinate profits of Dunbar & Co.," said the subcommittee, "constituted the major portion of the excessive cost of distributing donated commodities in Illinois." The State of Illinois indicted Dunbar and three others, but a panel of judges quashed the indictments.

It was no surprise that Republicans, out of power for 20 years, should cast greedy eyes on more than 200,000 full- and part-time Agriculture jobs, but some of the patronage endeavors raised eyebrows. A Senate agriculture subcommittee revealed that in Missouri the State Republican com-

mittee urged grand old party leaders to take over the 4,300 Federal farm jobs in the State. In one county, a motel operator was installed as farm-office manager. In another, a fist fight erupted when Republicans tried to give a Federal farm job to a party leader who had broken a bin seal and sold his Government-mortgaged corn.

Around the Nation, lucrative legal aspects of farm loans were switched from Government to private attorneys, with Republican lawyers getting the gravy. Washington sent lists of grand old party precinct and county chairmen to the States for Federal farm appointments.

In Montana, Carl O. Hansen, State Farmers Home Administration boss, was forced to resign amid conflict of interest charges. Hansen bought wool on a commission basis for a private firm while directing the State FHA office. An assistant on the Government payroll helped Hansen with the private wool purchases. At the top level, a Senate investigation of FHA inefficiency led to the resignation in June 1956 of the national administrator, R. B. McLeaish.

What's wrong with the giant farm program? Democrats blame Benson's bungling, but that's only a part of the story. Benson personally opposes many of the subsidies, in degree. He told a Senate committee that we need better programs than those which lose markets, restrict the opportunity for farmers to make their own decisions, and pile up surpluses.

There must be better programs—to this all sides say "aye"—but no one has the answers. Democrats as well as Republicans want to continue farm-aid spending; neither party wants to write the kind of laws and regulations that would stop chiseling for fear of giving all farm programs a black eye.

The programs have grown so big—all farm spending will approximate $5,500,000,000 this year—that neither party is able to control them. Nobody can predict the impact on the total economy of a price-support program for a single crop. Nobody, indeed, knows enough to manage almost $8 billion worth of surpluses.

The page reserved for the history of the Government's 25-year struggle to shore up a farm economy that is changing so fast it can hardly be measured, let alone managed, might be headed with this inscription: "Too much sugar. Too many flies. Not enough flypaper."

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON

I have seen the article in Look magazine entitled, "Fraud, Graft, and Folly in the Farm Program." The article has in it a number of half-truths, distortions and falsehoods. There is nothing new in it. Many of the infractions of law and regulation described in this article were uncovered by our own investigators. It is largely a rehash of charges made against the Department by various investigating committees of the Congress during the past 4½ years. Very little is said in the article regarding our defense against these charges. This defense has been made in full detail. It was and is available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in printed hearings of the various committees. The authors of the article chose to report the charges and ignore the defense.

The article alleges that Government farm programs have occasionally been abused. With this I agree. It is impossible to handle multibillion-dollar programs without some abuse. The article charges the Department with lagging in moving to correct these abuses. With this I disagree. It infers that large numbers of farm people are fundamentally dishonest. This I totally reject.

For 4½ years we have been trying diligently to reverse the trend toward a socialized agriculture. We have repeatedly urged legislation which would change the unsound, wasteful features of the old program born during depression and war. We will continue our fight for a sound program and for a prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture.

A REALISTIC APPROACH TO THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today the administration and Secretary Benson are recommending to Congress legislation which represents further progress toward turning back to the American farmers the management of their own farms. I am not necessarily endorsing all their suggestions, but they do represent a realistic approach to the farm problem.

The projection of the high support incentive production plans of World War II over into peacetime economy has resulted in the inevitable accumulation of huge amounts of agriculture surpluses.

Not only has this brought about tremendous losses for the American taxpayers, but also the ever-present threat of these huge inventories in our warehouses has inevitably had a dampening effect upon market prices.

Had this been recognized in the immediate postwar period and the 90 percent wartime incentive production support prices been lowered, as was intended, the plight of the American farmer over the past 10 years would have been much better and the producers of those affected commodities would not be in the situation in which they now find themselves.

Likewise, the high support prices for a few basic commodities has resulted in an unfair advantage to certain types of farmers while at the same time other groups of farmers were actually being hurt by the same program, for instance; Over 80 percent of the price supports and stabilization costs in the 1956–57 period were concentrated in 3 crops and in butter and manufactured dairy products. Nearly one-half—48 percent—of the costs were incurred on 2 crops, wheat and cotton.

The major Federal costs of price supports and stabilization programs based on fiscal years 1956 and 1957 are as follows:

	Percent of costs	Percent of total cash farm receipts from 1956 sales
Wheat	30.0	7.4
Cotton	18.2	5.9
Corn	13.8	5.2
Dairy products	20.2	14.7
Poultry and poultry products	0	10.6

Last year the cost of the agriculture support program was in excess of $3¼ billion. Eighty percent of this cost was represented by losses sustained on the 4 above mentioned crops.

Furthermore, the type of program which has been in operation for the past several years has been a major benefit to the large scale and ofttimes absentee type of farmer while the middle or small farmer received a negligible percentage of the benefits; for instance; as 80 percent of the total, or about $2½ billion, was being spent on 4 crops, 80 percent of this amount went to less than 27 percent of those farmers, while 56 percent of all the farmers producing corn, wheat, cotton, and dairy products received only 9 percent of the benefits.

The purpose of any sound agriculture program should be to protect and assist the bona fide farmer and not to promote and encourage the expansion of the absentee ownership or corporation type of operation.

A further glaring example of the inequity in our basic farm program, and one which is corrected under the administration's new proposal, is the example mentioned a couple of weeks ago wherein it was pointed out that under the operations of the soil bank program 10 large operators received $1,470,582.53 subsidy from the United States Government, with the top beneficiary receiving over $250,000.

It should also be pointed out that under the existing program only farmers in certain States are being supported while in many other States he is being allowed to shift for himself.

I call attention to the fact that while wheat and corn account for 12.6 percent of the total cash farm receipts the expenditures of the Government in support of these two crops represented 43.8 percent of the total cost of our agriculture support programs.

On the other hand, not only has the poultry industry, which represented 10.6 percent of the total cash farm receipts, operated without the benefit of any support prices but also it has been confronted with high feed costs resulting from the artificially supported grain markets.

I commend the poultry industry, which on numerous occasions has been confronted with marketing problems and low prices, upon the fact that it has been realistic enough to realize that the solution to those problems does not rest with the United States Government.

What the American farmer needs and wants is a sound agriculture program designed to help the bona fide American farmer, and not one which is designed to promote absentee ownership, or to expand the corporation type of operation at the taxpayers' expense.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it is important at this time of national and international crisis for us to pay great tribute to the fine nonpartisan career service and the outstanding people in it. The examples of splendid performance of public duty and unselfish dedication are unparalleled in world history.

It was on January 16, 1883, that President Chester A. Arthur signed into law the Civil Service Act. At that time the new law covered only a handful of employees. Today the Civil Service Act covers 86 percent of all Federal employees and 91 percent of those in the continental United States. Nearly two and one-half million men and women engaged in occupations embracing every

type of employment in the Federal Service are covered. Their daily work and actions touch Americans every day of their life.

Since 1883 much has been done to transform the civil service into a true career service, but the basic fundamentals of the merit system were established by the original law.

It is in keeping with the dignity of this 75th anniversary development that we openly and intelligently reexamine this law to make certain whether it is adequate or whether it should be changed.

The overwhelming responsibility which the Federal Government now faces requires degrees of expertness which a few short years ago were never conceived of and makes it imperative that we know the executive branch of our government is working in the most effective possible manner to attract good people to the public service and seeing that they are fairly treated as they produce great things for all the people of the United States and continue to bring reassurance in the years of international tension.

During these 75 years of the history of the Civil Service Act, many committees, including Presidential committees, have made studies and recommendations for the extension of its coverage and the improvement of its operation.

Within the last 2 years the Hoover Committee on the Reorganization of the executive branch of the Government has had a task force studying the program and made substantial recommendations for changes, based on the information they obtained in these hearings.

Several bills have been introduced carrying these changes into effect and I hope this session of Congress will have an opportunity to act on them.

Near the conclusion of the first session of the 85th Congress, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] introduced S. 2317, which, if enacted, would establish a commission to study and revise the present compensation system for civilian salaried employees of the Federal Government and amend the compensation schedule of the Classification Act of 1949.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for many years, I appreciate the need for this type of study.

The bill provides that there be established a Commission of 12 members—4 chosen from the executive branch of the Government, 4 from private life, and 4 from the Congress of the United States.

This Commission, if given proper authority could, in my opinion, be of valued service to the future of the civil-service system.

I should also like to pay tribute to the dedicated private citizens who have formed and supported and directed the National Civil Service League. The National Civil Service League was founded in 1881 and is truly a citizen organization that is devoted to the adoption in government of a modern personnel system based on merit, and to exclusion of public employment from partisan control.

The present officers of this organization are—as were those of the past—dedicated individuals, promoting the cause of a nonpolitical merit system for government employees. It was this private group which helped bring the Pendleton Act into existence and has continued to work in a constructive manner throughout the years, with the Congress as well as the executive branch of the Government. The history and vitality of such a citizens' group is, in itself, a tribute to the dynamic and fully democratic nature of our Government.

The ability to allow complete and open relationships between such private organizations and all branches of government has been a factor which has lead to important strength in public administration and our entire democratic process.

Again, Mr. President, I say it is an honor and a privilege to pay tribute to the civil-service system and what it has meant to our Nation on this, its 75th anniversary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation issued by the President of the United States on the 75th anniversary of the Civil Service Act be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Whereas the Federal civil-service system was established by the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, and will be 75 years old on January 16, 1958; and

Whereas the enactment of that act and the establishment thereunder of a merit system of employment within the Federal Government have given impetus to the establishment of similar systems at State, county, and municipal levels of government; and

Whereas a strong civil service, based on the merit principle, is now recognized as an essential factor in stable, responsible government in the United States, as well as in many other countries; and

Whereas the 75th anniversary of the Civil Service Act is an appropriate time to salute the civil service of the United States and to increase public knowledge and understanding of its importance in our system of self-government:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby call upon the people of the United States to participate in the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Civil Service Act on January 16, 1958, and throughout the ensuing year.

I also call upon the heads of Federal departments and agencies, governors, mayors, and other public officials, as well as leaders of industry and labor and members of all public-spirited groups, to study our Federal, State, and local civil-service systems, with a view to their continuous improvement in every way possible, and to arrange appropriate ceremonies in honor of the public service of our able and devoted civil servants throughout the country.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America do be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 13th day of January 1958, and of the independence of the United States of America the 182d.

[SEAL] DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.

AGRICULTURAL PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the President has sent to Congress a message on agriculture. It is my further understanding that in the message he recommends a continuation of Public Law 480, as well as an extension of the Wool Act. I am in favor of both proposals, because I believe they represent sound judgment on these subjects.

I understand the President also suggests that we take a look at the soil bank program. I believe that is long overdue.

However, if my understanding is correct, the President also advocates a change in the price support structure for the basic commodities, and that he advocates legislation which would allow a leeway in price supports for the six basic commodities, ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

In my opinion, Mr. President, if such legislation is enacted it will mean that parity will end up at 60 percent. The most recent indication of what the administration is doing in the field of farm props is the action taken recently with relation to dairy products.

The Department of Agriculture has announced that at some time in the near future—I believe on April 1—the price supports on dairy products will drop to 75 percent. I believe that recommendation goes entirely too far.

I would call to the attention of the administration that over the past 5 years or so, 600,000 small farm families have left their farms. I would further point out to the administration that at the present time, based on figures furnished by its own Commodity Credit Corporation, 1,400,000 farm families earn less than $1,000 a year. For the past 6 years the income of farmers has been declining, while the costs of the farmers have been rising steadily. Alone, over this period, this segment of our economy has been caught in this price-cost squeeze.

I sincerely hope that Congress will not be in accord with the recommendation in the recent message by the President of the United States for a lowering of price supports to as low as 60 percent. If I had my way, the lowest price support, insofar as the 6 basic commodities are concerned, would be 90 percent. I believe farmers would be able to live within that particular orbit. However, if price supports are reduced to 60 percent, then we can expect more and more small farmers to be forced off the land, and more and more corporate farming to come into being.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter which I received from Mr. Kenneth J. Sire, of Billings, Mont. I believe it is one of the finest letters on farm problems that I ever received, and I hope every Senator will take the time to read it.

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

BILLINGS, MONT., *January 4, 1958.*

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is not often that I write Members in Congress, but in my book I think

it is time I vent my feelings. Since Congress is controlled by the Democrats I am hoping they may be able to do something.

As for world affairs, that is your department, but I think this administration is doing poorly. As for business, well the chamber of commerce and the Republicans seem to be doing pretty well. I'll let Walter Reuther take care of labor. I am writing as, and I know on behalf of, and for the farmer. I might mention very strongly, small farmer.

The program which Benson tries so hard to coat with sugar for urban consumption is to force the small farmer out of business. Continued dropping of prices will do just that, leaving production in the hands of corporations which will intensify our surplus problem, rather than ease it. Not many years ago there were 6½ million farmers; today there are 4½ million. Where we had 3 farmers living off of the land we have now 2 farmers, and yet the acres in production are the same or larger.

It is the land which is doing the producing. You drop prices and you force the smaller out who is absorbed by his larger neighbor. The land is still there, it is still producing, the difference being that 1 farmer is doing it instead of 2. North of Great Falls, Mont., there is a large farmer. He, his 2 sons, and 4 hired men occupy and produce an area once inhabited by 42 farmers and families. Those 42 farmers had their cows, pigs, chickens, beef animals, grains, and hay all coming from the land. They, as 42 farmers, did not produce nearly as much toward surplus as does this man today. This particular situation is proved by the fact that today on fewer acres we are producing more. I might mention my entire discussion is in terms of wheat, and the small producer of wheat, because I am familiar with his problems.

Today there are 4½ million farmers of which 2½ million are not contributing to our surplus problem. Freeze them out with lower prices and you will have the same land in production with 2½ million fewer families living off the land with the result that our so-called surplus problem will be intensified.

Who benefits from Benson's program? The average small farmer does not. Not a single one of his crackpot ideas has been of a nature where I could benefit. I have not received $1 under his program because it is and was not designed for the small fellow.

The taxpayer has not benefited. Benson is spending as much or more.

The consumer has not benefited. Four years ago I sold my wheat for $2.15 per bushel. This year I will be lucky to get $1.70 per bushel, yet bread has gone up 4 cents per loaf during that same period and my costs of farming have increased a full 25 percent.

I don't care what Benson, Fortune, or Time magazine say. I know what is happening to me and it doesn't hurt good.

My solution: exactly as General Motors or Du Pont would do, curb production. Put a bushel limit per producer, not farm. Permit the price for this limit to be parity with the grand total not in excess of domestic consumption. Any wheat in excess to go at the free market. Put a limit on corn and feed grain and that limit be per producer. Let the farmer do with his excess acres as he sees fit. Cut out soil bank and all the rest. Let him live with a limit on wheat and feed grains.

There is not a single segment of our economy that isn't protected, either because of size, unions, or Government help. What is so wrong to help the small farmer through his elected representative?

You gentlemen in Congress have got to do something, and you sure as the dickens should establish that Congress passes the laws and the administration only administers those laws.

The least you can do is get prices back up and Benson out. It is serious for the small fellow.

Very truly yours,

KENNETH J. SIRE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF MATERIALS RELATING TO COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 28.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read Senate Concurrent Resolution 28.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of materials relating to legislative and administrative action of the Federal and State Governments in connection with the development of the water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries. Such compilation shall be prepared under the direction and supervision of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed 5,000 additional copies of such Senate document, of which 1,000 copies shall be bound in cloth and 4,000 copies shall be bound in paper. One-half of such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and one-half of such additional copies shall be for the use of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) was considered and agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 11, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) dealing with the presidential succession.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana that the Senate proceed to the consideration of 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.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to create a joint Congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 on page 5, line 22, to strike out "1957" and insert in lieu thereof "1958".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "1957" and insert in lieu thereof "1958".

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before the amendment is acted on, I may say, first, that I did not know the Senator intended to offer this particular amendment. I, myself, would not wish to delay the final report of the committee. What is the date which the Senator is now proposing?

Mr. GREEN. The concurrent resolution was introduced in 1957. The year is now changed to 1958, 1 year later, but the date remains June 30.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had thought the concurrent resolution now before the Senate provided that the report would be made on June 30, 1958. Is that what the committee amendment proposes?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is very important that the joint committee report to Congress this year, so that there will be time for Congress to act on the question before adjournment sine die.

Mr. GREEN. The year is changed from 1957 to 1958, and the date remains June 30.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So there would still be time for Congress to act this year?

Mr. GREEN. I think so.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is that the only amendment?

Mr. GREEN. That is the only amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who is unavoidably absent at this time. It is an amendment which is customarily included in resolutions of this kind, which create committees. The amendment is as follows: On page 6, in line 5, following the word "assistants", to read:

Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed, and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

I understand that the amendment is acceptable to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

AMENDMENT OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated 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.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, the Presidential succession measure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting minority leader whether the civil aeronautics bill, if passed over at this time, will thereafter be made the pending business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The bill will remain on the calendar, and will not be brought up until it is cleared with the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Oklahoma, the author of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to create a joint Congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. GREEN obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Was the amendment I offered adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not yet been adopted.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 proposes the creation of a temporary joint Congressional committee of 10 members, 5 from each House of Congress, to study all aspects of the nomination, election, succession, inability, and duties of the President and Vice President. The purpose of the proposed study is to achieve a sound basis for legislative action necessary to make the laws certain and complete in this most important area of Government activity.

For 12 years, beginning with January 1946, I have crusaded for the establishment of a joint committee of the Congress to study the several problems inherent in presidential succession. I have introduced bills in 1946, 1947, 1949, 1951, 1953, 1956, and 1957. On three occasions, my proposals received Senate approval, but died in the House. My most recent effort, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, has been on the Senate Calendar for almost a year. I hope it will be approved without further delay.

I am aware that two measures which have been introduced in the Senate relate, in part, to the matters covered in my resolution; but these measures have never been reported by the committee to which they were referred. It is my belief that remedial legislative action in the area of presidential succession should be predicated on a concentrated and scholarly analysis of the problems involved. In my opinion, the most adequate and appropriate forum for such analysis would be a joint committee of the Congress.

To those who would argue for the establishment of a national commission on presidential succession, I should like to explain why I differ with them. The Chief Executive ought not be in the position of appointing members of a commission to study his own office. A joint committee would be less cumbersome in organization and operation than a national commission. It would be less expensive, involve less delay, be a more direct approach to the problem, and be in a better position to coordinate its studies with those independently made by standing committees of the Congress.

All of us are conscious that ambiguity shrouds the constitutional provisions relating to the transfer of the Executive power of the United States. We should endeavor to resolve that ambiguity now by cool, deliberate consideration and action. Adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 provides the opportunity. I urge its approval.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the taking of action by the Senate on the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island.

As he has pointed out, he has been rather persistent over a period of years in attempting to have a study of this subject matter made.

As I expressed earlier, I hope, however, that the appointment of such a joint committee—if the concurrent resolution is finally agreed to by the other body—will not delay the taking of action by the Congress of the United States in dealing at this session of the Congress with the matter of presidential succession, with particular reference to presidential disability.

This question certainly is not a partisan one. There have been several instances of this sort in the history of our country; I refer to the case of President Garfield, who was incapacitated following the attempt—which of course was finally successful—to assassinate him. He was in a condition of coma for a period of time, and was incapacitated, although he was not immediately killed by the assassin. Subsequently, there was the case of Woodrow Wilson, who was incapacitated for a considerable period of time. It so happened that in both those cases the condition of world affairs was such that no serious damage was done to our country. However, such a situation could develop at any time in the future of our Nation, regardless of whether the then occupant of the White House will be a Democrat or a Republican. The matter should be approached from a nonpartisan point of view.

I hope the joint committee—if the House of Representatives agrees to its appointment—will be appointed immediately, so it can get to work on the question and can hold whatever hearings may be desirable; or if by any chance the House of Representatives does not elect to take that course of action, then I hope that the respective standing committees of the two Houses of Congress will, at this session of Congress, before the sine die adjournment, act on proposed legislation or on a constitutional amendment dealing with this subject.

Several different approaches have been suggested. Undoubtedly the Congress will wish to explore those several possibilities in the way of determining presidential disability. But the Congress should not continue to delay finding a solution for the problem, and I certainly hope the Congress will act on it before the sine die adjournment of this session.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was not able to hear all of the remarks of the Senator from California, but I wish to call his attention to the fact that the constitutional amendment subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee has before it three proposed constitutional amendments relating to the disability and removal of the disability of the President, and also a bill, introduced by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

Some time ago we announced hearings to be held before the subcommittee, to commence on the 23d of this month, at which time we hope to hear from the Attorney General and a number of political scientists and constitutional lawyers of ability.

It is the hope of the subcommittee—and I believe, of the Judiciary Committee—in the near future that an appropriate resolution or other measure may be reported by the Judiciary Committee.

Of course the House committee has already held hearings and, I believe, is in the process of holding more.

I do not know whether the Senator from Rhode Island has in mind going into the same subject matter that is being covered by the Judiciary Committee, if the proposed joint committee is established. I think it would be an unnecessary duplication in that particular field.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will yield, I might say that, so far as I know, in our legislative procedures there is nothing which would in the slightest preclude hearings being conducted by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee before the subcommittee to which he has

referred. I was glad to learn that such hearings are to be held. That merely underscores the fact I mentioned earlier, that I hope that at this session of the Congress some action can be taken on the question of presidential disability.

As the distinguished Senator from Tennessee himself knows, the President of the United States recommended at the last session of Congress that the matter be taken up. There are honest differences of opinion as to whether the suggestions the President made and the suggestions which the then Attorney General made are the procedures which the Congress will finally decide to approve or care to follow; but there certainly is a very real problem involved, and one which must be considered by the Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will certainly agree that it is a most important problem and one that should not be left dangling without being settled. I think the President is to be commended for taking the initiative himself and asking that the entire problem be considered by the Congress. The point I was making was that I did not know if the joint committee which would be established by the resolution of the Senator from Rhode Island contemplated covering the same field or whether there would be a duplication of part of the inquiry or just what the situation was.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to answer the question, I do not see that there will be duplication. I hope the present examination into the question will continue and that the results of the inquiry will be available to the joint committee which would be appointed under the resolution, if adopted. The joint committee would deal with a good many questions besides the one question that the present committee is considering. It seems to me it is very advisable to clear up the whole question, if possible, so that in the eventuality referred to, the disability of the President, there may be no interruption of our form of government.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from California yielded the floor?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I have yielded the floor, but I shall be glad to answer any questions that are directed to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I had not had the opportunity of examining the powers which would be granted to the joint committee under the resolution. I did not know whether the joint committee would have authority to report bills to the Senate or the House, or if the bills it recommended would have to go to the regular standing committees, in which event a bill with reference to a constitutional amendment or relating to legislation defining disability or restoration of ability of the President would come to the Judiciary Committee. I think that point ought to be cleared up.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I do not think that there is any doubt that the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is correct. As the minority leader said, the adoption of the resolution would not preclude in any way the study which the committee is undertaking. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has said, the work of the joint committee would not duplicate the work of the Judiciary Committee. We recognize the authority of the Judiciary Committee, but this inquiry would go a little beyond the study of that committee, and its findings might be useful to the study made by the joint committee.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. GORE. Has the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee recognized any lack of jurisdiction of his subcommittee in this field?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator all proposals for constitutional amendments are, of course, referred to the Judiciary Committee. The various proposals for constitutional amendments in connection with the inability of the President, and the removal of the inability, and all constitutional amendments with reference to authorizing Congress to have presidential primaries in connection with the selection of the nominees, have always been referred to the Judiciary Committee. I think there is no question about the committee's jurisdiction. We have had hearings in past Congresses on questions of selection of nominees for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency. We have had hearings on the question of succession. Of course, a succession bill was reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate some time ago.

Mr. GORE. If the special joint committee is to study the identical subject matter being considered by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary headed by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, how can duplication be avoided?

Mr. KEFAUVER. So far as I can see, it would just mean that there would be two committees studying the matter.

Mr. GORE. Does the resolution come to the Senate with the recommendation of any established legislative committee of the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is my understanding that the resolution was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I do not know of any standing committee that has recommended it.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. MANSFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee 2 or 3 questions for my own information, because I am not familiar with the resolution. My first question is, Am I to understand that the Judiciary Committee now has, and has had for some time, under study and consideration the major subject matters of this proposed resolution?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to my colleague from Oregon that the Judiciary Committee now has under study and, before this resolution was put on the calendar by the policy committee, had announced hearings in connection with the problem of determining when inability of the President occurs and how that inability may be removed. In that connection, we have before us proposals for constitutional amendments and also proposals for legislation. The Judiciary Committee has also had before it for a number of years, and now is considering, different methods of electing a President, either by popular vote or by the Mundt-Coudert plan or the Lodge-Gossett plan, different alternatives to the electoral college. The Judiciary Committee has also had before it bills and proposals for constitutional amendments to enable Congress to devise some other means for the selection of nominees for the Presidency and the Vice-Presidency than by conventions, that is, a national primary system for the selection of the nominees by the major parties for President and Vice President.

The Judiciary Committee, of course, has in times past had before it for consideration bills with reference to succession to the office of the Presidency, and related matters of that kind.

At this point I should like to clear up the record. My colleague from Tennessee asked if this proposal for the joint committee had been recommended by any standing committee. I thought my colleague was referring to the Judiciary Committee. This matter did not come before the Judiciary Committee. The resolution was presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The joint committee, of course, has been recommended by a resolution from the Rules Committee, but has not been recommended by any other standing committee.

Mr. MORSE. My next question is this: Does the Senator from Tennessee believe that the subject matter of this resolution falls within the jurisdiction of both the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration? The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has just invited my attention to what the Rules of the Senate have to say with reference to committees, page 42 of the Rules and Manual of the United States Senate, subsection (d).

> Matters relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; presidential succession.

The matter seems to fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and, therefore, the resolution would be properly reported by that committee.

Does the Senator from Tennessee believe that the Judiciary Committee also has jurisdiction over the same subject matter?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am quite certain that all the points suggested in the resolution with reference to establishing the joint committee are covered under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee

and the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Of course, as was stated by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], that fact is not contested. An effort is not being made to take away the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration or the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is desired to have a committee to study and make its recommendations. I take it those recommendations would be made to the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration. I suppose that is where they would wind up.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit, I am a little concerned, Mr. President, about what I fear is a growing tendency in committee procedures of the Senate to duplicate effort, with corresponding duplication of cost.

I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee clear the matter up, if he can. I am a little concerned as to whether, if we pass this resolution and the Committee on the Judiciary continues its investigation, we shall not find ourselves paying out money for identical studies, only to have the two studies finally submitted to a standing legislative committee for a report to the Senate, when one committee could have done the job all alone.

If the point I raise is a valid point, I think, Mr. President, our Senate leaders ought to get together and make a recommendation as to who is going to do this job, because I do not think we can justify paying twice for the same objective.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say in response to the Senator's observation that as I understand the resolution to establish the joint committee there is no authority to report bills on the committee's own motion. Its recommendations would have to go, in the main, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

As to the matter of all constitutional amendments, all legislation affecting the inability or removal of the inability of the President, the establishment of presidential preference primaries, or the abolition of the electoral college, all of those related matters are being considered and have historically been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. Some aspects of the problem are properly, of course, under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

This proposal would really amount to the establishment of another committee to hear testimony and make recommendations with reference to matters which will be acted upon by the other two committees. So far as I am concerned, the subject matter requires all the light we can obtain. If the Senate desires to have two committees considering the subject I have no personal objection, although I imagine we would have the same witnesses before each committee. We would cover pretty much the same field.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, has the Senator concluded?

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit me, I should like to address a comment or a question to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and to the acting majority leader, as follows: Has the leadership of the Senate, in placing this matter on the calendar today, given consideration to a question as to whether this involves duplicating costs?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that until the majority policy committee had met on yesterday, I believe it was, and I was telephoned by the majority leader, I did not know that the matter was going to be up for consideration today. I assumed the decision was made by the majority policy committee.

The one question I raised, both with the majority leader when I spoke to him and also publicly on the floor, was that I wanted to be sure that the passage of such a resolution creating a joint committee would not delay action by the Congress of the United States on the question of presidential disability, because I think—and I am expressing a personal opinion—that matter should be considered and acted upon at this session of Congress.

I was personally pleased to learn that the Committee on the Judiciary is holding some hearings on the subject.

I believe the discussion has brought out that there may be some duplication, but I do not believe that it will in any way foreclose the Committee on the Judiciary from going ahead with its hearings, which have been indicated.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join with the distinguished minority leader in what he has had to say, and to point out that this type of legislation has passed the Senate three times previously; that it was reported out by the Committee on Rules and Administration unanimously; that it was reported out by the Democratic policy committee unanimously; that there will be some duplication, perhaps, but we think that over the long run it will be beneficial to the Committee on the Judiciary, which we realize has primary responsibility.

We desire to be helpful. That is the purpose behind the proposal. I hope the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will recognize the intent that there be no duplication and no precluding anything from coming under the jurisdiction of the Senator's committee, but instead a desire to be helpful and to meet a difficult and troubling problem.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. I wanted to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the resolution does not contain exactly the subject matter before his committee, but is very much broader. In the first place, it covers all of the questions as to the election of the President and Vice President, and how they shall be elected. Second, it covers the succession to the office of the President, when the President ceases to be. In the third case, it covers the inability of the President to discharge his powers and duties.

Finally, it covers the powers and duties of the President.

All of that subject matter would be covered by the report of the joint committee, which would carry a great deal more prestige and influence than any committee of either one House, in my opinion.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. In response to the Senator from Rhode Island, let me say that I know the Senator is a very able and distinguished Senator, and carries a great deal of prestige. However, inasmuch as the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate have had a great deal of experience with this question over a period of a great many years, I must disagree with the Senator in the statement that a report from the proposed joint committee would carry more prestige and authority than a report from the Judiciary Committee of either the House or the Senate.

The second point is that all of the questions mentioned by the Senator from Rhode Island—the election, the succession, the definition of disability, a new method of electing the President, or a constitutional amendment for a presidential primary—necessarily involve amendments to the Constitution. That subject is fundamentally and primarily one over which the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction.

If it is the idea of the Senator from Rhode Island that we should not act in the Judiciary Committee until the proposed joint committee has held full hearings and made its report, I believe that, in the interest of expediting consideration of these important questions, the proposed joint committee should not be established.

If it is the idea of the Senator from Rhode Island that the Judiciary Committee should proceed with its hearings and make its reports, and not wait upon the action or the hearings of the proposed joint committee, I have no particular objection to it. But we do not want our committee placed in a position in which, when we have a bill to report, we shall be met with the argument that the joint committee has not had time to consider it, and that we should not act until the joint committee has considered the subject.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I think the Senator's committee should proceed with its work. I am sorry that it has not proceeded faster and produced results.

This question has been brought up year after year. On three different occasions a measure dealing with the subject has passed the Senate, and the subject has been before the Senate upon many other occasions.

I think we are constantly being reminded of the risks we are taking in not providing for all these possible contin-

gencies—not merely for the contingency of the death of the President or inability of the President to act, but a great many other contingencies which are left undecided by our present Constitution and laws.

A study by a joint committee should carry enough authority to produce results. That is one reason why there should be a joint committee.

A further point is that we do not wish to pass a measure which the President must sign. There must be action by the Senate and House combined, rather than action with respect to which the President would be passing on his own case.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I point out that any statute, to be effective, must be signed by the President.

Mr. GREEN. That may be true; but that does not necessarily imply that such a course would be necessary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not know how we could enact any law without the concurrence of the President.

The point I wish to make clear is that if the Judiciary Committee reports a bill, we should not be met with the argument that we should not proceed, but should defer action until the joint committee has had time to hold hearings and make a report.

I think this question should be acted upon at an early date. We already have quite a record. There was testimony before the House committee. We have a great deal of information in the Senate committee. There have been previous hearings on the subject, and we shall be ready to act within a very short time. We would not wish to be delayed by consideration by the joint committee.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that we are in full accord with the position he has announced. We desire to be helpful. We recognize the primacy of the Judiciary Committee. We want the hearings to get started. We hope, if the concurrent resolution is adopted, that what the joint committee will do will be helpful to the Senator's committee in arriving at a final determination.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Senate has already passed similar measures upon three separate occasions. But that is not enough. If the Senator's committee reports a bill and it receives the approval of the Senate, that will not accomplish anything further than was accomplished by the previous action of the Senate. But if a joint committee is appointed to consider this subject, it may succeed.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I wish to congratulate both the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Rhode Island on their interest in this very vital subject.

My observation of the activities of the Senator from Rhode Island extends back to the 80th Congress, 12 years ago, when he and I were members of the minority on the Senate Committee on Rules. As I recall, the other party was in charge of the organization of the Senate, and in charge of that committee.

At that time the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island was the leader in insisting on what is now so obvious to all of us, that there were certain questions which should be decided. The suggestion which he made then I considered to be sound. He now makes the same suggestion. I supported him in reporting unanimously from the committee a proposal to deal with the subject. As I recall, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] was at that time a majority member of the Rules Committee.

The purpose of the effort which was initiated by the Senator from Rhode Island was to have a joint committee, because of the fact that, apparently, the subject had been differently viewed by the two Houses up to that time. I believe that the same situation has prevailed since that time, perhaps because the rules pertaining to succession to the Presidency affect one House more directly than the other.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island felt that the reports of a joint committee, appointed by the two Houses, would have great weight before the standing committees which would consider the various proposals. If the proposal of the joint committee involved a constitutional amendment, of course it would have to be referred to the Judiciary Committee in the Senate, as well as the Judiciary Committee in the House. However, the Senator from Rhode Island felt that a study submitted from a joint committee of that kind would receive a favorable hearing and preferential treatment. I agreed with him then, and I still agree with him.

I should like very much to be consistent. Having approved this approach repeatedly in the past, it seems to me that now, when this problem is so much more actively before the conscience of the country than it has ever been, it is time to renew the effort.

I assure the Senator from Tennessee that I, for one, would not desire in any respect to detract from the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. I could not if I wished to do so. The proposal before us would not detract from the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

A given subject would not necessarily come before the Judiciary Committee, because certain parts of the study involve possible statutes, which would not involve the proposal of a constitutional amendment.

On this subject the Constitution itself, in article II, paragraph 5, provides as follows:

> In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

There are other features of the subject matter proposed to be assigned to the joint committee which could be handled by statute, rather than by constitutional amendment.

It seems to me that not only is no loss of jurisdiction involved on the part of the Judiciary Committee, the committee so ably served by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, but that, instead, the proposal of the Senator from Rhode Island, that a joint committee be appointed, would mean that in its very deliberations it would, to some degree at least, compose the differences in points of view between the two Houses, and that its report upon any proposal would commend itself immediately to the wisdom of the two Houses and of their standing committees. Certainly such a report would be entitled to great respect.

So, in order to remain consistent, and particularly in view of the present situation, which brings this question to our attention much more forcefully than I think it has ever been brought to our attention before—and we all regret that situation—it seems to me that we should take the same position, and invite the other body to join with us in this effort, which we have tried to initiate two or three times previously by unanimously adopting a measure with that objective in view, in the hope that joint consideration in a committee of high standing, which would not have power to report legislation, other than for consideration by the committees, would result in a higher standing and prestige for such a measure than would be the case if it were merely introduced by a Senator, by a Member of the House, or by a group of Senators.

Therefore I hope that, while giving our approval again to the long and studious effort of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, which is completely nonpartisan, as is shown by the fact that he originated this effort back when the Senate and, in fact, both Houses were under the control of the now minority party, we will support this effort at this time; and I do so without the slightest intention of slowing down in any way or impairing in any way the efficiency or effectiveness or jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I believe this is a good way for us to go into this subject matter, and is one which may quickly bring back to us proposed legislation, either by way of constitutional amendment or statute, or both, which would command great respect of both Houses of Congress.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the observations of my distinguished colleague from Florida. I believe I should point out to him that, in an effort to follow and to implement the provisions of the Constitution which he has read, a number of bills have been introduced in both the House and in the Senate. One such bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Maine

[Mr. PAYNE]. Those bills have been introduced in an effort not only to define disability but to set up some method of deciding when the disability shall have ceased to exist.

The bills have been filed on the theory that this could be done by statutory enactment, rather than by constitutional amendment. Those bills, both in the House and in the Senate, have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and they are among the bills on which, I announced last week, hearings had been set to begin on January 23.

I say to my colleague from Rhode Island and to my colleague from Florida that I have no objection whatever to a joint committee making a study of the subject, but with the understanding that there will not be any request or suggestion or any demand made upon the Committee on the Judiciary or upon the Senate that action on any of these matters now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary be withheld or deferred until the hearings of the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island have been concluded and the report made by that committee.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I believe I can give the Senator from Tennessee that assurance. We have nothing like that in mind. We are in full accord with the Senator's view.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know that no Senator would wish purposely to delay consideration of a bill, but it might conceivably happen that if the Senator from Rhode Island had begun hearings on the matter of disability, and its definition, and our hearings were already completed, and our report filed, a request might be made that the whole matter be deferred until the other committee had completed its lengthy hearings. However, if I might have assurance that that is not going to be the case, I would have no objection.

Mr. GREEN. I have no objection to giving that assurance.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Very well.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am perfectly willing to yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he yields the floor?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator from Florida has pointed out a matter which I hope the Committee on the Judiciary itself will consider in its hearings, and which the proposed joint committee, too, will consider, if in the judgment of the other body a joint committee should be created. That is the language in the Constitution which reads:

> And the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability, both to the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

It is quite conceivable to me that Congress, after proper hearings and following debate and discussion on the floors of both Houses of Congress, might determine that this could be done by legislation, rather than by constitutional amendment.

Congress might determine, out of an abundance of caution and in a desire to provide adequate safeguards, to both pass legislation and adopt a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment. If Congress, in its judgment, determined to act under this constitutional provision, which appears to give Congress the authority to act in the case of the inability of a President to act and to determine when the disability shall be removed, and passed such legislation, and if the President of the United States signed such legislation, it seems to me that the courts would give tremendous weight to such action in passing judgment on that kind of Congressional action, particularly when there appeared to be a constitutional provision permitting Congress to act in that field.

We must all keep in mind that even under the most accelerated conditions the adoption of a constitutional amendment might very well entail several years. We live in an age of jet planes and missiles and atomic power. Therefore I do not believe it is a matter which should be left with any uncertainty. The very safety of our Republic, and perhaps the preservation of human freedoms elsewhere in the world, might very well depend on leaving no hiatus in the matter of the executive power in this country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the observations of the distinguished minority leader. I realize that this is not the time or place to discuss whether the purposes we have in mind, or the purpose of the President in asking Congress to consider the question, can be accomplished by legislation, rather than by constitutional amendment.

I do wish to point out that in the speech I made on this subject last week I went into the subject in some detail. I referred to the question that would arise as to the validity of legislation passed under the section of the Constitution which the Senator has read. It largely revolves around the word "both."

In any event, the former Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, and most constitutional lawyers, I believe, agree that the risk would be too great to attempt to rely solely upon statutory enactment, and that this is particularly true in the matter of trying to set up rules of procedure for the removal of the disability, so that the President could again act after the Vice President had taken over. That is where the great rub comes.

The Attorney General and others have pointed out that unless we were absolutely certain about the legality of what was done, in the event the President resumed the office of the Presidency after having been out of that office, his acts might be questioned, and a great many lawsuits and disturbances, economic and political, of a tremendous magnitude might result.

In any event, these are matters upon which the Committee on the Judiciary will have further hearings. We will endeavor to report either resolutions, constitutional amendments, or bills which we think will properly deal with the problem.

The only assurance I wanted—and I now have it, both from the Senator from Rhode Island and the acting majority leader—was that there would be no holdup or delay as a result of the creation of the joint committee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder if it is possible to have action on the Green resolution at this time, so that the resolution may be agreed to and the Senate may go on to other business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the President's agricultural message to Congress should give both the farm and nonfarm population much food for thought.

Agriculture is the basic industry of the land and without a strong agriculture, the country itself cannot be strong.

With the President's message as a whole, I am in agreement. It includes many admirable recommendations.

For example, shifting the emphasis of the soil bank to the conservation reserve and eliminating the acreage reserve, which pays farmers for not producing and lends itself to great abuses, is a good recommendation which will meet with the general approval of all people.

Our land is our heritage, but much of our heritage has been dissipated.

It will be good for the country to set aside and revitalize over a period of years or put to its proper use land which is tired, worn out, eroded, or misused.

The President's proposal to continue the rural development program and to do all that we can to keep the families on the land, but, at the same time, help them to live decently, is also good.

We must remember, however, that the success of the rural development program will not depend wholly upon the attention of special counselors or county agents or other factors of the direct program.

Whether the million and a half families now living on incomes of $1,000 a year or less will be able to remain on the land and improve their position will depend largely upon the success of other programs, such as the REA, the Agricultural Conservation program, rural highway construction, and the extension of small industries into rural areas.

If we adequately provide for those programs, then the prospects for progress in the rural development program itself will be greatly enhanced.

The President's recommendation that Public Law 480 be extended will meet with the approval of almost everyone.

Public Law 480 has contributed largely to the fact that we have recently been enjoying the largest business in agri-

cultural exports that we have ever had either in peace or war.

The temporary drop in export business below last year's record high is due partly to the fact that the amount authorized under title I of Public Law 480 for this fiscal year is proving to be inadequate and partly because the sale of cotton for export last year was so successful that we no longer have adequate supplies of the proper grade.

The time to sell agricultural surpluses is when someone wants to buy.

Not only should Public Law 480 be extended, but adequate provision should be made for doing the maximum amount of business which can properly and successfully be done under title I.

The President makes recommendations which, if approved by Congress, will enable us to continue our traditional high production of cotton and to retain our foreign and domestic markets.

There may be some difference of opinion concerning details of the cotton program, but the President's recommendations in general are adequate and sound.

The same may be said of the recommendations relating to the corn program.

The wool program should be extended as recommended by the President.

Wool is a deficit commodity and cannot be regarded in the same light as are those commodities which are produced in surplus.

Because of weather conditions, the wool program has not yet been able to operate to its fullest extent.

With the recommendation for continuance of the school-milk program, I am in full accord.

The recommendation of the President that the Secretary of Agriculture be given greater discretion in alloting acreages to basic commodities would probably prove helpful.

This would also be true of the request to give the Secretary discretion in fixing price supports between 60 and 90 percent of parity if there were assurance that such supports would not promptly be placed at the lowest possible level under the law.

The Secretary has this discretion in regard to small grains at the present time and has not fixed supports even as low as 60 percent.

However, apprehension has been growing that supports would be placed at the lowest possible level permitted by law. This apprehension should be allayed.

This fear that the Department intends to lower price supports generally has been stimulated by the recent action of the Secretary in announcing a reduction in price supports for dairy products to the minimum.

I myself will reserve my decision as to whether to support this particular part of the President's program until I am assured that it will be used properly and not misused.

Although, as I have stated, the President's agricultural message on the whole is good and is one to which I can give my approval, there are, however, some recommendations of the President and actions on the part of the Secretary in which I cannot concur.

It would not be fair for me to let the impression prevail that I will support all proposals of the administration whether I believe in them or not.

I disapprove wholeheartedly of the change in the support price for dairy products. The parity formula has never been favorable to dairy products, yet the administration now proposes to lower supports not only 25 cents per 100 pounds, as already announced, but asks for authority to lower them another 50 cents a hundred pounds.

This would bring the support level of milk to the farmer down to about 5 cents a quart. I do not believe any consumer in the United States wants the farmers to produce milk for 5 cents a quart.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield with the understanding that I do not lose the floor, and for a question only.

Mr. JAVITS. I was hoping to agree with the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I would expect the Senator from New York to agree with the Senator from Vermont in this respect.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to ask a question bearing on the dairy problem, which is very serious for New York. I have very great respect for the Senator's knowledge and integrity. I agree that no consumer would want to have the farmer sell his milk for any ridiculous price.

But does the Senator translate a reduction in the support price, such as would be authorized in contemplation of the President's message, into harm to the farmer so as to result in a reduction in the supply of milk, because it was unprofitable to produce it, and thus very seriously harm the city consumer?

Mr. AIKEN. The question as to how the support level affects the supply of milk is one which has been argued over and over again since I have been a Member of the Senate. It has never been answered satisfactorily to me. Sometimes it affects the supply one way, and sometimes another.

New York State can overproduce. New York State farmers, after several years of being in a bad squeeze, have, during the last few months found themselves on a profitable level. I should like to have them stay there.

The dairy program is one part of our agricultural program that is making progress. Dairy farmers generally had a good year in 1957. I see nothing wrong with that and hope they have many more of them.

The dairy producers themselves have done a remarkable job in developing markets, improving the quality of their product and devising more economical methods of production and handling.

The amount of dairy products owned by the Government has decreased in terms of milk equivalent from 10,381,000,000 pounds at the end of calendar year 1954 to only 1,748,000,000 pounds at the end of 1957.

If that is not progress, I do not know progress when I see it.

At the time when the announcement of the reduction of the support price for dairy products was made on December 18, 1957, the Department stated that—

> During the 1956–57 fiscal year which ended last June 30, the cost to the Federal Government of programs primarily for the stabilization of dairy prices and incomes was $379 million.

That release gave the impression that the dairy situation had gone from bad to worse. It put the dairymen of the country in the worst possible light. But that statement was not correct.

In order to arrive at the figure of $379 million, the Department has included not only accumulated losses on products acquired in previous years, but also the cost of dairy products used by the armed services, dairy products used in lieu of dollars for overseas programs, and dairy products used in programs authorized by the Congress, such as the school-milk and school-lunch programs and various other programs, for which dollars would have had to be used if dairy products had not been available.

The total actual loss on the dairy program for that year could not be far from $100 million.

This is a far cry from the $379 million referred to in the release, and also is a far cry from the losses sustained as a result of earlier programs.

Had this support program been left alone, the dairy farmers of America would have had their own problem well in hand, with supply and demand in balance, in another 2 or 3 years.

The second proposal of the President with which I cannot agree is, indeed, an indirect proposal. I think it will be found in the last paragraph of his message. It relates to the financing of REA cooperatives. It speaks of broadening the base for borrowing by these cooperatives.

If I correctly understand the situation, however, in high positions in Government there are those who intend that in the future, REA cooperatives would be required to go to Wall Street for money for financing generating and transmission facilities.

There may be some cooperatives who are strong enough to do this. There are many others, however, to whom this requirement would mean embarrassment and possibly failure to service their areas.

Let us not fool ourselves. The corporate utility interests do not just want to put the REA cooperatives on what they may call a sound financial footing. They want to kill them; and any requirement that the cooperatives go to Wall Street for their money would be an effective step in this direction.

The power companies can spend unlimited amounts for propaganda and advertising purposes, and can charge the cost to their consumers. The REA cooperatives have no such advantage as this.

I wish to serve notice that I will oppose any move which seems likely to lead to the ultimate destruction of the rural-electrification program.

The third matter to which the President refers indirectly, and with which I cannot agree, relates to the agricultural conservation program.

There have been efforts, which began some years before President Eisenhower took office, to rearrange this program in such a manner that a large part of its benefits would be lost to most of the States, and any gains would be acquired by a few.

If the practices of this program are restricted to what some choose to call permanent practices, and if the utilization of any of the funds for lime, phosphorous, and other mineral elements necessary to efficient production is prohibited, then most of the States east of the Missouri River will be definitely penalized.

The benefits to my own State of Vermont would probably be reduced from 75 to 80 percent; and the same would be true in the case of most of the States east of the Missouri River, as I have said.

I cannot support any proposal to increase greatly the benefits from this program to a few States, while decreasing them to most of the States.

I am sorry that I cannot agree with all of the President's agricultural program; but it seems best to make it clear here and now that such is the case, rather than to let the farm people of the country believe that I will support any proposal which I believe will work to their disadvantage.

Nor will I support any effort to place upon the shoulders of our farm people any blame for conditions which properly belongs to other segments of our national economy.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish to commend the Senator from Vermont for his excellent statement. I heartily agree with him on the position he has taken with respect to the decrease in the price supports for farm commodities. Certainly dairy farming is a most important segment of the farming economy.

Let me say that a wheat farmer who has a large farm can produce wheat at a much cheaper price per bushel than can a farmer who has a smaller number of acres. However, that situation does not necessarily apply to the dairy farmers; a dairy farmer who has only a limited number of dairy cows can compete fairly well with the large operator. I was very sorry to see the supports for dairy commodities decreased. I may say that in the apartment in which I was living when Congress adjourned last August, I was paying 25 cents a quart for milk. Upon my return, this month, I find that I have to pay 30 cents a quart for milk.

I heard the Senator from Vermont say that if the program were put into effect in the way the Secretary of Agriculture wants it done, the support on milk would be lowered to a point where the average farmer would only receive about 5 cents a quart for his milk.

Mr. AIKEN. I referred to the support level. This year it amounts to approximately 7 cents a quart. The Secretary announced a reduction, as of April 1 next, of $3 a hundred, which will bring it down to approximately 6 cents a quart. The request in the President's message is for authority to lower that support to approximately $2.50 a hundred, which would be 5 cents a quart. I do not believe any consumer who is paying from 20 to 30 cents a quart for milk wants the farmer to produce milk for 5 cents a quart.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself also with practically all the other things the Senator from Vermont had to say, particularly with respect to the REA.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Vermont for the stand he has taken in regard to dairy products. I think he is entirely correct. I also agree with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], in regard to wheat.

I am one Senator who agrees all along the line. So far as cotton, corn, wheat, dairy products, tobacco, and all the rest are concerned, I believe in the high supports; and I do not favor lowering any of the supports.

I also wish to commend the Senator from Vermont for his remarks regarding rural electrification. I think it has been a Godsend to the farmers of the Nation. I know it has been in South Carolina. In 1934, only approximately 5 percent of the farms of South Carolina were electrified, whereas today approximately 96 percent of the farms of South Carolina are electrified. That is good, not only for the farmers, but also for everyone else, for the South Carolina stores sold a great deal of electrical equipment, most of which was manufactured in other States, States north of the Mason-Dixon line. So all concerned made a great profit out of that operation, and it has been beneficial for the Nation as a whole.

Therefore, I hope nothing will be done in any way to wreck or stop the cooperatives throughout the Nation. Instead, I hope they will be allowed to proceed in the way they have proceeded in past years.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. Of course, the REA cooperatives originally went into what was called the "skim-milk territory," which the utility companies either could not or would not serve. After the REA's went into those areas, things began to change. The farms began to show improvement. People painted their buildings. The Senator has seen all of that occur.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Absolutely.

Mr. AIKEN. After a while, people built new homes along the lines; they did so because they could obtain electricity. Finally, small industries moved there. That area was converted from "skim-milk territory" to—in some instances—a lucrative service area.

Now those who refused to serve it in the first place want to "muscle" in and take it away from those who had the courage and foresight to go ahead and do the job. I believe we should stand by those people who built the progressive rural areas. They took chances. They had to fight everything to get in there at all. They had Government help. The job is not done yet. There might be some cooperatives that could go to Wall Street and borrow ten, fifteen, or twenty million dollars for generating plants; but there are hundreds of others that are still on the borderline. Perhaps they need a $200,000 plant with which to produce power and keep them going and serve their people. The difference in the interest rate alone could mean the difference between their continuing to be successful and their failure and having to give up the ghost.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). 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, without amendment, 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.

PROCEDURES FOR REPORTS BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES RELATIVE TO DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Order No. 1188, Senate Resolution 148. I wish to announce at this time that it is not intended that any action be taken on the resolution until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A 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.

The resolution was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the message which has just been delivered to the Congress from the President of the United States

relating to the so-called food and fiber or agricultural policies. I want the record clear. Today my comments will be general in nature. Later it will be my intention to analyze this message and the administration farm bill paragraph by paragraph, section by section, and to attempt, at least to the best of my ability, to set the record straight, because in reading the message in the time that has been permitted me, I find not what I would call inaccuracies, but I surely find distortions of what are the facts.

Mr. President, all that President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have outlined in this farm message is another program that will result in weakening American agriculture and perpetuating low-income hardships for a neglected and, I say, mistreated segment of American citizens. It exposes what this administration has been seeking all along, despite all its denials; namely, cheap agriculture. I say this is an insult to the American farm families who have every right to share equally in the American standard of living.

Nothing in this message offers any hope to alleviate the distressed and depressed conditions in American agriculture, but, much to the contrary, the message would indicate that things are improving, when the facts are to the contrary.

The national averages alluded to in the message are averages which do not take into consideration great areas of American agriculture. The way one judges what is happening in the American farm economy is by what is happening to the American farm family. One does not judge the price of agricultural land by the price of suburbia real estate, real estate taken out of agriculture that will be used for developing shopping centers. That is not a fair standard.

Fortunately, as a program, it will never see the light of day, because this Congress is too patriotic to enact it. Congress just will not become a party to such blatant liquidation of agriculture.

I submit the message is misleading and is based on false assumptions disguised as facts. It attempts to hide the failure of this administration's farm recommendations to date by asking Congress to again follow it down the same misguided path of further depressing farm income.

The same arguments voiced by the President for lowering supports still further were voiced on the floor of Congress and elsewhere when this administration won approval for the program now in effect. The same promises of what would result were made then. Yet the administration now complains about the results that really happened. This is not a frank or honest approach supported by facts and experience available to the Department of Agriculture.

I cannot help but note that at the time we discussed the so-called flexible price formula we were told that when supplies were in abundance price supports would be lowered, that when supplies were more in line with demand, price supports would be raised. In the instance of a certain quality of cotton, for example, where the surpluses have been liquidated, the administration now finds, under the formula which it itself recommended, price supports would be raised. And it is at this point that the truth comes out, because it is at this point that the administration says it does not want to have the formula, the escalator clause, which would provide a more equitable price for the cotton, to come into effect.

I say to my friends in every part of agriculture that every agricultural commodity and every agricultural producer is in this together. If we permit the Secretary and his agents to divide agriculture, if we permit the Department to "work over" and finally depress the dairy industry, it will soon come to cotton. If we permit it as to cotton, it will soon come to soybeans and vegetable oils.

I sound a word of warning that every commodity group had better stand together. As Benjamin Franklin said so aptly, "We either hang together or we will hang separately."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that has been his view all along. I serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with him. We see eye to eye on this matter. Producers of all commodities, whether of cotton, tobacco, wheat, or other commodities, must get together and do something for agriculture in the United States. If we do not, we shall all suffer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina, who is a dedicated, trustworthy, and experienced friend of the American farm family and the American agricultural community.

Mr. President, it is certainly intellectually dishonest to call the flexible price-support program of 75 to 90 percent of parity rigid. It is called rigid now, although the administration fought for this program 3 or 4 years ago as the answer to what it claimed was rigid in the past. I know that in 1954 the administration said that the 90 percent of parity program was rigid. They said, "What we need is flexibility. We need 75 to 90 percent of parity." They won their argument, because of a Presidential veto of a good farm bill. Now they have the 75 to 90 percent of parity.

Now the same Secretary who called that formula flexible 3 years ago calls it rigid today. The only thing that is rigid is the thinking of the Secretary—intellectual calcification.

Mr. President, the truth is there is nothing more rigid about 75 to 90 percent than 60 to 90 percent of parity. All it means is that one formula permits the Secretary to drop prices still lower.

In this farm bill or this farm proposal the formula is to be 60 to 90 percent. This is what one can call recession for agriculture in easy but determined stages.

A flagrant example of what I am talking about has already been discussed very ably by the Senator from Vermont, in the instance of dairying. Secretary Benson has already announced his determination to cut dairy price supports to the very minimum the present law allows, but now he wants authority to cut them still further, and still further in the future, so he asks that the law permit lower minimums of 60 percent of parity.

Instead of cutting production, the previous lowering of supports has resulted in the farmers having to increase their output in order to meet minimum living costs.

Mr. President, it is my intention—not today, but when I have the opportunity to evaluate all the statistical evidence which is available to us—to point out that these programs which the Secretary says are reducing production are not doing so. I shall be able to present evidence to my colleagues—incontrovertible evidence—that the very program which this administration told the American people would lead to the solution of farm problems has instead aggravated those problems, intensified those problems, and cost the American people millions and millions of dollars.

Senators will remember that the present Department of Agriculture is spending more money in 1 year than previous administrations spent for agriculture in 4 years. The present Department of Agriculture, under this administration, Mr. President, has its own program under its own management, and despite having its own program under its own management, agricultural conditions continue to be worsened.

Mr. President, one of the answers given now by the Secretary is that we must simply move farmers off the land. That is the Secretary's way to solve the problem—apparently by liquidating the people.

Mr. President, instead of cutting production, as I said, the program has resulted in production levels being increased. It is ridiculous, therefore, for the President to still be talking about higher supports as incentives for higher production, when slashed income has resulted in just such incentives under the present program.

It is equally ridiculous for our President to be talking from one corner of his mouth about the lowering of prices to cut production, and then out of the other corner about giving the farmer more freedom to produce more, and that is what the message says. There are two kinds of bait. There is one kind of bait which says to the farmer, "We want you to cut production and in order to do it we are going to have to lower supports." Then a paragraph later the message says, "If you want to produce more you have to have more freedom, and that means having lower and fewer price supports."

Mr. President, one cannot have it both ways, not even in the White House. Obviously this message from the President indicates that he is simply putting his signature to Secretary Benson's stubborn determination to permanently relegate agriculture to a second-rate position in the American economy.

I was asked the other day about the President's budget for agriculture. I did

say then, and I shall repeat now, that while I thought the budget was not what it should be—I do not mean to make generalized accusations, and I shall later in an agricultural speech to the Senate comment upon it—I thought there was one item in the budget which should have been included. I did not feel the travel money for the Department was adequate. I thought they ought to provide in the budget a number of one-way plane, train, and bus tickets, starting with the Secretary of Agriculture and some of his associates. I think that would be a very good expenditure. That would be a trip which is really necessary.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator ever pick up a hitchhiker?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should be happy to do that, may I say to my genial friend, who is always so hospitable. I should be happy to do so, and I know the Senator from Oregon, on his treks back across the country, would not mind stopping off at Salt Lake City, if need be, to let out at least one passenger.

Mr. President, in conclusion, at a time when our food and fiber may well be one of the most valuable forces we have for freedom in this world, it is tragic to see such treatment of our food and fiber producers.

I rise to say, Mr. President, at a time when Congress is concerned about a shortage of rockets, missiles, space satellites, at a time of concern about our national security, there is only one segment of our economy which is fully prepared for any eventuality. They are the greatest patriots in the world—the American farmers, the American farm families, and the American agricultural economy. Rather than be condemned, I suggest they should be praised. In fact, American agriculture should get an E-award for efficiency. American agriculture should get a citation for service beyond the call of duty. Instead of that, farmers are given abuse. Instead of that, farmers are told they ought to work for less. Instead of that, farmers are told production is unwanted, at the very time food and fiber may be the instrumentality we need for peace.

When I think of the President's state of the Union message, I remember he called for works for peace. I suggest, Mr. President, that one of the works for peace is the compassionate, humanitarian, and generous use of lifegiving food. When I think of the dairy farmers and think how important powdered milk is for the hungry people overseas, I say to the President of the United States that he should call upon our dairy economy to increase its production rather than reduce it. He should call upon our dairy farmers to step up their output, so that we can meet some of the great crying needs of humanity. This is one thing the Soviet Union does not have. We have agriculture, Mr. President, that does not require the critical examination of an investigating committee to see why it cannot produce. Our agriculture is able to produce. But we have an administration which I say has never appreciated the potentialities of this great force.

Mr. President, so long as we have such bungling administration of our farm programs by people unwilling to see agriculture share fairly in our economy, no laws we enact can do much good. The truth is that neither Mr. Benson nor this administration has a workable farm policy, other than the simple advocacy of removing or making ineffective any Federal program designed to equalize agricultural income.

I invite to your attention, Mr. President, the fact that in point eight of the President's message he fortunately—and I wish to commend him—recommended the extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. He recommends the extension for 1 year. I have conducted hearings with regard to that act, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, at the request of the chairman. I have been interested in the proposal ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. I say to Senators that an extension of 1 year is uneconomic. I say to Senators that an extension of 1 year does not provide for adequate programing. I say to Senators that an extension of 1 year will cost money which will not yield results, and we ought to have an extension for a minimum of 2 years, so that we can program our agricultural resources so that they will do the good around the world that can be accomplished by their judicious and wise use.

So, Mr. President, I call upon my colleagues not to be stampeded by this latest barrage of mimeograph paper. I call upon them to examine most carefully the food and fiber policy of the Nation. I suggest that time after time we have been misguided down a path of so-called agricultural solutions which have ended in agricultural catastrophes.

I remember that at one time it was said that the acreage reserve would do the trick. I remember a letter which I received from the Department of Agriculture dated September 30, 1954. That letter said to me, when I proposed a conservation reserve, that the conservation reserve was too costly; the conservation reserve was subject to maladministration; the conservation reserve was not a sound agricultural policy.

Today, at long last, the administration admits that its acreage reserve, which was subject to abuse, which was very effective in 1956 in the agricultural belt as a political instrumentality; the acreage reserve, into which we poured almost $1½ billion, has done little or nothing except to bring shame upon agriculture. But the conservation reserve is the long-term, long-range, sensible, well-designed program of conserving the fertility of our soil, rather than paying people to do nothing. I am delighted that at long last the administration has indicated, at least, that the conservation reserve makes sense. It made sense 3 years ago, but then it was ridiculed. Now it makes sense because the proposals of the administration have been found to be indefensible, in terms of their adequacy, because of the failure of this administration to apply them justly and equitably.

This will not be the last of the argument on agricultural policies. I know that the farmers are a diminishing number in our economy. I suppose that is why some people think they can be treated with such disdain. So long as there is one farmer left in America, I will raise my voice for at least equality of treatment for him. I submit that the arithmetic of politics is no way to judge what is fair, decent, and just. The American farm economy has taken it in the neck too long. It seems to me that it is time for certain changes in those who administer our agricultural policies.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield. In fact, I would prefer to yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In the latter portion of the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota he almost answered the question which I intended to ask him.

I noticed, when the Senator was talking about picking up a hitchhiker, that he did not pick up the Secretary of Agriculture in Salt Lake City and bring him here. He let him out at Salt Lake City.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator meant to take him home to stay.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

I must confess, however, that apparently the Secretary's policies are those of the President. I have said, so many times that it is almost redundant, that until there is a change in the White House there will be no basic change in agricultural policies. However, I must say in all candor that there are a number of people whom I know, who are good, solid Republicans, who could do a much better job as Secretary of Agriculture. At least, they would try to believe in some of the programs. I feel that the Secretary does not even believe in his own programs.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was interested in one particular comment which the Senator made. In fact, I was interested in all his comments, but there is one about which I wish to ask him particularly. It relates to the movement which characterizes almost every action that is taken to try to force people off the farms. As I understand, the Senator feels that the message is a continuation of that philosophy. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do; and I think the seventh or eighth paragraph of the message so indicates.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was about to ask the Senator if that were not the case. The President states that there are 2,700,000 other farms which produce relatively little for sale. He tells a few other things affecting, positively or negatively, those farms, and then he dis-

misses them. Does not the Senator think it is quite significant that those people at least make a living on those farms for themselves and their families?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Even if they produce very little for sale, if they are able to make a living for themselves and their families they are doing something, are they not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. They certainly are, and that is very important in a period of rising unemployment, which we are now facing.

The present Presiding Officer [Mr. MORSE] spoke 2 days ago about the unemployment problem in his State. I suggest that to have a farm program which has as one of its purposes the process of human attrition, driving people away from their land, is only to aggravate unemployment, and, furthermore, not to take into consideration human values.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator believe that we shall never solve the farm problem or establish a good farm policy until we make an attack on a broad front, with a program that is bold and venturesome?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is any of that philosophy reflected in the message?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The message is "old biscuits, hardly warmed up." The biscuits are becoming older.

However, even with the present farm program, with many aspects of which I disagree, if there were a careful, methodical, spirited administration, we would have much better results.

Finally, I have disagreed with some of the policies which we have enacted, but I feel that the administration of the Department of Agriculture has not been up to standard. I feel that it has been weak. I feel that it has been indecisive. I say that the administration of the Commodity Credit Corporation has depressed market prices and has tended to accumulate inventory. Today the very existence of the private grain trade is threatened because of the Commodity Credit Corporation stepping in and taking over the field of business.

This Senator has said many times that the purpose of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to supplement private activities, and not to supplant them. I do not wish to see our agriculture Government-owned and socialized. However, I submit that there is not a sensible merchant in the country who any longer holds much inventory. The reason he does not hold much inventory is that he is never sure where the Department of Agriculture policies are going to lead. Therefore he dumps the inventory on the Government. That is why today the Government has huge stocks in inventory.

I do not mean to be personal in my references, but I see before me a former Secretary of Agriculture, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. At times we have disagreed with respect to price support levels. I have not tried to pretend that price support levels represented the last word. I think they are but a part of the total agricultural picture. However, I will say that the Senator from New Mexico was able to dispose of tremendous quantities of goods in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation while he was Secretary, without depressing normal market prices. He watched every single aspect of the transaction, and did not permit the Government to destroy both the farmer and the private trade in farm commodities. He watched the program. He administered it. I call for sound administration now, along the same principles.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When he was Secretary of Agriculture, the Senator from New Mexico administered the program in such a way that it did not cost the taxpayers billions of dollars. Is not that true?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I do not recall the facts, but I remember that some years ago during the debates I heard the report made that on certain transactions the Government actually made money.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But that is not true today, is it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Government did make money. I remind the Senator from Minnesota that it was a little easier to do so then than it would normally be. One cotton transaction involved $225 million, and a copra transaction involved several million dollars. I fully agree with the Senator that the aim of the Department of Agriculture should be to clear the shelves.

Regardless of how I feel—and I have differed with the Senator from Minnesota many times on what the level of the price supports should be, and how the program might be administered—no price-support program will do any good if we continue to load the shelves with billions of dollars worth of commodities, only to have them dumped into the markets.

Not long ago I talked with one of the largest purchasers of cotton in the United States. I do not want to embarrass him or the mills he operates by mentioning his name. However, he is a substantial buyer of cotton. I said to him, "Are you still holding to your old policy of not buying any cotton?"

He said, "Why should I gamble? I just go out and take my cotton out from under the loans. I have so much of it, I do not have to gamble."

This has the effect of depressing farm prices. That is one point with respect to which I believe the present program has been extremely deficient, because it is necessary to clean out the shelves of these tremendous overhanging surpluses as we go along.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly agree with that particular objective in our farm policy, if it is done wisely and not blindly. There are ways of using our abundance constructively instead of just competing for the farmer's normal market.

THE THREAT TO AMERICAN PRIVATE FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the greatest threat to American private foreign investments today is the confiscation and nationalization programs sponsored by several foreign governments which are under the Communist influence. As the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has said so often, "Confiscation is the attribute of communism. Private ownership, the integrity of property rights, and contractual obligations, on the other hand, are the distinguishing characteristics and handmaidens of the free world." I join the Senator in that feeling and apprehension.

The troubles in the Middle East resulting from the nationalization of the Suez Canal Co. by Egypt, the current confiscations and nationalizations in Indonesia and other parts of the world under Communist domination, threaten the peace and security of the free world. Such actions threaten all private and governmental investments abroad.

Most of the difficulties our own country has experienced with our neighbors south of the border have arisen over the confiscation or nationalization of private American properties—in Guatemala, Venezuela, and particularly in Mexico. Secretary Hull was harassed for several years due to the nationalization of our oil properties in Mexico. Many private investors are concerned with world conditions where the climate for trade and investment is overshadowed by the constant threat of confiscation.

At the recent convention of our National Foreign Trade Council in New York—and incidentally this Council is composed of members owning over 90 percent of our private foreign investments—this organization again passed resolutions on this vital subject matter. Among other things the council resolved:

> The convention places particular emphasis on good faith and integrity as basic requirements in the creation of climates favorable to the international flow of private investment capital. This means, specifically, recognition of the sanctity of contract and respect for private property rights on the part of governments of nations seeking such capital. A further essential is the provision of safeguards against expropriation, nationalization, or other taking of private property owned by nationals of other countries.
>
> Private enterprise has been and continues to be largely responsible for research and development in advanced industrial techniques and in their productive application. In the more highly developed economies, recognition and respect for the private property rights so created has a solid legal foundation.
>
> To encourage and accelerate the dissemination of these valuable techniques in other areas, recognition should be accorded to privately owned technical industrial information, and protection as positive and effective as that afforded to other property rights should be provided by the governments concerned. Economic development will move

forward at a faster rate in those countries which provide the necessary protection.

To this end, it is important that procedures for the recognition of industrial property rights be standardized throughout the world by domestic law and by adherence to the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.

The free world has a right to be disturbed at the action taken by the delegates to the recent Asian-African Conference at Cairo. The delegates there—dominated by Russian influence—freely discussed confiscation. Russia, it seems, promised to supply those countries with any losses they might sustain by seizing and confiscating foreign investments, particularly our own.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] discussed the evil effects of our continued seizures and vesting of the assets of our former enemies, the Germans and Japanese, on Monday of this week.

I endorse and subscribe to his views. The Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act, of which I am chairman, will make a determined effort during the present session of the Congress to resolve our differences with respect to the vested assets problems.

Mr. Harry Schwartz of the New York Times has written a very illuminating article on the subject matter. It appeared in the Times on January 7, 1958. I send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks.

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

MOSCOW STEPS UP ECONOMIC WAR ON PRIVATE INVESTMENTS ABROAD—BACKS CONFISCATION OF ASSETS OF THE WEST IN UNDERDEVELOPED LANDS—CHAOS IS DECLARED TO BE SOVIET AIM

(By Harry Schwartz)

The Soviet Union's economic war against the West reached a new high in the closing days of 1957 after having gained major successes earlier in the year.

At the Asian-African meeting in Cairo late last month the Soviet Union issued an open declaration of war against all western private investment in the underdeveloped countries. By backing confiscation of such existing investment, Moscow obviously hopes to block any substantial future private investment in these countries.

As the Soviet spokesman indicated clearly in Cairo, Moscow's picture of the future is one based upon the pattern set by Egyptian nationalization of operation of the Suez Canal and Indonesian seizure of Dutch assets. A major spread of this pattern would torpedo economic cooperation between the major western nations and the non-Communist underdeveloped countries. In resultant chaos and economic hardship, the Soviet Union is apparently confident it can make great gains and bring more countries under Communist rule.

SOVIET CONFIDENT

Long ago Soviet spokesmen made plain they believed the key economic weakness of the West was its dependence upon oil, copper, and other raw materials from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. If Moscow can deprive the West of many of these sources of raw materials it feels confident its victory in the competitive coexistence struggle will be assured.

At the Cairo meeting the Soviet Union sought to convince the Asians and Africans that they did not have to fear any economic consequences of widespread nationalization of foreign private investment. It sought to convince them that Moscow was ready and eager to give them all the capital resources they needed for economic development.

While the Soviet propagandists held out glittering promises of aid in Cairo, they kept silent about the key fact of the Soviet economy at present; the Soviet Union itself is suffering from a severe capital shortage and has had to cut back its own economic development plans because of that shortage. Barring some major change in the world situation, the Soviet Union can give only marginal additional help to the underdeveloped countries whose needs for foreign capital total many billions of dollars. These totals are beyond anything Moscow could or intends to give these countries in the foreseeable future.

Moscow's line was received credulously and hopefully in Cairo. The Soviet promises of aid to Syria and Egypt appear to have made a great impression throughout Asia and Africa because of the amounts directly involved in these deals, which follow earlier Soviet promises to and partial deliveries of aid to India, Afghanistan, Indonesia, Burma, and Turkey.

In its economic aid propaganda offensive, Moscow has several advantages over the West that it uses skillfully: Soviet aid is offered in the form of long-term loans carrying very low interest, usually about 2 percent, and lacking much of the redtape that usually surrounds similar Western offers. Moreover, the Soviet Union offers to assist underdeveloped countries with technicians, including the training of large numbers of young people from these countries in Soviet universities and other technical institutions.

The West is handicapped in this field by many factors. Western private investors expect dividends from their investment and naturally ask for safeguards for their initial investment. The West suffers from a shortage of technicians. Also, Western institutions for technical training are not equipped to handle large numbers of students from Asia and Africa.

Moreover, Soviet aid is not subject to scrutiny by the Soviet Legislature. United States economic aid, on the contrary, must face the Congressional gauntlet each year.

UNITED STATES AID IS LARGER

The Soviet Union has probably given or promised less than $2 billion worth of economic aid in all to non-Communist countries in the last 3 years, far less than the total of United States economic aid and private investment in those countries. Yet the political gains of the Soviet Union have been immense and the influence of Moscow has grown enormously in these countries, while that of the West has declined.

In much of Asia and Africa, Soviet aid is often considered to be philanthropy, while United States private investment is often considered to be a species of robbery and Government aid a means of political pressure.

However, an aspect of Soviet aid was revealed early in the year. Yugoslavia, which had been scheduled to receive Soviet aid, was punished when Moscow postponed the aid because of political disagreements with Belgrade.

ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING KLAMATH INDIAN RESERVATION AT KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am introducing in the Senate today the bill which the administration has sent to Congress for grappling with the grave problems confronting the Klamath Indian Reservation.

I am introducing the bill "by request" because I, myself, entertain serious doubts concerning certain of its basic features. I believe a far preferable solution would be my own bill, S. 2047, providing for Federal purchase of the Klamath timber and marshlands. I offered this bill for myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on May 9, 1957.

However, Mr. President, the sands of time are running through the hourglass on our opportunity to act. If we do not work out a reasonable solution before the end of this session of the 85th Congress, the valuable resources of the Klamath Reservation must go under the auctioneer's gavel, according to the terms of Public Law 587, passed by the 83d Congress in 1954. This could produce a chaotic situation.

Therefore, I believe the administration's proposal should be before the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. As chairman of this subcommittee, I think in all fairness it merits consideration and full hearings, despite the serious misgivings which I have regarding the bill. That is why I am introducing it "by request" today. This introduction on my part follows a very thorough explanation of the bill which was made to me personally on January 13 by the Under Secretary of the Interior, Hatfield Chilson. I appreciate his courtesy.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE TO REVIEW BOTH PROPOSALS

I am calling a meeting of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee for February 3, 4, and 5 so that hearings may take place on the administration bill, as well as on S. 2047, which already has been the subject of extensive hearings in the field at Klamath Falls, Oreg., and at Portland, Oreg., on October 2 and 4, 1957.

I fear the administration has made a mistake of serious consequences in not endorsing our Federal purchase bill, S. 2047. I think this because S. 2047 has received the united support of the Klamath Tribal Council, of the management specialists appointed by the Interior Department to supervise termination over the Klamath Tribe, of labor, and education and civic groups in the State of Oregon, of the Governor of the State of Oregon, of the special Oregon State legislative interim committee on Indian affairs, of conservation and outdoor groups, of most of the daily and weekly press—indeed, of virtually all segments of Oregon life. I doubt if any piece of legislation to solve a controversial problem in modern times has been so universally and unanimously supported by every major economic, social, and political group in Oregon. I have been proud that such a bill carries my name and sponsorship.

However, the administration has chosen not to back this bill as its answer to the grave riddle of the future of the Klamath Tribe and resources. It has presented an alternative proposal—a proposal which first offers the reservation for sale to private interests. This is the bill I am introducing by request in the Senate today.

Let me emphasize that the Eisenhower administration has thus assumed, once more, full and complete responsibility for what happens in the Klamath Basin. Because I am not at all convinced that the solution which they propose can satisfactorily undo the difficult problems created by the Klamath Termination Act, I am concerned to keep the record straight that this is a dilemma which I, both as a Senator from Oregon and as chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, have inherited from former Oregonians in public office before my own election to the Senate. Public Law 587, terminating Federal custodianship over the Klamath Tribe, was passed during the 83d Congress under the auspices of my predecessor in the Senate, Hon. Guy Cordon, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and in the House under the auspices of another Oregon Republican, Hon. Sam Coon, then Representative of the Second District, in which the Klamath Reservation is located. This legislation was backed by Ex-Gov. Douglas McKay, of Oregon, then serving as Secretary of the Interior in President Eisenhower's Cabinet, and it was, of course, accepted and signed by the President, himself.

ORIGINAL TERMINATION BILL CONTAINED UNWISE ASPECTS

The termination bill was put on the statute books despite the last-minute inclusion of the highly debatable withdrawal provisions, and thus created the present danger of hasty and ill-conceived liquidation of the reservation—unless we can effect some rescue operation by midsummer of this year. The Klamath muddle has now been compounded, in my opinion, by the unwillingness of the administration to accept the reasonable answer of Federal purchase, which we offered in S. 2047. The administration rejected our bill. Instead, it has sent to us its own proposal as an alternative. In so doing, the administration has asserted with vigor and emphasis its willingness to accept full responsibility for the Klamath situation. I question the wisdom of the administration's substantive decision, although I welcome this clarification of the issues at stake.

As I say, in view of the present dilemma faced by the subcommittee of which I am the chairman, I feel I must always keep those facts squarely on the record—but let me emphasize that I have made, and I fully intend to continue to make, every effort to keep partisanship out of our continuing search for a nonpolitical and workable solution to this perplexing problem, which will be in the public interest and that of the Indians. The press and the public have recognized that fact, and I want to assure my colleagues on the committee and all interested parties that we shall continue to proceed in this spirit.

In doing so, we shall also be acting in the spirit of the interim committee of the Oregon State Legislature which has subordinated differences of political allegiance in reaching a unanimous conclusion to endorse Federal purchase of the Klamath Reservation. This committee of the Oregon Legislature is headed by a Republican, State Senator Leander Quiring, of Umatilla County. It includes as a member Mr. David C. Epps, of Linn County, the State Democratic chairman. In disregard of such divisions, this Oregon legislative committee has endorsed without dissent the Federal purchase plan proposed in S. 2047. Our Senate Indian Subcommittee will give equal nonpartisan consideration to this bill and to the bill I am offering today at the request of the administration.

I believe the plan of the administration must be considered. Time is of the essence. As chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, I have an obligation to hear the administration and its spokesmen and adherents. That is why I have presented their bill "by request." It is only fair to do so.

Let me explain a few of the doubts which I harbor concerning the measure.

WHAT WILL BE ATTITUDE OF THE LUMBER INDUSTRY?

For the first time in history, a sustained-yield covenant is proposed to be written into legislation dealing with Indian trust land which may pass into private timber company ownership. This is a policy that the private lumber industry long has challenged, dating from the industry's bitter opposition to the pioneer bills of the late 1930's in this field sponsored by the late Representative Walter M. Pierce, of the Second Oregon District, even though the Pierce bill did not require sustained-yield management on private land, but only required minimum cutting practice. As I recall, the industry predicted this legislation could result in ultimate real control of cutting on private land so as to force sustained-yield management. I, myself, am not totally out of sympathy with the administration's long-range efforts in this respect, but I shall await with interest the reaction of such organizations as the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association to have this principle established in a bill to solve an Indian problem.

I want it to be well known that the subcommittee has still not been furnished with any information by the Department of the Interior on the overall value which is proposed for use in the planned sales. It is of vital importance to the Indians and prospective buyers that this information be made available.

Until we of the subcommittee and all the Members of the Senate learn the overall total value which should be placed on the ponderosa pine timber presently growing on the Klamath Reservation, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to pass finally upon the administration's proposed substitute for S. 2047.

The Department's recommendation does not set forth any data on the size of proposed sale units, the extent to which all prospective purchasers will be able to acquire units of sufficient size to meet their ability to finance a purchase.

The Department has included language which would limit the sustained-yield covenant to 75 years, which I believe is a lesser period than is required to grow a crop of ponderosa pine timber in the Klamath area and weather zone. We do not know at this time whether the proposed sustained-yield covenant will affect the price to be actually paid the Indians and the results of such a consequence.

I set forth these few points here in order to make the record clear that a sound private purchase proposal which adequately protects the Indians' rights may not be without major problems. It will be the purpose of our subcommittee to investigate thoroughly every facet of the administration's bill, and of S. 2047, before proposed legislation is reported to the full committee and to the Senate for action.

In conclusion, as one of the Senators from Oregon, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—and I am certain my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon, WAYNE MORSE, shares my views in this respect—I feel that we have before us at least two major obligations. One of them is to protect the equity and rights of the Indians, whose property this is, in the final analysis.

The other obligation is to safeguard the economy of southeastern Oregon and all the rest of our State, because what happens in southeastern Oregon to this vast stand of timber will have an impact throughout Oregon—indeed, throughout the entire Pacific Northwest.

Furthermore, with respect to the protection of the resources, we have a genuine obligation, as I see it, to continue the vast marsh of the Klamath Reservation as a marsh, where thousands, if not millions, of waterfowl have refuge, and where they nest and breed every year as they travel the great Pacific flyway between the Canadian Arctic and the tropical zones to the south.

If this marsh is put on the auctioneer's block, it very likely will be converted to grazing land or cropland. If that happens, thousands, if not millions, of birds will come and find no nesting ground or sanctuary. They will necessarily be driven from there to feed on the croplands of farmers near by. There then will ensue a fierce and bloody slaughter, without any regard to conservation practices; and the people who participate in the slaughter will have justification for so doing, because their crops are being destroyed.

It seems to me that this could do major damage, for generations to come, to one of the great natural assets of the North American Continent, namely, the vast flocks of waterfowl which still survive there and each year mysteriously travel between the Arctic and the Tropics.

I could speak in greater detail about the responsibility we face; but I wish to make one further fact clear. This is a problem which is not of my creation. It is a problem which has been brought about by the unwise, hasty, and ill-conceived termination of the Federal Government's custodianship over the Klamath Indian Tribe. At the 11th hour there was included in the legislation before the 83d Congress the withdrawal

provision which now confronts us with an emergency as to time.

If this session of the 85th Congress does not pass a bill which will solve the dilemma, the resources I have described will be sold at a bargain-basement sale commencing in August of this year. I believe that such a time schedule indicates the extent, the size and the urgency of the problem which confronts us.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the junior Senator from Oregon for defending, once again, the interests of the Indians. I should like to ask, if I may, 1 or 2 questions, to see if I am clear in my own mind.

I have inspected a number of Indian reservations, particularly in the Southwest. I have always been struck by the fact that the reservations which were set aside for the Indians were located on land which at that time had very little value, and which, unless there are subsurface deposits which will be discovered, has very little value now, and on which it is extremely difficult for the Indians to make a living.

In other words, if the white men did not want the land, the Indians were allowed to take it.

Do I correctly understand, in the case of the Klamath Reservation, that that reservation has extremely valuable timber?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The stand of ponderosa pine timber growing on the Klamath Reservation is one of the most valuable stands of such timber growing in the New World.

Ponderosa pine, as distinguished from Douglas-fir, is a very slow-growing tree. A Douglas-fir tree may grow to commercial stature in 80 or 90 years. A ponderosa pine tree, such as the type growing on the Klamath Reservation, may take almost two centuries to develop commercial volume. Thus the timber is of enormous value.

In further answer to the question of the Senator from Illinois, the value of the timber has been variously estimated as from $80 million to around $130 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not have been possible to develop the principle of sustained yield, and to cut a certain proportion of those trees each year, or to cut certain sections each year, and then to use the royalties for the benefit of the Indians?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me explain to the Senator the present situation on the reservation—but a situation which will end in August of this year unless Congress acts.

At present, and for many years past, the timber growing on the Klamath Reservation has been managed by trained and capable foresters of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. These men and their associates have sold this timber at competitive bids, under sustained-yield cutting practices. The Indians then have shared in per capita payments based on the stumpage fees which were received for the sale of that timber. This seemed to me to be a reasonable situation, one which certainly was in the interest of conservation of natural resources, which I know to be one of the major goals of the senior Senator from Illinois.

But the 83d Congress, under the urging of the Eisenhower administration, and particularly of Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, passed the unwise legislation to which I have referred. That was a law to terminate Federal custodianship over the Klamath Indian Tribe. Under the terms of that law, any member of the tribe can elect to withdraw and ask for his per capita share of the assets. The only way in which he could secure his per capita share of the assets would be to have a portion of the timber or the marshland sold, so that it could be converted into cash.

Thus, if Congress does not intervene, the Federal custodianship will cease this summer, and this vast block of timber, plus the marshland where waterfowl now nest, will be sold at public auction to the highest bidder.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand the Senator to say that, in practice, all the Indians will elect to have their shares withdrawn?

Mr. NEUBERGER. As I understand, a survey has been made by the Stanford Research Institute among the members of the Klamath Tribe. The survey was sponsored by management specialists appointed by former Secretary McKay to supervise the liquidation of the tribal assets.

If I am not mistaken, the survey showed that approximately 70 or 75 percent of the members of the tribe would elect to withdraw and receive their per capita share of the tribal assets.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was because some of them had already gone to the cities, and therefore they did not feel any continuing need for a home to which to return; and also because others were poor, and wanted to get a cash, lump-sum settlement. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes; the Senator from Illinois—as he generally is—is absolutely correct in his analysis.

Let me explain further that according to the appraisals of the timber which have been made, it is possible that each tribal member's share will vary in value somewhere from $35,000 per tribal member to approximately $55,000. The amount has not yet been finally determined, but it will be somewhere in the realm of that financial value. The Senator from Illinois can see that, therefore, a family of 4 on the Klamath Reservation or, although having left the reservation, or formerly on the reservation, can qualify for approximately $120,000 to $200,000 per family, a very substantial sum of money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course it will be argued that this should be left to the free choice of the individual Indian, and that he should have a right to choose whether he will live in a communal community, or whether he will take his share in cash and will go elsewhere.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Our bill, S. 2047, provides essentially that the Federal Government shall purchase the assets of the Klamath Reservation. Under that purchase, the valuable timber I have described will be added to the contiguous Fremont and Deschutes National Forests, and the United States Forest Service will manage the timber and will sell it at competitive bidding, open to all prospective purchasers, large and small. Of course the management will be under the traditional sustained-yield practices of the United States Forest Service. Under the provisions of the bill, the marsh area will be made a national waterfowl refuge, under the able management of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

It is true that our bill will require the appropriation by the Federal Government of a substantial sum of money. But if anyone has faith in the value of the natural resources of the United States, it seems to me that this marvelous stand of ponderosa pine timber—a stand which, if cut, will not be duplicated for perhaps centuries to come—eventually will return to the Federal Government not only the amount of money invested in the reservation, but also much more, in addition, as the years and decades go by.

So what the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I hope to do is have the Federal Government purchase the reservation, pay the Indians their fair, prorated share, according to what each tribal member is entitled to, but have the resources there managed by the United States Forest Service and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. That is the purpose of S. 2047, the bill we have introduced.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The group of Indians who wish to remain in the community would do so, would they?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Indians who wish to remain in the community could do so. There are many allotted lands, already belonging to Indians, which they would continue to own.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the plan, the Indians would get the income, would they?

Mr. NEUBERGER. They would get the income. They could live in a tribal status somewhat similar to that which they have today, but without Government supervision or direction.

I want to make this clear, because I have referred to the management specialists who were appointed by former Secretary of the Interior McKay. Those two men, Mr. Thomas B. Watters, of Klamath Falls, and Mr. Eugene G. Favelle, of Lakeview, Oreg., have, in my opinion, attempted to do a very conscientious and painstaking job in protecting the equity of the Indians involved. I think it significant that, although these two men were appointees of the national administration, they have unequivocally endorsed Senate bill 2047 for the safeguarding of the resources of the reservation. They have retained a capable forester in Earle Wilcox, formerly with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a vague memory that when Mr. McKay was Secretary of the Interior, he claimed that the Klamath Indians were supporting his

program. Will the Senator from Oregon discuss that issue?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes; I will. It is a complicated issue.

In fairness to Mr. McKay, let me say I believe it is substantially true that at the time the termination act was unwisely enacted in 1954, it was accurately said that the Klamath Indians were supporting his position, in favor of termination. I think that derives from many origins. In my opinion there was held up to the Indians the future prospect of having a great amount of money paid to them in cash at a relatively early date. In fairness to the Indians, I wish to say that not only people with red skins or people of Indian origin would respond to a lure of that particular type.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If I am not mistaken, white people are even more susceptible to such a lure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In addition—and let me say that I was not then a Member of Congress, so I speak from memory—I believe that the termination bill was sweetened by including in its provisions one for a $250 per capita payment for each Klamath Indian. I may be mistaken about that. But I think that may have been somewhat contributory to the Indians' position at that time. At that particular time the Indians were in favor of the termination act. The promise of the payment of a great deal of additional money had been held out to them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the feeling of the Indians now?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The feeling of the Indians now has remarkably changed. The executives of the tribal council testified before our subcommittee in October 1957, definitely and without equivocation in favor of Federal purchase, under the provisions of our bill. They said they thought this would be the best thing for the Indians; that it would bring the fairest price to the Indians; and that the Indian tribe, speaking through them, was in favor of Federal purchase.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, it gives to the Indians the same choice and the same capital payment as the McKay plan would do, but it conserves for the Government a unique stand of timber which, if it moves into private hands, probably would be quickly cut off. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct. Under the termination act passed in 1954, the management specialists might have to liquidate approximately 4 billion feet of pine timber in approximately 2 years. To dump that vast amount of timber on any market would depress the price, so the Indians would not receive anywhere near its fair value. In addition, all of it would be dumped on the market at this particular time, when new housing starts have been so stifled, due to the tight-money policy which the Members of the Senate have discussed at various times; and therefore the price would be even lower than the price under normal conditions.

Our bill contemplates giving the fair-payment price to the Indians; but the timber would belong to the Government and be sold over a long period of years by the United States Forest Service, on a sustained-yield basis.

The intervening circumstance which now has developed is the fact that the national administration, speaking through the Department of the Interior, has declined to endorse our bill for Federal purchase. Instead, the administration has sent up its own proposal. I am introducing this proposal today, by request, as the Senator from Illinois has heard.

This proposal first offers the timber stand to private enterprise, to private lumber operators. But if they reject it, the Federal Government will acquire the resources of the reservation. But many questions arise in connection with this alternative plan. One of them arises because of the fact that the timber would be sold in such large blocks that virtually all small timber operators might be excluded from bidding on it, because I understand that the cost of even relatively small blocks would be approximately $5 million, and obviously that amount of capital could not be raised by a small sawmill owner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it fair to say that the general policy of the Eisenhower administration has been to diminish the number and the size of Indian reservations, and that it aims at either their ultimate elimination or their great diminution?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would believe that would be a generally fair statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that the Indians, then, as individuals would be more or less forced to go out into the general population and live there?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe the Senator from Illinois has made a further accurate description of the policy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that the Indians should have freedom of choice. They should not be chained to the reservation, but I also think it is important that they should have a place to go home to if they find life in the cities unsatisfactory, and that if they are in effect squeezed out by the sale or impairment of reservations, perhaps results would be unfortunate. Many thousands of Indians have come to Chicago. I have tried to acquaint myself with the problems involved. While we have tried to be extremely friendly to them, it is a difficult adjustment for many to make. I have come to feel that it is highly important to keep the reservations not only for those who want to stay on the reservations but as places of refuge for those who try out industrial life and, for one reason or another, do not like it and want to go back to the reservations.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I share much of the feeling of the Senator from Illinois.

I realize that he has a much more profound sociological knowledge of this subject than I do. When we held our hearings at the site of the Klamath Reservation, there were elderly Indians who testified virtually with tears in their eyes over what would happen to their ancestral home. I think they should have the freedom to preserve their status.

There is one thing that disturbs me about this situation. The Senator from Illinois mentioned some of the bleak and meager reservations of the Southwest, where there are hardly any resources. I would prefer to have seen those reservations selected as the guinea pig for the termination program of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a good reason why that was not done. Nobody wants those reservations. They have no commercial value.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It seems to me it was an unfortunate choice—for more than one reason—that virtually the first Indian tribe selected for termination was an Indian tribe of one of the most complex sets of resources in its possession of any tribe in the Nation, and one of the most valuable natural resources. I would share with the Senator from Illinois the view that the tribe selected for termination should not have been an Indian tribe that had such a difficult set of resources to administer, and the maladministration of which could have been so ruinous to that particular geographic area, to Indians and white citizens alike.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Oregon.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I appreciate the very helpful information developed by the Senator from Illinois.

I have concluded my presentation. I understand the Senator from Tennessee was waiting to obtain the floor. Before I relinquish the floor, I should like to submit, by request, the administration bill dealing with the Klamath Indian Tribe, ask that it be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3051) to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), is amended by adding a new section 28 as follows:

SEC. 28. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 5 and 6 of this act.

(a) The tribal lands that comprise the Klamath Indian Forest, and the tribal lands that comprise the Klamath marsh, shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, jointly.

(b) The portion of the Klamath Indian Forest that is selected for sale pursuant to subsection 5 (a) (3) of this act to pay members who withdraw from the tribe shall be offered for sale by the Secretary of the Interior in appropriate units, on the basis of competitive bids, to any purchaser or purchasers who agree to manage the forest lands for not less than 75 years according to sustained yield plans to be prepared and submitted by them for approval and inclusion

in the conveyancing instruments in accordance with specifications and requirements referred to in the invitations for bids: *Provided*, That no sale shall be for a price that is less than the realization value of the units involved as shown on the appraisal approved by the Secretary pursuant to subsection 5 (a) (2) of this act, which is hereby determined to be their fair-market value if as much as 75 percent of the forest were offered for sale on a competitive market within the time limit provided in section 6 (b) of this act, as amended, without limitations on use. The terms and conditions of the sales shall be prescribed by the Secretary. The specifications and minimum requirements for sustained yield management to be included in the invitations for bids, and the determination of appropriate units for sale, shall be developed and made jointly by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. Such plans when prepared by the purchaser shall include provisions for the conservation of soil and water resources as well as for the management of the timber resource under principles of sustained yield. Such plans shall be satisfactory to and have the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture as complying with the minimum standards included in said specification and requirements before the prospective purchaser shall be entitled to have his bid considered by the Secretary of the Interior and the failure on the part of the purchaser to prepare and submit a satisfactory plan to the Secretary of Agriculture shall constitute grounds for rejection of such bid. Such plans shall be incorporated as conditions in the conveyancing instruments executed by the Secretary and shall be binding on the grantee and all successors in interest. The conveyancing instrument shall provide for a forfeiture and a reversion of title to the lands to the United States, not in trust for or subject to Indian use, in the event of a branch of such conditions. The purchase price paid by the grantee shall be deemed to represent the full appraised fair-market value of the lands, undiminished by the right of reversion retained by the United States in a nontrust status, and the retention of such right of reversion shall not be the basis for any claim against the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture shall be responsible for enforcing such conditions. Upon such reversion of title the lands shall become National Forest lands subject to the laws that are applicable to lands acquired pursuant to the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended.

(c) If all of the forest units offered for sale in accordance with subsection (b) of this section are not sold before January 1, 1960, the Secretary of Agriculture shall publish in the Federal Register a proclamation taking title in the name of the United States to all or any part of the unsold units that in his judgment are suitable for administration as a part of the national forest system. Compensation for such taking shall be the realization value of the units taken as shown on the appraisal referred to in subsection (b) of this section, and shall be paid out of funds in the Treasury of the United States, which are hereby authorized to be appropriated for that purpose not later than the time limit provided in subsection 6 (b) of this act, as amended. Such lands shall become national forest lands subject to the laws that are applicable to lands acquired pursuant to the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended. Any of the forest units that are offered for sale and that are not sold or taken pursuant to subsections (b) or (c) of this section shall be subject to sale without limitation on use in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this act.

(d) If at any time any of the tribal lands that comprise the Klamath Indian Forest and that are retained by the tribe are offered for sale other than to members of the tribe, such lands shall first be offered for sale to the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be given a period of 12 months after the date of each such offer within which to purchase such lands. No such lands shall be sold at a price below the price at which they have been offered for sale to the Secretary of Agriculture, and if such lands are reoffered for sale, they shall first be reoffered to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to purchase such lands subject to such terms and conditions as to the use thereof as he may deem appropriate, and any lands so acquired shall thereupon become national forest lands subject to the laws that are applicable to lands acquired pursuant to the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended.

(e) The lands that comprise the Klamath Marsh shall be a part of the property selected for sale pursuant to subsection 5 (a) (3) of this act to pay members who withdraw from the tribe. Title to such lands is hereby taken in the name of the United States, effective January 1, 1960. Such lands are designated as the Klamath Forest National Wildlife Refuge, which shall be administered in accordance with the law applicable to areas acquired pursuant to section 4 of the act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451), as amended or supplemented. Compensation for said taking shall be the realization value of the lands shown on the appraisal referred to in subsection (b) of this section, and shall be paid out of funds in the Treasury of the United States, which are hereby authorized to be appropriated for that purpose not later than the time limit provided in subsection 6 (b) of this act, as amended.

(f) Any person whose name appears on the final roll of the tribe, and who has since December 31, 1956, continuously resided on any lands taken by the United States by subsection (c) of this section, shall be entitled to occupy and use as a homesite for his lifetime a reasonable acreage of such lands, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may issue to safeguard the administration of the national forest.

(g) If title to any of the lands comprising the Klamath Indian Forest is taken by the United States, the administration of any outstanding timber sales contracts thereon entered into by the Secretary of the Interior as trustees for the Klamath Indians shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(h) All sales of tribal lands on which roads are located shall be made subject to the right of the United States and its assigns to maintain and use such roads.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall in any way modify or repeal the provisions of subsection 5 (a) of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), providing for and requiring members of the Klamath Tribe to elect to withdraw from or remain in the tribe, following the appraisal of the tribal property.

SEC. 3. The act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), is amended by adding at the end of subsection 5 (a) (5) the following sentence: "If no plan that is satisfactory both to the members who elect to remain in the tribe and to the Secretary has been prepared 6 months before the time limit provided in subsection 6 (b) of this act, the Secretary shall adopt a plan for managing the tribal property, subject to the provisions of section 15 of this act."

SEC. 4. The first proviso of subsection 5 (a) (3) of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), relating to distributions in $200,000 installments is repealed.

SEC. 5. The second proviso of subsection 5 (a) (3) of said act, relating to Indian preference rights, is amended by deleting "any individual Indian purchaser may apply toward the purchase price all or any part of the sum due him from the conversion of his interest in tribal property" and by inserting in lieu thereof "any individual Indian purchaser who has elected to withdraw from the tribe may apply toward the purchase price up to 100 percent of the amount estimated by the Secretary to be due him from the sale or taking of forest and marsh lands pursuant to subsection 28 (b), 28 (c), and 28 (e) of this act, and up to 75 percent of the amount estimated by the Secretary to be due him from the conversion of his interest in other tribal property."

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO NICOLAI BULGANIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I understand that the President's reply to Bulganin has not appeared in the RECORD. I wish to say that the President's straight-from-the-shoulder reply to Bulganin and his talk in the joint session should clear away the fog in the minds of people at home and abroad, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PRESIDENT TODAY MADE PUBLIC THE FOLLOWING LETTER TO NIKOLAI BULGANIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: When on December 10 I received your communication, I promptly acknowledged it with the promise that I would in due course give you a considered reply. I now do so.

Your communication seems to fall into three parts: The need for peace; your contention that peace is endangered by the collective self-defense efforts of Free-World nations; and your specific proposals. I shall respond in that same order and make my own proposals.

I

Peace and good will among men have been the heartfelt desire of people since time immemorial. But professions of peace by governmental leaders have not always been a dependable guide to their actual intentions. Moreover, it seems to me to be profitless for us to debate the question of which of our two governments wants peace the more. Both of us have asserted that our respective peoples ardently desire peace and perhaps you and I feel this same urge equally. The heart of the matter becomes the determination of the terms on which the maintenance of peace can be assured, and the confidence that each of us can justifiably feel that these terms will be respected.

In the United States the people and their Government desire peace and in this country the people exert such constitutional control over government that no government could possibly initiate aggressive war. Under authority already given by our Congress, the United States can and would respond at once if we or any of our allies were attacked. But the United States cannot initiate war without the prior approval of the people's representatives in the Congress. This process requires time and public debate. Not only would our people repudiate any effort to begin an attack, but the element of surprise, so important in any aggressive move, would be wholly lacking. Aggressive war by us is not only abhorrent; it is impractical and impossible.

The past 40 years provide an opportunity to judge the comparative peace records of our two systems. We gladly submit our national record for respecting peace to the impartial judgment of mankind. I can as-

sure you, Mr. Chairman, that in the United States the waging of peace has priority in every aspect, and every element, of our national life.

II

You argue that the danger of war is increased because the United States and other Free-World nations seek security on a collective basis and on the basis of military preparedness.

Three times in this century wars have occurred under circumstances which strongly suggest, if indeed they do not prove, that war would not have occurred had the United States been militarily strong and committed in advance to the defense of nations that were attacked.

On each of these three occasions when war came, the United States was militarily unprepared, or ill-prepared, and it was not known that the United States would go to the aid of those subjected to armed aggression. Yet now it appears, Mr. Chairman, that you contend that weakness and disunity would make war less likely.

I may be permitted perhaps to recall that in March 1939, when the Soviet Union felt relatively weak and threatened by Fascist aggression, it contended that aggression was rife "because the majority of the nonagressive countries, particularly England and France, have rejected the policy of collective security," and Stalin went on to say that the policy of "Let each country defend itself as it likes and as best it can * * * means conniving at aggression, giving free rein to war."

Now the Soviet Union is no longer weak or confronted by powerful aggressive forces. The vast Sino-Soviet bloc embraces nearly one billion people and large resources. Such a bloc would, of course, be dominant in the world were the Free World nations to be disunited.

It is natural that any who want to impose their system on the world should prefer that those outside that system should be weak and divided But that expansionist policy cannot be sanctified by protestations of peace.

Of course the United States would greatly prefer it if collective security could be obtained on a universal basis through the United Nations.

This was the hope when in 1945 our two Governments and others signed the Charter of the United Nations, conferring upon its Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Also, by that Charter we agreed to make available to the Security Council Armed Forces, assistance and facilities so that the Council could maintain and restore international peace and security.

The Soviet Union has persistently prevented the establishment of such a universal collective security system and has, by its use of the veto—now 82 times—made the Security Council undependable as a protector of the peace.

The possibility that the Security Council might become undependable was feared at the San Francisco Conference on World Organization, and accordingly the Charter recognized that, in addition to reliance on the Security Council, the nations possessed and might exercise an inherent right of collective self-defense. It has therefore been found not only desirable, but necessary, if the free nations are to be secure and safe, to concert their defensive measures.

I can and do give you, Mr. Chairman, two solemn and categorical assurances.

1. Never will the United States lend its support to any aggressive action by any collective defense organization or any member thereof;

2. Always will the United States be ready to move toward the development of effective United Nations collective security measures in replacement of regional collective-defense measures.

I turn now to consider your specific proposals.

III

I am compelled to conclude after the most careful study of your proposals that they seem to be unfortunately inexact or incomplete in their meaning and inadequate as a program for productive negotiations for peace.

You first seem to assume that the obligations of the charter are nonexistent and that the voice of the United Nations is nothing that we need to heed.

You suggest that we should agree to respect the independence of the countries of the Near and Middle East and renounce the use of force in the settlement of questions relating to the Near and Middle East. But by the Charter of the United Nations we have already taken precisely those obligations as regards all countries, including those of the Near and Middle East. Our profound hope is that the Soviets feel themselves as bound by the provisions of the charter as, I assure you, we feel bound.

You also suggest submitting to the member states of NATO and the Warsaw Pact some form of nonaggression agreement. But all of the members of NATO are already bound to the United Nations Charter provision against aggression.

You suggest that the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union should undertake not to use nuclear weapons. But our three nations and others have already undertaken, by the charter, not to use any weapons against the territorial integrity of political independence of any state. Our profound hope is that no weapons will be used by any country for such an indefensible purpose and that the Soviet Union will feel a similar aversion to any kind of aggression.

You suggest that we should proclaim our intention to develop between us relations of friendship and peaceful cooperation. Such an intention is indeed already proclaimed as between ourselves and others by the Charter of the United Nations to which we have subscribed. The need is, not to repeat what we already proclaim, but, Mr. Chairman, to take concrete steps under the present terms of the charter, that will bring about these relations of friendship and peaceful cooperation. As recently as last November, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union signed and proclaimed to the world a declaration which was designed to promote the triumph of communism throughout the world by every means not excluding violence, and which contained many slanderous references to the United States. I am bound to point out that such a declaration is difficult to reconcile with professions of a desire for friendship or indeed of peaceful coexistence. This declaration makes clear where responsibility for the cold war lies.

You propose that we broaden the ties between us of a scientific, cultural, and athletic character. But already our two countries are negotiating for peaceful contacts even broader than scientific, cultural, and athletic. We hope for a positive result, even though in 1955, after the Summit Conference, when negotiations for such contacts were pressed by our foreign ministers at Geneva, the accomplishments were zero. It is above all important that our peoples should learn the true facts about each other. An informed public opinion in both our countries is essential to the proper understanding of our discussions.

You propose that we develop normal trade relations as part of the peaceful cooperation of which you speak. We welcome trade that carries no political or warlike implications. We do have restrictions on dealings in goods which are of war significance, but we impose no obstacles to peaceful trade.

Your remaining proposals relate to armament. In this connection, I note with deep satisfaction that you oppose competition in the production of ever newer types of weapons. When I read that statement I expected to go on to read proposals to stop such production. But I was disappointed.

You renew the oft-repeated Soviet proposal that the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union should cease for 2 or 3 years to test nuclear weapons; and you suggest that nuclear weapons should not be stationed or produced in Germany. You add the possibility that Poland and Czechoslovakia might be added to this nonnuclear weapons area.

These proposals do not serve to meet the real problem of armament. The heart of that problem is, as you say, the mounting production, primarily by the Soviet Union and the United States, of new types of weapons.

Your proposal regarding central Europe will, of course, be studied by NATO and the NATO countries directly involved from the standpoint of its military and political implications. But there cannot be great significance in denuclearizing a small area when, as you say, the range of modern types of weapons does not know of any geographical limit, and when you defer to the indefinite future any measures to stop the production of such weapons.

I note, furthermore, that your proposal on Germany is in no way related to the ending of the division of that country but would, in fact, tend to perpetuate that division. It is unrealistic thus to ignore the basic link between political solutions and security arrangements.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, at a time when we share great responsibility for shaping the development of the international situation, we can and must do better than what you propose.

In this spirit, I submit some proposals of my own.

IV

1. I propose that we strengthen the United Nations.

This organization and the pledges of its members embodied in the charter constitute man's best hope for peace and justice. The United States feels bound by its solemn undertaking to act in accordance with the principles of the charter. Will not the Soviet Union clear away the doubt that it also feels bound by its charter undertakings? And may we not perhaps go further and build up the authority of the United Nations?

Too often its recommendations go unheeded.

I propose, Mr. Chairman, that we should rededicate ourselves to the United Nations, its principles and purposes and to our charter obligations. But I would do more.

Too often the Security Council is prevented, by veto, from discharging the primary responsibility we have given it for the maintenance of international peace and security. This prevention even extends to proposing procedures for the pacific settlement of disputes.

I propose that we should make it the policy of our two Governments at least not to use veto power to prevent the Security Council from proposing methods for the pacific settlement of disputes pursuant to chapter VI.

Nothing, I am convinced, would give the world more justifiable hope than the conviction that both of our Governments are genuinely determined to make the United Nations the effective instrument of peace and justice that was the original design.

(2) If confidence is to be restored, there needs, above all, to be confidence in the pledged word. To us it appears that such confidence is lamentably lacking. That is conspicuously so in regard to two areas where the situation is a cause of grave international concern.

I refer first of all to Germany. This was the principal topic of our meeting of July 1955 and the only substantive agreement

which was recorded in our agreed directive was this:

"The heads of government, recognizing their common responsibility for the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany, have agreed that the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany by means of free elections shall be carried out in conformity with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security."

In spite of our urging, your Government has, for now 2½ years, taken no steps to carry out that agreement or to discharge that recognized responsibility. Germany remains forcibly divided.

This constitutes a great error, incompatible with European security. It also undermines confidence in the sanctity of our international agreements.

I therefore urge that we now proceed vigorously to bring about the reunification of Germany by free elections, as we agreed, and as the situation urgently demands.

I assure you that this act of simple justice and of good faith need not lead to any increased jeopardy of your nation. The consequences would be just the opposite and would surely lead to greater security. In connection with the reunification of Germany, the United States is prepared, along with others, to negotiate specific arrangements regarding force levels and deployments, and broad treaty undertakings, not merely against aggression but assuring positive reaction should aggression occur in Europe.

The second situation to which I refer is that of the countries of Eastern Europe. The heads of our two Governments, together with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, agreed in 1945 that the peoples of these countries should have the right to choose the form of government under which they would live, and that our three countries had a responsibility in this respect. The three of us agreed to foster the conditions under which these peoples could exercise their right of free choice.

That agreement has not as yet been fulfilled.

I know that your Government is reluctant to discuss these matters or to treat them as a matter of international concern. But the heads of governments did agree at Yalta in 1945 that these matters were of international concern, and we specifically agreed that there could appropriately be international consultation with reference to them.

This was another matter taken up at our meeting in Geneva in 1955. You then took the position that there were no grounds for discussing this question at our conference and that it would involve interference in the internal affairs of the Eastern European states.

But have not subsequent developments shown that I was justified in my appeal to you for consideration of these matters? Surely the Hungarian developments and the virtually unanimous action of the United Nations General Assembly in relation thereto show that conditions in Eastern Europe are regarded throughout the world as much more than a matter of purely domestic scope.

I propose that we should now discuss this matter. There is an intrinsic need of this in the interest of peace and justice which seems to me compelling.

3. I now make, Mr. Chairman, a proposal to solve what I consider to be the most important problem which faces the world today.

(a) I propose that we agree that outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes. We face a decisive moment in history in relation to this matter. Both the Soviet Union and the United States are now using outer space for the testing of missiles designed for military purposes. The time to stop is now.

I recall to you that a decade ago, when the United States had a monopoly of atomic weapons and of atomic experience, we offered to renounce the making of atomic weapons and to make the use of atomic energy an international asset for peaceful purposes only. If only that offer had been accepted by the Soviet Union, there would not now be the danger from nuclear weapons which you describe.

The nations of the world face today another choice perhaps even more momentous than that of 1948. That relates to the use of outer space. Let us this time, and in time, make the right choice, the peaceful choice.

There are about to be perfected and produced powerful new weapons which, availing of outer space, will greatly increase the capacity of the human race to destroy itself. If, indeed, it be the view of the Soviet Union that we should not go on producing ever newer types of weapons, can we not stop the production of such weapons which would use or, more accurately, misuse outer space, now for the first time opening up as a field for man's exploration? Should not outer space be dedicated to the peaceful uses of mankind and denied to the purposes of war? That is my proposal.

(b) Let us also end the now unrestrained production of nuclear weapons. This, too, would be responsive to your urging against "the production of ever newer types of weapons." It is possible to assure that newly produced fissionable material should not be used for weapons purposes. Also, existing weapons stocks can be steadily reduced by ascertainable transfers to peaceful purposes. Since our existing weapons stocks are doubtless larger than yours, we would expect to make a greater transfer than you to peaceful purposes stocks. I should be glad to receive your suggestion as to what you consider to be an equitable ratio in this respect.

(c) I propose that, as part of such a program which will reliably check and reverse the accumulation of nuclear weapons, we stop the testing of nuclear weapons, not just for 2 or 3 years, but indefinitely. So long as the accumulation of these weapons continues unchecked, it is better that we should be able to devise weapons which will be primarily significant from a military and defensive standpoint and progressively eliminate weapons which could destroy, through fallout, vast segments of human life. But if the production is to be stopped and the trend reversed, as I propose, then testing is no longer so necessary.

(d) Let us at the same time take steps to begin the controlled and progressive reduction of conventional weapons and military manpower.

(e) I also renew my proposal that we begin progressively to take measures to guarantee against the possibility of surprise attack. I recall, Mr. Chairman, that we began to discuss this at our personal meeting 2½ years ago, but nothing has happened although there is open a wide range of choices as to where to begin.

The capacity to verify the fulfillment of commitments is of the essence in all these matters, including the reduction of conventional forces and weapons, and it would surely be useful for us to study together through technical groups what are the possibilities in this respect upon which we could build if we then decide to do so. These technical studies could, if you wish, be undertaken without commitment as to ultimate acceptance, or as to the interdependence, of the propositions involved. It is such technical studies of the possibilities of verification and supervision that the United Nations has proposed as a first step. I believe that this is a first step that would promote hope in both of our countries and in the world. Therefore I urge that this first step be undertaken.

v

I have noted your conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that you attach great importance to personal contact between statesmen and that you for your part would be prepared to come to an agreement on a personal meeting of state leaders to discuss both the problems mentioned in your letter and other problems.

I too believe that such personal contacts can be of value. I showed that by coming to Geneva in the summer of 1955. I have repeatedly stated that there is nothing I would not do to advance the cause of a just and durable peace.

But meetings between us do not automatically produce good results. Preparatory work, with good will on both sides, is a prerequisite to success. High level meetings, in which we both participate, create great expectations and for that reason involve a danger of disillusionment, dejection and increased distrust if in fact the meetings are ill-prepared, if they evade the root causes of danger, if they are used primarily for propaganda, or if agreements arrived at are not fulfilled.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, this is my proposal:

I am ready to meet with the Soviet leaders to discuss the proposals mentioned in your letter and the proposals which I make, with the attendance as appropriate of leaders of other states which have recognized responsibilities in relation to one or another of the subjects we are to discuss. It would be essential that prior to such a meeting these complex matters should be worked on in advance through diplomatic channels and by our foreign ministers, so that the issues can be presented in form suitable for our decisions and so that it can be ascertained that such a top-level meeting would, in fact, hold good hope of advancing the cause of peace and justice in the world. Arrangements should also be made for the appropriate inclusion, in the preparatory work, of other governments to which I allude.

I have made proposals which seem to me to be worthy of our attention and which correspond to the gravity of our times. They deal with the basic problems which press upon us and which if unresolved would make it ever more difficult to maintain the peace. The Soviet leaders by giving evidence of a genuine intention to resolve these basic problems can make an indispensable contribution to clearing away the obstacles to those friendly relations and peaceful pursuits which the peoples of all the world demand.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

MISSILE PREPAREDNESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a couple of days ago I said in a statement that the important thing for us, insofar as missile and preparedness developments are concerned, is to look ahead, and not spend our time in recrimination over past mistakes.

Certainly, there are plenty who can take the blame for the lag in our present defenses, from President to Cabinet members on down. But one makes little progress forward while looking backward.

Today I want to call the attention of the Senate, and through this body, to the President, to the mistake of one whose only error in this program seems to be that of over-zealousness, in an age when the big failure was the lack of zeal.

I am speaking of Col. John C. Nickerson, Jr., who has been banished to Panama to a routine job because he refused to take "No" for an answer. If Colonel

Nickerson's superiors had been showing the same zeal, then perhaps today we would have a satellite in the air and be nearer the Soviet in missile preparedness. When I refer to his superiors, I am not talking about Colonel Medaris or Mr. von Braun. I am speaking of others.

What Colonel Nickerson objected to was the memorandum by Charles E. Wilson, then Secretary of Defense, giving the Air Force jurisdiction over missiles beyond the 200-mile range. He objected to the decision and fought it. He has been shown to be right, for now, two Soviet satellites and many Soviet missiles later, the decision has been reversed and has been shown to be wrong. In fact, it seems quite clear now that the team at Redstone Arsenal, of which Colonel Nickerson was a member and which he was trying to keep working together by fighting this decision, could have launched a satellite back in 1956, almost a year before Sputnik I began to circle the earth.

In fact, there was testimony at Colonel Nickerson's court-martial that he and Ernst Stuhlinger, a former German scientist, now a member of the Redstone team, and an American scientist, had discussed a satellite launching as early as 1954. By September 1956 they had the hardware that was needed. Now the Jupiter is going to be used to make a satellite attempt, and if they are successful it will be with substantially the same hardware they would have used in 1956. The only difference would be that now the psychological advantage will be gone and the United States will only be duplicating an old Russian achievement.

In taking this action, there is no doubt that Colonel Nickerson made some mistake in judgment in the way he went about it. But at the same time he deserves considerable credit for placing the welfare of his country above his personal welfare in undertaking the fight at all, for he obviously knew he was running a considerable personal risk.

As a soldier, personal risk was nothing new to Colonel Nickerson. He has two Silver Stars, Distinguished Unit Citation, plus Bronze Star and the Air Medal. He first met the rockets during World War II—on the receiving end. They were the V–2 rockets developed by the German scientist, Wehrner von Braun, now an American citizen, and the leader of the Redstone team of which Colonel Nickerson was such a valued member. At his court-martial, a fellow-American veteran of the V–2 era, Julian H. Robertson, now president of the Erhlanger Mills Corp., of Salisbury, N. C., testified in Colonel Nickerson's defense. He told how he and Nickerson weathered the buzz-bomb attacks in London, and how Nickerson at that time became interested in missiles, and attempted to take a German rocket-launcher apart. He said that when the Allied troops were taking Brest, France, Nickerson took some crude rocket pipes, sent to the front by Ordnance, and fashioned a rocket-launching device that they fired toward the enemy. "Colonel Nickerson was among the few who then saw the potentials of that weapon," Robertson said. "He was a soldier's soldier."

The scientists with whom Colonel Nickerson worked at Redstone Arsenal, Dr. von Braun and Dr. Stuhlinger, also, now a naturalized American citizen, testified as to the effective work which Colonel Nickerson did in this field. Dr. von Braun said that he was one of the three top men on the program in the United States. These German scientists at Redstone Arsenal appreciated the work of their team for another reason also—they knew that many of the fellow-German scientists who had been captured on the eastern front were now working on rocket and missile development in the Soviet Union, and they knew the tremendous progress that was being made. They, perhaps more than the rest of us, and certainly more than the then Secretary of Defense, realized the time limit on this race. They, along with Colonel Nickerson, had also previously felt the frustration as men of science and vision who have tried to make important progress in the face of opposition from men of little vision. Dr. von Braun had felt it not only from Charlie Wilson in this country but also in wartime Germany, for he once spent 2 weeks in jail, sent there by Hitler, because he was trying to launch a rocket to the moon, when Hitler thought he should have been doing something more practical.

At Colonel Nickerson's court-martial, he was sentenced to a year's suspension from rank, loss of $1,500 in pay, reprimanded and transferred out of missiles. He was sent to Panama. Today he is inspecting locks and sewers in Panama.

I hardly think that this is a sensible use to be making of a man who is an acknowledged expert, a man of much more vision than those who court-martialed him, one who has a contribution to make to this Nation's race to space.

I say, Mr. President, let us take Colonel Nickerson out of the sewers of Panama and bring him back to the launching pads of the United States. If we are going to look around for scapegoats because we are running behind in the race to space, let us look at some of those who erred because of too little vision, too little zeal, and not at those whose only sin was overzealousness.

I urge the President, acting as the Commander in Chief, to review the court-martial and make the determination whether he wants Colonel Nickerson to remain the exiled victim of interservice rivalry and of his own eagerness, or whether he wants him devoting his proven talents to the missile program of the United States.

I think there can be but one answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

THE ATOMIC POWER PROGRAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the period in which we live has been variously described as the atomic age, and, more recently, as the age of space. However it may be described, the years and decades ahead present a challenge to the ingenuity and wisdom of mankind.

Throughout history, man's material progress has been measured by his ability to marshal sources of energy to supplement his own physical efforts. Indeed, industrial and commercial progress is measured by the amounts of energy consumed.

In the years from 1850 to 1950 the estimated total world consumption of energy was, to use a technical term, "4Q." What is the meaning of the term "Q"? It is a scientific unit of measurement, a quantity equal to the heat value of 38 billion tons of coal. In the next 50 years it is estimated that there will be a consumption of 16Q. That is 4 times the consumption in the previous 100 years, and almost twice as much as was used during the time from the birth of Christ to 1850.

For the most part, this very substantial quantity of energy has been obtained from fossil fuels, supplemented by devices to harness the power of falling water. The United States still has relatively abundant supplies of these conventional fuels measured in terms of the requirements of the past. But the scientists predict that mankind's energy requirements in the next 100 years will amount to 187Qs. That is 47 times the amount that was used from 1850 to 1950. Measured by this need, our supply appears inadequate for the long range future. On a world basis, known reserves of fossil fuels will be sufficient to supply only about one-fourth of total energy requirements.

If we are to avoid an energy shortage in the future, we must take today those steps which will insure a supplemental supply. The most readily available source of energy is atomic power achieved through controlled nuclear fission. And, if United States leadership in this vital field is to be assured, bold and big programs are necessary.

Mr. President, I have long considered our current program for the development of atomic power grossly inadequate. Because of tardiness in our program of atomic power, we are fast losing, if we have not already lost, our preeminence in this field. Last fall I had an opportunity to visit Europe, and while there I saw at first hand the progress being made by Great Britain and some countries in Western Europe and, perhaps more important, I saw evidence of the progress and great effort by the Communist regime in Soviet Russia to outstrip the United States in atomic power.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee a few questions. He has done much excellent, forward-looking work in this field, both when he was a member of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives, when he handled the nuclear appropriations, and also during his service in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am well aware of the bills the junior Senator from Tennessee has introduced, which, if they had

been passed at the time they were introduced, would perhaps have put the United States ahead in this field, rather than behind. I quite agree with the Senator we are behind in this field at the present time.

The point behind my questioning is that, even though there is a time lag of 18 months to 2 years in the ballistic-missiles field, through a "crash program" with mobilization assignments and with a bit of good luck we can overcome and overtake the leadership of the Communists in that field; is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. I have confidence that, with proper leadership, and with proper concentration of money, materials, and talents, the United States can not only overcome whatever lead the Soviets may now have, but outstrip them decidedly.

Mr. MONRONEY. We should not, however, neglect what is actually the development of the right arm of strength, namely, the development of atomic energy for peaceful uses. Should Russia vastly outstrip us in the use of commercial-sized reactors, which can be sold at reasonable prices, and placed in many of the neutral countries and in countries which today are even allied with us; should Russia be able to forge ahead of us in the commercial development of atomic reactors for power, for generation of fresh water from sea water, or for motive power for ships, trucks, or trains; should we lose that leadership while Russia establishes a supplier-consumer relationship with many of the uncommitted parts of the world, then we shall have lost a leadership which we cannot regain within time limits during which we could perhaps regain equality or superiority in ballistic missiles.

Mr. GORE. In reply to my able and distinguished friend from Oklahoma I invite his attention to the fact that President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union message that officials of the United States had failed to foresee the political and psychological impact of the Russian scientific breakthrough in the launching of the satellites.

I thoroughly agree with the statement by President Eisenhower. I happened to be in Europe at the time of the launching of the first satellite. I felt its impact, and I felt, as a result of my visit to the Soviet Union, that the Russians were as determined to outstrip the United States in the vital field of nuclear power as they were determined to outstrip us in launching the first satellite. If they succeed in establishing the commercial relationship to which the able Senator has referred, if they succeed in clearly outstripping the United States in the peacetime use of atomic energy, I must say to the Senator that I think they will have again scored a victory over the United States, and that the psychological and political impact of such additional victory may be as underestimated today in the United States as was the impact of the satellite launching.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it correct to say that we could even excel, in the period of the next 2 years, in the power to create millions or tens of millions of people, in our war potential, and yet still lose the war for the hearts and minds of people all over the world, because Russia has made the breakthroughs for the working reactors of atoms for peace?

Mr. GORE. Let us always bear in mind that the cold war is being waged for the loyalty, the affiliation, the hearts, and the minds of the peoples of the world, particularly the uncommitted portions thereof. If the United States permits the world to understand that it is seeking to place the greatest emphasis upon the destructive uses of atomic energy, I think she will make a great mistake. Let us maintain leadership in the field of peacetime uses of atomic energy. Thus I believe we shall be formulating a strong basis for appeal to the better instincts of mankind everywhere.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee was at the International Atomic Energy organizational meeting at Vienna, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I was present as an observer for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It seems to me that the administration, our leadership in the White House, has grossly underestimated the impact on the hearts and minds of people of the peacetime uses of atomic energy.

The President's great stroke in the direction of influencing world opinion in favor of America's peaceful desires was when he made a hurried trip to the United Nations some 3 or 4 years ago and delivered the hope-inspiring idea that America was willing to share its atomic know-how for peace, and also to put up, as a capital research fund, as much of its uranium as an international body would need to gear the efforts of the world scientists toward beating swords into plowshares and harnessing the atom to work for peace.

After he had made that great speech—and it had perhaps the greatest diplomatic impact of anything the United States has done during the present administration—the program was allowed to go into slow motion, until the organizational meeting at Vienna, which was the outgrowth of the seed which had long since been planted.

I still fear that the administration—and I shall be specific—first, showed a lack of the imagination necessary to conceive the importance to the people of the world which our leadership in this field could attain; secondly, it underestimated the President's own importance in world leadership in capturing the hearts and minds of the peoples of the world.

I remember that the great gift we made in enriched uranium, putting up some thousands of grams of enriched uranium as the capital investment in the bank, represented our first contribution to give meaning to the international organization.

In addition, we agreed to match, gram for gram, uranium of any other kind which any other nation would put into the bank for atomic research. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. GORE. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I also remember—and this illustrates the point of lack of imaginative leadership which is so basically necessary—the lack of realization by President Eisenhower of his influence in the world, in connection with the announcement of that great contribution, running, I am told, to $1 billion or more. The announcement was made at a cocktail party for the press, by Admiral Strauss.

The President would have done much better if he had recorded a message on tape or television film, so that the great conference could have been started with a word from the President on the meaning of atoms for peace to our country. It would have been much better to have started the conference with a word from our President, whose original idea it was, saying, in ringing tones, that we believe in and want peace, and are willing to make the major contribution to converting the atom into a workhorse for man's betterment.

Instead, the announcement by Admiral Strauss appeared on the want-ad pages of the world's newspapers. If the President had taken only 15 minutes of his time to tape record or film a message to that great conference, it would have made the headlines on page 1 of newspapers throughout the entire world, because the President of the greatest Nation in the world thought it important enough to deliver such a message.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on his always forward look in this great field. The potentialities for establishing world peace will be limited if America determines that it has time to lose. We must not lose the race in the field of peacetime use of atomic energy while we try to win the race in the ballistic missile field.

Mr. GORE. I am very grateful for the eloquent and able remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma. Like him, I felt, at the meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, the world's deep interest in peacetime uses of atomic energy, and I though I felt a yearning by the people of many nations to have the United States vigorously assert its leadership in this field. Uncounted millions of people all over the world want to see dramatic actions on the part of the United States. I think they want to see dramatic evidence that they can look with confidence to the United States for leadership. They want to see this leadership illustrated by programs of actions designed to assure technological superiority on the side of the free peoples of the world in this struggle.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the able speech he is making. I know how deeply interested he is and how well versed he is in the whole subject of atomic energy. I think the point he is now making is a particularly fine one. Personally I know very little about the subject matter. I have been very much concerned because a lack of a sense of

urgency in connection with this program has overcome this administration. A great deal of that lack of a sense of urgency has been due to the reliance the administration has placed upon private industry picking up the tab and doing the research work necessary to develop the peaceful side of atomic energy.

It so happens that in my State the Duquesne Light Co. has recently put into operation a plant for the atomic generation of electric power. That is fine. However, I have the feeling—and I ask the Senator whether or not it is his feeling also—that it is almost foolish to look to private industry to do the necessary research and development work for the peaceful development of atomic energy, because at the moment there is no profit in the program.

I yield to no one in my feeling that we must have private enterprise do everything that private enterprise can do, and that we must let the Government do only those things which private industry cannot do. However, I do have the strong feeling—and I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee agrees with me—that we cannot look for much help from private industry until such time as we can get the whole industry of atomic-energy production and development on a profitable basis, and that we are now far from that stage.

Mr. GORE. I wish, first, to thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for his generous compliments. In response to his question, I observe that he has referred to the one and only intermediate-size atomic reactor in the United States. We have no large-scale plant in operation. The Duquesne Light Co., to which he referred, contributed only $5 million toward the construction of the reactors; the Federal Government contributed $95 million.

Insofar as dependence upon private enterprise, stimulated by the profit motive is concerned, let me observe that, as a participant, in a small way, in the private enterprise system, I have never noticed that one who is governed by the profit motive is stirred to activity by the prospect of losses. There are no prospects for profits in atomic energy in the immediate future. We are put in the anomalous position, by the administration's policy, of depending upon the profit motive to maintain America's leadership in this vital field, when those governed by the profit motive cannot be stirred, are not stirred, and will not be adequately stirred, by the prospect of losses in order eventually to achieve the generation of economic power by the fission process.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator not agree with me that every day that we rely, to the extent that we are now relying, on the profit motive in private industry, to enable us to catch up with and keep ahead of the Russians in the field of the peaceful development of atomic energy, is only an additional day that we are running the grave danger of losing the race.

Mr. GORE. We are falling further behind every day in the actual construction and operation of large-scale atomic powerplants.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not intend now—and that I have not had any such intention in the past—to deprecate the expenditures of private industry in this field.

The Duquesne Light Co. has made a contribution. It has put $5 million into a reactor which is now generating electricity at a cost of 64 mills. It is a losing proposition. They will lose a portion of that $5 million. However, it may require not one Shippingport plant, but another generation, or a third generation or a fourth or fifth generation, before we finally do, by trial and error, develop, through experience, methods, and processes for generating electricity by atomic processes at economic rates.

I do not believe it is fair to expect Duquesne Light Co., or any other private corporation, to undertake such great losses. They have a responsibility to their stockholders, as well they should have. I think it is important, however, to the United States and to the position of the United States in world affairs, for the whole people to undertake this program, and for close teamwork to exist between private industry and Government, so that we may utilize fully the resources of Government, private industry, and our technical institutions in achieving the great goal of peacetime atomic power.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree with what the distinguished Senator has said. Would it not also be correct to say that it might not be possible during the next 5 years or so, when we in this country have an abundance of low-cost conventional fuels, to have atomic energy by reason of not being capable of competing with our present adequate supply—temporarily, at least—of low-cost fuel, whereas the people of the world whom we are trying to influence, in a peaceful and friendly way, toward better conditions do not have adequate supplies of low-cost fuel?

As the distinguished Senator knows, in Bangkok, Thailand, last year, at the Interparliamentary Union sessions, we saw the generation of electric power from teak wood and mahogany as fuels, to keep the tiny electric lights burning in the tourist hotels.

It seems to me that if we are to reach those countries, we must realize that the rest of the world is not as fortunate as we are with relation to cheap conventional fuels, and that coal must be transported half way around the world in order to generate the electricity those countries need. With the research and development that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has referred to, we can literally send in by airmail enough atomic energy to generate power to supply a city of 10,000 for a year or two. Let us consider for a moment the possibility in that way of touching the lives of those people with the 20th century brilliance of an electrically lighted age. That is our destiny. We should not fumble the opportunity, with the know-how that we have, to enlarge upon it.

As the distinguished Senator has said, and as the distinguished ranking member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and former chairman of the Joint Committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has said, it is later than we think, and that we should be the ones to make the breakthrough. We cannot make the breakthrough with blueprints, while Russia is showing reactors of 100,000-kilowatt capacity. We are not that good salesmen.

Mr. GORE. Before commenting on the Senator's able statement, I wish to advert to the Duquesne Light Co.'s reactor at Shippingport, and to advise the junior Senator from Pennsylvania that that reactor was begun under the terms of the McMahon Act, which was repealed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. We have no intermediate size reactors constructed or even in early prospect under the program based on the 1954 act. This program has been a gross failure.

To comment upon the statement of my friend, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, I should like to advise him that a little more than a year ago I was in Japan. I had a conference with the chairman of the Japanese Atomic Energy Commission. I undertook to persuade him and his country to wait until the United States had gone through its program of research and development, and I expressed the view that eventually a more efficient type of reactor would be produced here.

He looked at me and said, "But, Senator GORE, we cannot wait 5 years. You have an abundance of coal in your country. You have an abundance of oil and gas in your country. We have no such abundance, but we have millions of people who must live by production on these tight little islands."

That illustrates the point which the Senator has so ably made. Let me point out that Japan is one of the nations whose loyalty and affiliation mean a great deal to the United States in the cold war struggle. We have but to lose the loyalty and the affiliation of only a very few nations, which we could perhaps count on one hand, in order to lose the balance of power.

I yield to my able friend, the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Tennessee upon what he has been saying, and to ask him a question, to follow up the question asked by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania pointed out that the present cost of generating power from atomic energy was so much higher than the cost in connection with generating power either by hydroelectric methods or by coal, as fuel, that it was not profitable for private industry.

I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee would be able, if he thinks it is proper to do so, to tell us something about the comparative costs per kilowatt-hour of generating power by atomic energy. As I understand, the generating costs for hydroelectric power range between 2½ and 4 mills a kilowatt-hour. The cost of generating power from coal, I believe, is somewhat higher than that.

Can the Senator from Tennessee tell us what the approximate costs are at the Shippingport plant?

Mr. GORE. I believe the experience thus far at Shippingport shows the cost to be approximately 64 mills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Sixty-four mills?

Mr. GORE. Sixty-four mills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or 20 times the cost of generating power in the Tennessee Valley or on the Columbia River.

Mr. GORE. From large, efficient hydroelectric plants.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. GORE. And, of course, many times the cost of generating electricity by efficient steam-electric plants.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. GORE. But I wish to point out that this is our first atomic reactor to produce more than 5,000 kilowatts. It may well be that after the shakedown experience, Shippingport will be more efficient. But Shippingport was not expected to be an efficient or economic producer of power. It was the first effort we have made to generate electricity in amounts in excess of 5,000 kilowatts. We hope that the next generation of reactors of this type will be far more efficient.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator doubtless knows the facts upon which a news article which was recently published in the New York Times was based, concerning the costs at the Argonne reactor, which is located in my State. The article in the New York Times stated that the past costs had been 55 mills a kilowatt-hour, but that new developments which were being carried out made the operators confident that with the same apparatus more killowatt-hours of electricity could be generated and the unit cost reduced to 32 mills a kilowatt-hour. Does the Senator from Tennessee know about that?

Mr. GORE. I am aware of the press release, and of some of the circumstances. However, I point out to the able Senator from Illinois that Great Britain considers that she is now generating electricity by atomic processes at economical rates, and that she is pressing forward with a vast program of large-scale development. I think we must do likewise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I brought out the Argonne development merely as a basis for stating the fact that the Argonne reactor is Government-owned and Government-operated. Is not that true?

Mr. GORE: Yes; that is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, the significant reduction in cost which has occurred has been in a Government-owned reactor of a type for which the Senator from Tennessee has been pleading for some years.

Mr. GORE. That is true; but I also point out that the Shippingport reactor is owned by the Government, too.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Owned but not operated.

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Tennessee have any figures to show the costs of the big British reactors in terms of costs per kilowatt-hour?

Mr. GORE. None that I could supply to the Senator with any real confidence. I have heard costs discussed. As the Senator knows, cost accounting is a complicated field. When in Britain last fall, we discussed the subject. Suffice it to say that the British are staking their future economic survival upon atomic power.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is also true that the coal veins in England are much more shallow than those in the United States, and that they are also not regular, but follow the contour. So the costs of mining are extremely high.

I believe that the output per man-day in the British coal mines is approximately 1 ton, and has not increased for many years, whereas the American output, which was 4 tons 30 years ago, has risen to 3 or 4 times that much since then. So the British production costs for coal are much greater than ours; therefore, what might be economical there would not be economical here, where the tonnage price of coal is less. Is not that true?

Mr. GORE. That is true. I have just been advised by a member of the joint committee's technical staff that the latest information from Great Britain indicates that, on the basis of British cost data, the cost of atomic electricity in Great Britain is between 8 and 9 mills, which means that it may well be competitive there, as the able Senator has said. But it also means that there are parts of the United States in which it might be competitive.

Moreover, the indications are that further technological improvement may bring the cost of atomic electricity in Great Britain, and by Great Britain's program, to one-tenth the cost at which it is now being generated at Shippingport.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, this is corroboration for the Senator's thesis that inasmuch as the production of atomic power will be unprofitable in the United States for a considerable period of years for private industry, the Government should carry on the experimental work in order to make the breakthrough in costs, which probably will come.

Mr. GORE. The indications are that the generation of electricity by atomic processes in this country will be uneconomical until, by trial and error and experience in the actual construction and operation of atomic power plants, we have learned how to generate it at economical rates. It will cost money to do this.

I do not know how we can obtain such experience except through a program led by the United States Government. That does not mean that private enterprise should be excluded. There can be the closest teamwork and cooperation between the Government and private enterprise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand and quite agree with the Senator from Tennessee.

May I end my questioning on a minor and somewhat humorous note? Does this not provide the State of Colorado and the Rocky Mountain region with an economical substitute for the Colorado River project? Instead of generating power at excessively high cost, that area could be given the money to develop atomic energy. Would not that be much more appropriate than carrying out the Colorado River project in the Rocky Mountains?

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the remarks of the able Senator. I hope he will not lead me into a controversy concerning water in the Western States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know that the Senator from Tennessee, who wants Government appropriations for the development of water in the Tennessee Valley, has, in effect, formed a compact with Senators and Representatives from the semiarid States on the principle that if they will scratch his back, he will scratch theirs; therefore, he does not want to say anything which might diminish the appropriations for water.

But as one Representative from one of the "conquered" States of the Union, one of the big industrial States which pay the taxes, but which have very little voice, I applaud this progress in the field of atomic energy, and I hope we can furnish large quantities of cheap atomic energy to the people of the Rocky Mountain States, so that they will not continue to hold up the taxpayers of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The Chair did not hear what the Senator from Illinois said. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. After the description of the alleged relationship which the able Senator from Illinois has given, I should like to inquire the meaning of the term he used—"in effect."

The Senator has said that, "in effect," a compact had been formed. As I understood his description of it, the compact would seem to be quite in being.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to venture further into a subject into which I have perhaps somewhat inappropriately ventured. But I always notice that there is a sort of mutual admiration society between the various districts in the South which are interested in water and the Rocky Mountain region, which also is interested in water, and that the South now supports the Rocky Mountain States, and the Rocky Mountain States support the South; and no matter what the projects are, they are said to constitute conservation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, water is one of the essential elements of life.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that is incontestable. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Not only is water one of the essential elements of life; it is also essential for industrial progress and for economic development; and in the future the conservation of water will become one of the foremost problems of the Nation. Even today the water resource is becoming critical in many areas of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that without the Tennessee Valley development and the development at Oak Ridge and the power generated there and

the power generated by falling water at Bonneville, there could not have been the development of atomic energy in the first place, and we still are dependent on the high development of natural-resource electricity, in order to continue to have in the bank, so to speak, the atomic energy we now have?

Mr. GORE. Of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The voting record of the Senator from Illinois indicates that he always has supported the Tennessee Valley Authority and always has supported the power developments on the Columbia River, because there we have unique situations—large flows of water and low-generating costs.

But that is not an argument in favor of high-generating costs on the Upper Colorado or for large dams in Oklahoma. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the able senior Senator from Illinois upon the prescience of his personality and upon his conviction, and to welcome him into the compact as a full-fledged member. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no; I protest; I protest.

Mr. GORE. His record has been made. Like the junior Senator from Tennessee, he has maintained that the economic and efficient development of natural resources in any part of the United States makes all of the United States a stronger and better nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I must protest. I appreciate this eulogy on the part of my friend, but it goes too far. I favor the development of waterpower where it is economically and socially feasible, but not when we have to pay too high a price for it.

Mr. GORE. I said that the able Senator from Illinois has a record which sustains the point of view that economic and efficient development of natural resources in any part of the United States makes the whole country stronger and better.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All right.

Mr. GORE. I believe the Senator from Illinois will now agree with that.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not rise to defend the great resource developments on the Columbia River, because they need no defense; and I know that my friend, the Senator from Illinois, is one of their leading adherents.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the knowledge he always conveys to us about atomic energy, on which he is an outstanding authority.

I was pleased to hear him refer to the pioneering work done in connection with the submarine *Nautilus*. We in Oregon are proud of the fact that in the United States Bureau of Mines laboratories at Albany, Oreg., was developed the process for zirconium, without which the remarkable feats of the submarine *Nautilus* would not have been possible; and we are also proud of the fact that today at Albany, the Wah-Chang Co., Inc., is producing zirconium for the submarine *Nautilus* and other atomic submarines.

The question I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee applies to a very broad realm of the nuclear program, which concerns and disturbs many persons. Their alarm may be due to misinformation, but I am sure it is sincerely founded. It stems from the fact that many of these people are afraid of the possible deleterious impact on human life of the waste materials and the byproducts. In the Pacific Northwest we are particularly conscious of this problem because the famous Declaration of Conscience, which was written approximately a year and one-half ago by the immortal Dr. Albert Schweitzer, mentioned especially some of the wastes from the Hanford plant. I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee, through his vast knowledge of this subject, will give us some brief information about whether any actual peril is posed to human life, to genetics, and to children growing up in a particular area, because of possible dissemination of waste material from nuclear plants.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, unless a nuclear reactor is constructed with adequate safeguards, great dangers are involved. Not only must the United States undertake to occupy a position of leadership in this field from the economic standpoint and from the standpoint of international relations, to which the able junior Senator from Oklahoma referred, but it must also take the leadership in developing safe and efficient reactors. Unless the reactors—many of which will be located in areas of congested population—are constructed safely and with proper safeguards, millions of people would be in danger of suffering contamination.

Mr. NEUBERGER. There was an episode in England about 6 or 8 months ago, I believe; it involved possible contamination because of a leak or defect in a nuclear reactor. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. It was a rupture of a fuel element in a small reactor, and it contaminated an area of approximately 10 square miles, according to the information I have. However, the contamination was by isotopes of iodine, which have a half-life of only a few days, and therefore it did not contaminate the area with the deadly kind of poisoning which would be involved if strontium 90 had been showered over the area.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I always learn a great deal by listening to him.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I wish to say to him that the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Radiation is holding hearings on waste disposal this very spring. The problem is one which we regard as vital, and one to which the committee has given careful attention; and it is a problem to which the Atomic Energy Commission and the President have given attention; and it is one of the goals of the International Atomic Energy Agency. That is to say, one of the goals of that Agency is to develop efficient, safe, sound types of reactors.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Again I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on the same point, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that as we go forward in a semiexperimental or quasiexperimental field to develop large-scale reactors, in the interest of safety and the interest of establishing and creating safety standards, again the Government's construction of them would make possible the construction at locations much more distant from central markets than perhaps private industry could afford to engage in? In other words, the whole picture from the beginning—from the point of view of the protection of human life, and including the importance of the impact on the minds of the peoples of the world—indicates that the Federal Government should take the lead because only the Federal Government can deal with the losses which must occur as we go through this curtain of progress, in order to bring about at a 10- or 20-year earlier period the advantages of economic generation of electricity and other benefits from atomic power.

Furthermore, it seems to me that American free-enterprise industry—being allowed to have all of the know-how, without the payment of cost or royalty, after the Federal Government has developed, by means of its expenditures, these secrets—will have an opportunity to take the leadership in the markets of the world in connection with the sale of atomic reactors to Japan, Laos, Thailand, Pakistan, and other countries which today desperately need a fuel which can be easily transported, in order to supply their energy needs. It seems to me that would open the greatest field for private industrial development and production of these overseas reactors; and only through help from the Federal Government in making these breakthroughs can our private business not fall behind the government-subsidized and socialized manufacture of these by Russia and the Iron Curtain countries.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Again I say that we shall not be able to accomplish these goals until and unless this country has sufficient experience in the field to be able to develop economic reactors.

Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity of discussing this subject with my colleagues. I had not intended to speak at length today on the necessity for an accelerated atomic energy power program. Suffice it to say that we simply cannot afford the complacency and the unhurried manner which has marked our program to date.

In 1956, the Senate passed a bill which would have directed that the resources of this Nation be marshaled to bring into being processes for the economic generation of atomic power in commercial and industrial quantities. Unfortunately, that bill did not become law. It was defeated by a narrow vote in the House of Representatives.

During the 18 months since that action was taken by the Senate, the need for the vigorous power program it approved has become even more urgent. We have continued an inadequate program while other nations forged ahead. An additional 18 months of time has largely been lost. Further delay will but make it more difficult, if not impossible, to recapture the position of leadership which we once so clearly enjoyed.

I have today introduced a bill which includes the atomic power program already approved by the Senate, together with other proposals upon which I consider affirmative action to be needed.

Mr. President, the dreams of today become the realities of tomorrow. Who, except perhaps a Jules Verne, would have predicted even 10 years ago that 100 men, in 1957, in an enclosed vehicle, without access to air or fresh water, or light or warmth from without, could have conducted an extensive exploration of the previously impenetrable darkness beneath the polar icecap extending over a period of 5 days? Yet this feat was accomplished recently by the officers and men of the submarine *Nautilus*. The *Nautilus* traveled 1,383 miles under the ice and reached 87° north latitude—farther north than any other ship has ever sailed. It was made possible by atomic energy.

I believe, Mr. President, that this same source of energy can be used not only to propel a vehicle into space, but to make possible controllable mobility beyond the earth's atmosphere. Furthermore, I believe the utilization of atomic energy can make possible the maintenance in such a vehicle of the necessary conditions for human existence. Substantial competent scientific data supports these views.

Fuels employing chemical processes have limitations to which nuclear energy is not subject. The rate of release of nuclear energy can be controlled over a wide range, varying from an almost immeasurable intensity to comparative quiescence, with almost instantaneous acceleration or deceleration between the two extremes. No oxygen or other chemical substance need be present for its application.

If we are to succeed in the race to place into operation a space vehicle, subject to control and direction by man, we must proceed with all possible speed in the development of nuclear propulsion.

Some may think that manned space vehicles began to be seriously considered only upon the happening of recent events. Such is not the case. For several years the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been supporting a project on which the Air Force and the Atomic Energy Commission have been working and which, if successfully completed, will serve as a basis for the development of space travel. Within the next few days, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will begin hearings on the status of this project. These hearings will be a continuation of others which have been held involving the development of a nuclear-propelled rocket, upon which the Atomic Energy Commission has been engaged for some time. It is only recently that the veil of secrecy surrounding this project has been somewhat relaxed. In 1956, Congress authorized the expenditure of $9.1 million for construction work over and above that which had previously been planned. This money was subsequently appropriated.

Notwithstanding the support by the Joint Committee and the Congress and the excellent work of the Atomic Energy Commission, subsequent actions by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense have resulted in sharp cutbacks in this project and curtailment of essential work.

In January 1957, the Joint Committee ascertained that with only 5 months remaining of the fiscal year, 96 percent of that fiscal year's funds for construction work had not been released by the Bureau of the Budget, despite requests by the Atomic Energy Commission for such release. While some of this money has since been released—though not all—unnecessary delays have been caused. In addition, during the past year, cuts amounting to more than $16 million were made from funds previously authorized and appropriated by Congress for this project. These cuts were made without proper recognition or consideration of the technical aspects of the program.

In December 1956, a special committee of the Department of Defense concluded that this project was highly important to any consideration of large satellites in space flights, and concluded further that its potential military value was sufficient to warrant a prompt effort to demonstrate technical feasibility. Despite these recommendations, a cutback was ordered and the project was allowed to proceed only on what was called a moderate scale.

This program has been retarded, Mr. President, during a period in which the Soviet Government has been known to be working actively on a similar program. Evidence of Soviet activity appeared at least as early as November 1956 in a magazine Missiles and Rockets, which reported interviews with Soviet scientists who discussed their work in this field. It is imperative that this undertaking receive the full support of the Congress and of the President of the United States if it is to succeed.

The Atomic Energy Commission, with its network of national laboratories, staffed with nuclear scientists, is uniquely qualified to perform the technical work required for the development of manned nuclear rockets, capable of space travel. There is no necessity for creating an additional agency to undertake the task—at least, I see none now. We must utilize the technical proficiency available to the Atomic Energy Commission to the fullest extent if the United States is to remain the preeminent power in this atomic age.

I have included in the bill I have introduced specific authorization and direction to the Atomic Energy Commission to accelerate this project for nuclear propulsion of rockets and to initiate a project for a manned and controlled space vehicle. I hope this proposal receives promptly the full support of the Congress and of the American people.

Mr. President, I return now for a moment to the basic question of energy.

The feasibility of atomic energy for peaceful uses has been demonstrated. Technical obstacles which remain, though formidable, can and must be overcome. They will be overcome promptly if we will but make up our minds that they must be overcome and undertake to devote the necessary resources to the program as outlined in the bill I have introduced.

But our objectives must not be limited by the potentialities of fission energy, great though they be. Supplies of uranium, the fission fuel, though abundant in terms of all known yardsticks, are not inexhaustible. We know already that the potential energy available from the thermonuclear or fusion process dwarfs that available from atomic fission. The problems of harnessing it are vastly more difficult. There are many uncertainties about the possibility of obtaining thermonuclear energy in usable form. It may prove not to be feasible at all. Admittedly, years of research are required before the answers are known. Yet, the possibilities are enormous. We cannot afford to overlook this opportunity. Neither can we afford to lag behind other countries in this endeavor.

A breakthrough in the field of thermonuclear energy will not just happen. It will occur, if at all, only as a result of intensive effort. The bill which I have introduced today gives specific legislative sanction and support to a dedicated effort to crack the fusion barrier. It enunciates a policy decision on the part of the United States to endeavor, by all practicable means, to harness the energy of the H-bomb. The H-bomb itself was developed as the result of our compulsion to arm ourselves with the most destructive of weapons for the defense of ourselves and the free world. We must demonstrate to the world that we will apply ourselves equally as diligently to constructive efforts in the thermonuclear field for peaceful purposes.

Mr. President, the challenge of the space age will test our vision, our courage, and our willingness to make sacrifices today in the interests of a better tomorrow. We must not fail the test. It is in the hope of making a constructive contribution that I make these proposals and make these remarks.

THE FREE IMPORT POLICY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Reno Evening Gazette dated January 9, 1958, which contains a very pertinent paragraph having to do with the closing of mines of this Nation. The same free import policy is vitally affecting several hundred industries, including textiles, livestock, machine tools, precision instruments, crockery and glassware. That paragraph reads, in part:

> Not only in Nevada, but in all other mining States, the mineral producers are the victims of a Government free trade policy that started with the New Deal and has been

retained by the global giveaway believers in the executive and legislative departments back in Washington.

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

THERE'S A STRONG POLITICAL FLAVOR HERE

More noise about the need for a special session of the legislature comes echoing out of the southern part of the State. The source of this latest rumble is a Las Vegas assemblyman who has been acting for some time like a candidate for higher office.

Says he, the legislature should be summoned forthwith to dispose of a 3-pronged emergency. The sorry state of the mining industry is one-third of this emergency, and he would come to the relief of the distressed metal producers by doing away with the State's tax on net proceeds of mines. Then there is the never-satisfied school bloc that wants more money. And the third fraction is the gambling industry and its control.

There is no doubt that the mining industry needs help, but so do a lot of other industries in this State, too. And tax favoritism is not the remedy. Not only in Nevada, but in all other mining States, the mineral producers are the victims of a Government free trade policy that started with the New Deal and has been retained by the global giveaway believers in the executive and legislative departments back in Washington. For Nevada to repeal its tax on the output of the mines would be to subsidize this industry at the expense of all other enterprises and individuals in the State, and these other enterprises and individuals are also in need of tax relief.

Talking about the need for school legislation, the special session promoter suggests that the State's lawmakers forced school administrators to put more money into teachers' salaries and less into ornate and costly buildings. This was inspired by the confused state of finances in the Las Vegas school system, where millions of dollars have gone into luxurious auditoriums, mammoth gymnasiums, and other unnecessary and expensive luxuries. As a result, there isn't enough money left to give the teachers a substantial pay increase. This is a local matter. The State should not be called upon to discipline an extravagant school board, and at the same time put unneeded and binding restrictions on the school boards of the rest of the State.

As for the gambling business, one has only to recall what happened in the 1957 regular session of the legislature. The big gamblers—most of them centered in Las Vegas—just about controlled the legislature, and came within a whisker of getting themselves established over and above all legitimate business in the State. The same legislators who served in the 1957 session would be back for a special 1958 session. And the same lobbyists would be on hand to dispose of any efforts to clamp down on the gamblers.

Special sessions of the legislature are intended to deal only with emergencies—real emergencies. There is no emergency at this time, only a manufactured one. In fact, the whole proposal from Las Vegas sounds like the tentative platform of an ambitious politician calculating his chances for the 1958 State elections.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, for more than a century of time the Congress of the United States regulated our foreign trade and national economy in accordance with article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act (so-called reciprocal trade) transferred that Congressional responsibility to the Executive with full authority to transfer it to any one area on earth—under the auspices of any organization that he might spearhead.

In 1947 the President did transfer that responsibility of Congress to Geneva, Switzerland, where it now resides and is being administered by 37 competitive foreign nations through multilateral trade agreements—the terms of which Senators and Congressmen are not allowed to know until such agreements are signed.

It amounts to a conspiracy to destroy the workingmen and investors of this Nation.

Congress can regain its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign commerce and national economy by just sitting still and allowing the 1934 trade agreements to expire in June 1953.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is now 3 days since the President of the United States delivered his budget message. I believe the time has come for Members of this body to state freely and candidly their feelings about that document, for it is not too much to say that the fate of this Nation hangs to a large extent upon our ability in the Congress to awaken the American people to the deadly peril in which they live, and to take the legislative action necessary to insure our country's safety.

Mr. President, the President's budget message must be deeply disappointing to millions of Americans. His state of the Union message last Thursday led us to hope that at long last he appreciated the grave dangers facing this country. Yet it is now clear that the President has no real feeling of urgency about our present national insecurity.

He seems unaware of the changed world situation resulting from the rapid buildup of Russian strength and the steady deterioration of our own once-proud position. The speech made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] gave us a striking example in the field of atomic energy, where we have lagged and lagged and lagged, failed to appropriate the necessary money, failed to take the necessary action, and are on our way toward losing the preeminence in this field which came from our first discovery and breakthrough in the control and use of atomic energy.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his generous comments. I wish to observe that in my humble opinion a source of economic energy will be among the final arbiters of world power in the struggle for technological superiority.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator, and I thank him for his comment.

Mr. President, the budget message appears to have been drafted in a vacuum from which the sputniks, the successful firing of the Russian ICBM, the humiliating failure of our Vanguard efforts, the Gaither report, and the Rockefeller report have all been excluded. Indeed, those who drafted the state of the Union message must never have been introduced to the Budget Bureau and the Treasury officials who so obviously are responsible for the budget message.

Permit me to deal briefly with the field of national security.

Everyone would agree that it will take more than money to win back the security we have come so close to throwing out the window. Reorganizing our Defense Establishment and our State Department, and replacing old, tired, and obsolete thinking with men of imagination and a real sense of urgency are equally necessary. Yet without enough money we will never match the Russian pace. I am in no position to state categorically that the budget requests for missile development are clearly inadequate. Yet any citizen who reads the Rockefeller report or reads those leaked portions of the Gaither report, which I have every reason to believe are accurate, cannot fail to feel that the program in the missile area is inadequate. However, I am prepared to await the evaluation of the Preparedness Subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] before speaking further on this subject.

It must be clear to anyone who reads the budget message:

First, that the Strategic Air Force is not to receive any more planes than those called for a year ago, nor will its other critical problems be promptly financed toward solution, while the Russian Air Forces are being built up.

Second, that atomic-missile-carrying submarines are not being ordered in adequate quantities, while the Russians are building hundreds of submarines and are on their way to their own atomic-powered submarine.

Third, that reduction of manpower and funds for the Army further weaken our ability to deter "brush warfare," which the Communists can initiate any day almost anywhere in the world. Thus we stand still while Russia moves ahead.

Mr. President, as early as April 1956 I had occasion to remark in a public address that the budget for that year for military purposes in my judgment was $4.5 billion short of what was needed to properly protect the security of this country. Mr. President, I have had no occasion to regret that remark. I believe if that money had been appropriated we should not now be in the sad situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. President, let me turn for a moment to the field of education.

Everyone who has seriously studied our educational system and compared it with the Russian agrees that our desperate needs in this field in order of priority are: First, higher teachers' and college professors' salaries to attract and retain in the profession the best available brains; second, school and college construction; and third, scholarships and other methods for assuring that the brains of our country are adequately educated.

Yet the President ignores the salary problem, turns his back on the continuing school shortage situation which he

recognized a year ago, proposes to wreck the college housing loan program with higher interest rates and other restrictions, and confines himself to a temporary and modest college scholarship program. One may well ask where the President expects millions of American boys and girls to go to school in the years ahead and what caliber of instruction he thinks awaits them on arrival at the now completely obsolete little red schoolhouse.

Mr. President, in this morning's issue of the Washington Post appeared a column written by Walter Lippmann entitled "Not Good Enough," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

NOT GOOD ENOUGH

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President's program, as set forth in his message and in his budget, is not likely, it would appear, to win for him the kind of popular support which he will need in this Congress. For while his delivery of the message did much to quiet the apprehension about his health, the substance of his proposals will almost certainly produce a sense of disappointment and frustration.

The country was expecting and was ready for a large expanding national effort. What the President has proposed is a narrow concentration on specialized strategic weapons accompanied by a contraction in almost every other field of national activity. The program says, in effect, that if only we can catch up with the Russians in missiles, all will be well and we can retreat almost everywhere else along the line.

If experience is any guide, the President will find that the country cannot be rallied successfully to a program of this character. It expected a program of national revival. It is offered a program for contraction. The country will prove once more that a democracy can be rallied more successful by a big and a bold program—like, for example, the Marshall plan—than by a small and timid program—like for example, one which regards the United States as being too poor to build schoolhouses or to devote new water resources in the arid lands of the West.

A small and timid program provokes all the various interests that are hurt by it without interesting and rallying the great mass who will respond to a national call. There is every prospect, therefore, that in this Congress leadership will come not from the White House but from the senior Democrats, organized around RAYBURN and JOHNSON. For the Republicans who must run this fall the program is an invitation to disaster, and the President will have very little, if any, ardent Republican support. For the Democrats, the program is a political bonanza, enabling them to seize the initiative not only in the welfare measures, which are their old standbys, but also in the field of national defense.

This need not have happened if the President and his advisers had grasped the nature of the challenge, and had risen up to respond to it. Once it was certain, as it was, that there would be no opposition to getting more money for missiles, the crucial point was what this Nation was going to do about education and research. For that is where we are most deeply challenged, and it is there primarily and fundamentally that we must demonstrate to ourselves, and to the world, our capacity to respond to the challenge.

In this perspective, the educational proposals are a pitiably inadequate response, and the abandonment of the school construction bill an inexcusable retreat from responsibility.

How the program was put together becomes clearer as we see it as a whole. The sputnik has been treated as a challenge to our missile program which has to be met. The new money for missiles and the like has been covered by the President's accepting, as he never has before, the views of those in his inner councils who want to cut back and, in principle, would like to dismantle, the welfare measures which have come down from the New Deal.

No doubt there is room for cutting back on some of the subsidies and grants-in-aid. But the basic conception of the program is, considering the time we live in, a curious one—that this Nation, challenged as never before in its history, is to reduce and contract its national responsibility for the internal development and welfare of the Nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is one pertinent paragraph in that column which I should like to read. Speaking of education, Mr. Lippmann says:

In this perspective, the educational proposals are a pitiably inadequate response, and the abandonment of the school construction bill an inexcusable retreat from responsibility.

Last year the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], whom I see in the Chamber, and I joined in sponsoring two bills relating to education, to deal with the problems of teacher salaries and of school construction in a way which would preclude Federal control, and also to deal with the great need for scholarships to help outstanding young people who could not otherwise obtain higher education. At that point we awaited the President's school construction bill, which we believed would eventually come to the Senate. Now we are faced, a year later, with the fact that not one of those pieces of proposed legislation has moved forward, and the basic reason is that the President of the United States and his administration have been unwilling to use their full influence and give their full support toward working out solutions to the desperate crisis in education.

Mr. President, I should like to speak next of housing and urban redevelopment.

The President has turned his back on the goal of a decent home for every American family. By failing to sponsor needed amendments to public housing legislation, he would continue the present administrative roadblocks which have enabled Albert Cole, HHFA Administrator, a lifelong opponent of public housing, to bring Senator Taft's public housing program practically to a halt. By his completely unrealistic suggestion that State and local governments pick up a larger share of the cost of urban redevelopment, he has called for the slow strangulation of that program just as it was springing to life.

I am sure that many of my colleagues who came to the Senate from State and local governments know as well as I do that those governments are not now and will not be in the foreseeable future in any position to pick up a substantially larger part of the tab or check for any one of these desperately needed programs. The administration appears now to be on the way to abandoning these programs in a false plea for economy, despite the fact that last year the gross national product of this country reached a new peak, and we are unquestionably the richest Nation in the world. Despite those facts, we are devoting a smaller share of our gross national product to the public sector of our economy than we were devoting some 15 years ago.

Mr. President, by the President's failure to recognize that tight money and high interest rates have prevented home builders from selling as many as 1 million new homes in 1957 where the clearly demonstrable need is for 2 million a year, he has done his part to insure that no American family of moderate income will be able to buy a decent new home in 1958.

Mr. President, perhaps one of the most indefensible parts of the budget message is the lip service the President pays to area redevelopment legislation for communities with heavy and persistent unemployment. This, Mr. President, is a critical need, not only in my State, but in many another State. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], 17 other Senators, and I have cosponsored legislation to carry into effect some measure of relief for those pockets of unemployment in our country, which are now becoming greater and greater every day.

Mr. President, in the budget message we find faint praise for a program of area redevelopment, but the praise is accompanied by omission from the budget of every cent of the quite inadequate appropriation proposed for this purpose last year. This is one of the clearest demonstrations of deeds turning their back on words that I have had the opportunity to observe. It must be hoped the Congress will act to meet the important need for such legislation, and support its action wtih an adequate appropriation.

Mr. President, in the Washington Post of Tuesday, January 14, 1958, there appeared a lead editorial, spread over 2 columns, entitled, "An Inadequate Budget." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have that editorial printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

AN INADEQUATE BUDGET

The President's budget does not measure up to the challenge of the times. In seeking to avoid both deficits and tax increases, the administration is also avoiding—or seriously underrating—many vital challenges which face the Nation in a time of unprecedented peril from abroad and growth and change at home.

In ordinary times most Americans would applaud the President's dedication to the task of maintaining the relative freedom of the American economy. This is in large measure a question of how much of the national economic effort can be kept in private as distinguished from Government hands. And most assuredly there is no lasting freedom, either, in an inflationary spiral which destroys wealth and blights the fruit of labor.

But freedom has other enemies just now, in the sagging American educational base

and other unmet domestic needs no less than in the global military and economic efforts of the Soviet Union. Measured against these challenges and against the untapped capacities of this country for hard work and sacrifice, what the President proposes is in many ways a retrenchment and, we fear, a flight from reality.

Since 1955, expenditures have been rising at a fairly steady rate which, if maintained, would by next year have pushed the budget above the $74.3 billion peak of 1953. Appropriations—which lead expenditures somewhat—have been rising even faster, portending what the administration has in the past seemed more to fear than to comprehend, a very much higher level of spending commensurate with national growth in the decade ahead. Congress last year blunted the appropriation drive considerably with the aid of a divided administration. It provided only $67.7 billion of spending authority compared with $70.1 billion for 1957. But even before the sputniks, no one really believed the lid was on to stay. It is probable that Congress in the remaining months of this fiscal year will provide most of the $6.6 billion of supplemental appropriations which the President will ask, pushing the 1958 total $1 billion higher than requested a year ago. Spending, now projected at $72.8 billion, will also exceed the original estimates by about $1 billion.

But what of 1959? Here the pattern for this administration's remaining years should be revealed—the years in which the Nation either will begin to catch up with Russian weapons advances or fall irretrievably and disastrously behind; the years in which the Nation either will help meet the economic requirements of emergent countries in Asia, Africa, and South America or cast its destiny in a new isolationist mold; the years in which two decades of neglect of housing, educational, and other domestic needs either will be overcome or grievously compounded by failure to meet the far greater needs of an exploding population. These are needs in the public domain, requirements for collective action, and, in the main, for Federal action.

For 1959, the President proposes a reduction in total appropriations—which if achieved would be the first since 1954—to $72.4 billion, compared with $74.3 billion now sought for the current year. He calls for an increase in actual spending that would be smaller than that recorded in any of the post-Korean economy budgets. Spending would rise from $72.8 billion to $73.9 billion, an increase of 1½ percent, or less than the rate of normal economic growth and probably not more than what is required merely to offset inflation. Moreover, in the abandonment of some domestic programs and the projected sharp curtailment of others, Mr. Eisenhower lays the groundwork for a further relative contraction of the Federal share in the Nation's economy during the years beyond.

To be sure, the budget proposes some helpful shifts of emphasis. There will be considerably more money for certain missile programs, though apparently much less than many knowledgeable critics contend is necessary. Atomic energy development, research (at least in military fields) and science education come in for favored treatment. But at what cost. Other vital military programs—notably bomber procurement, dispersal of bomber bases, the submarine defense and missile programs and the Army's capacity for fighting limited wars against a potential enemy now equipped with many superior weapons—all have been notably, perhaps critically shortchanged.

Scarcely any increase in spending worth mentioning is asked for the mutual security program on which the President has laid such great stress. And civil benefits appropriations would be slashed by $4.4 billion, actual spending by $600 million. The lack of boldness in these two areas raises the question whether the administration is not beginning to think of a defense budget and the security it will buy as ends in themselves. Where are the works of peace? What is it that we are trying to protect? Is the United States to be concerned only with preserving freedom's square mileage—or is it concerned with freedom's institutions, its hopes and its promise of a richer and fuller life?

It is difficult wholly to reconcile this kind of a spending and appropriation budget with the philosophy which seems to underlie the revenue estimates for 1959. They call for a $2 billion increase over 1958 based in the main on current tax rates. This is $0.6 billion less than the growth which the President, a year ago, forecast for fiscal 1958 over fiscal 1957. But it is $0.6 billion more than the gain which now appears likely to be realized in fiscal 1958. Therefore it is probably neither unduly optimistic or pessimistic, but an informed estimate based upon continued expansion of the economy. The release of the pending backlog of defense appropriations already enacted will surely provide a short-term stimulant, and there is room for some safe further easing of credit curbs if this seems necessary. But for the long pull, the confidence which the administration reflects in its approach to 1959 revenue estimates will not be shared by the country—and growth will lag—if its leadership commands, "Do as I say, not as I do."

What is fundamentally missing from the 1959 budget is a recognition that this country cannot operate in these times "on the cheap." The share of the national product that is devoted to defense and to mutual security and to basic domestic services adequate for stable times is not enough for a time of extraordinary change and growth. It is time to face up to the need for a sizable increase in the Federal budget—and to stop pretending that the country either can or wishes to ignore whatever adjustments or sacrifices this may entail.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I first wish to express my regret that I was unable to be present during all of the Senator's message, but I wish to commend the Senator upon that which I have heard and associate myself with his remarks.

Secondly, Mr. President, I wish to commend the editorial staff of the Washington Post and Times Herald for what is one of the most intelligent and well-conceived and well-stated editorials that I have read for many a year. The editorial, which the Senator from Pennsylvania has just had printed in the RECORD, starts with what I would call an all-inclusive and all-descriptive sentence:

> The President's budget does not measure up to the challenge of the times.

I would add only that the President's budget does not place adequate confidence in the American economic system either.

I was particularly impressed by the words of the Senator from Pennsylvania when he noted that our economy is not operating at full steam, or full pace. With an economy in which steel production is at approximately 70 percent of capacity, and metals at far less than capacity production, and with an economy in which there are nearly 4 million unemployed, it is quite obvious that we are not even trying to test the American economy as to its capabilities.

I do not believe it is a budget which is adequate in terms of our defense needs. I have so stated in a letter to my constituents. I believe the budget fails to recognize anything that the Soviet Union is doing in terms of an economic offensive from an international standpoint. In the light of all the talk by the President and his associates about the dangers of the Soviet economy from the standpoint of its offensive, the budget before us is a retreat from last year. It is a retreat, and the American people ought to see it as such. Surely the budget does not take care of the basic social and human needs in our economy, as the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has so ably and brilliantly pointed out.

When we think of the great needs of our schools, when we think of the programs that we need for proper assistance to our schools, particularly in communities which feel the impact of Federal activity, when we think of the funds that have been withdrawn and that should be allotted for vocational rehabilitation, when we realize that the only suggestion with reference to REA is that it pay more interest, and when we take a look at the budget from the standpoint of slum clearance and housing and urban renewals and educational needs, and in the field of research, it is a budget of a tired and timid administration.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks, with which I am in complete accord. I recall that he was once the distinguished mayor of the great city of Minneapolis, and has a very clear understanding of the problems of State and local governments. I ask him whether or not he would agree with me, as a former mayor of Philadelphia who knows something of the problems on the State and local governmental level in Pennsylvania, that it is unrealistic and complete folly to believe that we can abandon any substantial part of the Federal programs to the States and localities without killing the programs?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Pennsylvania is again stating an obvious truth, namely, that State and local governments today are literally flat on their backs in terms of ability to raise additional revenues.

The rising indebtedness of this country on the State and local governmental scene is tremendous. The rise in the cost of government is far greater at the local level than anywhere else. Therefore, to say in a budget message that we will place these responsibilities on the local and State governments is to say that we are going to permit someone else to act as the political mortician for the burial of the programs. The administration does not have the intellectual stamina or the moral courage to say to the American people that the projects are going to be killed. What the administration says is: "Here is the corpse. You bury it." That is what the administration is saying, instead of finishing the job itself.

I believe in an expanding American economy. I do not believe our country has even started to prove its potentialities. I believe there is an opportunity in America for a far higher standard of living. We need people at the head of our Government, in responsible political leadership positions, to give our country a sense of direction. That is what is needed in every field of government.

Once we have that kind of leadership, the Soviet Union will become insignificant, and we shall not have to be worried about some of the problems which now confront us domestically and internationally.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota if he does not believe that the American way of life epitomizes the highest state to which man has been able to aspire and which man has been able to reach, and that that way of life constitutes one of the strongest elements of America's appeal for leadership?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. GORE. Yet, when we are challenged, one of the first things proposed is that we start whittling away at the American standard of living.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct in what he is saying. In substance, the administration is proposing a defense program that protects geography. I am not sure that it will even do that, of course. I am in favor of a program that will protect and guarantee what we call our free way of life. That is what the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Tennessee have been discussing.

The President has delivered another one of his lofty and worthy state of the Union messages. That was a job of the pen. Then along comes the budget message, which outlines the fiber and flesh and blood of the governmental policy.

The budget message is filled with salt water; there is not much blood in it, and there is not much fiber in it, either from the standpoint of defense or foreign aid, and certainly not from the standpoint of the domestic scene.

It is a budget which underestimates the ability of the American people to produce. It does not consider the capacity of the American economy. It is a budget which the Washington Post—and that is a newspaper which supported President Eisenhower in two campaigns and has supported his administration—calls, in one of its most significant editorials in this period of human history, inadequate to meet the challenge of the times. I say "amen" to that.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to compliment in the highest terms the able address and analysis being delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania. He has called to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the country the inadequate programs presented to Congress.

By way of illustration, I should like to point to the fact that the budget is wholly and utterly inadequate in its provisions to meet the Russian challenge on technical education. Does the Senator find in the budget adequate proposals for funds to meet the challenge of Russian scientific education?

Mr. CLARK. I do not.

Mr. GORE. I wish to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his efforts and his diligent work in this field.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Was not the Senator from Pennsylvania led to believe a month ago, by what was reported in the press dealing with interviews with Mr. Folsom, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that we would be presented with a rather broad and comprehensive program for Federal aid to education which—although not adequate, and even bearing in mind that the administration had taken a solid position for nothing—might at least be some advance in that field?

Mr. CLARK. I will say to my able friend from Minnesota that we had reason to believe that we would get a better program from Mr. Folsom than we had from his predecessor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Does the budget, which lays down the governmental policies so far as the executive branch is concerned, carry out that hope? I am not referring to the state of the Union message. That message was for public consumption. The budget, of course, is for consideration by Congress. The administration has a very nice way of separating the two. It really knows its business in that respect. The administration has one message for the public, and another one for the representatives of the people, who must vote on the policies.

We in Congress get the budget message. That has always less in it than what is promised to the public in the state of the Union message. It is an old system that is being worked over and over again. Does the budget message on education fulfill what the Senator was led to believe was the program of the administration in the field of higher education?

Mr. CLARK. I think it does not carry out what many members of the American public were led to believe would be the program. I do not like to indicate a bit of cynicism on my part, but I must say it was just about what I had expected. In my judgment it is about 25 percent of the minimum amount that is needed for education.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's judgment is good as to what was to be expected, and it is equally good as to an evaluation of what arrived.

If the Senator will permit me, as long as our colloquy relates to our observation of the budget, and is a part of the splendid presentation made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, I should like to ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of his remarks, there be printed in the RECORD my so-called letter to the editor, which I send out once a week to the weekly newspapers in the State of Minnesota. I regret to say that it is not used as widely as I should like to have it used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his courtesy.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Minnesota.

The budget is not really balanced, it is only by the most unrealistic estimating that the budget is brought into precarious balance. There is not one item of objective evidence to warrant the hope that the present recession will end before the year is out with a resulting increase in revenues. The indications are all the other way as unemployment increases, housing starts continue at an alarming low, and plant construction slows down.

Moreover, actual expenditures and obligational authority are grossly underestimated, as one can see from considering the $6.6 billion of additional estimated supplemental requests above the budget estimates which fiscal 1958 has already called forth. There is every reason to believe the experience will be repeated. Nor can this be blamed entirely on the Congress, because many of these additional appropriations result from the President's own requests.

We have one before us today, coming from the White House, namely, the additional request for appropriations in the defense field.

In point of fact, the budget is so clearly out of balance that prompt attention should be given to closing the many tax loopholes through which hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue to which the Government is in equity entitled are constantly slipping away.

I noted with interest what the President of the United States said—and it was a very radical thing for him to say—in his news conference yesterday, namely, that he would prefer a deficit to an increase in taxes. It may well be that economists can make a good case for that viewpoint. But can anybody make a good case for continuing the unconscionable tax loopholes which give privileges to groups in our society who are not entitled to them, while we have urgent budget needs in a time of great danger?

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for what he has said, and to associate myself again with his remarks relating to what are properly described as tax loopholes.

In the tax debates in the Senate in 1951, 1952, and 1954, some of us joined together to try to plug those loopholes and to remove them from the tax laws. I can only say to the Senator that the most recent revenue act sponsored by the

administration, instead of plugging the loopholes, expanded them. They took what I call a country path or a country trail, which permitted small vehicles of loopholes to get through, and made it into a 4-lane highway, so that a 10-ton truck of tax evasion could be driven right through the fiscal highway. Believe me, the loopholes are there. The Senator is correct. I shall join with him once and for all in any battle which comes up in the Senate to plug those loopholes.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I know that, since he was a distinguished Member of the 84th Congress, he will agree with me that we are not speaking in generalities when we say that in the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to the Congress dated January 5, 1956, the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] points out in chapter and verse exactly where the tax loopholes are, so that all who run can read.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is why I voted against the tax bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one must be fair; so, in fairness, one must commend the President for his strong stand—indeed, I would say his courageous stand—in support of reciprocal trade, a stand which, I am certain, caused great grief among the members of his own party, but a stand for which I think we must give him all due credit.

We must commend him for his advocacy of the mutual security program; for his advocacy of an extension of minimum-wage coverage; for an expansion of the National Science Foundation, although, in my judgment, that did not go far enough; and for his courage to be willing to admit now that he was wrong when he rejected last year the recommendations of the Cordiner Committee, which would have provided additional pay for qualified engineering and scientific and other specialized personnel, both in the armed services and in the civil service.

It takes a big man to admit he is wrong. I am happy to say that the President was willing to do it.

I hope the bills sponsored last year in the Committee on Armed Services by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service by me will promptly receive favorable action by this body, those bills embodying, as they do, the recommendations of the Cordiner report.

The fundamental difficulty with the President's budget is that it is based on an obsolete philosophy, a philosophy which fails to recognize the proportions of the Russian threat, a philosophy which in its heart believes that the real threat to American freedom is higher taxation.

In point of fact, we have for years stood almost idly by while our once strong national defense deteriorated in comparison with that of imperialist Russia and China, while the public sector of our economy was starved to keep taxes low for those who can afford to pay and while we put our Nation's emphasis on material instead of spiritual values.

The President of the United States calls for sacrifices; but he wants those sacrifices to be made not by those who can afford them, but by the children of tomorrow, who will forgo a decent education; by the homeless who will be denied decent shelter; by the old, who lack adequate security; by the jobless, who cannot obtain employment; and by the ill, whose health problems he will not face up to.

The President says:

I believe this budget adequately provides for our Federal responsibilities in the years ahead.

With all deference to a great military leader and a courageous American, I am compelled to say it does not.

The President says:

Americans have a tradition of uniting when their freedoms and welfare are threatened.

And so we do. The President says:

We do not shirk our clear responsibilities when new challenges arise.

Nor do we when brave and realistic leadership shows us the way. When Congress heard the President's state of the Union message last Thursday, I hoped we had found that leadership. It seems to me to have vanished over the weekend.

EXHIBIT 1

NEWSLETTER FROM SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

INADEQUATE BUDGET

After listening last week to President Eisenhower's promising words in his state of the Union address, it was a disappointment to study details of his budget message. Perhaps it was best summed up in the first sentence of a Washington Post editorial: "The President's budget does not measure up to the challenge of the times." The Eisenhower program, as revealed in the budget, is tragically short of meeting the Nation's needs in this space age. It grossly underestimates the Nation's capacity, as well as the necessity, to rebuild its defenses and at the same time to build its social and economic strength by which the competition with communism will finally be won. Once again it is apparent that in spite of his brave words, the President is unable or unwilling to rise above the bookkeeping mentality that shackled the Government's programs under the height of ex-Secretary Humphrey and brought the United States into mortal danger.

TURNING BACK CLOCK

For the sake of bringing the budget into precarious balance, the President has not only skimped on defense and foreign aid, but has proposed turning back the clock on conservation, housing, urban renewal, vocational education, social welfare, and other programs vital to the national welfare. His proposals for defense budget is less than military and civilian experts have said is necessary. Research and development for penetrating outer space have again been slighted and starved, virtually assuring that we will have to negotiate with the Russians on unequal terms. Budgeted expenditures for international economic and technical development—in spite of the President's eloquent words in the state of the Union message—are below what we should be doing anyhow, and much below what is required to match and counter the Soviet economic offensive.

IGNORES RECESSION

There is no recognition of the economic recession that continues to grow. If we are to engage in an all-out struggle with the Soviet, the first requisite is full employment and fullest utilization of our productive resources. The new budget fails to keep pace with our normal economic growth, let alone provide any incentive for accelerating that growth to meet any emergency challenge. Under present international circumstances, any recession in the United States is dangerous and all too costly. While our built-in safeguards may prevent a recession today from blossoming into the kind of full-fledged depressions we have had in the past, any economic slowdown and increase in unemployment reflects against our free economic system at a time when it is on trial before the world in competition with the state capitalistic system of the Soviet. We cannot forget that.

WAGING PEACE

Many of us took our greatest hope from the portion of the President's state of the Union message talking about waging peace. Yet no provision has been made for any effective action on this front. In fact, as the Washington Post commented editorially: "The lack of boldness in this area raises the question whether the administration is not beginning to think of a defense budget and the security it will buy as ends in themselves. Where are the works of peace? What is it that we are trying to protect? Is the United States to be concerned only with preserving freedom's square mileage—or is it concerned with freedom's institutions, its hopes and its promise of a richer and fuller life?"

SHIRKS RESPONSIBILITIES

"Americans," said the President, "do not shirk our clear responsibilities when new challenges arise." Yet that is exactly what the new budget does. It is a statement of lack of confidence in the American people, in the American economy, and in the Government of the United States to meet the promises and dangers of the dawning age of space conquest. It is the triumph of a balanced budget over a balanced program.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I have listened to the speech of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I do not question the patriotic impulses and motives which led him to deliver it. Certainly I am not here at this time of day to answer his speech in detail, because, in fact, I am sure that as the session continues it will be shown that on many of the things which he mentioned we are in agreement.

The only reason I rise is to refer to the final statement of his speech, in which he questioned whether the President has met the issues of this day. If this budget is adopted in its present form, a question may possibly arise as to whether it is in balance. A question may arise as to whether there should be deficit financing or a raising of taxes. As the Senator has said, that is a matter of judgment. Many economists might differ on that issue.

But if the programs which the Senator has suggested in his speech are needed at this time, and if the programs which my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has suggested are adopted, then this budget will be greatly out of balance, and the issue

will be whether we would support increased taxes. I may say that I would. We cannot have it both ways.

So I ask my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania if he and other Senators on his side of the aisle would support an increase in taxes to meet the program about which he has spoken.

Mr. CLARK. I can speak only for myself to the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky. So far as I am concerned, I would. I have so stated on many public occasions during the past 12 months.

Mr. COOPER. I think those who have questioned the program must meet that issue. I have listened to the discussion of the question as to whether the defense proposal and the foreign aid proposal are adequate. I can only say that they are greater than or approximate the proposals which were made last year, and which Congress struck down. The same may be said concerning the proposals on education, which it was not possible, even, to have come out of the committee of this body.

The question of direction can only be from the administration.

The question is whether the Nation wants to trust the administration or trust Congress, which has so greatly changed its position in 1 year.

Mr. CLARK. I did not in this speech question the adequacy of the programs for mutual security or foreign aid. I do not know enough about them to be able to say whether they are adequate or not.

Mr. COOPER. The amount is $300 million more than the Congress voted last year.

Mr. CLARK. I think perhaps the Senator from Kentucky was present when both the defense budget and the mutual security budget were before the Senate last year. I went across the aisle and spoke to 3 or 4 of my Republican friends and said, "If you gentlemen will propose amendments to those bills to restore the amounts requested by the President, you will get 1 vote from 1 Democrat." I could not find any takers.

Mr. COOPER. The record will speak for itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe our esteemed friend from Kentucky deserves a frank answer to a frank and direct question. Needless to say, if we are to be critical about the budget and say that it does not provide adequately, from one's point of view, for the national security and for domestic needs, what we are really saying is that we need more money. That is what I say. I say, furthermore, that if more taxes are needed, I shall vote for them.

I am not one who believes that even a deficit is the worst thing that could happen to this country. As a matter of fact, in an economy which is in recession, it may very well be that from an economic point of view deficit financing can be justified, because deficit financing provides greater credit for the American economy, strange as that may sound. But that is the way it works under this strange, mystical financial system we have.

I do not want to play both sides of the street. I respect the honesty and integrity of the Senator from Kentucky. We cannot be in favor of increased appropriations unless we are willing to pay for them, or to stand up and say that we are willing to take the responsibility, in part, for deficit financing. I am willing to do either of those things.

I do not share the optimism of some concerning the mutual security budget. I have only my personal point of view; I lay no claim to expert knowledge. But let me state my personal point of view. Last year the President originally requested $4,800,000,000 for mutual security. He retreated approximately $300 million before we in the Senate even got started on that authorization; the President reduced it of his own volition. That left a requested authorization of $4,500,000,000; and, as we know, that authorization was made by us largely intact. It was reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I believe no major changes were made in the Senate. The actual authorization voted by us was, in round numbers, approximately $4,400,000,000. The Senator from Kentucky is correct when he says the President's request this year, a request for $3,900,000,000, is approximately $800 million more—as I believe he said—than the amount which finally was appropriated last year. However, it is also $600 million less than was requested last year. The President of the United States does not make the appropriations; the Congress makes them. If the Congress makes a mistake, it must bear the responsibility. But if $4,500,000,000 was required last year, before sputnik, before the revelations we now have, before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee had the exposé it is obtaining now in regard to our inadequacies, before the State Department revealed—as it has within the last month—the dimensions of the Soviet economic offensive; if $4,500,000,000 was required last year, when Eisenhower could say, "Peace and prosperity," and could convince most of the people that he was correct, how in the world are we going to be able to get by with a request by the President for $3,900,000,000 this year, when supposedly the Soviet Union is making inroads in the Middle East; when supposedly, according to the President, the major threat of the Soviet Union is economic, not military? In that connection, I point out that the President said in his message that the major threat from the Soviet Union is economic. With the major threat from the Soviet Union being economic, the President now proposes that we retreat to the extent of $600 million from what he said were the minimum estimates last year, after he had revised those estimates downward to the extent of $400 million. Actually, the present estimate is $1 billion less than the President first requested last year.

Mr. President, I know that Senators do not obtain votes or do not make themselves great public heroes or great vote-getters by saying that the foreign aid program is inadequate. Nevertheless I say it is inadequate. It is grossly inadequate, not only in terms of money; it is also inadequate in terms of the way it is managed.

I repeat today what I have said to the Senate before. Last year the Congress was told that an international development loan fund was needed, and that the financing should be on a loan basis, and that we had to set it up at once. We did that. We appropriated money for the international loan fund. We authorized $625 million more for this year. But when was the loan fund established? It was established only last month. Only last month the administration finally got the board set up, and only within the last month did the administration finally find a director for it.

Mr. President, do you wish to know how many loans have been made? Up to last month, approximately one loan was made. They had to find one they could make. The same administration which tells us we must do these things, and tells us that the urgency is here and that the hour of decision has arrived, waited 6 months before it even moved to set up the International Loan Board. This is one of the reasons why the administration will have trouble getting international aid funds appropriated this year.

But I wish to go on record now as saying that I do not believe the mutual security budget is adequate. I think it reveals again the failure of this administration to recognize the proportions, the dimensions, the intensity, and the dedication of the Soviet menace. We have missiles misery. No doubt we shall be able to appropriate all the money the administration wants appropriated for missiles, and I am in favor of doing that. But for all we know, the Soviet may be leading us down a blind alley—an alley of rearmament and of constantly increasing expenditures for the military, while the Soviets are working out economic and loan programs and are beating us to the punch day after day.

Let us read the newspapers. I do not know who in the administration reads them. But this morning we were told in a feature article written by Mr. Kenworthy, and published in the New York Times—we were told it again—that the State Department itself has released reports that the Soviet Union not only is engaging in a tremendously large foreign-aid program, but also is keeping its promises and is delivering on schedule and is stepping up its economic offensive.

But what is Dwight Eisenhower recommending? Let us stop kidding ourselves, Mr. President. A newspaper headline does not mean that there is a bigger program. Instead, it may mean that we are being fooled.

This budget recommends a $600 million retreat from last year, in terms of the Presidential recommendation. Oh, yes; it is $800 million more than Congress finally appropriated. But the President does not appropriate; he recommends. I suggest that the President recommend a program that is big enough in any area. Then if the Congress makes a mistake or falters, the public will find that out. The public is fed up with a Congress that has put budget ceilings ahead of security. The public is fed up with a Congress and with an

administration that have put a balanced budget ahead of adequate security and power. It is time that we consider that fact.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Minnesota. I wonder whether he realizes that accountants have a little too much to do today with fixing public policies in a time of peril.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I also thank him for his presentation of these matters, because I do not like the budget.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

BUDGET REQUIRES CLOSING TAX LOOPHOLES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have always felt that the greatest compensation I receive from service in my position in the Senate is the education I receive by means of the enlightenment which is bestowed upon me from seminar to seminar, as I carry out my work in the Senate.

This afternoon I have taken one of the most educational seminars of my 13 years in the Senate, as I have listened to three great educational lectures by three of the keenest minds in the Senate. One was given earlier this afternoon by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], as he discussed some of America's problems in agriculture; one was given later in the afternoon by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], as he again brought to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the American people some very pertinent facts which they need to know in regard to the atomic-energy problem which confronts us.

I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have been proud to be associated with him, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and other members of the Senate as for the past several years we have sought to urge upon this administration the need for a crash program for the development of nuclear power. It will be recalled that some time ago I fought here on the floor of the Senate for the building of a pilot plant reactor at Hanford, Wash., only to be roundly criticized as a mere theorist by some of the reactionary press of my State and elsewhere. But I think this afternoon the Senator from Tennessee made a great contribution to our body of knowledge in connection with the atomic-energy needs of the country. I wish to commend him for what I think was an outstanding lecture—one suitable for delivery, let me say, from any college platform in America.

In the last half hour we have listened to a very able analysis of the budget, by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I do not have to tell the Senate that his position in American politics and the recognition that is given him throughout the country as a great constitutional liberal will cause his speech of this afternoon to be heeded from coast to coast.

The day when the President sent to Congress his budget message—and I have taken the time to read it—I knew that here was another manifestation of gross incompetence on the part of the President of the United States. Of course, I recognized that incompetence on Inauguration Day in 1953; my course of action since then has been a consistent one of seeking to awaken my colleagues in the Senate and the people of my country to the need to exercise our powers in the Congress of the United States to check a grossly incompetent administration. This is only the most recent bit of evidence which has been presented to us. But, Mr. President, it will not be the last.

I have always been willing to vote for the appropriation of funds for a demonstrable need to promote the general welfare of my country. I have also urged that we in the Congress do something to stop the favorable discrimination that the President of the United States, through his fiscal policies, has shown big business interests in the country from the very beginning of his administration.

The RECORD will show that I have fought the tax loophole proposals of President Eisenhower. I have felt they have been unjustified.

It is one thing to say that we must vote for increased taxes if we vote for higher appropriations—and I am ready to do that—but only after we have cleaned up the tax program of the Eisenhower administration and adopted a tax program based upon an ability to pay.

We would not have this tax problem, Mr. President, if a coalition had not gone to work in the Senate, when a group of Democrats entered into a coalition with the Republican side of the aisle and let the administration put through this unfair tax program. I hope now that as my colleagues give more and more evidence of their determination to carry the fight to the administration, there will be fewer coalitions and that we will insist that these questions be decided in the interest of the general welfare of the people of this country.

When we rid the tax system of the Eisenhower tax favoritism to big business interests in this country, then the senior Senator from Oregon will be ready to vote for increases in taxes based upon ability to pay; but until we do so I will vote for deficit financing because I do not propose to impose higher taxes upon the little taxpayers of this country—little so far as their economic status is concerned, but big when one considers what they pay in relation to their ability to pay.

PRESS AWAKENING OVERDUE

I wish to make these comments, Mr. President, because I am amused these days by the awakening of the American press, which has done such an effective Pravda job for the Eisenhower administration ever since it took office. By and large, the American press has much to answer for, because in my judgment, if it had carried out the historic responsibilities of journalism in this country, the American people would have had many of the facts that have been kept from them about this administration, and some reforms may have been brought about.

At long last, the Washington Post is beginning to write some editorials that raise some overdue questions as to the competence of the administration.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Pennsylvania placed in the RECORD a recent Washington Post editorial on the President's budget. I note that in the Washington Post of this morning there was an editorial entitled "State of the President," and I ask unanimous consent to have it incorporated at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

STATE OF THE PRESIDENT

It would be encouraging to think that President Eisenhower is as good as new. Unhappily, his news conference yesterday, the first since October 30, did not convey that impression. Mr. Eisenhower appeared to have aged and slowed down as a result of his stroke and other illnesses, and he faltered a good bit in answering questions. One can only admire his dedication and determination to carry out his job; but there is room for concern, too, over his diminished vigor.

In several particulars we thought the President was less than satisfying, despite the constructive general tone of his remarks. The first concerned his letter to Prime Minister Bulganin. Mr. Eisenhower seemed surprised to learn that his letter did not contain an expression of hope that it would receive the same publicity in the Soviet Union that the Bulganin message received here. This, of course, has not been the case; until yesterday, at least, the people of the U. S. S. R. had not learned of the President's letter. This kind of clamp on information is one of the real barriers to a rapprochement with the Soviet Union; it is one of the areas in which the Iron Curtain operates most viciously, and where the Soviet leaders acknowledge their fear of allowing the people to know the truth. With so much at stake, one would think that the President would have made sure that the stricture was in his letter.

A second and not similar point concerned the Gaither report. Mr. Eisenhower said that he would not release the report because it was made to him in confidence. This seems to us an altogether flimsy reason for withholding. This newspaper has enough respect for the distinguished Americans who comprised the panel to think that most of them would welcome publication of their conclusions; some of them, we feel sure, are dismayed that their warnings about the lagging trend of the country's defenses have not received more attention. The President may disagree with them. If so, let him state his disagreements; but let him give the public the whole story. The effect of the administration's performance, whatever the President's wishes, is to indicate that it is afraid to give the people the full facts about the defense peril.

A third point concerned reorganization in the Pentagon. Mr. Eisenhower's desire to avoid cramming through his own conclusions is understandable; but if he is waiting for a meeting of minds in the Defense Establishment, he may wait a long time. The responsibility for advocating necessary improvements is ultimately his; if there are to be changes, he will have to initiate them.

Finally, because of the heavy burdens on the President and his evident frailty, the influence of his advisers has become increasingly important. That is why it is so alarming to see the degree of insulation in which Mr. Eisenhower operates—to see him brush

aside all the mounting protests against Secretary Dulles and cling to him pathetically as the wisest man he knows.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think this editorial is long overdue. I think the editorial writers of the Washington Post should have been writing editorials of this type for quite some time now, because this is nothing new in regard to the condition of the President. It has been obvious, it seems to me, to those who want to see, for quite some time. But I am glad that we are at last beginning to get some objective journalism from the American press, as evidenced, for example, by an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune dealing with the fact that the Soviets are making great headway with their economic offensive in South America. I speak on this subject as chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Relations. It bears out what some of us have tried to tell the Senate in speeches for the past several years with regard to this subject. I have a second editorial from the New York Herald Tribune, entitled "Argentina Looks East." There is no new information in these editorials, but I am glad that the Republican editorial writers of the New York Herald Tribune at last are recognizing some facts of foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 27, 1957]

THE SOVIETS TOUCH A SORE SPOT

The Soviet effort to move in on South American oil development, reported yesterday in this newspaper by Mr. Joseph Newman from Buenos Aires, touches a sore spot in hemispheric relations. Petroleum is the lifeblood of a modern nation. Those countries that do not have sufficient resources of their own in this vital respect, feel dangerously dependent on foreigners and must pay with precious foreign exchange for transfusions of the fluid. But even if petroleum is in the ground, expensive imports of skills and machinery are necessary if it is to be extracted. The long history of "concessions" to foreign capital in underdeveloped lands have made the latter very reluctant to grant the established oil companies rights of exploration and production. On these needs and fears the Soviet Union is prepared to capitalize.

Brazil, for example, where the Soviets are making their first moves through a trading firm called Torgbras, headed by a Brazilian, Col. Tito do Canto, has vested a government corporation, Petrobras, with the exclusive right to develop its petroleum potential. Brazil has had a serious problem with foreign exchange; its purchases of oil products abroad have accounted for some 20 percent of its imports and the use of petroleum products has been growing with the increased industrialization of the country. Petrobras has been sinking wells and building refineries to cut down on this drain of foreign exchange, and the president of Petrobras expresses confidence that by 1960 the government monopoly will produce enough to meet all Brazil's needs. This is challenged by many, in and out of Brazil. In any case, unless alien oil companies are to be taken into partnership for oil development, Petrobras will need large sums for extracting and refining machinery.

In most areas of Brazil's growing industry, foreign capital, private and public, has been welcomed. But petroleum is a hot political issue; the nationalists, both of the right and of the left (including the Communists), are intensely opposed to any weakening of Petrobras' position. The general policy of the United States has been to encourage private enterprise in the hemisphere, and the relaxation of Government controls over industry and finance. Petrobras thus has received no help from the American Government, and the transactions between American equipment and machinery manufacturers and the Brazilians have been on a straight commercial basis.

Now the Soviet Union which has no objections to government-operated industries—quite the contrary—has offered to supply Brazil with the drills, refining equipment, and other necessaries of a burgeoning industry. In other parts of the world the U. S. S. R. has, for political purposes, made economic arrangements that include long credits and barter deals for the commodities of the purchasing country, placing little or no immediate strain on foreign exchange. If the negotiations with Brazil are successful, the Soviets would have won friends among the Brazilian nationalists, established close liaison with, if not a measure of control over, the Brazilian oil industry, and be ready to extend operations to lands with a similar problem, such as Argentina and Chile.

It would be, of course, a major tragedy if this should occur. There is a long tradition of close friendship between the United States and Brazil, and American investment in that country has been heavy. Certainly no objections to Petrobras as a Government corporation should interfere with assistance to Brazil in this critical area of its economy. The American belief that private enterprise could do the job more efficiently is well founded in experience. But the emotions of nationalism are not amenable to argument. The United States cannot give the Soviets the keys to South America to prove its point.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 4, 1958]

ARGENTINA LOOKS EAST

It is bad enough that the free world has so bungled things as to allow a Soviet penetration of the Middle East. It would be catastrophic if we now witlessly abet a Soviet penetration of Latin America. But there are already signs of this happening. More than a week ago, our Joseph Newman reported the activities of a firm offering Soviet autos, oil drilling rigs, and other goods to Brazil. Brazil, like Argentina and Chile, believes that United States credits for such purposes have been withheld because Washington wishes to encourage private enterprise, and the South American countries favor government monopolies in certain areas of the economy. Now comes the natural result of Washington's coyness and Moscow's offers—Argentina is sending an economic mission to the U. S. S. R. next week. Brazil, Uruguay, and Colombia may follow suit.

To open South America to Soviet economic penetration, for so academic a reason as encouraging private enterprise in countries which are determined to keep certain industries in government hands, is stupid. Latin America generally feels that it has been given the short end of the stick in the disposition of United States economic aid. It is especially resentful of any effort by Washington to shape policies through such aid. Much damage has already been done, as the Argentine mission to Moscow makes clear. No more can be permitted to occur. Our relations with South America are so close and so important as to demand the instant correction of anything that weakens hemispheric unity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, following the editorials which I introduced from the Washington Post and the New York Herald Tribune, a remarkably critical editorial, for this newspaper, the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., which has given my State many an Eisenhower snowstorm editorial. The editorial is entitled "Impression of Weakness."

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

IMPRESSION OF WEAKNESS

The NATO report by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles to the people of America by television Monday night misfired so badly that there must be consternation in Washington and other NATO capitals on this Christmas day.

The contrived format of the show; the spectacle of two tired, aging men talking about the gravely compromised half-measures which both bind and separate America from its European allies, in falsely casual tones, without any air of great conviction, and with the President permitting Dulles to monopolize the program with a long monolog, then summarizing by reading a statement of generalities—all these added up to the worst public relations job in memory on issues of such importance to the United States and survival of non-Communist nations.

The sense of what they were trying to say—and most of it was sound enough—was lost to TV viewers dismayed by the physical appearance of the President, his face in profile for most of the time as Dulles droned on; the seeming vigor he displayed in public appearances in Paris entirely absent; the power and confidence he can convey to an audience coming through only at fleeting intervals. Ike's profile showed the toll of illness and bone weariness. At a time when the Western World desperately desires the President to take full and vigorous leadership, he sat and listened to a Secretary of State whose tireless capabilities have been frustrated, diminished by the rigidity of his crusader's mind.

Instead of the President's springing back into command, thus to assure free people that the NATO conference really was more fruitful than it appeared on the surface, Mr. Eisenhower sat back and allowed Secretary Dulles—whom, in effect, he had overruled in accepting the Paris compromises—to interpret, even to dissemble a bit, to repeat the tired theme of Soviet faithlessness, to make it appear that the NATO nations are in full accord, when, in fact, they have settled almost none of their deep disagreements.

Neither the President nor the Secretary even hinted at the economic sacrifices, the social and political readjustments, which the American people must accept if this Nation is to meet the Soviet challenge either by strengthening NATO or by perilous and far more costly withdrawal accompanied by massive, unilateral armament.

In rejecting the banal Soviet proposal for unlimited, all-nations U. N. debate, after Soviet scoffing of NATO's suggestion of a foreign ministers' meeting on disarmament, neither Eisenhower nor Dulles gave any hope for an alternative to massive armament.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall continue to support the President on any issue on which I think he is right, but this is one Senator whose criticism will not be silenced because there are those who think it is not good politics to tell the American people the realities

as to what is going on in this administration.

THE BUDGET

Mr. President, in connection with the budget, I wish to raise a question or two. I shall vote for whatever dollar amount is demonstrated, after the Appropriation Committee has considered the request of the administration, to be needed for defense. But after 13 years in the Senate I have come to expect a repetition of a stereotyped pattern in the Senate. Mr. President, whenever the Pentagon Building is ready for another raid on public funds, we should get ready for a great deal of scare propaganda. The old mills of propaganda for stirring up the hysteria of public opinion will turn it out overtime.

I do not doubt the fact that we are in a dangerous position. But we had better keep calm in this situation and not sit here as rubber stamps, giving approval to every budgetary request made by the Pentagon Building through the White House in connection with the defense program. I think we had better question how much padding there may be in such a request. I remember that in the Congress a few years ago we passed a bill, of which I was proud to be author. It was unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. I was a member of the committee at that time. It was a bill sponsored by the American Legion. It was a bill that the Hoover Commission and the Committee on Economic Development said would save millions of dollars. My recollection is it was said that it would save an estimated $2 billion. It was a bill that provided for the centralization of the purchasing operations of the Pentagon Building. The RECORD will show that we brought out in the hearings almost unbelievable waste in the purchasing of military supplies.

It will be recalled that last year, in the debate on appropriations, I asked for a progress report on what had been happening in the carrying out of the law, because it is the law. The Pentagon had not yet finished its cataloging, to say nothing of putting the law into effect. The Pentagon said it had to finish its cataloging first.

Mr. President, there is tremendous waste going on year in and year out in the Pentagon Building, and there is no dispute as to the facts of it. The President of the United States was elected to that office, in part at least, because of the general claim made by his supporters at the time that we needed a President who was a military expert and who could knock some heads together at the Pentagon Building. We have been waiting for that. What do we have concerning his activity to end jurisdictional disputes in the Pentagon? A reply to the effect that he hesitates to do it, because he does not want to use his position to do it. I say to the President of the United States that he owes it to the people of the United States to do it. It is one reason why they elected him, and it is about time he got on the job of doing it. He cannot do it off the job, either. It is a full-time job, and this is one of the most important tasks confronting him. It involves great savings, amounting to billions of dollars, which can be made for the benefit of the taxpayers, if the President of the United States will take the steps necessary to carry out the law already on the books to centralize military purchasing.

Thus, one can proceed ad infinitum with a bill of particulars against this administration, proving what I have said so many times, and repeat today. It can best be described as a grossly incompetent administration, one not working for the best interests of the people of this country.

THE FARM MESSAGE

The message we received today on agriculture, as I turn to a brief statement on it, is but further evidence of a lack of understanding on the part of the President of the United States as to what has happened in our country.

The farm message of the Eisenhower administration reflects a policy of destroying the ability of small farmers to continue on the land. The administration's theory is to force small farmers by an economic squeeze into congested urban areas where they will join the ranks of the unemployed and unskilled labor. This is a faithful carrying out of the big business philosophy which seeks to transform our family farms, traditionally the backbone of American agriculture, into factories in the fields.

Secretary Benson recently pointed out that 56 percent of our farmers produce only 9 percent of our farm commodities. Yet I note from the census figures that these 56 percent of our farm families live on 24 percent of our farmland. If the Eisenhower administration should be successful in transferring the land from the small to the factory-type operation by driving the small operator into the city one inevitable result would be an even greater production of surplus commodities.

The President had some grisly news in his farm message for the REA cooperatives too. If the REA's are forced to swallow the sugar-coated strychnine pill of private financing, they will die by the scores as a result of interest-rate increases and skyrocketing overhead charges.

The message promises to work diligently for lower price supports to the farmer. Translated this means lower prices at the farm gate for the unit of food or fiber sold. To get the same cash income, it forces increased production. Another factor that should be noted is that production costs have gone up at the same time as the cost to the farmer of consumer goods he uses has risen. In 1952 it took 76 bushels of wheat at $2.14 a bushel to pay for a 4-burner gas stove that cost $163. In 1957 to buy the same stove at $175 the Oregon farmer had to sell 85 bushels of wheat at $2.07 a bushel.

In 1952, 9 head of milk cows would buy a tractor, in 1957 it took 17 head.

The administration is shedding some crocodile tears over the plight of the small farmer in the message, but it fails to say that under Eisenhower the interest rates of Farmers Home Administration loans for farm ownership have risen from 4 percent in 1952 to 4½ percent now. Soil and water loans are up from 3 percent to 4½ percent.

The facts as to what this administration has done to scuttle the interests of the small farmers of America speak for themselves.

As I close my comment on the farm message, I wish to say that I shall be very much interested in seeing what kind of sugar-coated pill the Eisenhower administration will try to feed the farmers for their political swallowing in the 1958 campaign. My judgment is that they have swallowed all the Eisenhower pills they intend to swallow. In 1958 this administration will start getting a very clear answer from the farmers for the way it has betrayed its trust to the farm population of this country.

Mr. President, I now turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

ALLEGED CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I seek to do justice to a group of doctors who feel that the senior Senator from Oregon has done them an injustice in the past, and I shall do so by way of explaining the history of this incident, and I shall ask to have certain items printed in the RECORD.

On August 21, 1957, by request, I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of monographs in regard to antivivisection.

These materials were supplied by individuals who are genuinely concerned over the possibility that inhumane practices are followed in many instances in the dissection of animals for research purposes by medical scientists.

One of the items inserted in the August 21, 1957, RECORD referred to an experiment conducted by Prof. Fred R. Griffith, Jr., of the University of Buffalo, and his associate, Charles H. Whitcher.

Professor Griffith immediately protested the printing of the comments of this antivivisection group and supplied me with a copy of his report of the experiment as it was published in the American Journal of Physiology in January 1949. I asked to have it printed in the September 29, 1957, issue of the RECORD, because I thought common courtesy called for such action.

Before inserting the monographs supplied by those who oppose vivisection, I made it clear that I am not an antivivisectionist; that there should not be useless experimentation, and that such experiments on animals as are performed should be conducted in the most humane manner possible. In addition, I pointed out that I knew nothing about the facts, true or alleged, which were set forth in the antivivisection materials, but that the people who requested their insertion in the RECORD were entitled to have these publications available for the reading of Senators.

They were responsible people. They were sincere people. They have very deep convictions in regard to the question of experimentation on animals, and in a democracy they have the right to petition their Government. When all

is said and done, the insertion of material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a form of petitioning the Government.

Mr. President, an important item that was overlooked by several medical scientists when they protested so vigorously my placing of those items in the RECORD, is the fact that under our system of government people have the right to express views that are not popular. I hope the day never comes when the opposite is true. Under the Constitution these same people have the right to have their points of view considered by the legislative branch of the Federal Government. The insertion of their materials by request merely implemented their right to be heard. It will be a sad day for our Nation if fear of vigorous criticism or political reprisals ever deters a United States Senator from placing materials in the RECORD when he deems it proper to do so.

By the same token, the medical scientists whose animal research activities were protested by the antivivisection group are entitled to be heard on their side of the case, and to use equally vigorous terms in retorting.

Mr. President, that is why I offered Professor Griffith the same courtesy that had been given to those who protested his experiments. I told him I would place in the RECORD any comments he might care to submit. He accepted my suggestion and has submitted a rebuttal letter dated October 8, 1957.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Griffith's letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSIOLOGY,
UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO,
Buffalo, N. Y., October 8, 1957.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator, the Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On August 21 of this year you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a reprint of a leaflet put out by the National Humane Association of Chicago (an antivivisection outfit) which very seriously misinterpreted a report of an animal experiment which a student of mine and I had published in the American Journal of Physiology, volume 156, No. 1, January 1949, under the title "A Possible Role of the Skin in the Effect of Adrenaline on Body Temperature and Respiratory Metabolism". The gist of the experiment, to make a long story short, consisted of testing the effect of adrenaline injected into cats that were perfectly normal, except for being anesthetized, and then later after the effect of this first injection had worn off another similar injection was given after the animal, still completely anesthetized, had had most of its skin removed. To a layman, unacquainted with the long and complex effort to come to an understanding of how the powerful hormone adrenaline produces the many of its important effects, this may seem a very superficial and silly thing to have done; although I assure you it actually proved to be very important in its result. The misinterpretation referred to above, however, had to do with the truth and veracity of our claim that the animals were properly anesthetized; and this, in turn, was due to our use of the anesthetic dial-urethane for this purpose, the National Humane Association claiming that dial (and overlooking the urethane) is not an anesthetic but merely a soporific which would not have made the animals painless in surgical anesthesia but merely sleepy and groggy. It is true that in human medical use dial is usually used merely as a soporific (sleeping pill) to produce sleep and not for surgical, painless anesthesia; but the difference is merely one of dosage as any physiologist, pharmacologist, or properly trained physician knows. Some anesthetics are so powerful in their action and have such narrow limits of safety that they are not safe in the untrained hand of the layman; but dial can be safely used in small amounts as a sleeping pill; larger doses—and especially when combined with an unequivocal anesthetic such as urethane—produce complete, painless, surgical anesthesia. When I brought this to your attention in a protest against republication of the misinterpreting leaflet of the National Humane Association in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, your reply was that you felt bound to give equal recognition to both sides of controversial questions. This is an unexceptional attitude and is highly to be commended; the only difficulty of applying it here, however, is that you, as a layman, could not know that there is no real controversy involved; there are no pros and cons to be balanced against each other and debated. Dial-urethane as used by us does produce, as we reported, deep, painless, surgical anesthesia; any statement to the contrary is simply untrue. It's as simple as this: If I had done an experiment, in reporting which it would be necessary to make the statement that "fire can be made to cause a burn" you, as a layman, would know from experience, I was telling the truth; so, if some organization that was opposed to the kind of experiment I had made and, wishing to disparage both me and my kind of work, came out with a brochure to the effect that "fire cannot cause a burn," you, I am sure, from universal experience, would recognize its error and, I am also sure, would not feel compelled to give it the status of space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an opposing side of a controversial issue. The only difference between the real controversy at issue here and this hypothetical one is: Everybody knows fire can cause a burn; on the other hand, perhaps only a few hundred specially trained experts in all the world know the fine points about many unusual anesthetics; therefore many people can be easily fooled by a pretentious statement by a seemingly authoritative organization. I would, therefore, have no real objection for the statement "fire cannot burn" to be republished in the RECORD because nobody would really ever be fooled; but every time the erroneous statement of the National Humane Association about my work is taken up and republished a great many people are taken in by it and I immediately receive another batch of scurrilous and usually anonymous letters condemning me for my implied brutality—which doesn't really matter; and animal experimentation is given a black eye for an entirely false and erroneous reason—which matters a very great deal. There may be plenty of sound, high, moral and ethical arguments about animal experimentation which deserve debate and consideration pro and con impartially; but to confuse the uninstructed lay public by broadcasting a technically abstruse but entirely real error is not, I think, being impartial or fair. Dial-urethane is a perfectly reliable general anesthetic when used as we used it.

Yours,

FRED R. GRIFFITH, Jr.,
Emeritus Professor of Physiology.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, several weeks after I inserted, by request, certain material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21, 1957, on the subject of alleged cruelty to animals in medical research, I received a very strongly worded letter of criticism from a Mr. Ralph Rohweder, executive secretary of the National Society for Medical Research. I ask unanimous consent that this letter, dated September 27, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH,
Chicago, Ill., September 27, 1957.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In recent weeks I have received letters of anguish and anger from persons in the medical sciences. They are disturbed that you should have used your influence to aggravate the scurrilous libel against more than 100 of America's distinguished medical scientists published originally by the National Antivivisection Society and its pseudonym, the National Humane Education Association.

The antivivisection propaganda you had reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was issued in pamphlet form beginning in 1949. The distortions in this material were exposed in a series of side-by-side comparisons published in the Bulletin for Medical Research beginning in September 1950.

While you specifically disclaimed any knowledge of the facts, can you really escape responsibility for throwing the mud still farther?

As I recall, the expression "McCarthyism" refers to character assassination with unproved accusations. What is it to have published a series of attacks on individual scientists when you "know nothing of the facts, true or alleged, set forth in the material"?

I am enclosing copies of some of the articles that appeared 5 to 7 years ago clarifying the antivivisectionist distortions.

Time has, however, made these refutations all too modest. It is the nature of basic research to seem impractical at the time. Like living things, the seeds of basic research take time to flower and bear fruit.

We know now, for example, that Dr. Ivy's work on artificial respiration revealed that the method then prevalent was almost totally useless. Thousands of victims of drowning and electric shock were dying simply because the prevalent method of artificial respiration would not even produce sufficient tidal volumes of air to maintain life. As a result of the work by the Ivy group at the University of Illinois, a new effective method of artificial respiration has been adopted by the Red Cross, the Boy Scouts and other such agencies throughout the world.

Another piece of research excoriated by the antivivisectionists gave us the most effective chemotherapeutic substances so far discovered for use against cancer. This was research on the purines at the Sloan Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, New York.

These are but two examples. Other research subjected to public scorn by you has already saved thousands of lives.

I realize that a Senator is urged to act in some way on hundreds of matters for which he has insufficient time to become informed. It would seem reasonable, however, to avoid actions to defame the character of individuals unless there is time to become reasonably confident of the grounds.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH A. ROHWEDER,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a reading of Mr. Rohweder's letter makes it quite evident that he did not have a com-

plete understanding of the obligations and functions of a United States Senator in making known the views of fellow American citizens, particularly where they are in opposition to Mr. Rohweder's views. Consequently, I replied to Mr. Rohweder supplying him with the information that he lacked, and at the same time I offered to do exactly what my colleagues in the Senate would have done under similar circumstances; namely, I informed him that I would give him and his associates the same courtesy in making their views known in reply to the antivivisection groups.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a copy of a letter dated October 16, 1957, containing my reply to Mr. Rohweder.

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

OCTOBER 16, 1957.

Mr. RALPH A. ROHWEDER,
Executive Secretary, National Society for Medical Research, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. ROHWEDER: Your letter of September 27 arrived in my office on October 8. Had you thought about the subject of your letter at greater length, I believe you would have delayed mailing it much longer. In fact, I have a hunch that you would have replaced it with a letter that demonstrates an elementary knowledge of the democratic process. A friend in Oregon also sent a copy of your emotional mimeographed sheet directed against me.

I read with amusement your silly assertion to the effect that it was something akin to McCarthyism for me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21 certain materials expressing the views of an antivivisection group. Your assertion demonstrates that you were guided principally by your adrenal glands in issuing this diatribe.

What you failed to comprehend is a very fundamental concept of our democracy; namely, that the people have the right to express points of view that may not be popular. This is one of the great strengths of our democracy. In inserting the materials that appear in the August 21 RECORD I made available for the reading of Senators the position of the group that opposes vivisection and as I indicated in my remarks preceding this insertion, I am not an antivivisectionist.

When a Senator inserts material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by request, he does not sponsor it. Under those circumstances he extends an accommodation to individuals or groups who ask for the insertion of material that they believe, from their point of view, should reach the attention of Members of the Congress through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If you sat in my seat in the Senate, you would soon discover that there are many people or organizations who hold to points of view quite different from your own, but who, in a democracy, are entitled to be heard and have their petitions considered by the legislative branch of the Federal Government. This is one of the rights they enjoy under the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States. When they ask the elected representatives to insert materials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they are exercising one of the methods of petitioning their Government.

The whole tenor of your intemperate letter and mimeographed sheet indicates that you have little understanding of the nature of a Senator's obligation to represent all segments of society, including those who disagree with you and your associates.

What you fail to understand is that by inserting the antivivisectionist's views I did not underwrite their position. Let me make it clear to you that their point of view is not going to be silenced by trying to drop some sort of iron curtain of censorship between them and the public. To the contrary, if their allegations are baseless the only way they are going to be silenced is by the publication of the facts. I think you should recognize the importance of being prepared at all times to meet the attacks of the antivivisectionists. The issue they have raised is one that cannot be killed and buried, because it will not remain dead.

By way of contrast to your outbursts, I plan to do for your group exactly what I did for the antivivisectionists. I shall publish in an early issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 1958, the 10 articles attached to your letter entitled "The Scientist's Version," in answer to a portion of the items I inserted for the National Humane Education Association. In that connection, I note the comment in your September 27 letter, "Time has, however, made these refutations all too modest." If you wish to supplement or revise any of these articles before I insert them, I shall be glad to hear from you and will cooperate in every way possible.

Upon checking the August 21 daily RECORD and the materials you supplied, I note that you have not submitted items to refute the following leaflets: the first on page A-6891, those appearing on page A-6892, the second on page A-6893, the first on page A-6894, the first on page A-6895, those on pages A-6896 and A-6898, the second on page A-6899, that on page A-6900, those on pages A-6901, A-6902, A-6903, and A-6904. If you wish to forward replies to these I shall see to it that they are also inserted in the RECORD.

Prof. Fred R. Griffith, Jr., supplied a reply to the leaflet appearing as the third item on page A-6691. It will be published in the January RECORD.

In closing, let me assure you that I shall never let criticism or reprisals of the type set forth in your letter and mimeographed sheet dissuade me from publishing the views of any group that may be unpopular to you or your organization, in the event I deem it appropriate to make these views known through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Rohweder not only sent a scorching letter to me, but he became remarkably active in sending into Oregon and elsewhere certain material roundly criticizing me for having given the forum of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to those with whom he is in disagreement. All in all, it would appear that Mr. Rohweder is not an exponent of dignified silence as a method of showing disdain for the antivivisectionists or for those who insert their materials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am pleased to report, however, that Mr. Rohweder accepted my invitation to insert in the RECORD, by way of reply to the antivivisection materials, the explanations of the scientists working in these instances.

His letter of January 8, 1958, setting forth his own additional comments, is less vitriolic than his former correspondence, and I would be less than human if I did not appreciate that fact.

I ask unanimous consent that his January 8 letter be inserted at this point in my remarks in order that the scientists who criticized the antivivisectionist material that appeared in the RECORD on August 21, 1957, may have a fair opportunity to set forth their rebuttal of the charges leveled against them.

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

NATIONAL SOCIETY
FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH,
Chicago, Ill., January 8, 1958.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: The scientists named in the antivivisectionist tracts published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have responded gratefully to your offer to present their explanations of their work. However, as tends to be the case when many people are involved, we still do not have all the documents.

We shall send them all to you shortly.

Naturally I am sorry that I did not convey to you clearly enough the philosophy of our objection to the publication of the antivivisectionists documents.

Of course antivivisectionists have a right to express their views. No one, certainly not this society, objects to honest expression of antivivisection opinions. There is, however, one obligation associated with freedom of speech in America. The person who specifically defames the character of another must know what he is talking about.

In other words, abstract opinion enjoys almost complete license but specific, damaging charges against individuals must be backed by evidence.

This is why it seemed to me so anomalous for you, especially, to publish a collection of personal attacks with the comment: "I know nothing of the facts, true or alleged, which are set forth in this material."

It may not satisfy you one bit to know that perhaps my over-strong reaction was due to the very degree of my respect for your identification with the great, warm humanitarian principles of the American law.

This is the psychological phenomenon that make breaches between friends and breaks in families especially emotional.

I sincerely hope that we may soon wash out the bad products of hasty action and hasty reaction.

Sincerely,

RALPH A. ROHWEDER,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am asking unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain monographs explaining the experiments by the medical scientists upon animals, and setting forth their rebuttals to the antivivisection monographs previously mentioned. I think these scientists are entitled to have this material available for the reading of Senators in exactly the same manner as the antivivisection materials were made available.

Mr. Rohweder has not supplied answers to all the materials I placed in the RECORD on August 21, but he has my assurance that they will be inserted in the RECORD when received. If for any reason I cannot get unanimous consent to have them inserted in the RECORD I want him to know that I will stand on the floor and read them into the RECORD.

NUCLEAR PROPULSION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the people of America have so much interest in the possibilities of a satellite, a space ship, or even a long-range intercontinental ballistic missile that I feel it important that there be some discussion of the

progress we are making in the general field of nuclear propulsion as it might be related to missiles or satellites.

To begin, we would of necessity be discussing what has been called Project Rover. This is the code name for our project for nuclear rockets to propel long range missiles and possibly satellites. I want to make an attempt to indicate what happened to slow down Project Rover, why we are not making very much headway in the study of nuclear propulsion as far as missiles, airplanes, and satellites are concerned, and what we may do to increase the tempo of our activities in this very important field.

This is not an attempt to become involved in arguments as to the politics that may, or may not, be involved in nuclear propulsion. I am going to try to recite the facts, and people can make their own political conclusions from them. Personally, I think we will be better off if we avoid some of the political discussion that could be indulged in, and devote our time to deciding what steps America must take if we are not to lose both the psychological and the military values that are involved in this whole program.

I want to go back to July 1956. At that time Project Rover was adequately financed for the ensuing fiscal year 1957, involving many millions of dollars for construction and operations.

I might say that it is a little embarrassing to keep saying that it was adequately financed by a satisfactory number of millions of dollars. I regret that it is not possible to break down the classification placed on this program, so that the American people may get some idea of the size of the work involved. The program carries a classification tag, even though it seems to me we are not fooling anyone with it but the American people.

We had had a problem in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Atomic Energy Commission had appeared in a special meeting in late June, had testified that it needed some additional money for construction, and had received over $9 million in additional funds through the following steps:

On June 22, 1957 the Atomic Energy Commission came up before the joint committee, at the AEC's own request, to ask for the added $9 million which they said was urgently needed to push ahead the Rover program. In response to this urgent plea the joint committee immediately approved authorization of the extra funds and I remember that I personally made a special visit to the Senate Appropriations Committee the same day, I think it was a Saturday, to ask that the money be made available to AEC. The Appropriations Committee duly approved this request and the money was appropriated.

I cite that because there are some people who say that Congress is responsible for the slowdown of many of these projects. The Atomic Energy Commission came before us at a special meeting one morning, and it placed its recommendation before the Committee on Appropriations the same day.

It is my understanding that the initial AEC request for operating funds for fiscal year 1957 was cut down by about $4 million. Of course, we were then going through a period of study, and were attempting to learn what the future of nuclear propulsion would be insofar as ballistic missiles and satellites might be concerned.

At that time, Mr. Eger Murphree, connected with the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, was a guided missile czar. At least that was his title. He appointed a committee under the chairmanship of General Loper, who is chief of the Military Liaison Committee. There were 10 members on the committee:

Herbert B. Loper, chairman, Nuclear Rocket Propulsion Committee, Assistant Secretary of Defense—Atomic Energy.

J. B. Macauley, special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Research and Development.

J. H. Sides, rear admiral, United States Navy, Deputy to the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Guided Missiles.

Dr. Clark Goodman, assistant director for technical operations, Atomic Energy Commission.

A. R. Luedecke, major general, United States Air Force, chief, Armed Forces Special Weapons Project.

Leland S. Stranathan, major general, United States Air Force, director of development planning, DCS/DEV.

D. J. Keirn, major general, United States Air Force, chief, Aircraft Reactors Branch, Atomic Energy Commission.

Dr. Herbert F. York, director, University of California Radiation Laboratory, Livermore.

Dr. Homer J. Stewart, California Institute of Technology.

Mr. Allen F. Donovan, Ramo-Wooldridge Corp.

The terms of reference of the Loper committee were to determine the prospects of meeting the original requirement for testing the rocket's nuclear powerplant by a certain date within the next few years. The exact date, I am told by the Defense Department, must still remain classified. It is a little difficult to show how this subject was postponed; nevertheless, it is still classified.

The Loper committee made a report and I am not desirous of questioning in any way the wisdom of that report. I do, however, point out that they indulged in a somewhat difficult task. They were charged with the responsibility of determining the prospects of the application of nuclear propulsion to an intercontinental ballistic missile, and to discharge that responsibility, the committee felt that its members should compare the potentials of nuclear propulsion and chemical propulsion devices, which might become available in the same time period. That was a pretty tough assignment.

We knew a lot about chemical propulsion because we had had a good many tests of small chemical devices, and when the Loper committee attempted to predict from these early tests what the properties and capabilities of a superchemical fuel might be in a couple of years, there was no assurance that the estimates were to be correct. The committee members merely did the best that they could to determine what might be the final estimate of propulsion by a superchemical not yet developed, and the qualities of which were not known.

On the other hand, they also had to estimate how nuclear rocket propulsion might work. And this was a shot in the dark. We had never attempted to develop the extremely high temperatures which would naturally accompany nuclear propulsion. Likewise, we had no device in which we had tried to check its lift properties. So in the end, the Loper committee had to guess how a nuclear rocket propulsion device might work. And I do not criticize it for guessing, because that was the purpose of its appointment. In any event, the Loper committee concluded that the AEC should engage in a "prompt effort to demonstrate the technical feasibility" of the project by a specified date within the next several years and should continue at the then existing rate and scale of effort.

To illustrate the difficulty, I was discussing the subject with an expert who had participated in the work, and he said to me, "We were asked to compare oranges with lemons, even though we had never seen the lemons."

At an earlier time in one of our hearings, I developed the fact that project Rover, which is the nuclear rocket propulsion project, was decelerated by the Department of Defense, and that it was the decision of Mr. Murphree to cut back the Rover program even before a formal Loper report was issued. This was discussed at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on January 28, 1957.

I therefore wish to point out that Mr. Murphree, who had spent his life with chemicals and chemical fuels, and gasoline and similar substances, cut back Project Rover before the Loper committee had given him advice as to whether or not Project Rover should be cut back.

I think we need to bear in mind that the decision of Secretary of Defense Wilson did not carry out the recommendation of the Loper committee. In fact, General Loper was not even consulted before the decision was made. The report was ignored by Mr. Murphree and a letter, dated January 12, 1957, was prepared to the AEC for Secretary Wilson's signature which largely negated the original requirement which had been received from the Department of Defense, and established a requirement to demonstrate the feasibility of nuclear propulsion for an application not yet really known. No time was indicated when this should be done, and the words "a modest effort" were used instead of the recommendation that it be done promptly. In other words, there is a big change from a prompt determination to a modest effort to check it out.

The Department of Defense could help clear up this whole situation if it would release the Loper report. I believe that the original requirement was to demonstrate the feasibility of an engine involving nuclear propulsion on a short time scale. I think that the present goal is far from that. We hope to see a first preliminary test of one of the devices in

the next year or two and if it works, we can then proceed to move on to other tests. It will be well into the 1960's before there is a real test of the powerplant that might be used in nuclear propulsion. In any event, the target dates for the project have had to be moved back—and by that I mean delayed—at least 2 years, and maybe more.

This cutback had its significance in the dollars that were assigned to this sort of work. The flow of fiscal 1957 funds for AEC work in nuclear rocket propulsion was held back by the Bureau of the Budget pending the Loper report. That meant that from July, 1956 until January, 1957 the Bureau of the Budget withheld almost all the operating and construction funds allocated for this work. This involved many millions of dollars. Now they allowed some money during this holdup period. They allowed the AEC group interested in the rocket program to go ahead on a month to month ration, but they were not allowed to spend any of the construction money, except $1 million, which went into the laboratory at Livermore, Calif., and there was a little money that went into the design of certain facilities for the Nevada Proving Grounds. But this money for design work was in reality wasted because AEC could not subsequently use the plans which had been prepared and had to junk them and take an entirely new set of plans and go to work.

In the early part of January, 1957 the Bureau of the Budget on the basis of the letter from Secretary Wilson saying that "a modest effort" should be made, reduced the construction funds $10 million from the total appropriated by the Congress and approved by the President. Well, a million dollars had already been spent at Livermore, so that had to be subtracted from the remaining funds. The operating funds at that time were cut by nearly $6 million. That, of course, meant that the work could not proceed at both Livermore and Los Alamos, and the AEC therefore had to choose the laboratory that seemed to have the most capability and the best approach to the problem, and cut out work on Project Rover at the other laboratory. The decision was reached to go ahead at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory and assign certain other work to the Livermore laboratory. There just was not enough money for both laboratories to operate, and I want to suggest now that I think it would have been well if both laboratories had been allowed to proceed.

Anyhow, Project Rover was assigned to the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory the end of January 1957, and another related project under a classified code name was assigned to Livermore.

I regret that some newspaper people have cited to me the code name, but I still cannot use it. Incidentally, this is a very promising project, and nothing should be allowed to interfere with the progress that is being made and can be made on that. The money that had been spent at Livermore, and the group of people who had been brought together for Project Rover at Livermore were identically the kind of facilities and the types of people needed in this other classified project and, therefore, the effort which was going on at Livermore on Project Rover could be, and was, successfully and properly diverted to work on this project, and this was done and I think successfully.

The budget for fiscal 1958 did not allow any more funds for construction for Rover because of the late date of getting started on the 1957 funds. Obviously, since the Atomic Energy Commission could not commit all these funds in the few remaining months of fiscal year 1957, asking for more funds for fiscal year 1958, which obviously could not be spent, would have been a little absurd. The AEC was allowed an operating budget for fiscal 1958 which was a little less than that for fiscal 1957. The ground rules for 1959, which were indicated to AEC, were that efforts were to be carried on at approximately the same level as 1958. The net result has been the moving back or delaying of the target date for demonstration of feasibility by at least 2 years from that which was set out in the directive to the Loper committee.

Now I have had it reported to me that the AEC had planned to accelerate the Project Rover expenditures and had planned to use for fiscal 1958 about $20 million more than has actually been allotted. I believe that the planning experts, or those in charge of the program at AEC, would admit that that was about the 1958 figure which they hoped to reach. Of course, Livermore was included in the program at that time and when the Bureau of the Budget clamped down unilaterally in January 1957, AEC's original planning figure was completely unrealistic and, therefore, it had to be abandoned.

I know we have a fiscal 1959 budget before us, and I suppose that the dollars for the Rover program will be carried in that somewhere and will be revealed in time to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and to other proper members of the Congress. But it undoubtedly will not request added authorization for construction money because the original authorization which was in the 1957 budget has never been withdrawn from the books. The AEC has a $10 million authorization left over from the previous cutbacks, and if they go ahead with their present plans, this construction work will probably stay well within the authorization figure.

I do not wish to be understood as saying that there are no other funds for the nuclear propelled rocket program because the Air Force does have some money for this purpose. In 1957 it was authorized to spend a few million dollars and then again in 1958 an additional few million dollars on the studies and development of airframes, tanks, pumps, and so forth, associated with the nuclear propelled rocket. AEC will probably not have the responsibility for the airframe that undoubtedly should belong with the Air Force, but these groups have been working well together, and I think that they will probably continue to get along very nicely.

The important point for some of us to remember is that a missile to go to the moon, for example, or a vehicle to travel in outer space, cannot just be suddenly concocted out of a bucket load of chemicals. I do not hesitate to say that on the basis of information I have gathered from scientists, I do not believe we will ever have a missile capable of going to the moon and back again unless it be nuclear propelled. Bear in mind that it will take about 3 million pounds of lift, according to those who have done some calculating, to get off the ground a missile that is capable of going to the moon. If that estimate is accurate, we now have no engines that will give anywhere near that amount, even when you group a great battery of them together in a single device like the Atlas, and if we cannot get more than that from the Atlas engines, we would surely have a hard time in building a chemically fired engine that would give a lift of 3 million pounds. So when people talk about putting manned missiles or space vehicles on the moon, they are probably talking about waiting until we attain nuclear rocket propulsion, and that is why it is important to speed up nuclear propulsion in this country.

I cannot speak here of the comparative strength of a nuclear engine of this size because the lift of our largest chemical rocket engine is still classified.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not nuclear energy possess certain other characteristics which chemical fuels do not possess, and which would cause it to be an effective—perhaps the only effective—source of energy to be used in the areas beyond the earth's atmosphere?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee, who has certainly been a diligent member of the committee in trying to examine these questions, that it possesses certain qualities which are very valuable.

Many of us who have been down under the sea in the *Nautilus* were impressed by the fact that the *Nautilus*, once launched under an icecap, can navigate under it for months, if need be, before returning to discharge its passengers.

One man in the *Nautilus* said, one evening, when a group of us were aboard, "If you wanted to test the real capability of the *Nautilus*, the only thing which need ever bring it back to harbor would be the necessity for allowing the sailors to reenlist." The *Nautilus* could stay under the sea, as it has done, and cross the oceans indefinitely.

The same general qualities apply to a nuclear-propelled projectile, when we once have it. We will not only put it up in the sky, but we will be able to keep it there for a long time, if we desire to do so.

Furthermore, in the case of intercontinental ballistic missiles, we all recognize that if a missile is to be fired with a relatively low trajectory and is designed to hit a target of an area of only 5 miles, the problem is much more difficult than one in which the missile can be tossed into a higher trajectory and be brought

down again, as in the case of a nuclear rocket.

Anyone who doubts this should try to toss a basketball into a wastebasket.

This high trajectory possibility has attracted the attention of scientists who are greatly interested in nuclear propulsion for the intercontinental ballistic missile. There are other interesting situations which arise in connection with the ICBM—and to which I shall refer later.

A three-stage weapon is a very cumbersome object to put into the air. Its weight—that of the heavy warhead and the three heavy engines—is so great that the delicate machinery inside might have a tendency to fail. One little valve caused trouble in one of our missiles the other day.

The Senator from Tennessee knows that there is hardly a part of the *Nautilus* which was not built in duplicate. That was to make certain that the *Nautilus* would continue to traverse the ocean. Then a path was laid out for it once it was under the water. There is a great factor of safety built into it by extra parts.

A great factor of safety was built into every atomic bomb I ever looked at, and certainly in every hydrogen bomb, so that if one system of ignition failed, something else would be there to do the job.

But we cannot afford to follow that practice in the case of a chemically-fueled intercontinental ballistic missile. As I say, the problem is so great that we can have one chance, and one only. If a single valve fails, as it did a short time ago in one of our tests, the whole missile fails.

A nuclear-propelled device would be wholly different. Extra safety factors can be added, if desired. By a small change in the fuel supply of the nuclear element, it can be made certain that the lift will be tremendously increased. Therefore, the possibility exists that guidance systems can be added which will be far more cumbersome and far heavier than the guidance systems we are now talking about.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I said earlier on the floor that I agreed with the statement which President Eisenhower made in his state of the Union message that this country had failed to see the political and psychological effect of the Russian breakthrough in launching a satellite. That has an important effect.

We might as well acknowledge that the Russians have stolen a march on the United States; that they have beaten us to the launching of a satellite by means of chemical propulsion.

Overtake them we must. But there is not so much drama, there is not the impact on world public opinion involved in overtaking the Russians in a similar launching that there would be in leapfrogging the Russians, so to speak, and beating them to the launching of a manned satellite or space vehicle with controlled mobility.

Mr. ANDERSON. I could not agree more with the Senator. Furthermore, I might point out that at one time the Air Force had placed upon it the responsibility for a part of the program in this country for the development of plans for a large space satellite. I understand that one of our Government officials, when asked about this project, which had the code name "World Series," said he had never heard of it. I can only say that I had heard of it, and that many others who are interested in this program had heard of it.

It was a program which proposed that, ahead of the schedule of the Russians, we put into the heavens a satellite which would have carried a payload of at least 200 pounds. That included scientific equipment. At a later time, a satellite would have been launched carrying a payload which may have run from 1,000 to 5,000 pounds.

I think it is too bad that we did not do that. But, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, having failed in that regard, we will not have very much psychological advantage if we put into orbit something which weighs only about 1,100 pounds, as the Russian satellite does. We must talk about something else, it seems to me, which will have far greater possibilities.

If we could utilize some of the genius which I think we still have in this country, we might be able, as the Senator says, to leapfrog to these accomplishments.

I refer now to a talk I made at Rochester, N. Y., a couple of years ago to a conference on high energy nuclear physics. During the afternoon I had an opportunity to visit with a number of scientists who had been associated with the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, some of whom I had met at the time they were at Los Alamos. I stopped a scientist and asked him if he had any regrets about the period of time he spent on that rocky cliff at Los Alamos.

"Oh, yes," he said, "very great regrets, because as we went down the main highway, determined to build a bomb, we saw so many other interesting side roads we would have liked to follow, most interesting paths leading off into the most scientific, entrancing possibilities. But we had to push them away, forget them, and go on to the main goal, which was the bomb."

One of the interesting and fascinating sideroads they would have liked to follow was the possibility of putting a satellite into the sky. Ideas were conceived then which I believe should have been followed.

But I want to return to my statement that, in my belief—and this is not the estimate of scientists; it is just from my own discussions with men who are scientists—it will take 3 million pounds of lift to put on the moon a space vehicle which might be brought back. We do not have any means by which we can do that unless we use nuclear power.

So when men talk about putting space vehicles on the moon, they will probably have to wait until nuclear propulsion can be attained.

If we think that there are certain psychological advantages in space travel, interplanetary travel, and journeys to the moon or in the setting up of space platforms, then by all means we should be pushing the work in the development of nuclear rocket propulsion. Some persons have the idea of placing in the sky a great space platform. If we proceed by means of nuclear propulsion, rockets will probably be used in that connection; but nuclear propulsion must be used.

Furthermore, there is a possibility, and I list it only as a possibility, that we may find that even a 5,000-mile intercontinental ballistic missile will have to be nuclear propelled if it is going to have great reliability. I can conceive of our learning that the Atlas and Titan, well-designed though they may be, will have some possibilities of failure, and will not be as reliable as we want them to be. We just can not send up missiles with nuclear warheads unless we are sure they are going to reach the target for which they are intended and will not drop onto some friendly land between America and the target zone. So we shall want to be careful that each will reach its intended target.

Therefore, in order to press forward vigorously and effectively in developing nuclear rocket propulsion, we need a program that has clear objectives, even if they can not be too precise at this stage of the game. We also need clear lines of authority and steady support for the program, so it can be pursued to a successful conclusion at the earliest possible time.

In brief, I hope we do not get into the same fix we have been in for over 10 years with the aircraft nuclear propulsion program. Beginning with the old NEPA project in 1946, the ANP program has been characterized by ups and downs in funding, by on-again-off-again planning, and by an administrative setup that has been just short of chaotic at times. So far as I can see, there never have been any real clear objectives, nor have the contractors been able to find out where the program is going from year to year. In 1953, Secretary Wilson attempted to kill the project outright; but thanks to the intervention of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—and particularly through the efforts of MELVIN PRICE and the late Carl Hinshaw of the other House—it was kept going somehow. After 10 long years of this merry-go-round, it now appears that the project is once again getting back on its feet. But it has been a long and costly wait.

The point is that if we really need nuclear-rocket propulsion for missiles and for space travel—and I think we must have it—we are going to need some clear-cut objectives to aim for and a well-administered program to see that we get these promptly. Prospects of developing space platforms and taking trips to the moon give a whole new dimension to our life, and we must be prepared to cope with the situation.

One of the most important factors in connection with whether we succeed or fail in this new era is how well we

organize and conduct our scientific development efforts. It seems logical to me that since flight into space will require some form of nuclear propulsion, one alternative to be considered is to have the Atomic Energy Commission and some of its laboratories, such as that at Los Alamos, take on the development job. This would have the advantage of utilizing going organizations who are familiar with the kind of work which will be required.

Another alternative would be to set up a separate Government agency under civilian management, in which centralized responsibility would be vested, for space development plans. Such an agency could proceed to coordinate scientific efforts on space development throughout the country and overseas the construction of facilities for its own research and development work.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, an excellent study on the formation of a "Space Commission" and a prospective on Space Research in Operation, which were prepared by a special committee of the Los Alamos, N. Mex., chapter of the Federation of American Scientists.

Mr. President, I wish to say that these came about in a strange fashion. I got together a group of perhaps a dozen scientists who are very much interested in this field. I asked them, "If you were to handle it, if you were the responsible agency in Washington, and if you were given the task, how would you go about setting it up?"

They said, "Come back later."

When I returned, later, they had prepared the material which I now submit. It gives their viewpoint. It is not necessarily the final one. But whatever the steps which are taken, I would expect that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will be taking an active and continuing interest in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this subject is not new with me or with the other members of the Joint Committee. Back in June and July of 1955, I sent to the President two letters, cosigned by the junior Senator from Washington, Mr. JACKSON, who is chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee, emphasizing the importance to the Nation's future strength and security of a vigorous program—on a wartime footing—to develop an operational ICBM at the earliest possible moment.

On April 6, 1956, I spoke to the Sixth Annual Conference on High Energy Nuclear Physics, at Rochester, N. Y., and I should like to quote several comments from that talk:

From page 4:

Moreover, we should not restrict ourselves merely to consideration of hazards implicit in wars of annihilation with atomic weapons. In technology applied to military ends, novelty is ever a prime goal.

From page 10:

We may think of climate control or worldwide weather modification. Recent advances in meteorology suggest that efforts in this direction may produce useful results some time in the future.

Another example on a large scale which inevitably crosses national boundaries is the project to send a rocket into outer space. Purely from a geographical viewpoint, efforts to send missiles and ulitimately passengers to the moon and the nearby planets are of worldwide interest.

Mr. President, that was in April 1956—some time ago. At that time I received some interesting comments, as a result of that discussion. The text of my remarks was sent to all the members of the Federation of American Scientists; and there came to my office hundreds of letters suggesting that something should be done. After much consultation with members of the joint committee, Senate Resolution 295 was prepared. It proposed that the United States spend some time in this field, and that perhaps we set up a world laboratory to work on this outer-space problem or at least on such research.

In the normal course of events the resolution was referred by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to the Foreign Relations Committee. It requested the viewpoint of the Department of State. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, the text of Senate Resolution 295; the report of the Department of State. This report is particularly significant in view of the statement made by the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], before the meeting of CBS Affiliates at the Shoreham Hotel here in Washington, D. C., a few days ago, which I thought was very fine.

At that time—in 1956 when Senate Resolution 295 was introduced—the Department of State said:

As to the establishment of a world laboratory, experience indicates that greater promise lies in national efforts developed on a cooperative, or better still on a coordinated basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in the course of my remarks at Rochester, N. Y., in April 1956, I also said:

While the intensely nationalist feelings characterizing international relations on our planet at the present time suggest that we may even see, as a result of interplanetary travel, an extension of the competitive colonialism which the last century saw for the backward areas of this planet, the prospect of seeing different sections of Mars staked out by different national governments of this earth seems on the face of it ludicrous. Are we trying to play God and develop a new planet in our own image and likeness? A much more rational and probably more productive basis for the exploration and development of other worlds would be under an organization which properly reflects the common interests of all the peoples of this earth in such development. The Man in the Moon belongs to the children of every country, is a part of their dreamworld, and if reached by space ship, might better remain the property of all.

Returning now, however, from the fanciful and the future to the more immediate problems of initial efforts to get a space ship away from the earth, we recognize hazards of a rather severe sort which may arise as a result of the erroneous function of a space missile intended for the moon but which instead, through defective mechanism or planning, lands on the territory of another nation. If such a nation were at that time in an advanced state of tension in anticipation of a possible attack, this simple error might touch off the spark of world conflict.

Which brings me to the competitive race to develop an intercontinental ballistic missile. We in the American Congress have already learned that it would be a drain on all our budgets if that race should set a pattern in the whole field of space conquest. Russia and this country are working at high speed toward the attainment of an intercontinental ballistic missile, called by many "the ultimate weapon." Yet if the missile were to be attained almost simultaneously and prove to be as accurate as now forecast, if indeed it could carry atomic warheads with a striking power of several kilotons and place them within the area of a small circle, then no city in the world is safe, no jet interceptor can police the skies and no highway can promise egress from the affected area. In that day the people of the earth would banish the weapon as poison gas was outlawed in World War II, but only after the expenditure of fantastic sums of money, materials and scientific skills.

Might it not be better to examine the chance to use space conquest as another project for an international laboratory? If we will never use this weapon once we achieve it, might it not be set aside as one segment of worldwide competition that could be surrendered to the effort to halt the race for a full arsenal of atomic arms in every land?

From page 15:

It is to that problem that I have directed these words. If the great powers find themselves in an atomic stalemate today—and I think they do—it is a carryover of patterns of national security which modern science has rendered obsolete. The military techniques which might emerge from the new areas of technology that I have been discussing can make the stalemate no worse. Already it is at a level in which any major power can precipitate almost total destruction upon an adversary (and in return upon itself) if it should make so tragic an error in judgment. Yet there is the danger that if these new areas of technology are developed in secret, some nation which at some future time is led by reckless rulers, may feel that it has gained so great a lead in some field of science that it may dare to launch an attack for world conquest. While this error in judgment will almost certainly be answered by mutual annihilation approaching totality, every effort must be bent while still we have the chance to prevent such dreadful miscalculations from occurring. Scientists, it seems to me, might suggest to the statesmen that modern technology could make the greatest contribution to the security of great powers if statesmen would move as far as possible from the secret competitive development of technologies under which we have largely operated in recent years. The scientists might urge, indeed, that the race for atomic arms could best be halted by having new fields of science developed jointly by all nations.

It is that theme which I am happy to see stressed by so many leaders today.

Mr. President, the following statement was issued today by Hon. Carl T. Durham, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

I believe that what my associates on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have been saying today on the need to conquer outer space is very important for the security and prestige of this country.

We on the joint committee have been concerned with bold projects for many years. The development of the H-bomb and the *Nautilus* are examples. So also are peacetime proposals such as an accelerated atomic power program.

We consider this challenge of the conquest of outer space so important that I am appointing a special subcommittee on outer space propulsion to consider means of accelerating this country's efforts in this field. Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, who is vice chairman of the full committee and who has long been interestd in nuclear-rocket propulsion, has kindly consented to serve as chairman of this subcommittee. I would hope that the members of the committee in the House and in the Senate who have a special interest in this program will consent to serve on the subcommittee.

I expect that the subcommittee will be established and in operation following the executive hearings being held next week on this subject by the research and development and the military applications subcommittees.

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT ON THE FORMATION OF A SPACE COMMISSION BY A SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS, LOS ALAMOS (N. MEX.) CHAPTER, DAVID L. HILL, CHAPTER CHAIRMAN

Recent startling developments have pointed out for all the world to see that we have fallen dangerously behind the U. S. S. R. in the development and exploitation of science in the national interest. This hard fact is not surprising to anyone who has followed recent trends in the support and encouragement of Soviet science, including education, as opposed to our reluctance to place the proper emphasis on intellectual endeavors. Indeed the past few years have seen the emergence of an anti-intellectual climate and an atmosphere of smug self-satisfaction which places a premium on conformity and finds us woefully unprepared to meet the current challenge.

The root of the difficulties in which we find ourselves is in the system which places the military in such close control of scientific research and development.

After a long history of resisting and attempting to discard such developments as the steamboat, submarine, smokeless powder, radio, airplane, atomic submarine, atomic bomb, and so forth, the military, in the short space of ten-odd years has become scientifically inclined to the extent of investing large amounts of time and money in research. To be sure, in the absence of other support this was better than nothing; however, there is considerable doubt in the scientific community as to the ability of the military to conduct scientific research in such a manner as to produce optimal results for a given expenditure of time, talent, and money. The military has a long history of tradition for the sake of tradition, interservice rivalry and bickering, and a discouraging lack of imagination in scientific matters.

In view of all this, together with the success of the civilian Atomic Energy Commission, there seems to be little wisdom in permitting the military to continue to exercise direct control over such a large fraction of the talent and money devoted to research today. This is especially true in the case of research pertaining to space travel, satellites, and ultraterrestrial research in general. It is obvious that for maximum scientific productivity this research should be done in a climate unfettered by narrow traditions, not unduly restricted by precedent and free from the "orders" of a ranking officer.

We suggest one way in which these ends can be achieved. This is by the formation of a civilian Space Commission modeled after the Atomic Energy Commission, which has long since proved the wisdom shown in its formation.

In forming this Space Commission a few mistakes made in setting up the AEC could be rectified.

The Commission should comprise 5 to 7 members, and at least 3 to 4 of these should be scientists, the chairmanship being held by a scientist well experienced in scientific administration. Also included should be one representative each from industry and the military. As in the AEC, this Commission would report to the President and be empowered to request and receive appropriations from Congress. It would have the authority to decide what avenues of research (applied or basic) would yield the most profitable results for a given expenditure of time, talent, and money.

The establishment and staffing of the laboratories devoted to ultraterrestrial research would be one of its prime responsibilities. The Commission is to have the authority and stature commensurate with its responsibilities. It should have all necessary authority to decide an issue on its scientific merits without regard to irrelevant political considerations of interservice rivalry.

It is believed that with such a Commission the talent that is now widely dispersed would gravitate into work sponsored by this Commission resulting in the assemblage of our most able scientists in a well-coordinated organization. Such an organization is essential if we mean to regain the ground lost under the present system.

While the establishment of a Space Commission will do much toward giving order to a very disordered system, it is felt that much more can be done toward giving science and technology its proper place in the national picture.

The most important single step would be the creation of a Department of Science and Technology with full Cabinet status. It seems clear that the contributions of science and technology to the commerce, health, and living standard of our Nation make such a move mandatory. We know of no other field of human endeavor that has given anywhere near that of science to the peoples of the United States and the world in general. There is no doubt that almost all of our commerce today was created by science or at least depends heavily on it. (An excellent case in point is the television industry which has been created by science and technology in the space of fifteen-odd years, and is over a $5 billion industry.) Yet, we do not have a Department of Science and Technology while the need for a Department of Commerce seems clear to everyone. We, therefore, suggest that all steps necessary for the creation of a Department of Science and Technology be taken at once in order that science and technology may have its proper place in our society as soon as possible.

PROSPECTIVE ON SPACE RESEARCH IN OPERATION

America is faced with the elementary need for those tools which will insure our survival in the face of Russian advances in science and technology. The need is much broader than the word "missile" would imply although it has been strikingly demonstrated in these past few months for all the world to see by the Russian successes with earth satellites. We will consider the root causes for the slow start and then recognize the splendid opportunity afforded America for world leadership in the challenging and exciting new area of outer space research, and the technological harvest the Nation will reap from a properly oriented and organized program. It is manifest that in a sensible approach to the organization of a space research and development program, we will take advantage of this opportunity to win men's hearts and minds and not be content with narrow military objectives alone.

A. International aspects of space travel

Missiles, experimental satellites, and space platforms are but the steppingstones toward space operations and space travel. The idea of space travel has fired the enthusiasm of men. We propose that the United States combine the best of nationalism and of internationalism in its approach. Let us be nationalistic to the extent that we move ahead vigorously with our own resources without permitting the redtape of international agreements to delay our research and development. On the other hand, let us be international by having our laboratories open to the scientists of many lands and perhaps of all lands. Let them be welcome to come and join with us in our effort. Initially, they may come as guests, but soon such a program might lead to joint support from the government of many nations. Thus we may succeed in diverting the military threat of competitive nationalistic conquest of space. By turning men's minds away from missiles as a new arm of war, and directing their attention instead on the conquest of the new frontier, great resources of enthusiasm and good will may be mobilized around the world and redound to the benefit of the United States.

It is implicit in this suggestion that the work will be unclassified because we believe such an approach will be relatively more advantageous to the United States. This view is supported by the current failures of the classified approach in the missile field.

B. The value of extraterrestrial travel

We are unable now to evaluate in any quantitative way the worth to mankind of traveling to the moon, to the nearby planets or into outer space. However, the restless and inquiring spirit of man has throughout the ages pressed on wherever there were frontiers. The rewards of this search for knowledge are manifest. They include the very clothes we wear and the books we read. Our civilization is the composite of these outpourings of the inquiring spirit. Let the attention and energy of men be diverted away from this troubled planet of armed camps in which we live, and diverted toward the conquest of outer space instead of toward the conquest of each other.

C. National planning for nonmilitary objectives

Recent events have highlighted that the principal national planning for scientific research and development is in connection with military objectives. As a consequence the cultural and economic objectives of the United States, as well as its concern with maintaining prestige in the community of nations, has suffered because we as a government refuse to create appropriate authority for planning toward nonmilitary objectives. The present work of the National Science Foundation, as well as of certain other agencies, is of great value to our country. However, in order to be really effective this work must be amplified and must be placed at a higher level of operational authority in the Government. The creativity and productive power of private individuals, private institutions, and corporations may be aroused by such an authority to make their proper contribution to the national interest.

D. The fountainhead of military strength

In the present age of advanced technology, the defense of a country depends increasingly upon the wealth of scientific principles available for creation of military devices. By training and by delegated responsibility, however, the military people themselves cannot be expected properly to encourage and to support fundamental scientific research. Military decisions must always be taken in terms of present defense and military strength of the immediate future. Long-range commitments to scientific research having no forseeable application will always tend to be abused and sidetracked by a military directorate. Thus the necessarily restrictive military interest itself demands that an agency equivalent in authority, prestige and budgetary priority to the Department of Defense, itself, should be created to assure the optimum growth of our national science program. Its task should be to provide funds where needed, and to assure that the freedom of individual enterprise and incentive as required for creative work in science should always be present.

E. Organizational approach

The injury to our missiles program arising from intraservice rivalries and disputes has been sufficiently well publicized that it need require no comment here. Although the present missiles program should probably move toward the achievement of the immediate objectives under approximately the present organization, it is clear that the next generation of missiles should be mothered by an authority operating separately from, and independent of, the Department of Defense and its fighting subdivisions.

The research and development for our missiles program is presently under a diffuse structure which we shall call industrial producers type of organization. We believe this type of organization to be faulty and we propose instead a project-center type of organization for research and development. The industrial producers type of overall organization has a number of defects, including the following:

1. Research in fundamental science is not germane to the short-term profit interests of an industrial corporation. Hence with rare exceptions industrial producers do not have an adequate assembly of scientists.

2. When the aircraft companies were given the responsibility for research and development on missiles, they attempted to remedy their scienific staff deficiencies by going into the personnel market with disruptive salary offers to buy the necessary personnel to provide adequate contract proposals and then to fulfill their contract commitments. These hiring practices of the aircraft companies served to uproot many hundreds of scientists from places in which they were effectively contributing to the national defense.

3. The newly employed scientists were, with rare exceptions, utilized ineffectively and in many cases are still not being utilized effectively in the aircraft companies. In many cases, singly or in small groups, scientists are assigned problems to work on which can be effectively treated only by a substantial number of men working together. Thus there are not enough men together to make an effective or critical group.

4. Communication barriers between the companies prevent scientists in different parts of the country, who are assigned to work on closely related problems, from learning of the activities of their fellows. The natural difficulties of communicating between geographically separated companies are worsened by the proprietary interests of different industrial producers, which prevent them from making available to other industrial producers the information which one company may have uncovered.

5. Coordination of work by subcontractors has been, in the main, faulty. Thus missiles are assembled of components each of which may be satisfactorily meeting its specifications, but the overall assembly suffers because systems analysis for the unit as a whole has been inadequate. Many early failures of our missiles can be traced to the absence of sufficient overall coordination between the different companies contributing component parts to the missile.

6. Because each small team of scientists knows that there are probably several other teams trying to do the same thing, the sense of urgency on a given team, as far as the national program is concerned, is diminished. When the frustrations from inadequate staffing and the difficulties of communication become too wearisome, it is easy for a team to relax somewhat, assuming that somebody else will accomplish the job they find too tiresome to do.

7. A research and development program which must be closely coordinated to receiving and holding a contract for a specific job is defective for at least two reasons:

(a) The rush in each company to try to get a slice of Government money available in a given area of missile development leads to chaotic research conditions, with poorly conceived plans patched together to try to submit a proposal as soon as required for bidding. Such a proposal is very likely inadequate and in addition the pressure for its conception and preparation drains away manpower which should be left free for long-range research.

(b) In the present organizational setup, the research programs are in general closely tied to production and are subject to the same vagaries in support as are the production items. Thus, the continuity is lacking for the continuing long-term research necessary to make breakthroughs into new principles and methods; moreover, the knowledge in the scientific world that such impermanence of research operations is characteristic of the industrial producer, inhibits the ability of the company to acquire the highest caliber of scientific personnel.

8. The proprietary interests of the various industrial producers now engaged in the missiles program are providing a chief bottleneck for progress in this field. The Ramo Wooldridge Corp., which has the responsibility of receiving information on activities throughout the missiles field is unable to transmit to one company information which it receives from another because of the restriction of proprietary interests. Not only would it clearly be in the national interest to have free and complete exchange of information between companies, but would probably also be in the interests of the companies themselves in permitting each to achieve more efficient and rapid results. However, under the present system the old tradition of proprietary interests is tending to blind management to the necessity for a new mode of operation.

The characteristics listed above indicate why the industrial producer's approach has bungled our missiles effort.

In contrast, the project center type of organization was highly successful in the early years of the atomic energy project and also in the development and application of radar. Some of the advantages of the project center type of approach are the following:

1. Responsibility for achieving the proposed program is uniquely delegated to the project. Thus the highest sense of urgency is generated which leads to (a) the fullest dedication of the individual staff members to the task at hand, and (b) attracts into the project organization concerned scientists who wish to be sure they may go where they can make the maximum contribution to the Nation.

2. Scientists are brought together in one laboratory or at least into laboratories which are in close communication so that a sufficient number of people are available to form a "critical" or reactive unit for solving each particular problem.

3. A diversity of backgrounds, approaches and disciplines may be assembled in one large interacting project such that a minimum of delay is involved in working out new fields that require the merger of several disciplines and technologies.

4. The established objective is understanding of scientific principles and achievement of successful application. These objectives lead to better research results than the objectives mentioned above of rushing together some sort of contract application or, in general, trying to direct operations in such a manner as to be profitable from the short-range point of view.

5. Continuity of support for a research program is usually available so that the top-grade scientists are willing to make the investment of the years of time sometimes necessary to achieve significant advances.

6. The production of devices need not be done by the project organization itself. Once the specifications have been drawn as the result of the fullest liaison between scientists and engineers, then the work of production itself may be done in existing shops which are mostly under the roofs of the industrial producers. Industry moreover is accustomed to handling business this way and likes to receive a well-defined set of specifications and simply do the job as defined.

7. The organization operating the project should be neither a profit-seeking corporation nor directly an agency of the Government. The difficulties which the profit motive interposes in the conduct of long-range research and development have already been noted. The disadvantage of direct Government operation is the excessive amount of redtape which is then involved. Optimum operation apparently comes from a private nonprofit foundation or some other private agency which may operate the project on a cost basis for the Government.

8. When deserving programs of research have been conceived, there should be a minimum of difficulty in obtaining financial support for the research. A general defect at present in our country is that inadequate sums are available for the fundamental basic research that alone can generate the knowledge on which subsequent power over nature must rest. We have grown accustomed to spending large sums of money for engineering development but have not as a Nation yet come to understand that basic research itself is the source of all subsequent applications. Moreover, it must be emphasized that the criteria for the support of basic research should not be the existence of an immediate or apparent application of the results. Such criteria would inhibit the very creative process which is the objective of fundamental or basic research. It is to be observed that such an organization would avoid the fragmentation of effort characteristic of the present producer's approach.

F. Incentives

Clearly, if our system of free enterprise deserves to win out in the industrial competition with the Communist bloc of peoples, then it should be able to win the competition by the intelligent mobilization of the individual initiative, enterprise and resource of the free world. To some extent, the present mode of operation of the missiles program is a blundering effort to do just this. However, it seems apparent that we cannot longer afford to operate in a manner handicapped by the present difficulty of industrial producers in carrying on adequate scientific research programs. For the industrial production itself, we may continue to rely with confidence on our large industrial producers.

A review suggests that we, as a capitalistic country, have been exceedingly slow to apply capitalistic incentive to promote fundamental scientific research. Here we notice an amusing contrast with Communist Russia where tax-free prizes of large amounts have long been given to provide capitalistic incentive to the work of Soviet scientists. It is suggested that in the field of space research and operations, as well as in other important scientific areas, salary scales should reflect the importance of science to our society. In addition, a number of large prizes might be established for scientists and engineers. Such prizes might be offered for (1) ideas that come into use in national laboratories, world laboratories or elsewhere, even though such use is for research purposes only, and therefore not commercially rewarding. The size of the prizes might be determined by (a) the singularity of the idea involved, (b) the priority of the idea; (2) a second basis for prize awards would simply be the best papers in a given field each year.

From a long-range point of view, much has been appropriately said about the anti-intellectualism in America which discourages many talented youngsters from going into scientific careers, and much has also been well said about the inadequate level of science training available in our grade schools and high schools. We recognize these problems but do not dwell upon them here. Our objective in these comments has been to set a framework in terms of general comments, supplemented by specific suggestions, which we hope will permit an early, positive showing of results in recovering for America its position of leadership in this area of science and technology.

Although we have in this discussion for timely reasons concentrated upon space research and operations and termed this area of technology as the new frontier, it should be remarked that the nature of scientific progress has been such that new frontiers are ever opening to mankind and will probably continue to do so. Thus, the need for and justification of a Department of Science is even broader and stronger than its value in supporting science as it may apply in time toward our position in space research and operations. It is only that this field provides at the present time a most dramatic evidence of our need for a properly coordinated support of scientific research in this country.

We believe that much of the remedy for the dismaying state of our present missiles and space research program must come through legislation of imaginative and courageous conception. We believe that the fundamental defect in the present situation stems from our failure as a nation to comprehend the challenge of the new area of technology now opening for the conquest of outer space. It is imperative that America be set on the right track in moving into this great new endeavor. The above comments represent an effort to outline the character of legislation which would (1) mobilize the great energies and talent of the free world toward outer space research, (2) have the early effect of strengthening our military posture, and (3) cast our effort in such a form that it may tend to draw together the peoples of the world, and permit in the foreseeable future the full conversion of military postures into attitudes of cooperation of all peoples in the conquest of outer space.

EXHIBIT B

Senate Resolution 295

Whereas the principles which underlie scientific progress are universal in their application;

Whereas history reveals that all nations benefit from the cross-fertilization of ideas among the scientists of all nations;

Whereas the great progress of the United States in atomic energy and many other scientific fields has been furthered by the work of scientists of other nations;

Whereas the excessive isolation of basic scientific research behind rigid national walls breeds suspicion and may tend to divert a disproportionate part of the scientific effort to destructive rather than constructive effort;

Whereas greater communication and contact and common effort among the leading scientists of the world will produce more intensive progress in such fields as medicine, nuclear energy, weather control, and the solution of the mysteries of outer space, which will be of lasting benefit to all mankind; and

Whereas the present year, being the International Geophysical Year in which all nations are cooperating in meteorological research, provides a fitting occasion for the advancement of international scientific cooperation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States explore with other nations, through such channels as he finds appropriate—

(1) the means of conferring on an outstanding scientist in each of the major scientific fields, selected annually on the basis of contribution to the good of mankind, regardless of nationality, an honorary world passport;

(2) the means of creating a world laboratory to serve as a center of advanced scientific research and to supplement and facilitate national efforts in this connection; and

(3) the means of giving additional encouragement to the travel and exchange of scientists throughout the world and the exchange of scientific information.

SEC. 2. On the basis of such exploration, the President shall make suitable recommendations to the Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 12, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Reference is made to your letter dated June 26, 1956, addressed to the Secretary, requesting the Department's comments on Senate Resolution 295 introduced by Senator ANDERSON June 25, 1956, favoring steps for the advancement of international scientific research.

The Department is in sympathy with the broad objectives in the resolution of encouraging international exchange of scientists and scientific information. Its general comment on the measure is that the extension of the traditional national and international procedures does not appear necessary for achieving these ends. Its particular comment is that endeavors toward the issuance of honorary world passports and the establishment of a world laboratory are likely to encounter stubborn articles.

As you know, the Department has for some time administered exchange of persons programs in which opportunities have been provided for American scientists to study, teach and lecture abroad, and for foreign scientists to carry on similar activities in this country. It has encouraged private exchange programs, international scientific assemblies, and private travel by extending its advice and lending its facilities. Also, the Department has stimulated the interchange of scientific information through formal exchange agreements with foreign countries and through informal arrangements. It has also assisted private programs for scientific information exchange. Other departments and agencies of the Government carry on similar programs. Beyond these activities, the United States had contributed to the United Nations for the purpose of carrying out programs for the international exchange of scientists and scientific information. Thus, procedures and mechanisms already exist for the encouragement of scientific progress. It is the Department's view that these might well continue to be utilized to achieve the broad aims envisaged in the resolution.

Issuance of honorary world passports raises such practical questions as the constituted issuing authority, the likelihood of appropriate changes in national laws, and the matter of selecting outstanding scientists for such honor. This section of the resolution, moreover, may be regarded as discriminatory. In any event, an honorary passport would not in itself guarantee free mobility since many nations require a visa for entry.

As to the establishment of a world laboratory, experience indicates that greater promise lies in national efforts developed on a cooperative, or better still on a coordinated basis. Further, it is believed that the demand for such a laboratory originating from scientists themselves would insure greater success than would the initiation of such an establishment through Goverment auspices.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL
(For the Secretary of State).

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS, BEFORE A MEETING OF CBS AFFILIATES, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

I am here today to speak to a group which has a grave responsibility for informing our people.

In the Chamber of the Senate of the United States, I am the designated leader of the majority party. That is a title of which I am proud but one which carries with it responsibilities that would cause any man to be humble. But it is a designation which, for this occasion, I have left behind.

I am not here as a Democrat.

I am not here as a leader of the Senate.

I am here as an American.

In this town, we have the habit of dividing all things by lines of affiliation: the offices, the jobs, the various positions, and, sometimes, even our judgments.

At this hour in our history, I, for one, believe that there are certain facts which cannot be divided along such lines and certain judgments we must reach and decisions we must make together, as Americans, and as Americans only.

Even as we sit here at these tables there orbits in the sky above us—around and around this earth—the most compelling fact of our times.

The sputniks out in space have only one meaning.

There is no Democratic meaning.

There is no Republican meaning.

There is, in truth, no narrow American meaning.

In all history, mankind has never faced so great a challenge—or so great an opportunity. If outer space is allowed to become the province of the earth's imperialists, then the freedom we have fashioned at so high a price shall fall into eternal jeopardy.

If, however, free men set their sails for this new world as our forebears did when this continent was opened, then we have the opportunity of adding a new dimension to freedom—and, with it, the very real prospect of reaching our goal of total peace.

These are exciting thoughts, exciting goals.

We would be out of character with our American heritage if we were not stirred by what we can now see on ahead in this new age.

We would be even more out of character—both as Americans and as free men—if we should lose this hour of opportunity in preoccupation with partisan thoughts of who is to receive the credit and who is to receive the blame.

Facts are not partisan, and the facts are these:

For a decade now, the free world—led by the United States—has summoned up its resources and resourcefulness to contain the

most powerful and most ruthless aggressor ever to appear among the governments of the earth.

The physical containment has, in large part, succeeded.

It has succeeded, I should say, until now.

Today no responsible man can say or would say continued success of our past policies is assured.

There is now abundant evidence that a pattern of history is repeating. We, like the dynasties of ancient China on down to the Republic of France, have built a wall against aggression, but now we find that we are the imprisoned.

The Soviet has, dramatically, leaped over our wall.

More importantly, we are awakened to the reality that advances of Soviet technology and science have made our wall of security a relic of another age.

Let me cite for you certain specifics, certain facts which all of us, as Americans, must sit down and consider together.

These are not facts of my invention. These are facts testified to by our military leadership coming before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, of which I am chairman.

First. The Soviet has under arms nearly as many divisions as do all the free nations combined.

Second. The Soviet air strength is probably close to that of our own.

Third. The Soviet submarine armada now numbers 500, while ours totals only 110.

Fourth. The Soviet shipyards are building 100 new submarines annually, while we are building fewer than 10.

Fifth. The Soviet capacity to launch a one-half ton satellite into space indicates the capacity on their part to launch long-range ballistic missiles against our cities from Soviet soil.

Sixth. The Soviet has now the capacity to launch, from land bases or from its submarines, shorter range missiles against our installations at home and overseas.

These are military facts. They are important. I would mislead you if I did not say that there are more, more which in time I believe should become public knowledge.

What is the sum of these facts?

The facts of comparative strength between the two strong powers do not add up to disaster—but they do, clearly, total up to peril.

For the moment, the stalemate is not clearly broken. The Soviet striking power is great and growing greater, but our retaliatory power is great, also. This the Soviet knows, as we know.

The Soviet, however, also knows—as we must come to know—that the rate of growth of their striking power far exceeds ours.

We are behind but we are not yet hopelessly behind. Our peril becomes a disaster when we fall so far behind that there is no hope of recovery. It is to the prevention of that disaster all free men must now dedicate their efforts.

How is such disaster to be prevented?

Some, looking back to the past, will answer only that the Nation must retool its productive capacity, get ready for a massive effort, and move forward to match the Soviet sputnik for sputnik, missile for missile, and sub for sub.

If war were inevitable, I would join in such a call.

But no man who looks beyond the moment will suggest that war is the inevitable consequence of mankind's new adventure into space. I, myself, am confident that it is not.

Space may well be the sea in which the human race will someday find an island of peace.

To reach that island, we need more than weapons.

We need, in fact, to free ourselves of the bonds of a weapon psychology.

Our greatest need in this hour is to unleash the pioneering spirit and the daring and brilliance of our people and set this Nation's course on the pursuit of peace.

We cannot, of course, ignore the need for weapons now.

We need a faster rate of production for our missiles, far faster than any yet permitted or any yet envisioned.

We need continued production of our proved long-range bombers for our Strategic Air Command.

We need an acceleration of our submarine production.

We need these things now, for this reason:

In the past, we have had the time to mobilize and build our strength while others fought—on their soil—the wars we were eventually to enter and help provide the margin of victory.

We shall not have such time again.

Our own soil is within the target range of a hostile nation for the first time in the American experience.

For the next 10 years or more, we must be ready every night for any challenge that might come before morning. There is no other way.

Behind the security that such strength affords, though, we must do more than content ourselves with a stalemate. We must lay aside the illusion that a nation is strong merely because its military strength equals that of its adversaries.

If we can now buy time, and I believe that we can, we must make certain that we make proper use of what we purchase.

This means, as I see it, that we must change our ways—and those changes will make this both a happier land and a better world.

We have had since the end of World War II much time.

The evidence is indisputable that we have not used that time to full advantage.

What has been wrong? Why have we lagged?

Why do we stand now in a posture of relative weakness?

When such a question is asked, as it should be asked, there is an ever-present danger that we shall frame our answers in terms of credit and blame.

To do this now could well be fatal.

There is little question that wrong decisions have been made.

There is no question that such errors are divided along any partisan lines.

Furthermore, there is little doubt that such decisions, picked out of the context of the past, may seem glaringly wrong today, but at the time many of them met with majority approval.

As Prime Minister Churchill told the House of Commons on June 18, 1940: "If we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future."

I say that such must be our creed at this hour.

It is with that creed before us that we must proceed, as responsible men, to assess the position of free men in the world today.

I see no gain in picking petty quarrels with the past.

I myself am willing to draw a line at the here and now, and measure responsibility in terms of what is done for the future rather than in terms of what was done in the past.

From this base, I believe we can take a more honest look at the problems we face.

What are those problems? Let me call them as I see them.

First and foremost, I believe that we are paying too high a price for conformity.

Ours has been, always, a Nation built by the greatness of men's hearts and spirits and minds. America's vigor has come from the originality, the freshness, the vision of our people, all our people, not merely an intellectual elite.

For a decade now, we have seen growing a climate of contempt for these values. We are paying a price for that.

Our investigating committee has found, in some most striking examples, that this has been at the heart of some of our preparedness difficulties.

The fight to build for this Nation an atomic submarine is a record of the persistence against great odds of one man, Admiral Rickover, who believed that it could be built. Because he was more determined to perform than to conform, this brilliant man was—on numerous occasions—shunted into obscurity and his services to the Nation were very nearly lost.

This past few days, in our committee room, I sat 2 feet away from a great Army general and watched him choke back the tears of deep emotion. He told us that his decision to retire from service was final. He said he could not speak freely and he could not support a policy which meant placing American troops in the range of enemy missiles without adequate weapons of defense.

Over and over again, I have heard—and our committee has heard—the leading military men of this Nation come before us and say that a conventional system has cut back on our programs for unconventional developments.

Over and over, we have heard them say that we are not, even yet, doing all that we could and should be doing to move forward in this hour of challenge.

This is not the road to strength.

This is not the road America should travel.

We must turn to the dedicated men of vision and welcome them into the councils of respect and dignity.

We must provide a climate in which the men and women of our universities, our research centers, our career services, our world of journalism and communications can make a full contribution of their talents.

Let me make this point clear.

It is not true that the abilities of Soviet science far exceed those of our American scientists.

As free men, who respect the freedom of man's mind, we must not allow political policies to chain our most priceless resource.

As we face this problem of removing the fetters from our capacity, we must also remove the fetters of tradition from our policy.

Our defensive strategies, in a military sense, are undergoing reappraisal and reexamination.

It would be a mistake to stop there.

Our foreign policies require the same reappraisal.

So, also, do our domestic policies and values.

We have, for long, held a position of strength in world affairs. That position is no longer secure. We must not be so inflexible that we can imagine no changed policy to cope with a changed position.

Domestically, likewise, each of you as businessmen know that our economy is now undergoing a period of change. This change is not merely a cycle through which we are passing. There are new problems, new challenges arising to the very functioning of our system.

Channels of distribution are undergoing change.

Changes are evident in consumer demand and consumer taste.

Profoundly important population shifts are continuing.

We must not wait for calamity before undertaking a cure.

Just as we erred in our estimate of what Soviet gains might mean in the realm of technology, so can we err by complacency in our estimate of what domestic losses might mean in the realm of our economic health.

These things I mention only briefly, to emphasize that in this challenging period we need more, far more, than a purely military response to the Soviet challenge.

We need the marshalling of our resources, physical and mental, such as we have never had before.

We need imagination and freshness.

We need force and boldness in our leadership.

We need, further, I believe, to look beyond the danger evident now to see the horizons of peace in outer space.

I am no scientist and I do not pretend to be.

But the brilliant men of this age—the brilliant minds of America—tell us things that we cannot ignore.

Out in space, there is the power to control the earth's weather, to change the climate where we live, to alter the tides, and direct the Gulf Stream on a different course.

From space, snapshots can be taken of your backyard.

The whole technology of communication can be changed.

It is a fascinating, daring, exciting world.

The frontier it opens for human advancement exceeds any man has ever faced.

Surely we cannot, as leaders of free men, ignore it.

Surely we cannot, with this opportunity before us, fail to see that this affords us the one clear course to recapture the initiative for freedom.

Here is an opportunity to bring men together in common cause as never before.

Here is an opportunity for us to sponsor the flourishing of mankind's genius.

Before this session of Congress ends, I am hopeful that we shall be able to establish in our Government a proper agency for direction of a new national effort in this realm.

I am hopeful, also, that we shall be able to provide a program for the enlargement of our research activities, making the laboratories and the equipment available to draw the best from the minds of our people.

I am hopeful that, furthermore, we shall be able to foster the strengthening of our total educational process, not to produce an army of technicians, but, rather, to pour forth legions of broadly-educated men and women.

As we do these things, I trust that in our relations with other nations we shall be imaginative, and that we shall make it evident that America's free world leadership is not sterile.

We should, certainly, make provisions for inviting together the scientists of other nations to work in concert on projects to extend the frontiers of man and to find solutions to the troubles of this earth.

Our President, holding as he does the esteem of men throughout the world, has a rare opportunity to lead in this labor boldly and forcefully, and in the vigorous pursuit of peace he will find the Nation undivided in his support.

Further, it would be appropriate and fitting for our Nation to demonstrate its initiative before the United Nations by inviting all member nations to join in this adventure into outer space together.

The dimensions of space dwarf our national differences on earth.

If we are to win space as the outpost of peace, all men may—and should—share in that endeavor.

We, with our great resources and our great abilities, must not allow the leadership to slip from our grasp.

The world in which we live is a world in which danger abounds.

There is no greater danger, though, than for us to shrink from the responsibilities of the hour.

Ahead, if we move with speed, if we move with daring, we shall find fulfillment of our quest for peace.

If we are to reach such a goal, our response must begin now. This, more than we realize, is the year of decision, the year our course is set.

In such a year, we need be responsible men, loyal to our Nation, faithful to freedom, strangers to partisanship, and friends with the imagination that has been so much a part of our heritage.

ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this morning the Department of State made a very important announcement regarding the Government of India. I quote in full the statement:

> The Department of State announced today that the United States Government desires to assist the Government of India in meeting its current economic problem. It has accordingly informed the Government of India of its willingness to discuss a loan program of approximately $225 million from the currently available resources of the United States Export-Import Bank and the development loan fund. In addition the United States Government is considering on an urgent basis further measures to assist India in meeting its present grain shortage.
>
> The United States Government has invited the Government of India to send representatives to discuss these matters further. The Government of India has accepted this invitation; a delegation will leave India for Washington shortly.

The current economic problem arises from India's need of foreign exchange in connection with its second 5-year plan.

With the purpose of achieving economic self-sufficiency and stability, India began its first 5-year plan in 1950; and in May 1956, embarked on its second 5-year plan. These programs call for the development of a balanced industrialization with development of both public and private sectors of the Indian economy.

Great progress was made under the first 5-year program. Its greatest emphasis was upon agricultural production to provide food for the Indian people; and with the aid of good weather, production rose by about 23 percent. During the same period, a great effort was made to begin industrialization; and industrial production rose by 33 percent.

But, successful as it was, the first plan may be said to have laid only the base for the effort contemplated in the second 5-year plan, which began in May 1956. It is India's objective to provide new employment for the 8 million new workers who will come into its labor force; to increase its income by 25 percent—from $22 billion to about $28 billion—by 1961; and to increase investment 11 or 12 percent. Its emphasis is to develop the basic and heavy industries, among them coal, iron and steel, electric power, machine tools, and heavy chemicals, which themselves will generate subsidiary and consumer industries, and parallel with this expansion, to enlarge India's overburdened railway and other transportation systems.

The chief effort in such a program must be made by the Indian Government and its people, and no one recognizes this more clearly than do India's leaders. During the first 5-year plan, at least 90 percent of the total investment came from the Indian people. The total investment by the Indian Government and people in the second plan, of $12.2 billion, is roughly comparable to a total investment in the United States over a period of 5 years of about $250 billion. I do not know of any country in the world, unless it is Soviet Russia, which is making an effort of anything like this magnitude. And when we consider that it is being done by a people with an average per capita income of $55 and a per capita consumption of 1,900 calories daily, the magnitude of their effort should be better understood.

Even with this tremendous effort of self-help, an industry cannot be built in India without foreign exchange with which to buy the tools and steel and other capital goods which India cannot produce. India has drawn to the very limit upon its sterling reserves, it has restricted its imports and taken other drastic measures to meet its foreign exchange needs. Yet with all this, it is estimated that the gap in foreign exchange will amount to $1.4 billion. It is my understanding that India hopes that at least a minimum of $500 million of loans and capital goods to meet this gap may be provided by the United States.

It is in this background that I want to discuss briefly the important announcement that was made today by our State Department. Since India's independence, the United States has made available to India approximately $1 billion in grants and loans and surplus agricultural products. The announcement today that our Government is willing to discuss a loan program of approximately $225 million from the resources of the United States Export-Import Bank and the development loan fund, and that it is considering further measures to assist India in meeting its present grain shortage, cannot be considered unimportant. I should like to say that in my service as a representative of this country to India, I found a great interest on the part of the President and the Secretary of State toward affording India support in the development of its economic program. Today's announcement should be hailed as another step in this program.

I do want to state views which I hold on this matter of assistance to India, for the consideration of Congress and for public opinion in this country. I believe we should make the decision to see to it that India secures our full support in the attainment of the objectives of its second 5-year plan.

I know that the first priority of our Government and people is to take whatever steps are necessary to assure the security and freedom of the United States. The President, the administration, and the committees of Congress, including the Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, under the able leadership of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] are working at this task. I have no doubt that the Congress will support whatever measures are needed to protect this country. I do point out, however, that our security will depend upon elements beyond military measures.

Even as we undertake this first duty and priority of military security, we must do our best to hold together the elements of democratic strength and freedom throughout the world. Our security and freedom are inseparable from theirs.

The Soviet challenge is not military alone. Mr. Khrushchev has announced boldly that the Soviet Union intends to compete with the United States in fields in which we have considered ourselves supreme—the fields of industrial and scientific advancement. The statement recently issued by the State Department indicates that Mr. Khrushchev means what he says. In the last few years the Soviet Union has committed itself to advance approximately $2 billion to countries in Asia and the Middle East. And the launching of sputnik by the Soviet Union has symbolized to the peoples in these countries a new strength in science and technology, which are the very things they want most.

I know that we must guard our resources because our economic base must support whatever efforts we make in both military and economic fields. I know that every expenditure and particularly those relating to foreign aid, will be closely watched and opposed.

Nevertheless, there are many humane and long-range interests to support foreign aid to these independent countries which satisfy me. But today I argue our own self-interest and security. If these countries fail, or turn increasingly to the Soviet Union, we shall in time find ourselves isolated from a great part of the peoples of the world.

I believe strongly that the success of India in its efforts to achieve economic stability is essential to our future security and interest. India achieved independence in 1947, and in 1950 its constitution became effective. In the short time that has elapsed, India has held two free elections of the largest participation of free voters in the world. It has been able to reduce the dominions and princely states in existence at the time of its independence from over 500 in number to approximately 20. As I have said, it has successfully completed its first 5-year plan, and has a good chance of success with its second 5-year plan, if it receives necessary assistance. Whatever criticism may be made about India's foreign policy, India has great influence in the world and its objectives are peaceful. It is the second largest country in the world in point of population, it has great resources, an able and trained leadership, and it is pursuing its goals by democratic means. It is certain that the countries of Asia will watch with interest the experiment of Communist China, attempting to advance by totalitarian methods, and that of India by democratic and voluntary methods. If India should fail, there is grave danger that the peoples of Asia and the Middle East and Africa would view it as a failure of the democratic method and that the cause of democratic institutions in these areas would be in danger. If this should ever happen, we would find ourselves isolated from a great part of the world, the balance of power would actually be against us, and our present danger would be immeasurably increased. I hope that a successful and effective foreign-aid program will be developed during this Congress. The effort of India and our relationship to it in terms of support, is crucial in Asia, and to our goal of democratic institutions in the world.

In addition to the measures which are under consideration in the State Department, I have advocated that the balance of the wheat loan due the United States, approximating $170 million, now repayable in dollars, be changed into repayment in local currency. This would place it in conformity with our present Public Law 480 programs and, I believe, would enable the Indian Government to extend its credit at the World Bank and Export-Import Bank, perhaps by at least $100 million. But if this is not enough, I urge that in the remainder of India's 5-year program, we place ourselves firmly on her side, as Soviet Russia has done with Communist China, and supply the foreign exchange essential for her success. If this involves action by the Congress—and I believe it will—it should be taken.

The taking of such a step would show that the United States has creative plans beyond military measures. It would show that we have confidence that peace will be attained, and in the ultimate success of the democratic systems of the world. All of this, it seems to me, was implicit in the great state of the Union message which President Eisenhower delivered last Thursday.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FARM PROPOSALS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have read the administration proposals for agriculture thoroughly and carefully. I can agree with the administration when it recognizes that the American farmer is caught in a serious and devastating cost price squeeze. I can also support, and have already called for, extension of such programs as Public Law 480 to dispose of surpluses, the soil bank, the rural development program, and increased research into new uses and markets for agricultural products.

But the inescapable fact is that at the same time the administration advocates these measures to relieve the declining agricultural economy, it turns around and proposes a rolling readjustment which would lower price supports, wipe out corn acreage allotments, and so forth.

Five years ago I recommended the soil bank, Public Law 480, and also increased research into new uses for agricultural products. I pointed up the cost-price squeeze which pinched the farmer's income. I still support this type of constructive approach to the long-range solution of the farm problems. But I cannot sit idly by and condone measures which I believe would further aggravate the very problem which the administration states exists.

The farm program presented by the administration seems to be founded upon two major inconsistencies.

First. It recognizes that the farmer is caught in a cost-price squeeze and that the prices the farmer has to pay out as operating costs have doubled from 1939 to 1952, and have increased another 3 percent since then. But then the solution put forth is to lower price supports and further reduce income while the cost is still rising.

Second. The administration recommends the elimination of corn acreage allotments. It is not clear why this should be recommended when acreage allotments for the other basic crops would be increased. The reasons given for disposing of corn allotments are the very same reasons which I gave on the Senate floor and in the Agriculture and Forestry Committee last year in support of my efforts to obtain an increase in the corn acreage allotments to a level reasonably consistent with planting practices in the commercial corn area. The reason why only 14 percent of the corn production in the commercial corn area was eligible for the full price support is clearly evident from the 62 percent of the corn farmers who voted in favor of increased acreage allotments.

The President expressed concern over the surpluses which have accumulated and in his recommendations has attempted to arrive at a solution of the problem of surplus increases. The answer is not to be found in his statement that reduced price supports "should open the door to market expansion, increased acreage allotments and greater freedom to produce." If supports were to be reduced while our farmers were encouraged to increase production, it does not seem that a reduction in surpluses would result. Farm operators are faced with certain fixed costs which must be met with increased production if price supports are lowered—this, I say, is not the way to work a reduction in surpluses.

It is obvious that a long range constructive program must be evolved if American agriculture is to be placed in a strong and healthy economic position.

In order to do this I submit that priority attention should be given to the disposal of present surpluses and the curbing of future surpluses through the conservation reserve portion of the soil bank and through extension of Public Law 480. This should be the first task.

Price supports should not be lowered at this time. Such action would not lead to reduced production. It would, in fact, stimulate further production and will aggravate the surplus problem. So I repeat we should, first of all:

First. Extend Public Law 480 and support its provisions to dispose of surpluses through trade, barter, and international assistance programs.

Second. Support the conservation reserve portion of the soil bank. This program will take land out of production for a period of time up to 10 years, and will at the same time build up the soil.

Third. Inaugurate an expanded and vigorous program of research into new uses and markets for agricultural products immediately.

These are three vitally important steps which must be taken immediately.

These measures will attack the surplus problem. Once that problem is solved, the farmer's prices will rise, and the argument over price supports will cease.

Mr. President, I desire now to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

THE FARM PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a telegram as of this date from W. M. Thatcher, general manager, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn. The telegram refers to the farm economic question and to the question of farm price supports.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 16, 1958.*

The Honorable EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Many thousands of upper Midwest and Great Plains farmers fear that the Secretary of Agriculture's scheduled appearance before the Senate Agriculture Committee Friday will signal the launching of the administration's latest campaign to destroy price-protection laws. We join with them in believing that the only hope for farmers now is positive and immediate action by Congress to restore cuts in grain and dairy price supports and to firmly oppose any further cuts in farm income by the administration.

Specifically, we urge that you make clear your intention to help prevent a 22-cents-a-bushel cut in wheat prices already ordered by the Secretary of Agriculture for the 1958 crop. We ask, too, that you urge other Members of the Senate and House to give the same serious consideration to the economic plight of grain farmers as you are now giving to dairy farmers.

Wheat farmers have cooperated in every program to control production. They have taken a 37-cents-a-bushel cut in wheat prices since 1954. They are facing another 22-cents-a-bushel cut this year. Let us make it clear that the 22-cents-a-bushel cut on wheat price this year will be the equivalent of a 25-percent cut in net income. Farmers will take a $250 million loss from this cut alone. Dairy farmers face a similar loss.

Dairy co-ops have protested vigorously in behalf of their members against the Secretary of Agriculture's support-price cut. We are expressing the angry protest of grain farmers. This entire region is concerned with this loss. Congress is the only hope of farmers to reverse the Secretary's unfair cuts in dairy and wheat price supports. Any cut in farm prices piled on top of already falling farm income threatens to widen the existing business recession into a real depression. It is your responsibility to see this does not happen.

M. W. THATCHER,
General Manager, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.

P. S.—Copies of this wire sent to all members of Senate and House Agriculture Committees and to upper Midwest Senators and Representatives.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, OF MINNESOTA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 242), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I considered AUGUST ANDRESEN a personal friend and associate. I knew him as a completely devoted and dedicated public servant. He was a man who was concerned with people and their problems. His 16 terms of service to the people of Minnesota are clear and convincing evidence as to the esteem they had for him. His record of service is a tribute to the great effort he always put forth for his people.

Mr. President, a little more than a year ago, in the fall of 1956, I was privileged to attend a dinner given in honor of the late Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN and the late Mrs. Andresen. The dinner was at Winona, Minn. His friends came from various parts of the State, but of course that was his particular district, the First District of Minnesota. His friends paid tribute to him and to Mrs. Andresen. I am happy that that occasion took place while they were both living, because Mrs. Andresen died in the year 1957, only some 6 months following the dinner.

At the time the people of the First District of Minnesota told of the untiring efforts of Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, in his effort to serve the people, his constituency in the First District. I was privileged to speak briefly at that dinner. I paid tribute to Representative ANDRESEN'S public service.

AUGUST ANDRESEN established a very personal approach in carrying out his duties. He has actually become a real part of many homes and families in southern Minnesota. His will be a keen loss to the farmers, the small-business men along the main streets, the laboring men, the professional people throughout the entire State of Minnesota.

He was their friend, servant, and counselor. The people confided in him, had faith in him, and trusted him. This confidence, faith, and trust were never misplaced with AUGUST ANDRESEN.

There is a real emptiness today in the hearts of all who knew AUGUST ANDRESEN—there is an emptiness in the Congress of the United States—and there is a void which never will be completely filled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on proceeding to the consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to.

Under the second resolving clause the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THYE and Mr. HUMPHREY as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative from Minnesota, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 20, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 3, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Harker T. Stanton	Professional staff member.	$7,399.98
Henry J. Casso	do	6,214.32
Edward P. Guinane	Professional staff member (to July 31).	632.72
Cotys M. Mouser	Chief clerk	5,723.88
James M. Kendall	Assistant chief clerk	5,590.08
Betty M. Mason	Clerical assistant	2,867.28
Blanche M. O'Berg	do	3,483.84
Helen A. Miller	do	2,815.92

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$3,703.31
Additional funds authorized during period	15,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	18,703.31
Expended during period	3,480.37
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	15,222.94

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Everard H. Smith	Chief clerk	$7,399.98
Thomas J. Scott	Assistant chief clerk	7,150.62
Francis S. Hewitt	Assistant clerk	6,704.76
Edmund T. King	do	6,348.06
Kenneth J. Bousquet	Professional staff member.	6,704.76
Earl W. Cooper	do	6,808.80
Herman E. Downey	do	6,704.76
Leonard E. Edwards	do	6,348.06
Joe E. Gonzales	do	6,258.90
William J. Kennedy, Jr.	do	6,348.06
Cecil C. McDaniel	do	6,704.76
Harold E. Merrick	do	6,704.76
Raymond L. Schafer	do	6,348.06
Thomas F. Shannon	do	6,036.00
John M. Witeck	do	6,214.32
William W. Woodruff	do	6,704.76
Gloria S. Butland	Clerical assistant	2,713.14
Virginia D. Carroll	do	2,713.14
Leon DeVille	do	2,610.42
Mildred L. Fowlkes	do	2,713.14
Ruby C. Hutchinson	do	2,713.14
Sally L. Heath	Clerical assistant (from July 16).	2,298.67
Mamie L. Mizen	Assistant clerk	4,646.16
Rebul H. Nichols	Clerical assistant	2,713.14
Rose M. Parker	Clerical assistant (to July 15).	208.97
Gardner C. Turner	Staff member	6,704.76
Alonzo B. Gonzales	do	4,049.04
Maurice P. Pujol	do	5,500.92
Franklin B. Dryden	do	6,036.00

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report on miscellaneous expenses during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of June 30, 1957	$24,151.49
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957	
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957	24,151.49
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1957, as of June 30, 1957	350,301.39
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957	
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957	350,301.39
Amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1958	380,000.00
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957	23,127.77
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957	356,872.23
Unexpendedbalance of amount authorized by Reorganization Act for 85th Cong., as of June 30, 1957	6,240.72
Additional authorizations by S. Res. 154 and 187	20,000.00
Total available for expenditure	26,240.72
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957	15,577.91
Unexpended balance as of Dec. 31, 1957	10,662.81

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Atkinson, Herbert S.	Assistant chief clerk	$4,400.97
Be Lieu, Kenneth E.	Professional staff member.	6,145.00
Braswell, T. Edward, Jr.	do	6,808.85
Dantzic, Maurene E.	Clerical assistant	2,867.33
Darden, William H.	Professional staff member.	6,808.85
Francovitch, Virginia C.	Clerical assistant	2,404.90
Johnson, Edna E	do	2,764.56
Welker, Mary M	do	2,764.56
Wingate, Harry L. Jr.	Chief clerk	6,145.00

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$3,942.84
Additional funds authorized during period	10,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	13,942.84
Expended during period	2,538.65
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	11,404.19

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 2, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Bush, Morris W	Investigator [1]	$1,102.24
Canaday, Alyce D	Clerical assistant	2,353.50
Cooper, Genevieve	Secretary	2,661.78
French, Stuart P	Special counsel	5,010.48
Friedenberg, Ronald	Attorney [2]	4,415.97
Gilleas, Ben J	Attorney	4,516.69
Hartford, Carolyn G.	Stenographer [3]	465.22
Hewell, Harry Pat	Attorney [4]	1,184.16
Horwitz, Solis	Counsel [5]	4,440.12
Jeffries, Jo Ann V	Clerk-typist	2,096.58
McGillicuddy, Daniel F., Jr.	Attorney	5,055.06
McPherson, Harry C.	Attorney-investigator [6]	1,058.52
Miller, Mary M	Stenographer [7]	612.69
Neal, Robert M	Attorney	3,381.12
Shepard, Don E	Research assistant [8]	1,006.14
Stewart, Jo Ann	Assistant clerk [9]	524.14
Toskes, Philip J	Investigator	3,535.26
Wheeler, Shirley H.	Stenographer	1,942.44
Wilson, Glen P	Assistant clerk [10]	788.93

[1] From Nov. 12.
[2] From Nov. 16.
[3] From Nov. 19.
[4] From July 8 to Oct. 2.
[5] From Sept. 1.
[6] From Nov. 1.
[7] From Nov. 12.
[8] From Nov. 1.
[9] From Nov. 16 to Dec. 31.
[10] From Nov. 14.

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$156,983.19
Additional funds authorized during period	None
Total available for expenditure during period	156,983.19
Expended during period	50,461.09
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	106,522.10

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
John H. Yingling	Chief clerk	$7,400.00
Robert A. Wallace	Staff director	7,150.67
Paul Cyr	Assistant clerk	6,808.85
William F. McKenna	Counsel (to Dec. 15)	6,241.45
James B. Cash, Jr	Professional staff member.	6,808.85
Donald L. Rogers	Counsel	6,808.85
Henrietta S. Chase	Clerical assistant	3,432.52
Florence Barr	do	3,175.61
Pauline C. Beam	do	3,124.23
Caro M. Pugh	do	3,124.23

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$9,311.75
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	9,311.75
Expended during period	1,551.58
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	7,760.17

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 45, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Matthew Hale	Assistant counsel	$6,808.85
Arthur J. Wilson	Staff assistant	4,646.47
Olin Cavness	do	4,302.88

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$79,122.19
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	79,122.19
Expended during period	22,268.87
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	56,853.32

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

(S. Res. 44, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing

the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Jack Carter	Staff director	$6,808.85
Milton P. Semer	Chief counsel	6,808.85
Dean F. Cromer	Staff assistant	5,322.60
Carl A. S. Coan	Research director	5,233.44
Dudley L. O'Neal, Jr.	Assistant counsel	4,049.04
Clarence R. Jacobs	Investigator	3,329.70
Mildred Mitchel	Clerical assistant	2,661.78
Doris I. Thomas	do	2,507.64
Betsy L. Rill	Clerical assistant (to Aug. 31).	630.36

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$54,703.52
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	54,703.52
Expended during period	42,004.13
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	12,699.39

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Leo A. Casey	Chief clerk	$7,399.98
Charles W. Lee	Assistant chief clerk (from Sept. 1).	3,500.98
William P. Gulledge	Professional staff member.	7,150.62
Donald P. Feldman	do	5,188.80
Ruth W. Bryant	Clerical assistant	3,483.84
Arlene B. Williams	do	3,483.84

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$8,339.05
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	8,339.05
Expended during period	1,829.35
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	6,509.70

M. M. NEELY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Elizabeth B. Springer	Chief clerk	$6,258.90
Evelyn R. Thompson	Clerical assistant	3,483.84
Betty Mae Tapy	do	3,483.84
Sandra Everly	Clerical assistant	$2,507.64
Jesse R. Nichols	Document clerk	2,918.70
Serge N. Benson	Professional staff member.	6,808.80
Samuel D. McIlwain	do	7,150.62
Reginald Barnes	Professional staff member (from Dec. 16, 1957).	383.09

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$8,956.67
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	8,956.67
Expended during period	4,962.00
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	5,038.00

HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Carl M. Marcy	Professional staff member.	$7,399.98
Pat M. Holt	do	7,150.62
Alwyn V. Freeman	do	6,808.80
Julius N. Cahn	do	6,808.80
C. C. O'Day	Chief clerk	6,808.80
George C. Denney, Jr.	Assistant chief clerk	6,808.80
Mary Ann Sames	Clerical assistant	3,368.27
Milrae E. Jensen	do	3,312.57
L. June Connell [1] (to Oct. 13, 1957).	do	1,766.32
Orrin E. Cressey [1] (to Dec. 17, 1957).	do	2,707.90
Judith Anne Lund [1] (from Dec. 23, 1957).	do	93.18

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$5,330.29
Additional funds authorized during period (S. Res. 152, agreed to July 3, 1957)	10,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	15,330.29
Expended during period	[2] 13,908.56
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	1,421.75

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 59, agreed to Jan. 30, 1957.
[2] Includes $5,000 statutory receipt.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

(Under authority of S. Res. 185, agreed to Feb. 8, 1956; S. Res. 286, agreed to July 13, 1956; S. Res. 61, agreed to Jan. 30, 1957; S. Res. 151, agreed to June 26, 1957; and S. Res. 192, agreed to Aug. 26, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Goetz, Betty Lou	Staff director	$5,010.48
Smith, Carolyn F.	Assistant clerk	2,473.37
Underwood, Paula L.	do	2,421.99
Welsh, Carolyn W. (from Sept. 16).	do	2,710.26

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period by S. Res. 151, June 26, 1957	$10,000.00
Additional funds authorized during period by S. Res. 192, Aug. 26, 1957	30,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	40,000.00
Expended during period	13,999.31
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	26,000.69

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM

(Under authority of S. Res. 35, agreed to January 30, 1957, as amended)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Bowen, Theresa	Assistant clerk	$2,747.42
Burroughs, Betty	do	2,490.51
Douw, John DeP.	Assistant clerk (from July 1 to Sept. 21).	458.08
Hansen, Morella R.	Research assistant	4,031.91
Kuhl, Arthur M.	Chief clerk	6,808.80

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$32,658.83
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	32,658.83
Expended during period	17,169.60
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	15,489.23

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Walter L. Reynolds	Chief clerk	$7,150.62
Glenn K. Shriver	Professional staff member.	6,808.80
Eli E. Nobleman	do	6,808.80
Richard J. O'Melia	Professional staff member (to July 7, 1957).	264.78
Miles Scull, Jr.	Professional staff member.	6,808.80

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Ray Kiermas	Professional staff member (from Sept. 4 to Oct. 31, 1957).	$1,741.96
W. E. O'Brien	Professional staff member (from Nov. 1, 1957).	2,012.00
Ann M. Grickis	Assistant chief clerk	3,997.68
Ray Barnett	Clerical assistant	3,175.56
Vivien I. McConnell	do	3,072.84
Kathryn Keeney (Mrs.).	do	2,918.70
Esther M. Hutchinson (Mrs.).	do	2,815.92

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$9,802.63
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	9,802.63
Expended during period	1,258.08
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	8,544.55

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Buffalohide, Maxine B.	Assistant clerk	$2,815.94
Calabrese, Alphonse F.	Investigator	6,036.00
Dearborn, Alice S	Assistant clerk	3,021.47
Duckett, Margaret W	Acting chief clerk (to July 15).	234.66
Do	Acting chief clerk (from Sept. 9).	1,786.39
Duffy, LaVern J	Investigator	5,278.03
Dunne, Robert E	Assistant counsel	5,278.03
Egan, Thomas G	Investigator	5,278.03
Healey, John S	do	5,278.03
Juliana, James N	Chief counsel to the minority.	6,808.84
Kamerick, Paul E	Assistant counsel	6,808.84
Kennedy, Rosemary K.	Assistant clerk	2,764.56
Maher, Joseph F	Investigator	5,278.02
Maxwell, Barbara L	Acting chief clerk (to Sept. 8).	850.27
Multy, Leo C	Investigator	5,723.89
O'Donnell, Donald F	Acting chief counsel	7,101.08
Switzer, Mildred L	Assistant clerk	2,764.56
Tierney, Paul J	Assistant counsel	6,036.00

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$132,470.36
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	132,470.36
Expended during period	103,575.45
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	28,894.91

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1958.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Adlerman, Jerome S	Assistant chief counsel.	$7,150.67
Aporta, John Allen	Investigator	5,500.96
Beck, John W. Jr	Research assistant (to Nov. 30).	1,283.77
Brown, Delores I	Assistant clerk (from Nov. 14).	681.60
Brucas, Marie	Assistant clerk	2,250.75
Cheasty, John Cye	Investigator	2,456.27
Davies, Dorothy H	Assistant clerk (from July 15).	2,535.83
Greene, Robert W	Investigator (from Dec. 2 to 11).	293.22
Gross, Helen K	Assistant clerk (to Sept. 27)	1,336.20
Johnson, Vernon J	Investigator	4,722.99
Jones, Edward M	do	4,646.19
Kaplan, Arthur G	Assistant counsel	5,233.44
Kelly, James P	Investigator	4,253.83
Kennedy, Robert F	Chief counsel	7,400.00
Kenney, Mary F	Assistant clerk	2,747.42
Kilburn, Jeanne F	Assistant clerk (from Oct. 7).	1,218.19
Kopecky, George M	Assistant counsel	5,545.55
Langenbacher, Irwin	do	5,456.34
Lynch, Mary A	Assistant clerk (from Dec. 12).	264.69
MacIntyre, Duncan M.	Assistant counsel (Aug. 1 to Nov. 15).	3,078.84
Martin, George H	Investigator	5,268.02
Mates, Lillian	Assistant clerk	2,764.56
Maxwell, Barbara	Assistant clerk (from Sept. 19).	1,400.45
May, Walter R	Investigator	5,545.55
McGovern, John J	Assistant counsel	6,808.84
McInerney, Michael J.	Research assistant (from Sept. 20).	1,032.25
McShane, James J. P	Investigator	4,253.83
Meriwether, Robert L.	Clerical assistant (to Sept. 18).	797.19
Mills, Ralph W	Assistant counsel	6,036.00
Novello, Angela M	Assistant clerk	3,226.94
O'Donnell, Philip K	Assistant counsel	5,367.20
O'Hara, Eleanor D	Assistant clerk (to Sept. 20).	693.57
Osolin, Katherine F	Assistant clerk	2,250.75
Ranstad, Harold	Assistant counsel (from Aug. 1).	2,898.35
Ricciuti, Angeline M	Assistant clerk (from Dec. 4).	337.61
Rowlett, Rita D	Assistant clerk	2,764.56
Rufo, Marie M	Assistant clerk (to Nov. 15).	1,957.81
Salinger, Pierre E. G	Investigator	6,808.64
Schofield, Marie S	Assistant clerk (to Oct. 15).	1,522.74
Scott, Yvonne	Assistant clerk	2,764.56
Shea, Mary D	do	2,764.56
Sheridan, Walter J	Investigator	5,545.55
Sloan, Susan	Assistant clerk	2,507.65
Sullivan, Elizabeth K	Staff editor	2,764.56
Terry, John A	Research assistant	1,942.46
Von Derau, Inez M	Assistant clerk	2,250.75
Watt, Ruth Young	Chief clerk	4,151.84
Wilber, Georgia H	Assistant clerk	2,764.56
Willse, Sherman S	Investigator	4,253.83
Young, Ruth B	Assistant clerk (from Oct. 21).	1,218.19

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$197,057.63
Additional funds authorized during period	150,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	347,057.63
Expended during period	299,308.38
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	47,749.25

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from June 30, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Callaghan, Richard L	Chief clerk	$7,400.00
French, Stewart	General counsel	7,150.67
Gamble, James H	Professional staff member.	6,808.87
Lineweaver, Goodrich L.	do	6,808.87
Stong, Benton J	do	6,808.87
Callaghan, Marcia M	Clerical assistant	2,867.33
Davis, Dorothy A	do	2,713.20
Donnelley, Rosemary	do	3,072.87
McSherry, Nellie D	Assistant chief clerk	5,545.55
Todd, Pauline B	Clerical assistant	2,867.33

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$7,567.44
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	7,567.44
Expended during period	5,898.47
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	1,668.97

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees under Senate Resolution 46, agreed to January 30, 1957, during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Culp, Gordon C	Professional staff member.	$4,641.43
Curtis, Dorothy S	Clerical assistant	2,713.14
DeMaras, James H., Jr.	Professional staff member.	2,527.53
Eaton, Eugene D	do	5,813.04
Erickson, Karen	Clerical assistant (to Sept. 15).	745.12
Harrington, Joan M	Clerical assistant	2,713.14
Heller, Hanes A	Research assistant (to Sept. 7).	596.12
Hoban, Cecelia A	Clerk-stenographer	2,815.92
Holderer, Geo. B	Professional staff member.	6,258.90
Horgan, Edward E., Jr.	Research assistant (from Sept. 16 to Dec. 31).	934.22
Humphrey, David J	Research assistant (to Aug. 31).	1,349.68
Lahr, Mary Catherine.	Clerical assistant	2,661.78
Mann, Jerry E	do	2,045.18
Mapes, Milton C., Jr.	Professional staff member.	5,411.76
McDonald, Joseph F., Jr.	do	6,036.00
Nelson, Elmer K	do	6,808.80
Nyce, Peter, Q., Jr	Research assistant (to July 30).	67.22
O'Connor, Adele R	Stenographer	2,661.78
O'Toole, Richard F	Professional staff member.	6,437.28
Redwine, Robert W	do	6,258.90

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$112,941.36
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	112,941.36
Expended during period	95,024.94
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	17,916.42

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Standing Committee and Subcommittee.

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Bailey, James E.	Assistant chief counsel.	$6,808.84
Barton, Frank L.	Staff member	6,808.84
Baynton, Harold L.	Chief counsel	7,350.72
Jarrett, Edward	Chief clerk	7,150.62
Moore, Jeanne C.	Clerical assistant	2,661.80
Rudolph, Vera B.	do	3,483.89
Shaffer, Martha P.	do	3,072.84
Smigen, Cecelia M.	do	3,072.84
Wissman, Bertram O.	Assistant chief clerk	6,808.84
Zapple, Nicholas	Staff member	6,808.84

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$8,610.73
Additional funds authorized during period	0
Total available for expenditure during period	8,610.73
Expended during period	1,626.15
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	6,984.58

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(S. Res. 26, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Black, John W.	Staff member	$3,792.18
Bourbon, August J.	do	5,545.55
Bowers, Joan A.	Clerical assistant	2,507.65
Busby, David	Staff member	5,322.62
Butz, John R.	Clerical assistant	3,226.99
Fadely, Catherine E.	do	2,815.95
Huse, Harry C.	Staff member	5,322.62
Kohler, William L.	do	4,302.88
Luckey, Albert B., Jr.	do	5,545.55
Monk, Jane E.	Clerical assistant	2,507.65
Murphy, Robert T.	Special counsel	6,808.84
Moore, Milo	Professional staff member (through July 31).	1,134.80
Ogden, Daniel M., Jr.	Staff member (through August 31).	1,075.66
Rogers, Kathryn B.	Clerical assistant	2,404.89
Stern, Edward A.	Staff member	4,965.92
Torre, Catherine C.	Clerical assistant	2,610.42
Watkins, Charles D.	Staff member	3,894.94

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$152,499.99
Additional funds authorized during period	0
Total available for expenditure during period	152,499.99
Expended during period	80,123.13
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	72,376.86

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters relating to petroleum and petroleum products)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

None.

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$50,000
Additional funds authorized during period	0
Total available for expenditure during period	50,000
Expended during period	0
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	50,000

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE OF THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Joseph A. Davis	Chief clerk	$6,808.80
Francis C. Rosenberger.	Assistant chief clerk	6,808.80
Thomas B. Collins	Professional staff member.	6,808.80
George S. Green	do	6,808.80
Robert M. Kilgore	do	6,808.80
J. Carlisle Ruddy	do	6,808.80
Wayne H. Smithey	do	6,808.80
Robert B. Young	do	6,808.80
Mary I. Rogers	Clerical assistant	3,278.34
Mildred E. Canon	do	3,278.34
Carrie Lee Conner	do	3,278.34
Katharine M. Ellis	do	3,278.34
Costas C. Chrissos	do	3,278.34
Richard F. Wambach	do	3,278.34
Beatrice M. Gray	do	2,815.92

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$7,504.69
Additional funds authorized during period	0
Total available for expenditure during period	7,504.69
Expended during period	1,209.47
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	6,295.22

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

(Under authority of S. Res. 49, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Caldwell, James N., Jr.	Assistant counsel (to Oct. 1).	$2,049.43
Escoe, J. Delmas	Assistant counsel	4,188.01
Grieg, Lydia S.	Secretary	2,610.42
Irwin, Mary A.	Legislative consultant.	4,252.24
MacNaughton, Marcia J.	Research assistant	2,199.36
Maloney, Walter H., Jr.	Assistant counsel (from Oct. 21).	1,260.62
McCandless, Sue H.	Research assistant (from Nov. 1).	681.74
Patton, William D.	Assistant counsel	4,136.63
Simmons, Belva T.	Research assistant	2,507.64
Slayman, Charles H., Jr.	Chief counsel and staff director.	6,808.80
Teeple, Jane W.	Secretary (to Dec. 1).	2,089.70

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$66,651.61
Additional funds authorized during period	0
Total available for expenditure during period	66,651.61
Expended during period	35,748.69
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	30,902.92

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

THOS. C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

(Under authority of S. Res. 50, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Downey, Mabel A.	Clerk	$3,021.42
McElroy, Marcia L.	Stenographer	2,096.58
Huss, John D.	Clerk (to Sept. 15)	1,002.02
Wood, Harlan	Counsel	6,808.80

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$39,060.55
Additional funds authorized during period	0
Total available for expenditure during period	39,060.55
Expended during period	14,485.96
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	24,574.59

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(S. Res. 51, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing

the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Ashcraft, Ann	Clerk	$2,302.08
Blair, Drury H	Staff member	6,808.80
Brown, James M	Legal assistant	5,188.80
Buckner, Catlett L	Staff member	4,456.63
Burton, Robert R	do	5,723.88
DeGooyer, Franzetta R.	Clerk	2,970.06
McCarthy, Mary C	Clerical assistant	2,250.72
McCloskey, Mary J	Clerk	2,970.06
McMullan, David M	Clerical assistant (to Sept. 20, 1957).	817.63
Mesmer, Fred M	Staff member	6,808.80

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$56,916.86
Additional funds authorized during period	0
Total available for expenditure during period	56,916.86
Expended during period	41,981.48
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	14,935.38

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Subcommittee and Full Committee Chairman.

JANUARY 8, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(Under authority of S. Res. 52, agreed to January 30, 1957, as amended)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Louis, Margaret M	Stenographer	$2,147.94
McGill, Elizabeth T	Secretary	3,278.34
Mitler, Ernest A	Special counsel	4,253.82
Perian, Carl L	Research director	3,997.68
Schonberger, Claude M.	Research assistant (to Oct. 20, 1957).	2,097.63
Sullivan, James L	Chief counsel	5,010.48

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period:		
S. Res. 52	$29,788.97	
S. Res. 126	74.42	
		$29,863.39
Additional funds authorized during period:		
S. Res. 191		10,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period		39,863.39
Expended during period:		
S. Res 52	$24,514.65	
S. Res. 126	33.11	
		24,547.76
Balance available for expenditure at end of period:		
S. Res. 52	$15,274.32	
S. Res. 126	41.31	
		15,315.63

JAMES O. EASTLAND, *Chairman.*

THOS. C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES FROM WESTERN EUROPEAN NATIONS

(Under authority of S. Res. 53, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Guthridge, Eleanor C.	General counsel	$6,808.80
Beaton, Adele V	Clerk (to Oct. 3)	1,348.71

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$36,913.85
Additional funds authorized during period	0
Total available for expenditure during period	36,913.85
Expended during period	10,291.09
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	26,622.76

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

WILLIAM LANGER,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPROVEMENTS IN THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL CODE

(S. Res. 54, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Gasque, Cecial A	General counsel	$6,808.80
Culotta, Samuel A	Associate counsel	5,055.06
Amidon, Robert H	Attorney (from Dec. 10, 1957).	568.95
Langer, Jennie J	Secretary	3,638.04

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$27,045.68
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	27,045.68
Expended during period	17,641.80
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	9,403.88

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS

(Pursuant to S. Res. 55, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1958, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Clesner, Herschel F	Investigator	$3,797.27
Erceg ovich, Ann M	Secretary	2,686.90
Gibbons, Richard M	Secretary-typist	2,147.94
Haaser, Stephen G	Chief clerk	4,787.52
Hollabaugh, Marcus A:	Counsel	6,808.80
Hoy, Ann S	Secretary	3,175.56
Huber, Walter B	Investigator	4,787.52
Solo, Robert A	Consultant [1] (S. Res. 167).	452.22
Stedman, John C	Associate counsel	[2] 8,337.71
Vernon, Raymond	Consultant [1] ($945.55 under S. Res. 167).	1,007.21

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$52,599.77
Additional funds authorized during period	0
Total available for expenditure during period	52,599.77
Expended during period	39,585.04
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	13,014.73

[1] (W. a. e.) When actually employed.
[2] Includes w. a. e. salary for May and June 1957 paid in August.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

(Under authority of S. Res. 36, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds aavilable to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

No employees.

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$4,958.71
Additional funds authorized during period	0
Total available for expenditure during period	4,958.71
Expended during period	628.86
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	4,329.85

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SENATE ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE

(Under authority of S. Res. 57, agreed to January 30, 1957, as amended)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds

available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Arnett, Lucy V.	Stenographer	$2,815.92
Banner, Paul H.	Economist	4,548.06
Beaton, Adele V.	Stenographer (from Oct. 4).	1,261.70
Blair, John M.	Chief economist	6,808.80
Bolton-Smith, Carlile.	Attorney	6,808.80
Browne, E. Wayles, Jr.	Economist	5,768.46
Chaney, Katherine Ford.	Stenographer	2,404.86
Chumbris, Peter N.	Counsel for the minority.	6,714.68
Clifford, George E.	Assistant counsel	4,975.22
Cole, Raymond C., Jr.	Investigator	4,447.12
deFelice, Antoinette M.[1]	Stenographer	81.87
Dixon, Paul Rand.	Counsel and staff director.	6,808.80
Flurry, Horace L.	Assistant counsel (from Sept. 3).	4,161.51
Green, Paul S.	Hearing editor	4,921.32
Hamilton, Irene Till [1]	Economist (from Sept. 18).	1,072.75
Layton, Philip R.	Assistant counsel	5,768.46
Measday, Walter S.[1]	Economist (from Nov. 22).	114.31
McHugh, Donald P.	Counsel	6,808.80
Montier, Gladys E.	Clerk	3,381.12
More, Carolyn A.	Research stenographer (from Nov. 1).	715.98
Neville, Gareth M.	Assistant counsel	6,808.80
Oliver, Mae	Records clerk	3,278.36
Oishine, Lucille L.	Research assistant	2,764.56
Ott, David J.	Junior economist (to Aug. 19).	170.63
Posmantur, Peter T.	Attorney (from Oct. 30).	971.68
Read, Arlone.	Stenographer	2,507.64
Roseman, Louis.	Attorney	2,867.28
Rice, Downey [1]	Assistant counsel (from Sept. 11).	534.43
Shine, D. Bruce.	Research assistant (from July 16 to Sept. 9).	365.34
Snyder, W. B. Watson.[1]	Consultant	1,123.61
Sparks, Wilbur D.	Attorney	4,548.06
Waltman, Vera M.	Stenographer	2,439.69
Whitaker, Ken G.[1]	Consultant	411.11
Williams, Thomas C.	Research employee	2,713.14
Zalany, Emily W.	Stenographer	2,559.00

[1] When actually employed.

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$133,652.32
Additional funds authorized during period (S. Res. 166)	50,000.00
Total available for expenditure during period	183,652.32
Expended during period	127,645.94
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	56,006.38

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

ESTES KEFAUVER,
Subcommittee Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

(Under authority of S. Res. 58, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Baker, Dorothy C.	Records manager	$4,646.16
Barber, Frank D.	Investigator	3,740.76
Betts, Mary E.	Secretary	2,507.64
Buckley, Wilburn.	Investigator	5,857.62
Dua, Bernice E.	Secretary	2,507.64
Duffy, Edward R.	Investigator	5,144.22
Fox, Miriam O.	Confidential secretary.	$3,483.84
Frank, Nelson.	Investigator	3,843.54
Garcia, Roy.	Clerk	3,021.42
Hutto, Ralph H., Jr.	Assistant editorial director.	5,055.06
Lowell, William E.	Editorial director	6,303.48
Malaney, Elinor L.	Confidential secretary.	3,483.84
Malaney, Ethel A.	Stenographer	2,764.56
Mandel, Benjamin.	Research director	6,303.48
McManus, Robert C.	Investigations analyst.	6,125.16
McManus, William F.	Research assistant	3,792.18
McShan, Antoinette M.	do	3,124.20
Morris, Robert.	Chief counsel	6,808.80
Pierce, Clarence A.	Investigator (through Oct. 31).	2,493.84
Poe, Edgar A., Jr.	Clerk (through Sept. 20).	954.64
Richards, Ann E.	Stenographer	2,970.06
Rusher, William A.	Associate counsel (to Aug. 19).	1,703.81
Schedler, Dean.	Investigator (from Dec. 15).	323.38
Schroeder, Frank W.	Chief investigator	6,125.16
Sisson, W. D.	Clerk (from Sept. 4)	1,563.16
Sourwine, J. G.	Associate counsel	6,808.80
Stavropulos, Mary.	Clerk	2,610.42
Tonnar, Helen H.	Secretary	2,764.56
Munson, Lyle H.	W. A. E.	712.40
Stokes, Alvin W.	W. A. E. (Oct. 22–30).	283.96

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$183,421.03
Additional funds authorized during period	0
Total available for expenditure during period	183,421.03
Expended during period	129,568.52
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	53,852.51

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Stewart E. McClure.	Chief clerk	$6,808.80
Roy E. James.	Assistant chief clerk	6,808.80
Crawford C. Heerlein.	Clerical assistant	3,483.84
Vivien T. Harman.	do	3,381.12
Thelma W. Blankenship.	do	3,124.20
Marjorie M. Whittaker.	do	3,072.84
Helen H. Papps.	do	3,072.84
Alice H. Price.	do	2,867.28
Helyn Eagle.	do	2,867.28
Lucille Gould.	do	2,661.78
Mary Miniutti.	Clerical assistant (to Aug. 31; and from Sept. 3 to 5).	877.67
John S. Forsythe.	General counsel	6,808.80
William G. Reidy.	Professional staff member.	6,808.80
Michael J. Bernstein.	do	6,808.80
Merton Bernstein.	do	6,808.80
Frederick Blackwell.	do	5,199.66
Paul Cotter.	do	6,808.80
Joseph Stone.	Professional staff member (to Aug. 31).	2,269.60

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$7,019.67
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	7,019.67
Expended during period	3,527.90
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	3,491.77

LISTER HILL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Brawley, H. W.	Chief clerk	$7,399.98
Kerlin, J. Don.	Professional staff member.	6,808.80
Paschal, Frank A.	do	7,150.62
Faucette, Andrew McC.	do	6,808.80
Finzel, Hubert H.	do	6,808.80
Perrott, Virginia E.	Assistant chief clerk	3,543.82
Sisk, Elizabeth R.	Clerical assistant	3,398.24
Thornton, Peggy L.	do	2,670.34
Gooselaw, Jay E.	do [1]	2,670.34
McDonald, Innis E.	do	2,927.26
Finney, Joan M.	do	3,072.84

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$6,998.99
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	6,998.99
Expended during period	4,031.38
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	2,967.61

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 20, agreed to Jan. 30, 1957.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE GROUP LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM, THE CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM, AND THE POSTAL SERVICE

(S. Res. 25, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Alexander, Betty C.	Clerical assistant	$2,211.31
Brown, Paula M.	Clerical assistant (from Aug. 8).	1,461.51
Gandal, Gabriele.	Clerical assistant	2,516.20
Johnston, Nannette G.	Clerical assistant (from Nov. 1).	1,015.71
McEnroe, Louella C.	Clerical assistant	2,935.80
Miller, William W.	Investigator	4,839.59
Fuller, Walter D.	Consultant (per diem).	3.79
Gaines, Pendleton.	do	7.58
Helwege, Walter R.	Consultant (per diem, from June 6).	262.89
Putman, Russell L.	Consultant (per diem, from Nov. 13).	11.37
Seastrunk, F. Jack.	do	11.37

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$38,320.41
Additional funds authorized during period	
Total available for expenditure during period	38,320.41
Expended during period	17,715.94
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	20,604.47

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Theo W. Sneed	Professional staff member.	$6,303.48
John L. Mutz	do	6,303.48
Frances Ortiz	do	6,303.48
Filo M. Sedillo	Chief clerk	7,399.98
Charles N. Kapnic	Assistant chief clerk	6,303.48
Eloise Porter	Clerical assistant	3,483.84
Frances T. Clark	do	3,483.84
Ercilia E. Martinez	do	2,918.70
Lorenzo E. Tapia	do	3,021.42

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$9,475.00
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	9,475.00
Expended during period	----------
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	9,475.00

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

(Under authority of S. Res. 34, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Fernandez, Cruz S	Clerical assistant	$3,483.84
Graves, John R	Clerk (to Sept. 1)	1,255.48
McBride, Paul	Clerk (from Sept. 1)	3,032.04
Mollica, D. F	Clerk	3,406.77
Mounton, Rodney F	do	5,278.02

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$57,025.97
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	57,025.97
Expended during period	24,716.87
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	32,309.10

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

JANUARY 6, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Harrison, Gordon F	Chief clerk	$7,399.98
Moore, Marian G	Assistant chief clerk	3,483.84
St. Claire, Darrell	Professional staff member.	7,150.62
West, Langdon C	do	6,808.80
McCain, Robert S	do	6,036.00
Hanlon, Joseph	do	5,010.48
Gavin, B. Floye	Clerical assistant	3,483.84
Mitchell, Elizabeth S	do	3,072.84
Sharp, Hildreth T	do	2,601.84
Downs, Eleanor L	do	2,713.14
Coder, John P	Printing and editorial assistant.	1,017.96

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$9,813.80
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	9,813.80
Expended during period	1,467.95
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	8,345.85

THOS C. HENNINGS, Jr.
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Clark, Alice	Chief clerk	$3,535.26
Duffy, James H	Chief counsel	6,808.80
Gale, Clara R	Research assistant (from Dec. 7).	471.36
Humphrey, David R	Clerical assistant (from Sept. 5).	2,609.38
Kath, Norma H	Clerical assistant	2,302.08
Mase, Sadi J	Associate chief counsel	6,808.80

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$43,619.61
Additional funds authorized during period	----------
Total available for expenditure during period	43,619.61
Expended during period	24,442.99
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	19,176.62

THOS. C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1957.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1 to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Amis, William D	Professional staff member.	$6,189.53
Byrne, Elizabeth	Assistant chief clerk	3,483.84
Jehle, Philip F	Professional staff member.	5,759.52
Messick, Wiley S	do	5,237.38
Novak, Gertrude C	Clerical assistant	2,610.42
O'Connor, Blake	Professional staff member.	6,189.53
Ruppert, Minna L	Chief clerk	5,322.60
Ryan, Nell F	Clerical assistant	2,404.86
Smith, Don W	Clerk-messenger (from Sept. 1).	1,363.48
Stults, Walter B	Staff director	7,399.98

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$8,389.84
Additional funds authorized during period	None
Total available for expenditure during period	8,389.84
Expended during period	5,722.32
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	2,667.52

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1957.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

(Pursuant to S. Res. 42, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Total salary received
Adams, Walter	Professional staff member (from July 1 to 31; and from Aug. 19 to Sept. 16).	$2,193.95
Alford, William C	Clerk-messenger (to July 7).	71.54
Burwell, Rose M	Clerical assistant (July 1 to Oct. 16; and Nov. 18 to Dec. 31).	1,778.02
Chaternuck, Pauline	Clerical assistant (from Oct. 17).	883.04
Creech, William A	Professional staff member.	4,597.14
Dye, Elaine C	Clerical assistant	2,302.08
Erickson, William J	Professional staff member.	5,768.46
Flynn, John J	do	4,597.14
Foulke, Roy E	Professional staff member (to July 31).	841.50
Hall, Edwin P., Jr	Clerk-messenger (to Sept. 9).	705.20
Hendry, James B	Professional staff member (July 2-6).	118.16
Smith, Don W	Clerk-messenger (from Aug. 26 to 31).	51.10
Weadock, Robert L	Professional staff member.	4,646.16
White, Lee C	do	5,500.92

Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period	$55,926.91
Additional funds authorized during period	None
Total available for expenditure during period	55,926.91
Expended during period	42,740.98
Balance available for expenditure at end of period	13,185.93

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 16, 1958:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

James Major Baley, Jr., of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina for the term of

4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 9, 1957.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Nelson P. Rose, of Ohio, to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury, to fill an existing vacancy.

The following-named candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeon

George Brecher

To be senior sanitary engineer

Lewis A. Young

To be scientist

Robert R. Omata

To be assistant scientist

Clarence J. Weinmann

To be nurse officer

Jessie M. Scott

II. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be assistant sanitary engineer

Morton D. Sinkoff

III. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

Bohdan G. Giel
William F. Mayes

To be surgeons

Daniel M. Bloch — Thayer M. Mackenzie
Maurice F. Herring, Jr. — Alfred S. Nelson

To be senior assistant surgeons

Gordon Allen — Mark H. Lane
Clement P. Cotter — William C. Mohler
John L. Getz, Jr. — Joseph J. Noya
Lloyd Guth — Jacob Robbins
Martin D. Hicklin — William L. Walter
William M. Jackson — Harry W. Weller

To be assistant surgeon

John R. S. Remsberg

To be dental surgeon

John M. Frankel

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

F. D. Morse, Jr.

To be senior sanitary engineer

Thomas H. Seltzer

To be scientist

George E. Jay, Jr.

To be assistant pharmacists

Mark H. Barnett
Wesley R. Gladhart, Jr.
Paul J. Le Sage

To be sanitarian

Donald R. Johnson

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Lucile G. Buderer
Harriett Hicok
Virginia D. Hines

To be senior dietitian

Janet E. Stroupe

IV. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

Christopher E. Kennemer

To be senior assistant veterinarian

Paul Arnstein

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Thomas Morgan Watlington, O16780, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Norman Edgar Youngblood, O28996, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Alphonsus Lane, O17075, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lyle Edward Seeman, O17082, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David William Heiman, O17094, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Everett Potter, O17098, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert George Butler, O17191, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Legare Kilgore Tarrant, O17208, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Evan McLaren Houseman, O17307, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ralph Thomas Nelson, O17308, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alexander McNair Willing, O38619, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Louis Edward Cotulla, O29069, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Harvey Cash 2d, O38628, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Norman Hayden Vissering, O41603, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Dreyfus, O29117, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alvin Galt Viney, O17511, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Lloyd Person, O17517, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Philip Henry Draper, Jr., O17543, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Milton Colby, O17562, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ralph Robert Mace, O17578, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Darwin Hamlin, O17619, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edmund Chauncey Rockefeller Lasher, O17624, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Reisner Ranck, O17647, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Kerr Ghormley, O17674, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Little Cook, O17675, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lester Skene Bork, O17685, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Greene Calloway, O17690, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, O17706, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hugh Mackintosh, O17716, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Nelson Marquis Lynde, Jr., O17730, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bruce Easley, O17735, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Norfleet Griffin, O17775, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Arnold Carter, O18023, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Philip Campbell Wehle, O18067, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hamilton Hawkins Howze, O18088, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18157, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Christian Hudgins Clarke, Jr., O18213, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Knox Wilson, Jr., O18218, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., O18232, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Theodore Francis Bogart, O18245, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Paul Russell Weyrauch, O18252, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Herbert Lucian Scofield, O29462, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Derrill McCollough Daniel, O29500, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Theodore William Parker, O18369, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William White Dick, Jr., O18384, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Frew Train, O18415, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Knight Waters, O18481, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Orlando Collette Troxel, Jr., O18487, Army of the United States (colonel U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Thomas Pachler, O18488, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edwin John Messinger, O18503, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edwin Anderson Walker, O18552, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Rogers Woodward, O18582, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert John Fleming, Jr., O17095, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals, chaplain

Brig. Gen. Frank Alden Tobey, O41698, Army of the United States (colonel, chaplain, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Louis Jacob Rumaggi, O14900, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Olaf Helgesen Kyster, Jr., O16830, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Mercer Christie Walter, O17151, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Ned Dalton Moore, O18212, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Alphonsus Lane, O17075, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Arnold Carter, O18023, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Paul Amos Gavan, O17169, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Frederick Bohlender, O17814, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Fraley Van Natta, O17086, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Alvin Galt Viney, O17511, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Thomas William Mattingly, O20068, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. Frank Sherman Henry, O18989, United States Army.

Col. Kenneth Adelbert McCrimmon, O18336, United States Army.

Col. Harold Walmsley, O18769, United States Army.

Col. Howard Raymond Whittaker, O29408, United States Army.

Col. George Thomas Powers 3d, O19137, United States Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299.

To be major

James, Lee B., O25619.

To be major, Women's Army Corps

Parks, Dorothy W., L280.

To be captain

Estrada, Leon P., O68098.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Brown, Raymond V., O75157.
Granger, John D., O75197.
Haywood, William M., Jr., O75207.
McCord, John S., O75247.
Roberts, William P., O75277.
Thomas, David L., O75305.
Wallace, Danny C., O75312.
Wilks, Clarence D., O75318.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

To be colonel

*Radsch, Rex William, O251592.

To be lieutenant colonels

Ashworth, Talmadge DeWitt, O348299.
Bacharach, Gustav Moore, O316111.
Banks, Keith Bateman, O296383.
Bash, James Hoyt, O310183.
Benner, James Daniel, O343091.
Cameron, Harry Frank, Jr., O371208.
Coffey, Frederick James, O291713.
Cole, John Scott, O329506.
Cumming, William Francis, O307078.
Downing, Wayne Edward, O311990.
Elting, John Robert, O297917.
Emmerich, Rollins Stanley, O342278.
Fallen, Arthur John, Jr., O311965.
Goodwin, Walton, 3rd, O314438.
Jacks, Samuel T., O336314.
King, Ryan William, O363232.
Kitto, George Joseph, O311723.
LaPointe, John Thomas, O302493.
Lautz, Edward Hale, O306360.
Leidholt, Ernest Bruno, O312990.
Luther, Henry, O355252.
Rice, Kenneth Eaton, O321728.
Rolle, Norman Benjamin, O307520.
Schimmel, Bernard Hastie, O285646.
Springer, Louis Ferguson, O308918.
Thacher, Coleman Wallace, O318126.
Wyles, Eben Richards, O311589.

To be majors

Abel, Carl Mullaney, O1321134.
Abrino, Francis Eugene, O347987.
Adair, George William, O346621.
Adams, Robert Dewey, O1321729.
Adams, James Dana, O1633513.
Akins, James Don, O454330.
Andrews, George Henry, O885383.
Anido, Victor Maurice, Jr., O400743.
Augustauskas, Anthony Stanley, O1284626.
Bachtel, Charles Levi, O1634283.
Baker, Chester Argus, O373526.
Bankson, Rodger Russell, O353092.
Baranouskas, Raymond Martin, O1302757.
Barton, Jack Everett, O455350.
Baxter, Samuel Ford, O370439.
Beach, William Victor, O373546.
Beebe, John Eliott, Jr., O350538.
Bell, William Woodrow, O354682.
Bercaw, Roger Matthew, O1822316.
Bergsagel, Ralph Monrad, O1573039.
Bermingham, Peter Francis, O1058723.
Betts, Charles Archibald, O379879.
Billard, Jules Frederic, O1014799.
Bishop, Raymond Chapman, O403627.
Blom, Arthur Ralph, O345765.
Boardman, William Morgan, O485039.
Boesch, Eugene Francis, O900014.
Bogen, Paul Logasa, O355729.
Booth, Reed Alexander, O353066.
Born, Raymond Nicholas, O455595.
Bott, Frederic Charles, O451081.
Boudman, Arthur Belles, O1051042.
Boughn, Robert Estes, O395744.
Boyce, William Murray, O364353.
Brashear, Goldman Taylor, O452022.
Bremkamp, Louis Edward, O425627.
Brewer, Dwight Cleland, O408121.
Brey, Albert Joseph, O393404.
Brown, Burnett Jackson, O384169.
Brust, Robert Philip, O391121.
Burdell, Frank Edward, Jr., O450078.
Burgess, John Frank, Jr., O415367.
Burkholder, James Brooke, O392322.
Burns, Donald Edwin, O453138.
Buser, George Wager, O454341.
Buttleman, Leslie Louis, O1308469.
Campbell, John Edward, O385096.
Carroll, Walter David, Jr., O328170.
Carter, Lamar Gordon, O342723.
Case, Frank Borton, O1535567.
Chamblee, John James, O2034666.
Charles, Alvin Kenneth, O426222.
Chegin, Thomas Eugene, O402781.
Clark, William Jerome, O1825116.
Clautice, Edward Wellmore, O370396.
Cole, Jack Newcombe, O450829.
Comrie, Russell Malcolm, O374514.
Contole, William Salvatore, O352670.
Cook, Harvey James, O393475.
Cook, Richard Halliday, O394007.
Cotter, Arthur Edward, O421018.
Coupe, Robert Dennis, O1311985.
Cowan, Donald Erwin, O378196.
Craig, James Lewis, Jr., O316415.
Crawford, Grover Lee, Jr., O335563.
Cullen, Joe Clark, O405785.
Cunningham, Thomas Joseph, Jr., O1283382.
Cushwa, William Ellison, O1283035.
Cutter, James Frederick, O352842.
Daly, Thomas Martin, O1554885.
Darms, John Livingston, Jr., O450842.
Daulton, James Otto, O1016425.
Davis, Woodrow Wilson, O1703775.
DeLancey, Raymond Winthrop, O335096.
De Milt, Irving Francis, Jr., O1031398.
Dempsey, Michael Angelo, O1296336.
Derosier, Gerald Arthur, O398010.
Dittmer, Robert Edward, O1580868.
Dosch, Harry Albert, Jr., O351100.
Downey, Earl Courtney, O411360.
Draper, James Leon, Jr., O407465.
Driscoll, Arthur Francis, O1795776.
Duke, Henry Bradford, O349007.
Durst, John Edmond, O405757.
Duttweiler, Charles Henry, O1112126.
Dwyer, Frank Arthur, Jr., O418311.
Dyer, Joseph Cross, O906431.
Ernst, Carl Julius, O338888.
Farber, Leo Joseph, O408578.
Fellows, John Lee, Jr., O1291612.
Files, Maynard Whitney, O386767.
Finnegan, John Bernard, O1102725.
Ford, John Millspaugh, O1308319.
Foster, Gayle Herbert, O340522.
Francis, Gus Christ, O371149.
Fuller, Robert Joseph, O438626.
Fullerton, Thomas Kennedy, O413687.
Gaddis, Shelton, O353108.
Gallagher, Hugh Thomas, O1548059.
Gates, Vincent Ira, O1284317.
Gausman, Willis Ferdinand, O449209.
Geehan, Bernard Thomas, O382672.
Genger, Edward Paul, O1322907.
Gill, William Edgar, O379858.
Gillen, Joseph Xavier, O1040719.
Gilroy, Eugene Michael, O1173619.
Gobeille, Gerard Alphonse, O1052360.
Goff, Kenneth Joseph, O1165181.
Goldberg, Seymour Louis, O1296197.
Goldblum, Kirby Donald, O361861.
Golden, Simon Socrates, O1633238.
Goodell, Henry Ward, AO1039976.
Gundling, David Louis, O407763.
Hager, Ernest Julius, O1285579.
Haley, John James, O392232.
Haley, Joseph Kelly, Jr., O377570.
Hall, John Broughton, O1173980.
Hall, Lloyd Carroll, O407885.
Hames, William Elbert, Jr., O1647065.
Hamilton, Doyce, O1300480.
Hamilton, Howard Edmund, O450296.
Hansen, Herbert Carl, O1551416.
Hansen, Richard Arthur, O455639.
Hanson, Mark Kellogg, O426815.
Hanson, Walter Scott, O421014.
Harris, James Benjamin, O400913.
Hayes, Arthur Ennis, O1001147.
Hayes, Melvin Bennett, O1581786.
Hearst, Don Allen, O1286647.
Hensley, William Wilson, O1581174.
Higgins, Wayne George, O371409.
Hills, Henry Murel, O315460.
Hinton, Reginald James, O1313094.
Hodge, William Lyle, O1048819.
Holland, Norman Leonwood, O1573287.
Hollis, Charles Edwin, O1548075.
Holm, George Philip, O454681.
Holt, Harvey Scott, Jr., O371789.
Howard, Harry McVern, O441001.
Hulsey, Alvin, O1301309.
Hunt, Wheeler Houston, O372236.
Hustead, George Lincoln Thomas, O391507.
Hutchinson, Wallace Charles, O386002.
Ice, Jack Carleton, O1037550.
Irving, Thurman Algernon, O353004.
Jacobs, Harold John, O1283615.
Jensen, Norman Christian, O375770.
Johnson, Elliott McClintock, O1283440.
Johnson, Walter Raymond, O1296532.
Jones, Charles Evans Hughes, O390371.
Jones, Robert Ellis, O376938.
Kalergis, James George, O453613.
Kane, Frank Raymond, Jr., O1045793.
Keisel, Walter Irving, O373741.
Kennon, William Upshur, O352483.
Kersey, Sidney Prentiss, O328123.
Kirkwood, Walter Vernon, Jr., O375096.
Kohlhagen, Werner S., O1049541.
Kolankiewicz, Charles Francis, O1558170.
Kramer, Theodore Jr., O1166106.
La Mont, Charles Edward, O367436.
Ladd, Harvey Martin, O1181935.
Lahmer, John Arthur, O389208.
Lail, James Gano, O426722.
Lau, Ernest Victor, O455966.
Laudieri, Mario Frank, O407457.
LeClair, Joseph Albert, Jr., O1048870.
Ledgerwood, Howard Gail, O1280064.
Lehman, Arthur Maurice, O1636203.
Lehman, Robert Hersh, O1040564.
Levy, Gilbert Paul, O1575420.

Lewis, Keith Lester, O1548093.
Lewis, William Douglas, O416137.
Licord, Frank Albert, O681916.
Lieberberg, George, O1635029.
Likens, Ellery Albert, Jr., O1016024.
Lindow, Rodman Edward, O379038.
Loomis, Jester Mortimer, Jr., O370235.
Lovejoy, Charles Douglas, O374232.
Lowrie, Elvin Stewart, O1286314.
Lucas, John George, O407180.
Lyon, David Lockwood, O462176.
Malone, Patrick Matthew, O1051271.
Marsh, Curtis Naum, Jr., O316325.
Martin, John Roy, O399024.
Martin, Robert Wheeler, O1285969.
Mason, William Hovey, O397347.
Mathews, Bernard Lilse, O370509.
Mathews, Charles Braxton, Jr., O1046555.
Mattice, Edson Russell, O358222.
Mattson, Rudolph Leonard, O1823179.
Mausert, Ryerson Newhall, O360170.
Mayer, Edward Emil, O423736.
Maynard, John Blackwell, Jr., O315060.
McConnell, John Arvel, O346769.
McConnell, Kendred Chris, O452014.
McDowell, Richard Dittmar, O423199.
McGowan, James Frederick, O418864.
McGrath, Vincent Jerome, O1638044.
McKaney, William Aloysious, Jr., O401337.
McKay, Robert John, O1167108.
McKean, Sterling Judd, O341423.
McMullin, William Carrington, O352459.
Mendelson, Sheldon Harold, O375162.
Merrill, Clifford Royce, O450462.
Miller, Maynard Charles, O329984.
Mills, Webster, O362454.
Misdom, Howell Ellis, O356572.
Mitchell, Barry Harry, O453184.
Mitchell, George Rodda, O1290982.
Mollen, Irving Roth, O352341.
Montesclaros, Melecio Juan, O1305289.
Moore, Alva Joseph, O401751.
Moore, Robert Lee, O387362.
Moran, James Joseph, O453873.
Morrell, John Russell, O1105038.
Morris, Raymond Claude, O359755.
Murday, Stanley James, O424853.
Murphy, John Leo, O401692.
Newman, William Curtis, O354474.
Noonan, James Henry, Jr., O1059024.
Oberg, Vincent Gustavus, O1046593.
Oberman, Marvin Dee, O1284008.
Pearson, Robert Alexander, O1573502.
Pelham, Charles Clay, O366819.
Pell, Mark Gair, O340436.
Peters, Gus Stanley, O449601.
Phillips, Wayne Nevel, O1170136.
Picciotti, Romulus Augustus, O428718.
Pickett, Joseph Robert, O1285115.
Pierce, Thomas Arthur, O1944781.
Pool, Flournoy P., Jr., O451841.
Pope, Cornell, O1104345.
Povendo, Nicholas Anton, O451513.
Prebil, Fred Charles, O376553.
Prentice, Neil Buchanan, O1106414.
Prescott, Dana Serr, O453446.
Pumphrey, A. T., O540446.
Quante, Frank, Jr., O391106.
Rael, Zacarias Francisco, O1101629.
Rankin, Robert Bruce, O449838.
Reid, Marion Mercer, O1017388.
Renfro, Henry Moore, O349066.
Rich, Arthur Armstrong, O367202.
Riggins, Jack Franklin, O386895.
Riley, James Anderson, O371534.
Riley, William Thomas, Jr., O463940.
Rogers, George, O1172628.
Rogers, Poole, O1581347.
Rollason, Richard Norton, O452074.
Ross, Homer Glenn, O1286708.
Rounds, Raymond Bennett, O1040607.
Rowland, Will Cassell, O342971.
Rowlands, Richard Arthur, Jr., O387550.
Roye, Herbert Francis, O1283676.
Ryckaert, Elmer Bernard, O405774.
Sabel, August James, O455224.
Safer, Joseph, O342755.
Salmon, Henry Sanford, Jr., O408538.
Salthouse, Wirt Charlton, O362465.
Sanders, Joe Maxwell, O347853.
Sanderson, Walter Laurence, O470095.
Saunders, Raymond Wilbur, O382765.
Sauter, Louis Francis, Jr., O1580271.
Sawbridge, John Joseph, O462624.
Sayre, Gorden Earl, Sr., O374215.
Scales, Joseph Walter, O1182957.
Scanlon, Donald Lawrence, O1796160.
Schauers, Charles Julius, O451064.
Schmidt, Hugh Francis, O323268.
Schrecengost, Howard Elmer, O1284223.
Shealy, Carroll Durham, O383146.
Shelton, James Alexander, O465969.
Shropshire, Lewis Walter, O334652.
Silvestri, Armand Joseph, O1945491.
Skeath, Elbur Jay, O430493.
Skees, Hugh Shelby, O332924.
Skrien, Cyrus Alexander, O1045597.
Smith, Arthur Lewis, Jr., O341943.
Smith, Grover Gathreon, O1325529.
Smith, Malcolm White, O442992.
Smith, Marshall James, O1284040.
Sommer, Harry Arthur, O1586211.
Stell, James Howell, O1286915.
Stern, Gates Barnet, O341100.
Stier, Robert Joseph, O2035392.
Stine, Harlan Chester, O1010888.
Swanson, Arthur Victor, O1573962.
Swears, Clayton Cole, O453909.
Tanner, Royal Kendrick, O341970.
Taylor, Harry Joseph, Jr., O383419.
Taylor, Thomas A., Jr., O381958.
Terribile, Valentine Thomas, O376341.
Terris, Alexander Anton, O1170578.
Thomas, Joseph Anthony, O1579220.
Tinari, Emanuel Joseph, O1302905.
Trigg, Thomas King, O353458.
Troxell, Raymond Alexander, O423174.
Urban, George, O1171401.
Varhol, Michael Clement, O373963.
Waddell, Charles Christian, O405453.
Welch, Louis Charles, O406265.
Weltmer, Noyes, Jr., O360432.
Woolsey, Myron Frank, O1324384.
Wyatt, Othel, O395190.
Yarrington, William Ray, O454442.
Young, James Sanford, O1040859.
Zall, Emil Anthony, O1307116.

To be captains

Adams, Robert Edson, O961393.
Adams, Robert Frank, O2034656.
Agee, Charles Daniel, O520512.
Aiken, Jamie Lee, O2204195.
Aines, Donald Sutphen, O949399.
Alexander, Marvin Lucas, O2033672.
Allen, Andrew Sherrod, O955201.
Allen, Fred Eugene, O1298494.
Allison, James Wesley, O960928.
Allman, Phillip Hugh, Jr., O967669.
Alvarez, Alfred Anthony, O2033950.
Ambrose, Wayne Russell, O1924745.
Amburn, Warren Gamble, O1336587.
Amenson, Raymond Carl, O1178994.
Anderson, Burton Lloyd, O1649260.
Anderson, Philip Calvin, O536277.
Anderson, William Alex, O945641.
Armeli, Jerry Philip, O2202951.
Arnold, Stanley Watson, O1325363.
Arnold, William Joseph, Jr., O1059990.
Arnwine, Henry Boggess, O722973.
Ashley, Merle Welden, O1038422.
Austin, Henry Marshall, Jr., O1327800.
Badger, Joseph Eugene, O2021238.
Bailey, James, O1300438.
Bailey, John Franklin, O1313707.
Ball, John James, Jr., O2020871.
Bangs, Robert Ross, O1684938.
Banks, Thomas Girard, O2026261.
Barbour, Edward Lambert, O948508.
Barda, James Joseph, O1295980.
Barkley, James Robert, O965315.
Barlow, Bowman Orlando, O1019073.
Barnwell, John Carter, O1120323.
Barris, Donald Frederick, O1117352.
Baugh, Jack Ray, O1287649.
Baxley, James Warfield, O954486.
Bean, Robert, O1913379.
Beardsley, William Franklin, O956341.
Beauchamp, Darwin Delbert, O788311.
Beene, Dudley Crawford, O2279931.
Berger, Newell James, Jr., O949628.
Bergner, John, O1341619.
Birdsong, Eff W., Jr., O1179782.
Bishop, Bertram Joseph, O961373.
*Black, Marion Ray, O973640.
Black, William Edward, O1684937.
Bledsoe, James Elton, O1331807.
Blood, William Carr, O1341848.
Bodroghy, Robert Francis, O1913467.
Boland, Richard Henry, O1688405.
Boll, Kenneth Harry, O2262799.
Boman, Truman Robert, O1018042.
Bonham, Mark Myatt, Jr., O957422.
Bosan, George Steven, O545400.
Boutelle, Guy Chester, O2007270.
Bowman, Elmo Lyle, O2211115.
Bowman, James Homer, O1112577.
Boyer, Samuel Reitzel, Jr., O961901.
Bradley, James Thurman, O2207619.
Brann, Durward Herschel, O1171916.
Brennan, William Hubert, O2041414.
Bridges, Wayne Walter, O1112045.
Briggs, Jack Leroy, O2033963.
Brigham, Bruce Alan, O547557.
Brinker, Joseph Raymond, O1333422.
Brock, Luther Austin, O976097.
Brooks, Lawrence Phillip, O1338437.
Brown, Royal Baxter, O1340745.
Browne, Harvey Melvin, O1043583.
Brummer, James Louis, O1058738.
*Brundrett Tom Houston, O2207455.
Brunt, Julian Gould, O887328.
Buchanan, Thomas E., O961608.
Buchanan, James, Jr., O1178423.
Bundy, James Albert, O1166026.
Burns, George T., O1342321.
Burton, Kenneth Jack, O2209686.
Busbey, Arthur Bresnahan, Jr., O556641.
Bush, Sydney Arnold, O1647134.
Bushong, Charles Ralph, O1046384.
Bynum, Pierre Dallas, O1917616.
Byrne, John Patrick, O2021015.
Callanan, John Austin, O2014524.
Cannon, James William, O2014768.
Carey, Eldon Winfield, O1913250.
Carney, Jonathon Donald, O1331707.
Carpenter, Jay Dawson, O1031393.
Carranza, Hector, O2207370.
Carroll, George Franklin, O977933.
Case, Francis Richard, O1080552.
Case, Richard Haynes, O2019985.
Chamberlain, Edwin William, Jr., O1688805.
Charron, Frederick Eugene, O528466.
Chelenza, Nicholas Joseph, O1999830.
Cherry, Hugh George, O1552858.
Ching, Kenneth En Yin, O445557.
Chivers, John, O966623.
Chrisenberry, John Stanley, O1337139.
Cicero, Raymond Frank, O1302602.
Claridge, Earl Willis, O2262314.
Clark, John Lanham, Jr., O1012167.
Clark, Richard Paris, Jr., O1913307.
Clarke, Arthur Morrow, O737729.
Coan, Bernard Francis, O961195.
Coffman, Warren George, O2019292.
Cole, Philip Joseph, O1640965.
Collins, John Martin, O1640322.
Colville, Warren Randall, O1917805.
Condit, Ross Rowland, Jr., O491054.
Connors, Robert Joseph, O2206497.
Connolly, John Edward, O549099.
Conrad, Herman Andrew, O959646.
Cooley, Richard Edmund, O948968.
Cooper, William Walker, O779796.
Corley, Arthur Verrell, O2000759.
Cox, Kenneth Rudolph, O997270.
Coyle, Martin Joseph, O1060744.
Craig, Harry Wilbur, O854618.
Crane, Joe D., O1686494.
Crecelius, Richard Allan, O1177354.
Crochet, Elby Joseph, O2206747.
Cronin, Eugene Joseph, Jr., O1535597.
Crouch, Edward Oliver, O1305204.
Culp, James Franklin, O989597.
Cummings, Arthur Bernard, O2021043.
Cummings, Clyde Edward, O1186811.
Cushing, Robert Leo, O973855.
Cuta, Weston Walter, O1919167.
D'Ambrosio, Eugene Joseph, O1326698.
D'Louhy, George Joseph, O2274782.
Dahl, LaVerne Harold, O1315914.
Dalton, Joseph Richard, O1080439.
Dameron, Fred, O971578.
Daniels, Hiram Edward, O1913407.

Darden, Harry Lee, O1046068.
Daub, David Louis, O1642781.
Daugherty, Robert Murray, O1794789.
Davis, Joseph Arthur, O1173920.
Davis, Walter Ray, O511706.
de Latour, Louis Adam, O555847.
Delavan, Patrick N., O75172.
de Lorimier, Charles Tancred, O955760.
De Sanctis, John Nicholas, O1638952.
DeVall, Sherral Clyde, O1648574.
De Weese, Robert Edgar, Jr., O959313.
Decker, James William, O949993.
Del Vitto, Jon Marc, O2033607
Denham, John Paul, O1582678.
Dent, James Robert, O525367.
Desrosiers, Marcel Leo, O2200901.
Dews, Hampton, O1686738.
Diaz, George Francis, O1322002.
Dicus, Forest Joseph, O974009.
Dietrich, Frank Leslie, O954068.
Diggs, Walter Frank, O1556269.
Dillender, Jack Percy, O1824813.
Dinkins, Holly Walker, O1290042.
Dixon, Robert Mobley, O2033732.
Doren, Donald March, O1045717.
Dotur, Stephen Paul, O2028375.
Duarte, Stanley James, O1645807.
Ducote, Richard Joseph, Jr., O1101416.
Dufault, Robert Charles, O1041135.
Duff, Joseph Cornell, O979167.
Duke, Herbert Jackson, Jr., O1923507.
Dulaney, William Dykes, O993892.
Dunham, Wesley Loyal, O2211537.
Dunks, Fred, O1552053.
Dunn, Harold Raley, O1581671.
Dunn, Thomas Moore, Jr., O2021131.
Durham, Guy, O964370.
Durocher, Norman Lawrence, O2282483.
Earnest, George Custer, O2204424.
Eaton, William Henry, O2269569.
Eckes, LeRoy John, O543054.
Edwards, Ahmed Thomas, O956072.
Eichinger, Louis Simon, Jr., O1924651.
Ellison, Richard Wright, O521960.
Ellison, Robert Jack, O956034.
Ells, Leo Ernest, O2033922.
Elvington, Carl Willis, O2018664.
Emerson, Vaughn Claire, O1686662.
Emrich, Robert Fred, O1638220.
Ernst, Henry Samuel, Jr., O1589184.
Erwin, Charles Edward, O1693830.
Esco, Oliver Norton, Jr., O1341766.
Evans, Arthur Bracton, O993682.
Evans, Dell Guthery, O965713.
Evans, Lester Joseph, O972978.
Everding, Francis Roman, O2200425.
Ewing, James William, O1052763.
Farwell, Lester Charles, O522595.
Faulkner, Oscar Lee, Jr., O2014814.
Fender, Louis Hill, O947182.
Ferrell, Odel Preston, O1178141.
Fierke, Alfred Henry, O1177793.
Firnstahl, Norman Paul, O949757.
Fisher, Charles Mecabe, Jr., O1546978.
Fisk, Eugene Norman, O1327829.
Fitzgerald, Douglas Inmon, O1046798.
Fitzgibbons, Eugene Thomas, O2200291.
Fleshman, William Howard, O1177798.
Flournoy, Robert Wilson, Jr., O2061816.
Fogel, Milton Irving, O1559326.
Fortune, Samuel Alfred, Jr., O959105.
Fox, William Innis, O1340276.
Franks, Glenn Edward, O1185219.
Frye, John William, O1683461.
Fulmore, Charles Eugene, O971033.
Fulton, Taylor Roscoe, O957268.
Gaige, Delburt Clair, O963182.
Gallagher, Francis Edward, O971260.
Gardner, Frank Keith, O1649019.
Garman, George Albert, Jr., O2284032.
Gately, Matthew John, O1335774.
Gatrell, Wallace Bassett, O946697.
Gentry, Paul, O1917624.
Gentry, William Henry Lee, O1185037.
Giacomozzi, Francis, O1015730.
Giamario, Theodore Thaddeus, O1556423.
Gibson, Ramon Shroyer, O1031317.
Gieson, Robert John, O463992.
Gilbert, Robert Raymond, O543438.
Goen, Ira Jeane, O2021066.
Gojsza, William Paul, O1118719.
*Gordon, Phillips Nason, O994285.
Gorler, Howard William, O1698147.
Gorwitz, Bertram Kall, O1176352.
Gouge, Kenneth Guy, O2205220.
Gough, Robert Byron, Sr., O1337292.
Graber, Gordon Ladd, O1299732.
Grabowski, William Stanley, O1555049.
Graham, Elmer Harvey, O543932.
Grasser, Peter George, O2033740.
Graver, Herbert Arthur, O1169985.
Green, Warren Larry, O1948913.
Greene, Vernon Edward, O2005633.
Gregg, Arthur James, O2021060.
Griffin, Frank L., O1688574.
Grisard, Gus Henry, O1633909.
Grombacher, Gerd Susman, O885638.
Guss, Stephan John, Jr., O1950359.
Hagadus, Raymond, O2025514.
Haigler, Rayford Hansel, O2204700.
Haile, William Guthrie, O514805.
Halloran, Joseph Edward, Jr., O527705.
Hammerle, Robert Arnold, O1330648.
Hanks, Clinton Martin, O2033784.
*Hanley, Thomas Lesley, O995987.
Hansoette, Raymond, O1550813.
Harsh, Keith Rolland, O1319618.
Hartline, William Emmett, O1178180.
Haugan, Edgar J., O1342271.
Hawley, William B., O1300795.
Haynes, James Thomas, O1334142.
Hays, Marshall C., O538610.
Hayward, Fred Otis, Jr., O1046478.
Head, Robert Laverne, O975996.
Heckman, Bill Alexander, O1553837.
Heisel, Clarence Leo, O991311.
Helker, Albert Aloysius, O2203269.
Henderson, Joseph Leroy, O1341267.
Hendrickson, William Richard, O994639.
Herigstad, Bert Henry, O1340655.
Hertzog, Frank Sherman, O522606.
Hesser, William Frederick, O1046126.
Heuston, Harold William, O1339360.
Hicks, Robert Ricker, O989257.
Hieta, Clifford William, O2210272.
Higginbotham, Travis Lee, O1685027.
Hill, James William, Jr., O500509.
Hinton, William Sanders, O1684989.
Hobbs, William Aaron, O2205135.
Hoffman, Paul Martin, O1556149.
Holbrook, Bruce, O963899.
Holper, Ambrose Clement, O1048416.
Holst, Melvin, O1913397.
Hooker, William Patterson, O1340895.
Horneij, Edwin Henry, O454738.
Hornstein, David Hood, O546711.
Horton, Charles Lawrence, O1913358.
Hoskin, Charles Edward, 3d, O443134.
Howard, Charles Franklin, O2204038.
Howard, Charles R., O1290250.
Howell, Fred Foster, O556810.
Huckaby, Lewis Clyde, O2262809.
Hughes, David Willis, O1055334.
Ingram, Earl, O1315585.
Irvin, Darrell Boots, O2211299.
Isaac, Lee, O377096.
Ishida, George Sadaharu, O1922516.
Israelson, Nathaniel Herbert, O1042606.
Iverson, Vernon LeRoy, O983365.
Ivins, William Edgar, O973910.
Jackson, Robert James, O1822010.
Jenkins, Paul William, O1172091.
Jensen, Frank Lewis, Jr., O1924588.
Johns, Leo Doyle, O1170021.
Johnson, Charles Walter, Jr., O2046315.
Johnson, Ernest Walter, O1013600.
Johnson, Ervin Vance, O1172094.
Johnson, George Norman, Jr., O965219.
Johnson, Haskell Lee, O1895141.
Johnson, Hugh Herbert, O977665.
Johnson, John LeRoy, O1548454.
Johnson, Robert Overn, O1637770.
Jones, Chesley Huey, O1645083.
Jones, Ernest Eugene, O1179470.
Jones, James Dalton, Jr., O2204420.
Jones, John Robert, O981608.
Jones, John Roberts, O2204058.
Jones, Norman Gordon, O1846937.
Jones, Paul Burnell, O1996694.
Jose, Allen Fremont, O2200868.
Kalagian, Samuel Peter, O826681.
*Kark, John Sobchuk, O1917881.
Karns, Robert Henry, O954216.
Karst, Ralph August, O1595612.
Kelly, Arthur Lancaster, O994681.
Kendree, Ulmont Redvers, Jr.
Kerns, Raymond Clyde, O1175190.
Kersey, Irwin Joseph, O960106.
Kiehhnau, Donald Wilbert, O975669.
*Killen, Milton Stribling, Jr., O2205351.
*Kimman, John William, Jr., O981429.
Kincy, William Perry, Jr., O533703.
King, Justice Burnard, O1650176.
King, William Thaddeus, Jr., O1035299.
Kinnaird, Ralph Donald, Jr., O976163.
Kinnan, Floyd Hamer, O1054650.
Klevesahl, Fred Carl, O1686766.
Knight, John Christian, O2203566.
Koch, Richard Parry, O1339451.
Komoto, Yasuro, O1540915.
Krakower, Albert M., O816881.
Kreiner, Richard E., O2203009.
Krug, Robert Wright, O2014786.
Labar, Merwin Kent, O986756.
Laflamme, Norman Albert, O958054.
Lamason, Jerry Lynn, O1120591.
Lamm, Warren Willard, O1688634.
Lampert, Ernest Robert, O539914.
Lange, Arthur George, Jr., O1339549.
Lantzky, Karl Albert, Jr., O544452.
Larkin, Daniel Thomas, O982695.
Larkin, James Joseph, O434034.
Larsen, Edward Dean, O1186982.
Lawrence, Clyde Kelley, O2002476.
Lawrence, J. W., Jr., O1688653.
Lemonier, Donald Joseph, O1042866.
Leahey, Wallace Joseph, O1327017.
Leary, James Timothy, O2033947.
Leary, John Richard, O552002.
Leavey, William Joseph, O974534.
Lee, Donald Clifford, O2208219.
Lemr, Charles Francis, O992767.
Leneker, Herbert Warren, O2017419.
Lennon, Lynwood Bridger, O979837.
Leon, Robert Morris, O1165250.
Leonard, William Blair, O1555850.
Leroy, Charles Louis, O976071.
Levitt, David Maurice, O975536.
Lewis, Hilliard Harrison, Jr., O982647.
Liebershal, Theodore Michael, O974462.
Lindley, Joseph Haskell, O533456.
Lindstrand, Nelson Leonard, Jr., O2046694.
Lippencott, George Henry, O1633372.
Little, Lewis Dewitt, O2019479.
Littlejohn, James Jeffries, O980843.
Livingston, Douglas Morris, O1634075.
Long, Carl Lawrence, O530635.
Louis, Eugene, O1053231.
Low, Russell Vernon, O966154.
Lowman, Richard Delbert, O2033853.
Luckey, James Preston, O1573900.
Luper, Robert Bryan, O955570.
Lynch, Camille Leo, O1581922.
Lynch, James Edward, Jr., O519237.
Lynch, Thomas David, Jr., O1178880.
MacDonald, Alan, O1043412.
MacDonald, Robert William, O972281.
MacPherson, William James, O460036.
Malinowski, Theodore B., O1330203.
Martin, Hugh Gatz, Jr., O1038428.
Martineau, Leo Joseph, O165832.
Martinez de Andino, Jose Antonio, O954380.
Martino, Angelo James, O1688717.
Mathieu, Robert Nicholas, O2208639.
Mattice, Harold Howard, O989701.
Mattingly, Howard, O1596415.
Mattoon, Hugh Maxwell, O548102.
Maughan, George, O1332393.
Mazuchowski, John Paul, O949165.
McCaffrey, John Ellsworth, O1550656.
McClary, William Taylor, O1797677.
McConnell, Donald William, O1183126.
McCune, John Ramey, O1056800.
McDade, Robert Alexander, O1317324.
McDonald, Francis Archibald, O1560498.
McGlone, James Fortune, O2033107.
McGrew, James Wallace, O1646408.
McKennon, Alton Carneau, O978266.
McKenzie, Donald Hamilton, O2010598.
McKeown, William Leigh, O1688673.
McKiernan, Brian Joseph, O2014779.
McKinnis, Charles Cyrus, O1175799.
McKlveen, Richard Bradley, O1635076.

McLaughlin, Robert Leo, O1341457.
McLean, Charles Patrick, O2033859.
McTaggart, Richard Russell, O1686745.
Mearns, George, O541758.
*Meeken, Stanley Raymond, Jr., O2201067.
Meers, Boyce Rhea, O1342200.
Mellen, Thomas Wright, O1285267.
Metosh, Cyril Patrick, O1688595.
Middleton, Harry Fredrick, O1341563.
Miele, Anthony Raymond, O1341353.
Migaleddi, Peter Dante, O946108.
Miles, Edwin Ralph, Sr., O987851.
Miller, Allen Wallace, 3d, O1055672.
Miller, David Irving, O1643879.
Miller, Herman Jefferson, Jr., O957904.
Miller, John Gilmore, Jr., O956926.
Millett, Lewis Lee, O1540712.
Minkel, Edward Joseph, O1651261.
Mitchell, Bartholomew Vincent, O2200632.
Mitchell, John Edward, O2204967.
Mitchell, Stephen Clare, O1015770.
Mittelstadt, Jack, O1319634.
Moore, Jesse Norman, O1166569.
More, Roryo La Verne, O2023297.
Morehouse, Richard Carlton, O2032295.
Morgan, Thomas Leo, O1018715.
Mortrude, James Oliver, O971102.
Moseley, Lonnie Leroy, O763709.
Moye, Jack Joyner, O1913460.
Mulligan, Donald Edward, O991136.
Mundinger, Robert George, O514465.
Munroe, Irving William, O969531.
Munroe, Roscoe Hoyt, O1540945.
Murray, Stephen Sutherland, O1314313.
Myers, Philip Henry, O958978.
Myers, Robert William, O2210270.
Myrick, Stonewall Jackson, O977270.
Neal, Harold, O959263.
Nelsen, Ellsworth, O2014485.
Neumann, Edward John, O949548.
Newport, Elswick, O1117303.
Newton, Cleon Hampton, O1796141.
Nicholson, James Edward, O1180644.
Nicholson, Leslie, O1181972.
Novak, Thomas Edward, O992239.
O'Brien, Peter, O2208622.
O'Neill, William James, O1325927.
Ohm, Herbert Phillip, O965275.
Oligher, Howard Loy, O412637.
Orr, Robert Clayton, O2210725.
Osick, John Joseph, O1037893.
Otterbourg, Charles Raymond, O1046223.
Overstreet, Lewis Daniel, O1313120.
Pannell, Napoleon Bonaparte, O1183588.
Papile, James Dominic, O2018914.
Parker, Wilbur Reese, O1548119.
Parmaley, Gee William, O413798.
Parsons, George Augustus, O959360.
Parsons, Othal Talmadge, O1019333.
Paulson, Norman Walter, O1118782.
Payne, Bruce Ryburn, 2d, O1326058.
Payne, Thomas Allan, O1057201.
Peat, Howard T., O938585.
Pence, Lawrence Dean, O1922574.
Penrose, Clifford Eugene, O1287580.
Percival, Allen Clare, O460448.
Perry, Raymond Lee, O1590103.
Persall, Jack Gordon, O977611.
Persky, Harold Dean, O450162.
Phelps, Franklin Edmunde, O2210384.
Phelps, Harry Joe, O1186885.
Pineau, George Pierre, O1062864.
Pinney, Harold Davis, O2017111.
Pittenger, Ronald Ray, O1059909.
Platts, William Holbrook, O969501.
Pleier, William Francis, O1688417.
Plyler, Daniel Bruce, O972196.
Pollard, William Francis, Jr., O1313301.
Polson, Harold Alfred, O1924757.
Pottle, Arthur Freeman, Jr., O544258.
Powell, Elbert Wells, O2029439.
Powell, Richard Louis, O1183596.
Preston, John Edward, O991234.
Preuss, Richard John, O2211434.
Proctor, William Martin, O1293830.
Putman, Oliver Lawrence, O1045217.
Quinn, Daniel Gibson, O2206555.
Quinn, John D., O1341701.
Quinn, Thomas Gene, O2208225.
Rainer, Hewlett Evan, O2262953.
Ray, James E., O995621.
Redd, Milton LeRoy, O963137.
Redshaw, Ward Fuller, O985765.
Reese, Emmett Calvin, O966054.
Rehm, Walter Richard, O1340930.
Reign, Lewis Lingo, Jr., O1118791.
Reisacher, Robert William, O522392.
Rettie, Robert Grant, O1061525.
Rettstatt, Karl Thompson, O1341040.
Rich, Roy Morene, O2033795.
Riggsby, Raymond Monroe, O885708.
Rishell, Clair Lyle, O1688528.
Ritz, Robert Emmett, O992450.
*Rizor, George Arthur, Jr., O2211112.
Robbins, Stephen Leon, O1184291.
Robertson, David Hiner, O1169307.
Robinson, Herbert Allen, O1062068.
Rock, Fairfield, O442209.
Rodgers, George Manuel, O2207202.
Rodgers, Thomas Edward, O2074546.
Roegge, Alvin Lawrence, O928596.
Roley, Ronald James, O1598351.
Romero, Paul Varela, O2025595.
Rose, Harry Archibald, O1168057.
Roseman, Frederick Ellsworth, O982546.
Ross, Douglas Mackenzie, O1634273
Ross, Marvin Gilbert, O1336428.
Rossini, Martin Amato, O1635280.
Rothwell, Louis Jay, O2014758.
Rovegno, Lawton Cowie, O1342004.
Rubin, Harry, O2203025.
Rutherford, Benjamin, O1175297.
Ryason, Robert Raymond, O2208355.
Sabol, Fred, O1917535.
Salvador, Felix, O959328.
Salzman, Charles Nathan, O1648679.
Sample, James Clarence, O955636.
Savelle, Duane H., O1688699.
Sawyer, Robert Kendal, O2009782.
Scales, Robert Hinds, O1101648.
Scanlan, Francis Edward, O2021038.
Schaefer, Martin William, O1061536.
Scheib, Helmut Victor, O2018582.
Schiff, Erwin Herbert, O1582464.
Schrenk, Ralph Dale, O991241.
Schrinel, Paul Joseph, O1651708.
Schultz, Robert Dee, O1333719.
Schulz, Theodore Grandi, O556945.
Schwartz, William Craig, O1330760.
Seideman, Charles Henry, O1913221.
Selfe, John Keith, O840981.
*Seliskar, Jack, O1924810.
Shanley, Irving Thomas, O1918880.
Sharpe, Melvin Bruce, O955806.
Shea, William Leo, O1688719.
Simmons, Melvin Lee, O984721.
Simon, Paul Norman, O1342012.
Sims, Thomas Auburn, O2204090.
Singleton, Jack, Jr., O529509.
Sisson, George Dillard, Jr., O2014751.
Sites, George Edward, Jr., O949852.
Sizemore, Burley, O964382.
Skeiber, Stanley Charles, O411802.
Slaughter, John Ritter, O521836.
Smeltz, John Oscar, O989022.
Smith, Carroll William, Jr., O2207542.
Smith, Charles Wade, O2210204.
Smith, Edward Bradshaw, Jr., O2017295.
Smith, Malcolm Russell, O977443.
Smith, DeWitt Clinton, Jr., O1322277.
Smith, Elbridge Alvah, O1177640.
Smith, Gerald Alfred, O1633567.
Smith, Harry Arthur, O1175317.
Smith, Merle James, O1554278.
Smith, Paul Vincent, O1318097.
Smith, Sam Henry, O977818.
Smith, Thomas Eldridge, O2014578.
Smith, William Franklin, O954749.
Smith, William Murphy, O1913463.
Snow, Morgan Williams, O1120411.
Snyder, Paul Beck, O2020998.
Soll, Donald Armin, O1030519.
Speer, James Bryan, Jr., O992778.
Standish, Myles Ellsworth, O1646623.
Squires, Shreve Durham, O962724.
Stark, Lloyd, Jr., O1335592.
Steen, Jud Oliver, O538772.
Sterling, William Richard, O540397.
Stevenson, James Russell, O1296928.
Stockell, Charles White, O1182721.
Stooke, Willard Nixon, O1102072.
Suddaby, Arlen Reed, O2014532.
Sweeney, Bradley Warren, O2207155.
Sweeney, Harvey Orvin, O1334376.
Swenson, Richard Wesley, O442722.
Swilley, George Reson, O527655.
Swope, Herman Enos, O1166391.
Symmes, Kenneth Russell, O1341722.
Taft, Philip Henry, O528411.
Tank, Albert Kessler, O442777.
Taylor, Royal R., O1292614.
Thomas, Charles Newby, O973165.
Toohey, James Bernard, O1019040.
Trask, Norman Edward, O2014542.
Trost, Leonard Edward, O522004.
Trost, Robert Walter, O545178.
Tucker, Harold, O1686727.
Turk, Stanley J., O1168115.
Tynan, James Daniel, O1309447.
Tyree, Louis Andrew, O2014698.
Underwood, Maurice Roscoe, O978178.
Updike, Robert Earl, O2210291.
Upton, Clifford Aman, O1540900.
Vallese, Blaise Humbert, O984318.
Van Dyken, Harold Bartholomew, O753312.
Vaughan, George Leland, O1340236.
Veazy, Eli Lincoln, O2202997.
Veteto, Hobart H., O1913298.
Vogt, John Edward, O974420.
Wagner, Matt Richard, O1693128.
Walker, Aaron Eugene, O2060862.
Walker, Faris Thomas, A959284.
Walker, John Robert, O516847.
Warrington, Robert Oneil, O971300.
Watkins, John B., Jr., O991508.
Waugh, William Lee, Sr., O1688771.
Webb, Roy Lester, O579596.
Weber, John Paul, O1799018.
Weeks, Robert John, O1175355.
Weibel, Rodney Wilson, O1115823.
Weidner, Earl Rymond, Jr., O1651972.
Wester, William Albert, O1167271.
Wheeler, Neil William, O2014671.
White, Charles Lyle, Jr., O1688815.
White, Kenneth Henderson, Jr., O2021214.
*Wholey, Paul Robert, O2003814.
Wilkerson, Robert Thomas, O956593.
Williams, Gordon Elwood, O2020601.
Wilson, J. Frank, O2206157.
Wilton, Clifford James, O1688823.
Winchester, Harold Gene, O2206039.
Winningham, James Loy, O1688696.
Wolaver, James Francis, O441459.
Wortham, James Tilford, O946416.
Wright, Dean Earl, Jr., O2200695.
Wright, Floyd Donald, O1101295.
Wright, Lawrence Sidney, O1913251.
Yates, Arnold Robert, O2014624.
Yerkes, Charles Weaver, Jr., O2036575.
Yocom, Robert Dickerson, O1296309.
Young, Frederick Lee, O1304301.

To be first lieutenants

Adams, Henry Lloyd, O1915930.
Aikman, Jim Bill, O1937735.
Aiton, William Sheppard, O1876724.
Alter, Allen Grant, O1935318.
Ames, William Fentress, O1873321.
Anderson, Charles Witsell, Jr., O2002794.
Anderson, David Just, O1861683.
Anderson, George Byars, O2003338.
Andolina, Edward Samuel, O1873947.
Archibald, Norman Ellwood, O4019195.
Arkley, Robert James, O276874.
Austin, Kenneth Stuart, O1875764.
Bailey, David Gibson, O2004823.
Baird, Niven James, O1879934.
Baker, Fred Illsley, Jr., O1889789.
Balzhiser, Robert Maurice, O4016718.
Banze, William Charles, O1923521.
Barbano, Ralph Joseph, O1889339.
Barker, James Martin, O2003038.
Barnett, John Henry, O991716.
Barry, James Gordon, Jr., O1940622.
Bartolacci, Alfred Dean, O4001776.
Barton, Stephen Fletcher, O2210785.
Bass, Richard Herman, O4011783.
Beardsley, Hamilton Otis, O1929810.
Beasley, Lewis Edward, O2275935.
Becker, Hans Valentine, Jr., O2021673.
Beckwith, George Glen, O1930092.
Beckwith, William James, O1876373.
Beebe, John McRae, O2021000.
Behneman, John Francis, O1881492.

Bennett, Willard Magnus, Jr., O4016820.
Benson, Carl Gotfred, O990217.
Birmingham, David F., O1892989.
Bodine, James Frank, O1890597.
Bolak, Aloysius, O1876313.
Bond, Robert Glenn, O1933467.
Bowden, Hollis Allison, O955805.
Boyd, Gerald Marshall, O4019851.
Boyer, Gene Tunney, O4006107.
Boykin, Curtis Ralph, O1886830.
Bradley, Wray Erickson, O1919293.
Brantley, Edward Grady, O1914523.
Bray, Victor Hugo, O2266022.
Brazil, Hal Buckner, O968024.
Breunig, Joseph Timothy, O2021126.
Brinson, William Barney, Jr., O1887396.
Brobeck, Irvin, Jr., O2097838.
Brockwell, Leyburn Watts, Jr., O2004050.
Brown, Hugh Robert, Jr., O4044167.
Brown, Robert Franklin, O4021356.
Buckman, Joseph Clifton, O1880775.
Burch, Olger Dewey, Jr., O1879344.
Burgess, Bobby Lee, O2002800.
Burnison, George Ernest, O4016456.
Burns, Sumner Colson, O1932466.
Bush, Ralph, O1887205.
Buzzell, Kenneth Eugene, O1862054.
Bynum, Donald K., O2269080.
Calvert, Charles Leonard, O2205752.
Cannon, Glen Badger, O1889434.
Cannon, Sammy Joe, O1880396.
Carder, Kenneth Early, O970960.
Carey, Gordon Thomas, O4005119.
Carlson, Donald, O4015121.
Carpenter, James Albert, O1916477.
Cary, David Bromwell, O1893843.
Caudle, Lester Clegg, Jr., O4012542.
Chamberlain, George Robert, O1925782.
Chase, Marvin Knight, Jr., O2211529.
Ching, John Yen Sung, O4014566.
Chirlo, Michael Lawrence, Jr., O1930079.
Chriss, James Vincent, O1877858.
Clark, Donald Eugene, O1885402.
Clark, John Francis, O1935424.
Clark, Roy Clayton, Jr., O2096820.
Cleary, Alexander Bruce, O2211012.
Clements, John Kenneth, O4013360.
Clinton, Frederick Curtiss, O1922606.
Clyburn, Thomas Benjamin, 3d, O4013328.
Coggins, Donald Wade, O1937620.
Cole, David Albert, O4015069.
Comish, Leo Stanford, Jr., O1882138.
Comiskey, Ralph Edward, O1929215.
Cook, Ralph Jeffrey, Jr., O1891619.
Coursin, Raymond Edwin, O1894048.
Cozad, Jack Gerald, O4013366.
Cragun, Dwight Lloyd, O1929295.
Creekmore, Billy Brown, O4023742.
Crocker, Merle MacDonald, O1931420.
Crumit, Ellis Glen, O4006724.
Culton, William Hiram, O2265333.
Curry, Paul Richard, O1886423.
D'Renz, Charles Francis, O2097779.
Darling, John Edward, O1889575.
Davis, Addison Dimmitt, 3d, O2003522.
Davis, Richard Klare, O1882550.
Davis, Robert Stuart, O1887896.
De Muynck, Jack Edward, O1930868.
Dean, James Cook, O2030453.
Deets, Robert Morton, O1920185.
Delahanty, John Francis, Jr., O1881589.
Desmarais, Arthur Joseph, O1876419.
Diesu, Angelo James, O4009334.
Dieterle, Junior H., O1933408.
Diggory, Mark Lawrence, O4020564.
Dillon, John Patrick, O1932478.
Dixon, Philip Wesley, O4004966.
Dodds, Jack Allison, O1885659.
Duerr, Richard Dale, O4017551.
Dunlap, Robert R., O1886982.
Durany, John Adam, O1894135.
Durkee, Richard Yuill, O4006735.
Ecrette, Joe Dudley, O1880546.
Edgington, Roger Noel, O2034073.
Elfers, Delwyn Philip, O1931444.
Elliott, James Clay, Jr., O953638.
Ellis, James Paul, O1885930.
Ennis, John Alexander, O4001476.
Esperdy, Sergio Anthony, Jr., O1926857.
Fall, Eulan Thomas, O1935338.
Fallon, Joel Brian, O1935114.
Farmer, Garry Hilton, O4018893.
Favre, Rolland Mascot, Jr., O1893165.
Federhen, Herbert Melancthon 4th, O2201283.
Fedko, John Theodore, O1935638.
Fellerhoff, John Hersey, O4013963.
Ferebee, David Willoughby, Jr., O1876440.
Fink, Charles Augustin, O995514.
Fitts, William Henry, O1919253.
Fitzgerald, Thomas William, O4021174.
Fleming, Daniel Mahrt, O1926883.
Fleming, Robert Joseph, O1702266.
Flickinger, Robert Edward, O4000320.
Foster, Samuel Gibson, O1924891.
Frankhouser, Enoch Duncan, O1891139.
Freeze, James Elias, O2021621.
Friedman, Arthur Marshall, O1935845.
Fulton, Thomas George, O4013530.
Gallagher, George Merlin, O2034072.
Gallant, George William, O1893012.
Gallegos, William Joseph, O2206748.
Galyon, Norman Lester, O4009357.
Gan, Maurice Kaplan, O1888978.
Gannon, Timothy Gerard, O1882178.
Gardner, Frank Curtis, O1925316.
Gatti, Raymond Edward, O4020576.
Geoghegan, Malcolm Humphreys, O1876765.
Geraci, John Francis, O4009254.
Germuga, Gerald Andrew, O1892945.
Gessner, Richard Allan, O1862164.
Gibbs, Robert Mitchell, O1927841.
Gillingham, Richard Ivan, O4006613.
Gimple, Lloyd Allen, O4021090.
Glisson, William Charles, O2028692.
Glover, Rupert Franklin, O4005201.
Godwin, Ralph Lee, O1876307.
Gonzales, Orlando Eloy, O1931835.
Goodale, George Silas, O1889425.
Goodwin, Clifton Ray, O4014977.
Goodwin, William Earl, O1914885.
Gorham, John Milton 2d, O2002974.
Graffis, Howard Welty, O1935242.
Green, L. D., O1878756.
Gregoire, William Nelson, O1924976.
Griffin, Guilford Wayne, O1933779.
Griswold, William Herbert, Jr., O2208786.
Gum, Harold Hannah, O1917844.
Guynn, Jerry Clare, O4015745.
Hale, Marvin Luther, Jr., O4044402.
Haley, John Carter, O1887461.
Hall, Alvin Owsley, Jr., O1879241.
Hall, Richard Melcenis, O2265599.
Harman, Asher Waterman, Jr., O4003264.
Harrison, Hugh Barrett, O1924942.
Hennessey, Bruce Lee, O795939.
Herriford, Robert Levi, Sr., O1881261.
Hetherly, Jimmy Hilary, O1915955.
Heyward, James Oliver, O4012171.
Hickey, Thomas Bishop, O4015868.
Hill, Charles Edgar, Jr., O2004639.
Hobbs, Guy Everett, Jr., O4013098.
Holliday, John Philip, O1891198.
Holloway, Teddy Glenn, O4005806.
Holt, Daniel Rex, O4024154.
Homeyer, Bruno Curt, Jr., O1940633.
Hormann, Vaughn A., O4019346.
Horton, Richard Danforth, O1861661.
Howard, Jakie Milford, O1873849.
Hoye, James Gregory, O1883462.
Hughes, Martin, Jr., O1873285.
Hughes, Norman James, O4013407.
Hull, Frederick Burdette, Jr., O4002441.
Hurtubise, William Oliver, O4020783.
Husic, Robert Anthony, O4002147.
Hutchins, Alvin Carl, Jr., O1879146.
Hylton, Alvin Roy, O2102869.
Jacobsen, Richard Lavern, O4009364.
Jarvis, Robert Conway, O1887679.
Jensen, Harold Ernest, O976001.
Johnson, John Sigered, Jr., O1931558.
Johnston, John Allan, O1892304.
Jones, Gordon Dale, O1883236.
Jones, William Henry, Jr., O2002930.
Joyce, Robert Michael, O2283537.
Justice, Robert Eugene, O2034089.
Katz, Abraham David, O1873998.
Keith, Harlan A., O1341839.
Keith, Norman Aaron, O1915962.
Kelley, Robert Lee, O2028598.
Kelley, Robert Walker, O2030521.
Kelly, Edward Joseph, O4004416.
Kempf, Neil Harland, O1929315.
Kirkpatrick, James Samuel, O1934813.
Kostoff, Peter Clements, O1876869.
Kouten, James J., O998354.
Kramer, George Robert, Sr., O2104163.
Kurek, Robert Ashley, O2028390.
Lafever, Morris, O4012464.
Lang, John Edward, O1882881.
Lapinskes, George Sylvester, O4021816.
Larsen, David Philip, O1932104.
Laskowski, Frank W., Jr., O4012369.
Lefebvre, Bernard Roland, O1916154.
Lethcoe, Dale Leroy, O1929599.
Liggett, Wilson Merrill, O4017234.
Lloyd, Elwood Alon, O973382.
Lobdell, Edward Dunn, Jr., O4019351.
London, James Edward, O2266000.
Lovato, Lawrence, O4026541.
Lynch, William Arthur, O1883389.
Madsen, Charles Gordon, O2266265.
Malouin, Leon Francis, Jr., O4011504.
Marchioli, Alexander Dominic, O4028596.
Marrow, James Edgar, O4012063.
Martin, James Rodgers, O4013110.
Mashburn, Wilbur Franklin, O1919457.
Mason, Elijah Franklin, O4012596.
Mayer, David Edward, O4005702.
McCue, James Albert, O4003500.
McGarry, Bernard James, O1880219.
McGregor, John Ennis, O1882354.
McKay, Eugene Thomas, O1882679.
McKinney, John Walter, O1931272.
McMillen, James Arnold, O2021842.
McQueen, James Thomas, O4023756.
Meinhardt, Harry Philip, O1925817.
Mihalik, John Alfred, O4007147.
Milburn, Lloyd Edward, O1939870.
Mock, Newell Abbott, Jr., O4024058.
Monshower, Alvah Charles, Jr., O1919235.
Montrose, John Leslie, Jr., O2211988.
Mooneyhan, Jack LaVerne, O2004653.
Morgan, Abbott Robert, O4037753.
Morris, John Jerry, O1881677.
Morris, Joseph Jarrell, O2265611.
Morton, Hurshall George, O1919067.
Moseley, Robert Lawson, O4006541.
Mosher, David Lee, O4009204.
Moxley, Robert James, O4009829.
Mullen, Jack Leroy, O4001402.
Muller, Ludwig Jacob, O1926304.
Murphy, James Kenneth, O4017275.
Musser, John Bruce, O4017439.
Myers, Richard Leo, O1936986.
Myfelt, Kenneth Flaud, O2266415.
Neff, Paul Raymond, O1926667.
Nicholson, Rowland Joseph, O1928052.
Nikas, Nicholas Bill, O1926540.
Noffsinger, Gordon Alton, O4002225.
Nordstrom, Arthur Hugo, Jr., O4002226.
Norgard, Donald Richard, O1930029.
Nutter, Raymond Thomas, O4003042.
O'Boyle, Peter A., O1881806.
O'Grady, Patrick John, O1876280.
O'Meara, Edward Joseph, O1891823.
O'Rourke, Michael Keith, O2103688.
Omps, Avon Richard, O1873381.
Parini, Romano John, O4026604.
Parker, Wilson Cavitt, Jr., O1880390.
Patterson, Archie Olea, O2003843.
Paul, Lloyd Herbert, O1877639.
Paxman, James Carter, O4013765.
Payne, James Arthur, Jr., O1931026.
Payne, Thomas Leon, O1939420.
Persons, George Albert, O4003313.
Petersen, Peter Barron, O4006708.
Peterson, John Robert, O1883707.
Petree, Neal Cleere, Jr., O1880269.
Petty, Carlisle R., Jr., O2030506.
Piepho, Carlton David, O4009834.
Pinney, David Raymond, O2262543.
Pins, Dwane Francis, O1936464.
Poe, Donald Elliott, O1915828.
Pogoloff, Boris, O1879702.
Ponder, William Lester, Jr., O1936931.
Poplin, Carroll Bailey, O1887326.
Pratt, James Robert, O1931224.
Prawl, Sherlund Dale, O4017494.
Presson, Charles Wesley, O1872757.
Pruitt, James Robert, O1937281.
Queeney, Edward Leo, O1893057.
Quinn, William Joseph, O1875253.
Raab, Kenneth Edward, O4027771.

Raisig, Paul Jones, Jr., O4009060.
Ramsey, Phillip Edward, O1929224.
Ratcliff, Walter Allen, O1939903.
Reddell, Eugene Baxter, O1880962.
Reed, Lynn McCrea, O1884013.
Reid, John Ambrose, Jr., O1883878.
Revis, Blaine Amos, O4006936.
Riser, Clarence Albert, O1917939.
Ritz, Karl Clifford, O4004267.
Roberts, Norman Lee, O1883876.
Roper, Charles Alan, O1939471.
Ropp, Ralph Edwin, O1880091.
Rosing, Willis S., Jr., O4026381.
Ross, Robert Ingram, O4006015.
Roth, Loren William, O1695191.
Rozsypal, George Frank, O1919468.
Rufe, Charles Peyton, O4015503.
Rumsey, David Weaver, O1891824.
Russo, Vincent Mario, O1875264.
Sajo, Alexander John, O1926556.
Sampson, Edward Eugene, O4005780.
Sargent, Francis Michael, O1876442.
Schlager, Robert Lewis, O2004241.
Schleusing, Fredrick Carl, O2263360.
Schneider, Malven Eugene, O2266169.
Schultz, Paul Edward, O1889772.
Schweizer, Robert Louis, O4009198.
Scott, Albert William, O1881454.
Scudder, Wilbur Alanson, Jr., O1891269.
Seale, Billy George, O2021676.
Seaman, Richard Thomas, O4020924.
Seaton, Peter Paul, O4018149.
Selby, Carman T., O1925676.
Selig, William Louis, O4016495.
Severance, Fayette Leroy, Jr., O4011077.
Shave, Kenneth Leroy, O1701187.
Shea, Eugene August, O2263766.
Sheaves, William Bryant, Jr., O1920191.
Shields, Roger James, O4009062.
Short, Frisco Whalen, O1916016.
Shuler, William Aiken, Jr., O2004674.
Shunk, William Alexander, O1877469.
Sisman, Lawrence, O4000024.
Skeen, Henry Gene, O1936264.
Slocum, Frederick Vernon, Jr., O4006846.
Smith, David Campbell, O1937623.
Smith, Tommie Gene, O995342.
Snow, Robert Ray, O1935895.
Sprang, Alan Wesley, O4004132.
Spaulding, Stanley Lee, O2104533.
Spence, Thomas Henry, O4009787.
Spicher, William Frederick, O1893785.
Starr, Merle Dean, O2030534.
Steed, Robert Berkley, O4009401.
Stelmachowicz, Peter Joseph, O400132.
Stewart, Harvey Edgar, O2205911.
Stidham, Dorris Neal, O1928329.
Stockelman, James Clarence, O1890504.
Stocker, Lee James, O1890829.
Stokinger, Richard Henry, O4006441.
Strunk, Herbert Rankin, O4003674.
Stuckey, Jack Clayton, O1916077.
Sumpter, Cecil A., Jr., O2263586.
Swank, Robert David, O1889482.
Sykes, Earl Ray, O1882129.
Taylor, John Mason, O4001287.
Teague, Martin Wayne, O4024787.
Templeton, James L., Jr., O4024142.
Tennant, Frank Bair, Jr., O1886124.
Tenore, Jacob Andrew, O2030420.
Thomas, John Elam, Jr., O991917.
Thomas, Patrick Emerson, O4005858.
Thompson, Donald Keith, O4013671.
Thorpe, Marion Eugene, O1929165.
Todd, Harold Casselberry, O4016496.
Towle, Allan Martin, O4037421.
Trevethan, Alexander, O4004598.
Trosper, Robert Lee, O4024675.
Tufft, Arthur Herbert, O1889972.
Turner, Robert Ian, O997378.
Varnum, Charles Somers, O1927666.
Vaughn, Luther Cornelius, O4012671.
Veley, Corydon, Alexander, Jr., O1937503.
Vermillion, Lewin Edward, O4001456.
Vorhies, Harold Winston, O1889029.
Walden, Don Earl, Jr., O1876451.
Wall, James Edgar, O987194.
Walsh, Alden Churchill, O4011093.
Warden, Donald Wilmore, O1877474.
Watson, Robert William, O1883745.
Watts, Bobby Morriss, O1885624.
Watts, Harry Lee, 3d, O967783.
Weinstein, Saunder, O4015196.
Wells, Roy Davis, O1939478.
Wenneson, Richard Meade, O1884033.
Westin, Paul Robert, O1929343.
Westlake, Richard Keith, O1892246.
Weyland, Bruce Marion, O2102606.
White, Loren Jr., O1919045.
White, Richard Leon, O1877107.
White, Ulysses Xerxes, O4012129.
Wilcox, William Robert, O1925261.
Wilkes, Jack Byron, O2265110.
Willcox, Edward Cooke, Jr., O1885312.
Williams, Cyrus Lancel, O1886965.
Williams, Maurice Cameron, O1882264.
Williams, Raleigh Noah, Jr., O4005537.
Williams, William Hudson, O4011986.
Williford, Henry Grady, Jr., O1939424.
Wilson, Henry Haddon, O4023418.
Woeber, Frank Anthony, O1876757.
Wolbert, Herbert Karl, O1935521.
Wood, Charles Cox, O4011105.
Worthy, William Ward, Jr., O4006408.
Wright, Gilbert Parkhurst, O1876695.
Wright, Lewis Winbert, O4002775.
Young, Harrison Joseph, Jr., O1893711.
Young, Roger Quitman, O4037123.
Zapata, Roland Tamez, O1940785.
Zarnick, Dale Leroy, O1928588.

To be second lieutenants

Abbott, Lawrence Eugene, O4056930.
Acre, Lawrence Dale, O4050477.
Adelstein, Stanford Mark, O1929867.
Albert, George, O4057630.
Alexander, Joseph Edward, Jr., O4065525.
Allen, James Burroughs, Jr., O4058831.
Andrews, David Phillips, O4039391.
Andrews, William George, Jr., O4038816.
Ardizzione, Leo Anthony, O4030714.
Aschettino, Richard Francis, O4047382.
Aumock, George Eugene, O4030778.
Avera, Graham Joseph, O4075373.
Ayers, Bradley Earl, O4030716.
Ayers, Louie Frank, O4075631.
Badovinac, Nick John, Jr., O4010091.
Baggs, Linton Daniel, 3d, O4075775.
Bailey, Clarence Alvin, O4075632.
Bailey, James Allen, O4026298.
Baird, Richard J., O4060544.
Baldridge, Thomas Howard, O2104403.
Baldwin, James Albert, O2004735.
Barney, Charles David., Jr., O4051922.
Barnum, James Edward, O4042114.
Barnum, Robert Charles, O4061460.
Barrett, Francis Xavier, O1890189.
Barry, Arthur Alfred, O4039849.
Bass, Ogden Loeb, O4049306.
Bauer, Frank, O4010623.
Baumeister, Harold Joseph, O4069297.
Baxter, Richard Byron, O4077004.
Bayless, Robert Ewing, O4050593.
Beal, Bruce Talcott, O4025367.
Bean, Loring Bruce, O4033239.
Beck, Frederick Samuel, O4068535.
Bell, James Farrell, O4040481.
Bell, Leroy Crawford, O4058820.
Blair, Robert Joseph, O4033649.
Bomar, Hobby Jackson, Jr., O4076083.
Borichewski, Joseph C., 4032042.
Borris, Roger John, O4030523.
Bostwick, Clinton Clay, Jr., O4063364.
Boswell, Leonard L., O4063770.
Bowman, Richard Lindon, O1939699.
Bradford, Wilson Emery, Jr., O4032290.
Bramlet, James W., O4074237.
Bratt, Clarence Merle, O4046309.
Brier, James Roy, O4033037.
Brigham, David Ray, O4083184.
Brink, Donald William, O4062606.
Broman, Ralph Waldo, O4019326.
Brooks, William Cooper, Jr., O4044859.
Brown, Joe Augustus, O4028856.
Bruce, Bruno Ernest, O4040198.
Brumit, Charles Daniel, O4006988.
Bruns, Thomas Vincent, O4017822.
Brusanovski, Frank John, O4038979.
Bruskiewicz, Glenn Louis, O4060684.
Buckles, Rodney Gail, O4048065.
Budd, Chester Francis, Jr., O4074450.
Bue, Paul Andrew James, O4051423.
Burns, Paul Patrick, O4031922.
Burton, Donald Luther, O4049529.
Bush, Emory Wilton, O2268610.
Buxton, John Lacy, O4048856.
Cahalane, Robert Edward, O4064400.
Cahill, William James, O4058430.
Caldwell, Darrol Dean, O4059613.
Callahan, James Joseph, O4053210.
Camaren, Rueben James, O4013875.
Carey, James William, O4060127.
Carmody, Robert Warren, O4068412.
Catalano, Victor Joseph, O4042372.
Chakalian, Rouben Victor, O4076748.
Chapman, Charles Walter, O4030888.
Church, Campbell Scott, O4033657.
Clarke, Charles Cushing, Jr., O4076569.
Clinger, Charles Ellsworth, O1916343.
Clites, James Earl, Jr., O4068539.
Cochran, James Oliver, O2279147.
Collar, Robert Daniel, O4071685.
Colozzi, Salvatore Frank, O4052064.
Conklin, Willard David, O4071389.
Connett, Walter Theodore, O1883495.
Conroy, Robert Edward, O4066245.
Cook, James Henry, O4049354.
Couvillion, Herbert Harvey, O4024873.
Cowan, Robert Edward, O4030649.
Cowles, Richard Webster, O4062621.
Cox, Elbredge Reed, O4062940.
Crook, George Roger, O4024687.
Cross, Ray Shelton, O4028938.
Crouch, Curtis Sherman, Jr., O1940016.
Culkin, Donald Edward, O4064787.
Cullen, James Foster, O4031452.
Cumbus, John Riley, O4075387.
Daly, George Martin, O4034136.
Daniel, Bartow David, O4058785.
Davis, Harold Milton, Jr., O4065536.
Davis, Philip H., O4074466.
Davis, Robert Hugh, O4034307.
Day, Thomas Everett, O4017605.
De Amaral, Charles Francis, Jr., O4025672.
Deel, Arlin, O4070108.
Del Colliano, John Francis, O4059269.
Dickinson, John Richard, O4027857.
Dion, George Joseph, O4065935.
Dixon, Glen 3d, O4045039.
Dorand, Edwin Joseph, O4009743.
Downer, William John, Jr., O4030230.
Dreybus, George Newell, Jr., O4058683.
DuVal, Richard Allen, O4070440.
Dubois, Ronald William, O4052423.
Duncan, John Russell, O4062762.
Dunn, James Turner, O4044784.
Durant, John Joseph, O4052424.
Dwayer, William Melvin, O4047223.
Ebbole, Robert, O4046108.
Eitel, James Weldon, O4074375.
Ellingwood, Dean Chesley, O4020596.
Elliot, Harlen Oral, O4043031.
Ely, Sumner Richard, O4076519.
Emrick, Charles William, O4047478.
Epperson, Thomas Allen, O4071483.
Farrell, John Curtis, O4024494.
Faulkner, Jack Sherwood, O4045042.
Feaster, Lewis Lavon, O4060387.
Ferenz, James Francis, O4077125.
Finkbiner, Glenn Grover, O4025820.
Fiora, Edward Frank, Jr., O4041207.
Fisher, Harry Clayton, Jr., O4041202.
Fiske, William Sigmund, O4070362.
Fitzgerald, Thomas Edward, O4051971.
Fletcher, Edward Neale, O4058516.
Flynn, James Francis, O4068422.
Foster, Andrew Paul, 3d, O4058566.
Franklin, John Robert, O4031392.
Freshley, Robert L., O4025779.
Friedheim, Jerry Warden, O4059674.
Fries, Cecil Edward, Jr., O4070399.
Froebel, Martin Charles, O4071500.
Fuerbringer, Neil Lewis, O4041486.
Galvin, John Francis, O4064417.
Gantt, Gerald Dale, O4042884.
Garcia, Heriberto Arnaldo, O4025922.
Garneau, Lucien Roger, O4036918.
Gatlin, Clifford Irving, O4047850.
Gatti, Michael Angelo, O4031876.
Geddes, Garth Lowe, O1936552.
Goodman, Roland Alfred, O4047666.
Gorman, Irving Thomas, O4038232.
Gourley, William Harvey, O4035715.
Grace, Paul Martin, O4051834.

Grey, Harold Moulton, O4019689.
Griemsmann, William Klaus, O4051527.
Grossheim, Paul William, O4056473.
Guthrey, William Lawrence, O2021813.
Gutsmuth, Henry Ronald, O4047279.
Haas, Donald Anthony, O4050609.
Haberstock, Roy Alan, O4051657.
Hall, George Wheeler, Jr., O1931968.
Hall, Lawrence Henry, O4041170.
Hall, William Basil, O1925065.
Hall, William Earl, O4048846.
Hamer, David Thomas, O4010458.
Hamilton, Milton Hugh, Jr., O4034391.
Hamlin, Donald Auer, O4025679.
Hanchey, Jennings Brian, Jr., O1941110.
Haney, Kenneth William, 2d, O4017362.
Hanks, James Wesley, O4071185.
Harget, Paul Daniel, O4010118.
Harper, Henry Hearn, O4026615.
Harrington, Regis Arthur, Jr., O4057452.
Hartmann, Frederick Donald, O4057114.
Harts, William Garrod, O4048928.
Hatchett, Monte J., O4026272.
Hawkins, Richard Stubbs, O4066227.
Hay, James Ralph, O4036487.
Haydon, James Frederick, O4040785.
Hayward, Donald Paul, O4039080.
Herbert, Anthony Bernard, O2284605.
Herrman, Larry Jack, O4056928.
Higgins, James Maurice, O4059892.
Hill, Melvin Dale, O4068350.
Hoge, Philip Ramage, O4027345.
Holland, Billy Cox, O4062822.
Holmes, Justin Allen, O4062482.
Holt, Robert Braden, O4046936.
Hookway, William Arnold, O4032755.
Houts, Francis Coy, O4042272.
Howard, Bobby Gene, O1880486.
Hoyt, Richard Eugene, O4047491.
Huhn, John Norman, O4036969.
Humphrey, Paul Wayne, O4061994.
Hunt, J. Howard, O4068471.
Hurdle, Karl Vincent, O4029882.
Hurt, Maure, Jr., O4076900.
Hutchinson, Kent Crosby, O4074495.
Jacobs, Carl Marvin, O4041757.
Jacobs, Irwin Maurice, O4076622.
Jarrell, William John, O4049191.
Jensen, James Robert, O4031316.
Jensen, Kenneth G., O4050077.
Jerrett, Lyle Edward, O4052360.
Johnson, James Clifford, O4059833.
John, Joseph Michael, O4061327.
Jolly, Lewis, Jr., O4042559.
Jordan, Donald Havens, O2030494.
Joyce, Cecil Lee, O4045268.
Joyce, John Joseph, O4031879.
Judy, Jerry Edward, O4068387.
Kallestad, Richard Dean, O4018090.
Kantor, George William, O4059108.
Kanzler, Norbert Alvin, O4030242.
Keenan, George Edward, O1872470.
Keith, Donald Morton, O4060661.
Kelleher, Vincent James, O4035625.
Kelley, Norman Dale, O4058869.
Kelly, Edward Victor, O4051360.
Kelly, John Joseph, Sr., O4064423.
Kelly, Richard Patrick, Jr., O4037737.
Kemp, Freddie Lee, O4010976.
Kennedy, Paul Stanley, O4076824.
Kilgallen, John Edward, O4010360.
King, John Norman, O4068266.
Kinnard, Jason Lewis, O4044527.
Kirk, K. Leslie, O4013709.
Kirkwood, John Hugh, O4061872.
Kitay, Peter Nathaniel, O4065885.
Kleypas, Kenneth Allen, O4071948.
Kneibert, Richard George, O4064193.
Knipp, James Daniel, O4061348.
Knowles, Thaddeus Edwin, Jr., O4037567.
Koch, Edwin Kenneth, O4035514.
Krawczonek, John Michael, O4035752.
Lance, Edwin Virgil, O4077030.
Langford, James Jerry, O4043134.
Langridge, Alan Lewis, O4025582.
Lantero, Lawrence Louis, O4058287.
Lanzi, Constantine Herman, O4045313.
Layman, Earl Robert, O4042968.
Lehnert, Edwin Donald, O4024544.
Lenderman, William Roosevelt, O4068389.
Leonard, Richard John, O4017999.
Lewi, Kenneth Edward, O1880455.
Lewis, Charles Edward, Jr., O4069059.
Lewis, John Chester, O4046189.
Light, Clarence Oakey, Jr., O4033333.
Liska, Donald Joseph, O4065959.
Logan, William Henry, O4012157.
Long, John E., O4071417.
Longshore, Robert Louis, Jr., O4063129.
Loomis, John McArthur, O4010465.
Loop, James Walter, O4076933.
Love, Albert Scruggs, Jr., O4047932.
Lucas, Dale Adrian, O4060838.
Lynn, Charles Thomas, Jr., O4044180.
Machatton, Joseph George, O4061778.
Macheledt, Matthew William, Jr., O4056842.
Mahlberg, Donald Stanley, O2265975.
Manning, Billy Randolph, O4046403.
Marsh, Russell Ledwith, Jr., O4050236.
Martin, Ernest Harrington, O4049535.
Mathis, Philip Munroe, O2266157.
Matthews, John Grayson, O4010369.
McCamic, Jolyon Whitehead, O4042194.
McCollum, James Terry, O4061419.
McCray, Wayman Floyd, O4026198.
McCullough, Ronald Jay, O4004714.
McDonald, Merle Allen, O4024680.
McDuff, Charles Robert, O1940869.
McFarland, Timothy Vincent, O4050080.
McGar, Robert Douglas, O4024734.
McGinniss, Donald Theron, O4053254.
McMillan, Thad Calhoun, O4048002.
McMillen, Earl Joseph, Jr., O4004334.
McNelis, David Nicholas, O4035239.
McNutt, George Richard, O4046851.
McVeigh, Andrew Jackson, 3d, O4010980.
Mendel, Thomas Elroy, O4031089.
Merritt, Hubert Dean, O2272847.
Messer, Hollis Darrell, O4058572.
Meyer, Gerald Joseph, O4040696.
Mielke, Karl Albert, Jr., O4048778.
Miller, Ronald Wilbur, O4040860.
Miquelon, David Stewart, O4017404.
Molinelli, Robert Fletcher, O4076308.
Moody, Gordon Nelson, O4027361.
Moore, George Dewey, Jr., O4037102.
Moore, James Hubert, O4042902.
Moore, Jimmy Nelson, O4031244.
Moore, John Mac, O4025884.
Moore, Virgil Everett, Jr., O1926770.
Morrison, William Wallace, Jr., O4049937.
Montalvo, Martin Thomas, O4076729.
Morriss, Robert Henry, O1937383.
Mosher, Jack Beauford, O4063724.
Moss, Franklin Acker, O4062867.
Muckenfuss, Adam Eldredge, O4033995.
Munier, Paul Leo, O4017792.
Murphy, Vincent Paul, O4038726.
Murray Donald Theodore, O2021660.
Myers, Clair Gordon, O4031096.
Myers, Maynard Dale, O1917763.
Myrick, Howard Anthony, Jr., O4044986.
Naddef, Wilfred Joseph, O4040914.
Naegel, Charles Louis, O4035834.
Neighbors, James Daniel, O2004657.
Nickell, Phillip Dean, O2104842.
Noskowski, Nicholas Joseph, O4031498.
O'Brien, Robert Joseph, O4027286.
O'Connell, Marvin George, O4041052.
O'Rourke, Robert Lennon, O4046410.
Owens, Robert Corby, O4052927.
*Padilla, Ramon, O5301547.
Parker, Owen Lowell, O4050633.
Pearson, Roger Comstack, O4042863.
Penzler, Harry Donald, O4059862.
Pepper, Earl Elliott, O4019510.
Phillips, Robert Allen, O4048959.
Pipkin, John Robert, O4069182.
Pittman, Paul Hubert, Jr., O4043107.
Plant, Robert Anthes, O4052022.
Plunkett, Eli Benson, O4075661.
Pohlman, William Frank, O4039265.
Poindexter, Everett John, O1886604.
Posz, Joseph Daniel, O4047717.
Potter, Allen Randall, O4048651.
Priddy, Bobby Edward, Sr., O1935169.
Proctor, Marvin Prince, O4069660.
Purvis, John William Gregg, O4046256.
Putorek, William Paul, Jr., O4010522.
Quigg, Stuart Masterson, O4037761.
Raco, Joseph Daniel, O4004576.
Rakowitz, James Alphonsus, O4049211.
Rector, Donald Duane, O4040741.
Reed, James Robert, O4057570.
Richards, John Homer, Jr., O4062997.
Riley, Leonard Joseph, O4052459.
Riley, Ronald Thomas, O4031179.
Rimbach, Douglas Opie, O1938635.
Robertson, Gene Weldon, O4024694.
Robinson, Thomas Jefferson, O4037415.
Rodgers, Robert J., O5405036.
Rodgers, William Edward, O4033248.
Rose, Richard Edward, O4059368.
Ross, Robert Edward, O1893699.
Rowinski, Thomas Henry, O4066667.
Royal, James Wilson, O4026172.
Russell, George Gheen, Jr., O4071442.
Rydel, Albert S., Jr., O4032648.
Sanders, William Carlton 2d, O4063078.
Sandlin, Malcolm Ray, O4024897.
Sapp, Clarence Donald, O4068368.
Savery, Donald Fenwick, Jr., O4049117.
Scherer, George Halford, O4036163.
Schwartz, Norman, O4062675.
Scott, Frank Harry, O4031590.
Seagrave, David Allen, O4041232.
Sefton, Norman Harold, O4066378.
Serpico, Frank Lawrence, Jr., O4002770.
Shadoan, William Lewis, O4035196.
Shanahan, Norman Kim, O4042513.
Shaw, Robert Leland, O4050223.
Shearer, Donald Albert, O4035015.
Shepard, William Cullom, O4025116.
Sherzer, Morton Philo, O4046356.
Short, Kenneth Melvin, O4047761.
Short, Robert James, O4075663.
Shumway, James Dyke, O4059487.
Simons, Simon Ira, O4059986.
Simpson, John Edward, Jr., O4026096.
Sinclaire, John, Jr., O4045088.
Skanchy, Robert Kelly, O1928099.
Smith, Albert John, O4045090.
Smith, Derald Henry, O4075455.
Smith, John D., O4063182.
Smith, William Harvey, O4059171.
Smith, Willis Bryant, O4044550.
Snare, Ross William, Jr., O4060518.
Snyder, Ronald Edward, O4060816.
Soderberg, Charles Arthur, Jr., O4027747.
Sovers, George Arthur, O4046171.
Standeven, Ernest John, O4039114.
Steinmetz, Charles Paul, O4035412.
Stewart, Donald Edward James, O4036206.
Stewart, Joe Fancher, O4042651.
Stipe, John Warren Mobley, Jr., O4075665.
Stockhammer, Gordon Francis, O4065005.
Stone, Gordon Lee, O4075268.
Storms, Robert Newell, Jr., O4059735.
Sullivan, David Duane, O4041801.
Swagerty, Daniel Lee, O4061611.
Sweeney, Daniel Joseph, O4010434.
Taylor, William Jesse, Jr., O4031019.
Teed, John Frederick, O4033913.
Tennant, Harold Butler, O4077068.
Thornton, James Harvey, O4029174.
Tomberg, Ralph Thomas, O4030956.
Treat, Robert B., Jr., O4049641.
Trowbridge, Clarence Arthur, O4038911.
Tucker, Andrew Leon, O1925254.
Turner, Donald Eugene, O1923566.
Tyner, Robert Otis, O4013205.
Undercoffer, John Thomas, O4047556.
Underwood, Frank Eugene, O4032612.
Valerius, Millard Russell, O2104308.
Van Wootten, Richard Angus, Jr., O4021066.
Vydra, Anthony Ladislav, O4053020.
Wade, Herman Leverne, O4036535.
Waite, Richard D., O4074643.
Walenty, John George, O4070486.
Walker, Billy Murray, O4025247.
Walker, James Richard, O4045906.
Wallace, Edwin Lawrence, O4031271.
Walter, John Gale, O4032996.
Warner, Darrell Gene, O4035417.
Weiher, Ronald George, O4004829.
Welch, William Roy, O1941047.
Wesson, Robert E., O4028755.
West, Louis, O4071343.
West, Wallace Wayne, O4044497.
Weyers, Orval Leonard, O4056991.
Williams, Cyril Howard, Jr., O4000657.
Williams, Donald Edward, Jr., O4049348.
Williams, John Kent, O4061235.

Williams, Nevin Roger, O4046437.
Williams, Robert Caldwell, Jr., O4038510.
Williams, Thomas Lee, Jr., O4025486.
Wilson, Daniel Marvin, O4075478.
Wilson, Gary Lee, O4047759.
Wilson, William Eugene, O4006174.
Wingate, Jack William, O4042670.
Wolfinbarger, Herman Rickie, O4034351.
Wood, Leonard Thomas, 01876122.
Worsh, Frederick Murray, O4066560.
Worthen, Freddie James, O4012130.
Wurman, James Wade, O2276528.
Yancey, Ernest Vincent, O4010190.
Young, Gregor Theodore, 3d, O189174.
Young, Richard Bruce, O4076589.
Zeigler, Charles Sheldon, O4042991.
Zychowski, Edward Frank, O1929466.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

To be lieutenant colonels

Bush, Chester Keys, O297457.
Perry, Harry Edward, O398359.

To be majors

Ackerman, Everett Franklin, O451623.
Blackwell, James Marion, O477035.
Brumfield, Jesse William, O340130.
Cawthon, Charles Ready, O407674.
Devolites, Milton Charles, O450741.
Domina, Donald Eli, O1534002.
Kaplan, Clarence, O427384.
Kealey, Robert Charles, O2047021.
Lewis, Garland Bennett, O439614.
Lukas, Frank Walter, O1305079.
Morse, Warren Clinton, O407911.
Nolan, Patrick Theodore, O1639873.
Verfuerth, Vincent Paul, O509548.
Verzi, Martin Andrew, O1544147.
White, Wilson Elmer, O450921.

To be captains

Adams, Raymond Edward, O2048609.
Allen, Edward Vincent, O973899.
Clark, Dave Clyde, O2046923.
Coker, Larry Warren, O460093.
Coner, Charles Edward, O104265.
Cooper, Robert Eugene, O538574.
Couch, James Hamilton, O2050027.
Datel, William Emil, O2264587.
Dolson, James Frederick, O2047972.
Drotning, Theodore Benedik, O2049871.
Ellis, Paul Halstead, O1534474.
Goldstein, Bernard Lewis, O1547949.
Hazeltine, Stillman Edward, O959319.
Hinrichs, Herbert Harold, O2051172.
Hoffman, Edgar Franklin, O453820.
Hoffmann, Kenneth Leo, O1312769.
Israeloff, Joseph, O965869.
Kammerer, William Morris, O888414.
Kneepkens, John Alphonse, O1997260.
Kurtz, Myers Richard, O991984.
LaVault, Paul Aubert, O1534317.
Luban, Albert Joseph, O1547377.
Lucas, Kenneth, O988762.
Martin, Ersel Edward, O1534328.
Mattie, Edward Carmine, O2005587.
Nation, Marvin Eugene, O2007452.
O'Hern, Robert Stephen, O2046775.
Overmyer, Chester Ernest, O1311200.
Parkinson, Ralph Waldo, Jr., O1997306.
Patrick, Darvin Oliver, O961619.
Pemberton, Samuel Heywood, O2002515.
Pezzulli, Frank, O1337617.
Porter, William Raymond,O964967.
Poucher, Clyde Rolland,O1544242.
Ramshur, Loren Condell, O2014069.
Rowe, Russell Heavilin, Jr., O992533.
Shepard, Leonard Granville, O1547455.
Shively, Charles Joseph, O1543408.
Smith, Donald Eugene, O2013918.
Sternlicht, Irwin Robert, O981418.
Sutherland, William Benjamin, Jr., O1039237.

To be first lieutenants

Christie, Thomas Cecil, O4003645.
Dicker, Frank William, O994111.
Drenner, Buckley Lawerntz, O1917731.
Greene, Philip Densmore, O954242.
Grimes, Cecil Herrin, O1917802.
Killo, William Stephen, O4006114.
McDonald, Neil Jarvis, O2262964.
Moore, A. Gordon, O2104568.
Mueller, Louis Carl, O2263374.
Noble, James William Howard, O1888145.
Walter, Fred Lee, O2264434.
Webb, Richard, 3d, O4006303.
Williamson, Robert Luther, O996661.

To be second lieutenants

Allgood, Gerald Duane, O4049620.
Bethel, Howard Dwain, O4051353.
Bohnstedt, Nolan Duane, O4041696.
Bonfield, Robert Lawrence, O4042580.
Brown, George Lampros, O4066319.
Bunce, George Edwin, O4032928.
Cedola, Vincent Joseph, O4065922.
Cooney, James Patrick, Jr., O4056476.
Crenshaw, William Alva, O4075878.
Durr, Walter Leonard, O4039356.
Fitzsimmons, John Joseph, O4059881.
Gensler, Herman Harry, O2284018.
Gulevich, Wladimir, O2283670.
Hardman, John Goodwin, O4076791.
Haswell, Edward Alanson, O4049524.
Heldmyer, Harry Fredrick, O4059858.
Kinchen, Robert Preston, O4071265.
McGinnis, John William, O4047648.
Noble, Ralph Everett, O2282912.
Peterson, Charles Wayne, O4059946.
Pfeiffer, William George, O4056435.
Ryan, William Joseph, Jr., O2283679.
Salmon, Ray Weeks, Jr., O4019399.
Seeley, Sam Taylor, O2284554.
Smith, Robert Crow, O4016850.
Smith, Lee Roy, Jr., O1941038.
Sommers, George A., O4030316.
Walcott, Daniel Frank, O4061130.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3292, and Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

To be lieutenant colonels

Garnett, James, O389981.
Lee, John G., O1000148.
Nelson, Wilner Nels John, O329803.

To be majors

Ahern, Robert James, O375643.
Herrod, Ralph, O432411.
Hunt, James William, O1996938.
Marchus, David Edward, Jr., O1284356.
Martin, Harold Vandersand, O349588.
McCartin, George James Joseph, Jr., O456117.
O'Donovan, William Enlow, O1318075.
Starr, James Carleton, O1323039.

To be captains

Dorsey, Frank J., O1928024.
Hart, Robert Edwin, O955216.
Lennon, Daniel Aloysius, Jr., O1636208.
Smith, Donald B., O1685729.
Wofford, Ralph Webb, O1845374.
Wondolowski, Peter Stanislaus, O401750.

To be first lieutenants

Ashlaw, Herman W., O982547.
Beltman, Laurence John, O2276946.
Costello, John L., Jr., O2285391.
Dunn, Robert Edward, O2276820.
Kugler, John B., O2283742.
Loane, Jabez W., IV, O2287323.
Miller, Glen Robert, O4019098.
Moody, Glenn Ray, Jr., O2286801.
Oglesby, John Thomas, O2003605.
Pusateri, Lawrence Xavier, O2272591.

The following-named officers for appointment as chaplain in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

To be majors

Gorski, Joseph, O460877.
Helm, Donald Wallace, O482757.
O'Connor, William Vincent, O529709.

To be captains

Brown, Norman Richard, O2270830.
Burnette, Lester Eugene, O468886.
Heckard, Floyd Lee, O553084.
Higgins, William Joseph, O931819.
Jones, Joseph Woodrow, O1011833.
Kettler, Earl Cornelius, O996741.
Land, Clifton E., O2263945.
Lindsey, Chester Ray, O931676.
McMinn, Thomas L., Jr., O2273125.
Underwood, Carmah Curfew, O527992.

To be first lieutenants

Beasley, Joseph Hodgin, O2275727.
Brady, John Charles, O996290.
Casey, Walter Edward, O2274980.
Fosmire, William Lewis, O1878027.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Womens' Army Corp, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3311, and Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

To be majors

Kunert, Betty Katherine, L504648.
Wilton, Ella Amanda, L220109.

To be captains

Bennett, Judith Christian, L802010.
Biasini, Isabelle, L200289.
Brinegar, Maurine Olive, L803746.
Byrne, Elizabeth Josephia, L1020581.
Harllee, Frances Elizabeth, L804185.
Harth, Elizabeth Agatha, L603875.
King, Ruth Ann, L311162.
Moon, Lou Anne, L501262.
Wood, Nancy Benton, L402096.

To be first lieutenants

Babyk, Helena Florentyna, L1010542.
Berry, Elizabeth Anne, L1020003.
Collins, Joyce Louise, L1020641.
Devany, Rebecca Bland, L1010692.
Etheridge, Wanda J., L1010770.
Fea, Jennie Wren, L1020302.
Hunter, Onie Ruth, L1010889.
Long, Alice Agnes, L117528.
McWilliams, Bonnie Jean, L1010490.
Wachuta, Laverne Ester, L508209.

To be second lieutenants

Archambault, Claire Annette, L1010795.
DeSarro, Margaret Mary, L1010809.
Husband, Patricia Rue, L1010847.
Keil, Barbara Joan, L1010881.
O'Rourke, Kathleen Rosemary, L1010786.
Pleasants, Katherine, L1010808.
Pons, Mildred Elaine, L1020664.
Roffee, Ruth Olive, L1010829.
Sousa, Rita Esther, L5302004.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3294, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress; title 10, United States Code, section 3291, as amended by Public Law 85–155, 85th Congress:

To be lieutenant colonels

Griffin, David J., MC, O76176.
Moulton, Charles W., MC, O422005.

To be majors

Baze, Wallace R., DC, O73985.
Bhaskar, Surindar N., DC, O4023052.
*Hauschild, Thomas B., MC, O76206.
Horne, David E., DC, O5003647.
Kruszewski, Edward P., DC, O1725498.
*Mendenhall, Max K., MC, O76385.
Monahan, James L., DC, O74020.
*Price, Delbert D., DC, O1534363.
Rose, Lawrence R., MC, O75423.
Shaver, Robert C., Jr., DC, O352588.
Wakeham, Richard D., DC, O973604.

To be captains

Alderson, Thomas H., DC, O1878205.
Alexander, William N., DC, O2267388.
Beavers, William T., DC, O4043589.
*Bohling, Walter H., Jr., DC, O983077.

Blundell, Mary L., AMSC, R2594.
Bushnell, Theodore L., MC, O4027872.
*Catlin, Frank R., MC, O4030404.
Clarke, Theodore C., DC, O2270746.
Clement, Cecil F., Jr., DC, O1182542.
Cokrhame, Jack, MC.
Cotter, Anastatia, AMSC, R2367.
Crittendon, William F., MC.
Desetti, James G., Jr., DC.
Dewar, Betty J., ANC, N797013.
DuPree, Lydia, ANC, N804067.
Fukunaga, Francis H., MC, O4055398.
Gardner, Richard M., MC.
Halterman, James L., DC, O4046600.
Hathaway, Edythe J., ANC, N777453.
*Hathaway, Robert G., MC, O4022605.
Hehn, Mary K., ANC, N726430.
*Hemenway, Mary, AMSC, M2903.
Jender, Joseph G., MC, O4056127.
Jennings, William A., DC, O2271331.
Johnson, George L., MC, O4002277.
*Kirchner, Marvin M., MC, O75382.
*McClure, Gammon D., DC, O980924.
Mikvy, William P., DC, O4045718.
Neimes, Robert E., MC, O4016505.
Petz, Arthur J., MC, O4056319.
Schane, William P., MC, O5202342.
*Scully, Bernard R., DC, O1081175.
*Singer, Kathryn C., ANC, N725082.
Snartemo, Alfa M., ANC, N737169.
Stewart, Hugh A., Jr., DC, O2270969.
Suddarth, Jerome A., DC.
*VanMeter, Richard L., MC, O4050856.
*Vocke, Lester E., DC, O1799402.
*Weiland, Jerold T., DC, O4056102.
Worthington, Robert L., MC.
Zachary, Jimmy B., MC, AO3042041.
*Zimmerman, Joseph S., DC.

To be first lieutenants

Acomb, Kent M., DC, O4071026.
Aiken, Hovey E., Jr., MC, O4011641.
Baird, William L., Jr., MC, O1942354.
Baxter, Lucille N., ANC, N900056.
Burke, Frances M., ANC, N900272.
Christopher, Mildred E., ANC, N900104.
*Coats, William C., Jr., DC, O2277579.
*Coddington, Robert C., MC.
*Copeland, Sage D., MC, O2003672.
Dangerfield, Harry G., MC, O5701217.
*Dwyer, Mary P., AMSC, R20007.
Giordano, Wally P., MC, O5003221.
Gray, Barbara D., AMSC, M3037.
Harding, Clarke T., Jr., MC, O2283398.
Hersperger, Webb S., MC.
Jones, Virginia A., ANC, N900294.
*Latimer, Estill V., AMSC, M3030.
*Maier, Eugene S., MC, O2284732.
*Margolis, Bernard M., MC, O2284644.
McRoberts, Terry E., DC, O2284676.
Mooney, Patricia E., AMSC, R2655.
Morris, Mary V., AMSC, J100093.
*Newton, John P., MC.
Pickford, Barbara, ANC, N902280.
Quesenberry, Esther M., ANC, N792609.
Ranberg, Florence V., ANC, N901148.
*Roberts, Fred F., MC, O2283884.
Siegt, Dorothy M., ANC, N900472.
Sommer, Albrecht F. J. W., MC, O2282664.
Strickman, Bernard, MC, O5202690.
Tabrisky, Joseph I., MC, O5500582.
*Teofan, Ronald O., DC.
Thompson, Beatrice E., AMSC, M3031.
Waters, Dean G., MC, O5202691.
Wilson, Shannon D., ANC, N901478.
Zahn, Genevieve F., ANC, N805137.

To be second lieutenants

Arseneau, Joanne L., ANC, N902546.
*Forbes, Betty L., ANC, N902575.
Gregory, Barbara A., ANC, N902684.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Jones, David W., Jr., O43631.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant:

Roesser, Joseph C., O73481.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service, in the grade of second lieutenant:

Keolanui, Lawrence K., Jr., O72744.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

*Inlow, Neely S.
Johnson, William H., Jr., O4084573.
King, Damon D.
Kistler, Thomas E., Jr.
*Merrill, Benjamin L.
*Posey, William L.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

*Adamski, Richard G.
Alexander, Lon C., Jr.
*Allen, George E., II.
Allen, John R.
*Anderson, John L.
Bartlett, William E., Jr., O5305083.
*Bartlett, William G., Jr.
*Bauer, Donnell G.
*Binzer, Solomon V.
Black, Reuben, O5300911.
*Black, Robert D.
*Bouten, Franklin J.
*Bracey, Alonzo
*Bradley, Lee M.
Brown, John, Jr., O5300278.
Brownfield, Willim I., O5300493.
Burnett, Richard J., Jr.
*Caldwell, Chellus M.
*Churchill, Carl L.
*Cordonnier, David J.
*Corner, Charles R.
Cromartie, Eugene R.
*Culpepper, Oren R.
*Danner, Billy G.
*Davis, Carl J.
Davoli, James O., O5202947.
DeLoach, Ray B., O5302601.
*Dorsey, Harry M.
Downs, Clifford, Jr., O4068894.
*Feit, Thomas P. P.
Flynn, William S., O4085411.
*Foley, Roger M.
Gallagher, Harold D., O5504414.
*Gray, Josef E.
*Greenwalt, Randall A.
*Gregory, David T.
*Hall, David W.
*Harbuck, James B., Jr.
*Hartley, Robert G.
*Issel, Kenneth A.
*Kastenmayer, Walter W., Jr.
*Knight, Jerry C.
Landry, Gerard, O4065557.
*Larsen, Gary W.
*Lengyel, Jack R.
*Lovejoy, Dan H.
Lundgren, Duwayne C., O5400770.
*Luthy, Arthur P.
*Maddox, George B.
*Maldonado, Victor S.
Mattingly, Roger K., O5504559.
McBath, Donald L.
*Michener, Edward H.
*Morris, David W.
*Motes, Clyde L.
Mulloy, Robert L., Jr., O5302636.
*Murphy, Malcolm J.
*Olson, Bruce G.
*O'Malley, Joseph G.
*O'Toole, Thomas M.
*Parks, David W.
Pendell, Roger A., O5202290.
*Petesch, Gary L.
Plummer, Harold L.
Polo, Richard J., O4085339.
*Purser, Evan G.
*Riddle, Walker M., Jr.
*Roemer, Richard O.
*Rowe, Terry E., Jr.
*Rowley, Dan M.
*Schad, Charles T.
Schrader, Frederick A., O5202032.
*Shook, William H.
Sowell, Arnold M., O5201760.
Spiecker, John S., O5502743.
Steedly, Ronald E., O5300578.
Steinbach, James J.
Streips, Eugene A., O5303064.
*Sullivan, George C.
Suprise, Lyle G., O5504481.
Takane, James N., O5800013.
*Terpstra, John J., Jr.
Tipton, James A., O5302351.
*Tobiason, Robert G.
Ward, Rayburn L., Jr., O5302859.
*Warren, Peter J.
*Weiler, John L.
Whedbee, John S., O5302437.
*Wheeler, Edward W., Jr.
Williams, Jimmie L., Jr.
Wynn, Sidney R., O5303126.

NOTE.—Those officers whose names are not preceded by the symbol (*) were appointed, transferred, or promoted during the recess of the Senate. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were not appointed or promoted during the recess of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Ecclesiastes 12: 13: *"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man."*

Almighty God, grant that in our moment of prayer our listless and languid spirits may be quickened into newness of life and touched to finer and nobler issues.

We penitently confess that frequently we are guilty of the incredible folly of trying to solve our problems and discharge the duties and responsibilities of our high vocation without first holding counsel with the God of all wisdom.

May our sense of duty and our vision of the ultimate triumph of justice and righteousness, of peace and good will, be so clear and commanding that we shall never yield to doubt and defeatism.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignations from committees, which were read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1958.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I understand that I am to be appointed to the Judiciary Committee, and accordingly I hereby submit my

resignation from the Committee on Government Operations. My committee assignments then will be Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

Respectfully yours,

H. ALLEN SMITH,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1958.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Speaker's Office, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to become effective instanter.

In terminating my membership on this committee I wish to express to Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE and my other colleagues there my sincere appreciation for their many acts of friendship and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

BASIL L. WHITENER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL ALLOTMENT AND SUPPORT PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 308)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The people of the United States are living in a world of rapid change. Developments both abroad and at home require reemphasis in some of our efforts, redirection in others. This is true of defense, of education, of industry, and of labor. It is also true of agriculture.

The rapid changes taking place in agriculture are largely the result of a major breakthrough in agricultural science and technology. In recent years agriculture has been experiencing a veritable revolution in productivity.

A century ago, an American farmworker fed himself and three others. Today he feeds himself and 20 others. A century ago, our population was 82 percent rural. Today it is only one-third rural and only 12 percent of our population actually live on farms.

Farm production per man-hour has doubled since 1940. There has been more change in agriculture within the lifetime of men now living than in the previous 2,000 years.

Changes of such magnitude place great stress on our farm people and on the social, political, and economic institutions which serve them. Far-reaching adjustments are being made which involve the lives and hopes of 20 million men, women, and children on the farms of America.

The scientific revolution in agriculture is irreversible and is continuing. It cannot be avoided and it need not be feared. In recognition of this basic fact, we must find ways of utilizing more completely the abundance that our farm people are now able to produce; we must find ways of further expanding markets for this increased production, not only among our own citizens but among people all over the world who need the food and clothing we produce in such abundance. At the same time we must help our farm people to cope with the sometimes harsh consequences of their own unparalleled ability to produce, while preserving and strengthening free enterprise and the family farm.

Those who have fared best during the years of this agricultural revolution are the farmers on the 2,100,000 commercial farms that produce 90 percent of the food and fiber that goes to market. Affected quite differently are the farmers on the 2,700,000 other farms that produce relatively little for sale. To them, the farm is primarily a place to live, with an opportunity to grow products for home use, for about three-fourths of their income is derived from off-farm sources.

Commercial family farms have their problems. So do small-scale farmers, subsistence farmers, and part-time farmers. The problems, however, are not always the same.

There is evidence that those farmers who produce the bulk of our farm products are meeting the problem of adjusting their operations to the changes now in progress. Moreover, there are other indications of strength in our farm economy.

Prices received by farmers on the average are running 3 percent above those of a year ago.

During the last 2 years, farm net income has stabilized following several years of decline.

Farm real estate prices are at an all-time high, reflecting a basic optimism in the future earning power and security which farming and farmland ownership offer.

Three-fourths of our farms are owned by those who operate them, the highest percentage on record.

Total debt of our farm people equals only 11 percent of total assets as compared with 19 percent before World War II.

Exports of farm products, assisted by special Government programs, reached an all-time high of $4.7 billion during the year ending last June 30.

Surplus holdings of farm products in the hands of Government appear to have passed their peak. Government investment in price-supported commodities now stands at about $7 billion, $1 billion below a year ago.

Substantial progress has been made in programs of education, research, conservation, and other activities of proven merit. Work in all those areas has been substantially expanded.

With Government help, farm people, in the best American tradition, have gained bargaining power through their own farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperatives.

Yet key problems remain unresolved.

Rising production costs continue to limit net farm income. Prices of articles farmers buy more than doubled from 1939 to 1952. Since then they have risen 3 percent. Prices received by farmers have not kept pace with their increased production costs. These are hard facts every farmer faces.

Moreover, acreage controls have failed to bring agricultural production into line, despite the severe restrictions they impose on the individual farmer's freedom to produce and to market his products. And unrealistic price-support laws, some of which date back to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, result, as farmers now realize, in loss of markets.

Furthermore, there are large numbers of rural people who have not benefited from price supports. Nor have they benefited as they should from the great changes under way in agriculture. In fact, some have been put at a competitive disadvantage by the onrush of farm technology and other economic changes.

This is true not only in particular rural areas of low income, but for some people in almost every farm community. There are millions of rural people who, for reasons of small farms, poor soils, limited resources, age, inadequate credit, lack of education, poor health or insufficient managerial ability, have been unable to make the adjustments called for by modern technology.

Few of the dollars spent on agricultural programs have been of appreciable help to this group.

Price supports have scant meaning to a farmer with little to sell.

Reductions in acreage to support higher prices are contrary to the needs of a farmer whose production is already too small to give him a proper livelihood.

In my special agricultural message 4 years ago, I indicated that the Secretary of Agriculture would give attention to the problems peculiar to farm families with low incomes. As a result, the rural development program was initiated. It is widening opportunities for those rural people on the lower rungs of the economic ladder.

For underemployed farmers who desire to continue in agriculture, the rural development program, in cooperation with States and localities, offers research, education, supervised credit, and cost-sharing by the Federal Government in improving land, timber, and water resources. Farm and home improvements are a major part of the program.

For those who wish to supplement or replace limited farm incomes with greater income from nonfarm sources, there are being established vocational training programs in trades and skills. Additional industries are being established in farming areas where more employment and higher incomes are needed. Farm families which are interested are also being informed of job opportunities in other segments of the economy.

Though only about 3 years old, the rural development program has already achieved much, and with the increased emphasis planned for the coming year, progress promises to be more rapid in the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Basic agricultural legislation now on the books was originally devised as an emergency effort to cope with a depression, then changed to help fight a war, and subsequently revised again in an

effort to meet the needs of peace. It has not been adequately modified to deal with the effects of the technological revolution in agriculture. This must now be done.

It is essential that the following major steps be taken this year to improve the status of rural people in greatest need, to aid agricultural adjustment, provide more freedom, expand markets, and, thereby, to help raise farm family income.

First. The conservation reserve program of the soil bank should be strengthened, and the acreage reserve program terminated after the 1958 crop.

The conservation reserve has shown promise in retiring marginal acres from crop production, in aiding the cause of conservation, and in taking whole farms out of production. The program is wholly voluntary and must remain so.

Because of its late enactment, the acreage reserve program was hampered during 1956 in achieving production adjustment. And although the 1957 program succeeded in reducing wheat production by about 175 million bushels, cotton by 2 million bales, and corn by 220 million bushels below what it would otherwise have been, the number of farmers participating in 1958 is likely to be low, in part because of limitations that Congress imposed on the extent of participation by any one farm. So in the future the production adjustment accomplished by the acreage reserve is likely to be small.

We should now shift the emphasis of the soil bank away from the short-term acreage reserve, aimed at reducing surpluses of particular crops to the long-term conservation reserve, aimed at overall production adjustment.

This change will aid all farmers, especially the low-income farmer, who will, if he desires, be better able to retire his entire farm from production.

Expansion of the conservation reserve will be an effective instrument of adjustment only if it is accompanied by needed changes in price supports. It must not become merely a means of offsetting the production stimulus supplied by price supports held continually at incentive levels.

The budget message recommends a conservation reserve program of $450 million for the 1959 calendar year.

Second. Authority to increase acreage allotments for cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco should be provided. Under present legislation acreage allotments and price supports for certain of the basic crops are determined by legal formulas. Under these formulas, allotments have already been cut sharply. Allotments for certain crops are likely to be reduced even further, despite growing evidence that acreage restrictions have not brought about needed adjustments.

Authority should be provided for the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with criteria which the Secretary will propose to the Congress, to increase allotments up to 50 percent above the levels determined by existing formulas.

The law already specifies that the Secretary may provide price support at levels above those determined by formula, and this authority has been used. The law should also provide authority to increase acreage allotments when the statistical formula yields results clearly contrary to the general interest. But any acreage increases must be related to price adjustments which will permit the growth of markets necessary to absorb the increased production.

Such liberalization of acreage allotments as is possible would permit greater efficiency and higher incomes for small farmers who now are sharply restricted in the size of their operations.

Third. Acreage allotments for corn should be eliminated. The corn program has not worked. Huge surpluses have accumulated. As surpluses rise, present legislation provides that allotments must shrink. As allotments shrink, participation in the corn program dwindles. A year ago, 62 percent of the corn farmers who voted in the referendum favored the elimination of corn acreage allotments. In 1957, only about 14 percent of the corn production in the commercial corn area was eligible for the full price support. Thus, as allotments shrink, participation spirals downward, and price-depressing surpluses spiral upward.

Fourth. The escalator clauses in the basic law should be abolished. Provisions now in the law require that price supports be raised as soon as the surplus is reduced. This means that as one surplus is moved, incentives are automatically provided to build another. Until this basic law is changed, farm people can expect to be kept continually under the shadow of price-depressing surpluses.

The soil-bank and surplus-disposal programs have already cut deeply enough into our surplus to throw these escalator clauses into action to build more surpluses. Elimination of these escalator clauses is necessary if surplus-disposal programs and the soil bank are to achieve their purpose.

Fifth. The overall range within which price supports may be provided should be substantially widened. Presently, price supports must be provided by rigid formula for cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, tobacco, and dairy products between 75 and 90 percent of parity. This range is too narrow to permit the growth of markets needed to absorb the production which, despite acreage controls, our farms appear certain to produce. Price supports for the above-named commodities should be determined administratively between 60 percent and 90 percent of parity, using the 8 guidelines now provided by law for practically all other commodities. This needed change in price-support policy would open the door to market expansion, increased acreage allotments, and greater freedom to produce.

For commodities like the feed grains, with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture has had wide discretion in the past, price support has been offered at levels as high as could be justified under the criteria specified by law. This will be the Secretary's practice under the recommended legislation.

Sixth. Price supports for cotton should be based on the average quality of the crop. For cotton the law specifies that supports must be based on a grade that is far below the average quality. The law should be corrected to put cotton price supports on the same basis as for all other crops.

Seventh. The membership of the Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board should be enlarged and the Board's responsibilities increased. The recommended changes in determining acreage allotments and price-support levels will make additional administrative discretion a necessity. To assist the Secretary of Agriculture in exercising this discretion, the bipartisan Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board should be increased in number from 5 to 7. Members should be appointed by the President as at present, but with confirmation by the Senate. The Board should advise the Secretary regarding the establishing of price supports, determining of acreage allotments, and related subjects.

Eighth. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act should be extended. This law is one of the major authorities for moving surplus commodities. The law should be extended for 1 year with an additional $1.5 billion authorized for sales for foreign currencies. But it must not, however, be allowed to become a device to postpone needed production and price adjustments. The extension should be limited to 1 year to give Congress the opportunity for annual review.

Ninth. Research efforts aimed at increasing industrial uses of farm products should be expanded. Our farms and forests are a major source of our raw materials. To a greater degree than at present, these raw materials can be used in industry, thereby broadening markets for our abundant farm products. New uses and new markets can be developed for our surplus crops. To bring this about, increased utilization research is needed and is proposed in the budget message. This will be moving in the direction recommended by the President's Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products.

In addition to the nine steps outlined here, the Congress should, as recommended in the budget message, (a) extend the National Wool Act; (b) continue the special school milk program; (c) broaden the sources of funds for the Rural Electrification Administration; (d) require State participation in programs to relieve the effects of drought or other natural disaster; and (e) improve conservation accomplishment by restricting cost sharing to those practices which achieve longer lasting conservation benefits.

These several recommendations constitute a farm, food, and fiber program which will assist our farmers to adjust to today's rapidly changing economy. It is a progress program that can make a substantial contribution to the well-being of America's farm families.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1958.*

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 309)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the 7th Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 15, 1958.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1957—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 263)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1958.*

SECOND SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 306)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the second semiannual report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1958.*

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications:

JANUARY 16, 1958.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having been elected a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 16, 1958.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully tender my resignation from the Committee on the District of Columbia effective this date.

With the expression of my highest esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 16, 1958.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having been elected a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
Member of Congress.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 440) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, New York.

Committee on Government Operations: KATHRYN E. (Mrs. WILLIAM T.) GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania.

Committee on the Judiciary: BASIL L. WHITENER, North Carolina; ROLAND V. LIBONATI, Illinois.

Committee on Un-American Activities. WILLIAM M. TUCK, Virginia.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 441) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Education and Labor: JOHN A. LAFORE, JR., Pennsylvania.

Committee on the Judiciary: H. ALLEN SMITH, California.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts be kind enough to give us the legislative program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be the bill H. R. 3831, the tax bill, Technical Amendments Act of 1957, from the Committee on Ways and Means. If there is any rollcall on the bill, the rollcall will go over until Tuesday, and we could make arrangements, probably, to take it up later that afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] informs me that the committee appointed to attend the funeral of the late August H. Andresen cannot get back here until Wednesday, but we can work out later the matter of when to have the rollcall on the tax bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; we can discuss that later.

On Tuesday there will be the bill H. R. 9955, providing for a temporary increase in the public debt limit. The bill H. R. 3831 may be passed without a rollcall vote, and I understand the committee will not ask for a rollcall. Although I cannot speak for all the members of the committee, I understand that is so. However, there will be a rollcall on the public debt limit bill, I think that is safe to say.

I have been informed by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], that the supplemental appropriation bill will be reported out next week, probably either Monday or Tuesday, Tuesday being the probability, and that the bill will be brought up next week. I cannot state which day next week that bill will be brought up, except to advise my colleagues of the conversation I had with the gentleman from Texas, that the bill will be reported out and will be brought up next week.

Mr. MARTIN. To get the picture clearly before the Members of the House, what will we do on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Tuesday there is the bill providing for the temporary increase in the public debt limit. That is definite.

Mr. MARTIN. How long will the debate be on the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. They do not have a rule on it as yet. Can the gentleman from Arkansas give us some information on that? I see the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is here. They probably have some idea on that.

Mr. MILLS. It is very difficult to answer the question of the minority leader with respect to the time because there has been no discussion in the Committee on Ways and Means even on the point of how much time we will ask the Committee on Rules to give us for general debate on the debt ceiling bill. I hope we can dispose of it with a minimum of debate, frankly.

Mr. REED. If the gentleman will yield, I think an hour ought to be enough.

Mr. MILLS. That would be entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. MARTIN. It is my understanding that a rollcall vote will be had on this measure. How are we going to protect the Members of the funeral delegation who are attending the funeral of our late colleague from Minnesota? They will not be back, I repeat, until Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota when the burial of our late friend will take place?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The funeral will take place on Monday afternoon in Red Wing, Minn. There is no possible way that we, who are on that delegation of 12 Members, can return here and be ready for work on Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the statement of the gentleman is self-explanatory and the situation is clear to all of us, I am sure; so, so far as I am concerned, if my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is agreeable, if any rollcall votes are to be taken on Monday or Tuesday, they will be put over until Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN. That is very well, but I understand that this date might inconvenience some on the Democratic side; and if the majority leader cares to postpone the vote until Thursday that will be all right with me.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend is very kind. It so happens that it will conflict with something that the majority leader himself has committed himself to, but I am willing to subordinate myself for the benefit of the many and I will try to be here. I have a speaking engagement that I am committed to. If it is agreeable to the gentleman, if any rollcall votes should be called for on Monday or Tuesday, they will go over until Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is very generous; but, as I say, I am anxious to be equally generous with the gentleman from Massachusetts; and, if he wants the rollcall vote to go over until Thursday, that will be all right with me.

Mr. McCORMACK. But Thursday would be just as bad for me.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Friday, January 17, 1958, to file a report on the bill H. R. 9955, a bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 429) reaffirming belief in the merit system principle for Government employment.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Thursday, January 16, 1958, will mark the 75th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Service Act which signaled an end to the spoils system and marked the beginning of the competitive civil service that today embraces a career work force of more than 2 million employees; and

Whereas a competent career service is a foundation of good government, an informed citizenry the lifeblood of our democracy; and

Whereas the Government's ability to attract and retrain well-qualified people for the Federal work force depends upon an informed public opinion—upon public knowledge and understanding of the career civil service and its place in our democracy; and

Whereas it is advisable to focus public attention on the Federal service and on the achievements of career civil servants in behalf of the people they serve; and

Whereas the position of world leadership assumed by the United States underscores the need for public understanding of the responsibilities of the Government and of the career service through which vital programs authorized by the Congress are carried out: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House reaffirms its belief in the merit system principle for Government employment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE WEEK

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Resolution 429 as a means for the entire membership of this House to give appropriate recognition to one of the most important events in the history of our Federal civil service.

Seventy-five years ago today, on January 16, 1883, President Chester A. Arthur signed the first Civil Service Act. This act sounded the death knell for spoilism and political patronage in appointments to Federal positions. It marked the end of a long period of struggle for reforms to end a century of filling public offices without any regard to ability or the public interest—and to replace it with a plan based on the principle that superior qualifications are the only test of eligibility for public office.

In all probability the name of Charles Gieteau has little or no significance today to most of the 2,400,000 Federal employees who now enjoy the benefits of our civil service merit system. This disappointed office seeker's crime, when he assassinated President Garfield, crystallized public opinion to strong indignation which forced adoption of the Civil Service Act in 1883. This act remains the foundation of merit in Government employment as we know it. It has been the model for extension of the merit principle throughout State, local, and municipal governments in America.

It is most appropriate, therefore that we resolve today to rededicate ourselves to the great principle embodied in this law. But this resolution should be coupled with a note of caution. Devotion to the ideals of the Civil Service Act should not lead us into a false sense of security or overreliance on its infallibility simply because these ideals have withstood the test of time. We should never reach the point of relaxing our guard against any weakening of the merit principle. It is our responsibility not only to maintain this principle but to strengthen and extend it when changes are needed.

After all, as well and as soundly as the Civil Service Act was planned, and as effective an instrument as it has been for efficient Government, the early planners could not have been expected to foresee all of the needs and requirements, all of the complexities and problems, of the future. With all due honor to them, it is our duty to adapt the merit framework they provided to present space-age needs of our Government.

Your Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has maintained close watch to guard against any tendency toward weakening of the competitive merit system. We have conducted studies and investigations, on a continuing basis, to strengthen and extend the competitive civil service.

This can be accomplished only by full consideration of matters relating to the civil service in the Post Office and Civil Service Committees. Right now there are too many positions—such as the so-called supergrade positions and schedule C positions—that can be created without certification by the Civil Service Commission as to the propriety of their grades and salary levels. Prospective appointees to these positions should be subjected to the test of meeting minimum qualifications, established under Civil Service Commission standards, before they are placed in the positions. We have found many examples of appointments of individuals who simply do not have the qualifications for important Government work assigned to them. This creates a serious weakness at top level which is bound to interfere with efficiency and economical conduct of the public business.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that House Resolution 429 will receive the unanimous approval of the House as an evidence that we reaffirm our faith in competitive merit for our Federal civil service.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished chairman of our Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of House Resolution 429. I have introduced an identical resolution, House Resolution 430, marking the 75th anniversary of the Civil Service Act of 1883.

I have just come from a most impressive ceremony in which this occasion was observed by leaders throughout the executive branch. It is singularly appropriate that the program in this celebration included many very fine awards honoring Federal civil servants for long and meritorious service and outstanding accomplishments. These awards, I am sure, would have met with the full approval of the early planners who wrote the first Civil Service Act.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 429 is a simple yet strong reaffirmation of one of the most effective national policies ever laid down by the Congress of the United States. This is the firm and unshakable principle of merit in the selection of the men and the women who conduct the public business.

With this resolution the Members join 170 million Americans in observance of the diamond anniversary of our civil-service merit system. Federal, State, and local officials and employees—civic, professional, and educational leaders—outstanding businessmen and industrialists—from Maine to California and from Puget Sound to Cape Canaveral are celebrating National Civil Service Week in commemoration of the signing of the Civil Service Act by President Arthur on January 16, 1883.

It is a real tribute to the wisdom and foresight of those who took this first, great step toward efficiency and integrity in our civil service, that through three-quarters of a century their ideals have endured and grown in stature to universal recognition. Merit in the civil service today is as much a part of our national creed as the Bill of Rights.

It seems to me that there is something very fundamental—something symbolic of the American way of life—in the application of true merit standards to those who serve the public. The strong competitive spirit that built our independence, our wealth, and our world leadership is naturally receptive to the logic of a system in which the holding of public office rests on merit determined through open competition.

It has been my privilege, during 21 years as a Member of the House, to be associated very closely with our Federal civil service and to work toward a stronger merit system to the best of my ability. It is most gratifying to be able to report that the competitive merit system is immeasurably stronger today than ever before in history. More than 91 percent of Federal employees in the United States now are in the competitive service—compared to 61 percent 21 years ago. This is far cry from conditions when the Civil Service Act was signed, when merit applied to only 10 percent, a mere handful, of Government employees.

Nor should we overlook one of the chief benefits of a vigorous and enlightened competitive civil service—a benefit not foreseen, I am sure, by the early planners, but nonetheless valuable. This is the prestige it brings to our entire Government and all the people in it, the sense of confidence—yes, and appreciation—it instills in the public. Confidence begets confidence. There is nothing that contributes more to superior performance than knowledge that those we serve are aware of our efforts and give us the greatest gifts in their power—their confidence that their affairs are in capable hands.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ADMISSION OF OREGON INTO THE UNION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of 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.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, 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.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary this morning and asked that Senate Joint Resolution 131 be substituted for House Resolution 467, my own resolution, which had been reported out of committee only this morning. I did this in order to expedite this particular matter. Governor Robert Holmes and the centennial commission are most anxious to proceed with their plans as rapidly as possible.

I would also like to take this opportunity to invite you, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and the citizens they represent, to come and visit Oregon. We welcome travelers at any time, but we take particular pleasure in extending an invitation for 1959—Oregon's centennial year. On February 14, 1859, Oregon officially became the 33d State of the Union.

Oregon offers year-round vacation and recreational opportunities—skiing, swimming, hiking, boating, fishing or for the less energetic, relaxing in the sun. Proud of her 400 miles of rugged and constantly changing coastline, Oregon also boasts some of the highest peaks in the Cascade and Coast Ranges. Lakes and streams alive with fish and virgin forest still waiting visiting and local hunters—in scenic and active pleasures, Oregon is the equal of any State in the Union.

Blessed with a Mediterranean-type climate, Oregon rarely suffers from prolonged cold spells in the winter or long periods of intensive heat in the summer.

But in 1959, besides these natural and unchanging attractions, Oregon, for its 100th birthday celebration, will feature the Oregon State Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair. Countries all over the world will send their goods to Oregon giving Americans a chance to see exhibitions of these foreign products and, incidentally, bringing scenery, products, and industries to a national and international audience. A sideline effect of this exchange of goods will be the resulting stimulation of trade between this area of the country and the other parts of the world.

Since you have passed this bill which authorizes the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate our 100th anniversary, I want you to realize my hope, supported by all the citizens of Oregon, that all of you and your constituents can join us, in Oregon, for this celebration of a vital, prospering 100 years.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favor of this resolution. The 100th anniversary of the entry of the State of Oregon into the Union will take place on February 14 of next year and our State will proudly celebrate that event.

In connection therewith an international exposition will be held during the year in Portland and all the citizens of our State are joining in an effort to make it a memorable event.

It goes without saying that each and every Member of this House is most cordially invited to join us in attending the exposition and taking part in this festive year.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDRESS BY JOHN GLEASON, COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to be followed by such other Members from Illinois as wish to speak on the same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois delegation in this body today is experiencing a sense of great pride to which I, with other of my colleagues, wish to give expression. Last night the American Legion gave a dinner in honor of the Members of the Congress of the United States. This is an annual occasion to which all in the Congress, a large majority of us members of the Legion, look forward with keen anticipation.

The dinner of the American Legion is always an enjoyable and thrilling occasion, but the one last night will take a top position in our memories. The speaking program was confined to one address, that of the commander in chief, John Gleason. It was one of the best speeches in content and in delivery that I have ever been privileged to listen to on similar occasion. This was the tenor of the remarks of my colleagues on all sides. The address was brief. It was a

stirring challenge to the American patriotism that is deeply imbedded in all veterans. It was delivered with eloquent sincerity. Many of my colleagues remarked that it furnished a pattern for future after dinner speakers.

Commander in Chief Gleason did honor to himself and to the great American Legion. As one of the founders of the American Legion in Illinois, elected at its first department convention held at Peoria as chairman of the department executive committee, I was especially happy that last night's eloquent speaker, the commander in chief of the American Legion, is from the Department of Illinois. The thrill of pride that I experienced at the outstanding performance of Commander in Chief Gleason was equal to that which I experienced when, at the convention of the American Legion in Philadelphia, Howard Savage was elected as Illinois' first commander in chief of the great American Legion. It was Commander in Chief Howard Savage of Illinois who headed the second AEF on the return to France as legionnaires of the men who only a few years prior had been fighting on the battlefields of France in World War I.

May I extend to Commander in Chief Gleason the congratulations of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States on a job magnificently well done.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to call to the attention of the Members the following very fine address by John S. Gleason, Jr., national commander, the American Legion, at the national legislative commission's annual dinner honoring the Members of Congress, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., Wednesday, January 15, 1958:

The American Legion is proud and pleased to welcome you to this dinner in honor of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States. We are grateful to the Members of Congress who have taken time from their busy schedules to be with us so that we might first visit with them personally before paying tribute to them publicly tonight. And we are indebted to you officials and military leaders of our Government, to the members of the press, and to all of our distinguished guests for your courtesy and cooperation in joining us as we salute the Members of the most important legislative body in the world.

We in the American Legion are well aware of the many, grave problems which the Congress must resolve in the trying months ahead. We realize that the life and death issue of our security and survival must command the first attention and constant concern of you Senators and Representatives. And we recognize that to the difficulties and complexities of this supreme challenge have been added other serious problems affecting every segment of our economy, from farmers to veterans . . . every facet of our national life, from the welfare of our children to the care of our aged.

It is true that the responsibility for enacting the legislation needed to provide for our common defense and insure the welfare of all our people has been reserved to the Congress alone. But it is no less true that the obligation to understand, to accept and to carry out the purpose and provisions of the laws you enact is reserved to us, the American people.

One area in which the American Legion has been privileged to exercise a special interest and effort has been in the field of veterans' affairs. We have not yet explored the full range of this broad and complex subject. But we have long realized that the program of hospital and medical care and of other essential benefits for veterans enacted through the years by the Congress of the United States is the most comprehensive, the most constructive, and the most compassionate ever conceived and carried out by any nation.

The American Legion can never express too often or too strongly its deep appreciation to you Members of the Congress of the United States for the significant and lasting contribution you have made to the welfare of our Nation's veterans.

You have built wisely and well the sound structure of benefits now available to disabled veterans, and to the widows and orphans of our deceased veterans. But you appreciate, I'm sure, that this structure can always be improved. Certainly it must always be subject to change to meet developing conditions.

But improvement and emasculation are not synonymous. Neither are change and destruction, although some individuals, including responsible Government officials, seem to think so. This element would diminish the scope of the present veterans program, restrict its future availability, and undermine its historic, basic foundation—all in the name of economy, security, and social progress.

The American Legion is determined that this attack will not succeed. We're confident that it won't as long as the Congress of the United States has anything to say about it.

You can be equally certain of the American Legion's confidence and support of your efforts to arm America militarily, scientifically, economically, and politically against the increasingly powerful threat of Communist Russia.

If studied interest and informed, constructive comment will help to guide, encourage, and sustain you in the months ahead as you decide America's destiny, indeed, the destiny of civilization itself, then you can be certain that the American Legion's voice will be heard in the Halls of Congress and throughout our land. It will be the voice of patriots unafraid and dedicated to but one cause—the security and survival of America as a free Nation under God.

Be assured, too, that the American Legion will back you completely if, in your final judgment, our security demands that we forego a tax cut, forget about a balanced budget and raise the debt ceiling. We will support changes in the organization and operation of the Defense Department, and especially our rocket and missile research and development program, which are demonstrably necessary and practical. But these changes must be based on studies and recommendations clearly and completely nonpartisan in nature. And they must not do violence to the patriotism, the dedication and the abilities of those devoted Americans in our laboratories and our Armed Forces who have served and sacrificed beyond measure to meet the frightening challenge of Soviet science.

This is a time for patriotism and sacrifice, not politics and scapegoats. American Legionnaires and all Americans will meet the challenge to our freedoms and our survival. Of this response we are confident. To this task we dedicate ourselves tonight.

Strengthened by this knowledge, armed with this support, and inspired by divine providence, you Senators and Representatives of the United States Congress cannot help but provide the dynamic, courageous leadership which America so desperately needs in this hour of crisis. You cannot help but answer Daniel Webster's challenge, inscribed on the wall of the Chamber of the House of Representatives, to "see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Thank you for being our guests tonight.

MEETING OF INTERESTED MEMBERS REGARDING CONDITIONS IN THE SOUTHWEST

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, an acute disaster hit a great area of this country during the 1957 growing season. I will say that it was more than a disaster, it was a calamity in a large area of the Southwest and the Deep South and in the State of Minnesota. Heavy rains during the planting, growing, and harvest seasons greatly reduced farm yields and the quality of farm commodities. Farmers are unable to pay their 1957 obligations in a large percent of the territory ravaged by floods, excessive rains, early frost, and freeze.

A meeting will be held at 2 o'clock this afternoon in the committee room of the House Committee on Agriculture, 1310 New House Office Building, to discuss the extent of this disaster and what to do about it. I hope all those who are interested in this subject will be present. We will welcome your presence whether you represent an affected district or not.

THE MALLORY DECISION

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEATING) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it becomes increasingly clear, day by day, that Federal law enforcement officials—particularly here in the District of Columbia—are being handcuffed by the effects of the Mallory decision. They face a real crisis unless legislation is enacted to soften the reverberations of that opinion. The confusion among lawyers, the public, and the police as a result of this ruling on Federal arraignment procedures, should be cleared up without delay.

Never in my memory has there been such widespread consternation about a ruling affecting police operations. Numerous civic, legal, fraternal, and law enforcement groups all over the country have urged Congress to act.

Last July, I introduced corrective legislation and am gratified to note that the vigorous public reaction, plus the

natural alarm of police officials, is now being reflected in similar bills which have now been introduced in the other body.

A House judiciary subcommittee has already held extensive hearings on this matter, at which time both defense and prosecution points of view were forcefully presented.

I am confident that when all the evidence is in and the record evaluated, the subcommittee will agree that legislation along the lines of my proposal, H. R. 8600, provides the best available solution. Under the terms of this bill, statements of confessions obtained from a suspect would be admissible in evidence despite any lapse of time between arrest and arraignment. Of course, if during this period other circumstances militated against the rights of the defendant, it would be up to the jury to determine whether such circumstances destroyed the reliability of the confession. I believe this is a sane, workable and just measure which will provide adequate safeguards for both suspected criminals and for the public at large.

In an effort to speed action on this and related measures which have been introduced, I have urged the chairman of the subcommittee to request departmental reports and to prod final subcommittee action. I have further asked the Attorney General to expedite the Justice Department report as speedily as possible.

Further delay invites peril for all our citizens. The time to take the shackles off the police is upon us. Legislation to revise the Mallory decision is absolutely necessary in order to protect our citizens from criminal elements in our society. I hope the committee and then Congress as a whole will enact ameliorative legislation without further delay.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the administration desires that we should have larger farm units which will be permitted to produce in greater abundance at a lower price.

The farm program of the Eisenhower-Benson administration calls for reduced price supports and greater freedom of production. This policy denies the majority of our family farmers the right to share in the rewards of increased efficiency. This policy simply says that the family farmer must farm more acres, at lower prices, must work harder and longer, and still have no guaranty of any economic stability.

If the Government of the United States were to turn the printing presses loose in the Treasury Department and print an excessive supply of currency and because of this overproduction the valuation of the dollar went down—we would call it currency inflation of the worst sort and demand that it be stopped immediately. But the administration's policy for the farmer is to produce more at a lower price. This is commodity inflation of the worst sort and this policy needs to be changed immediately.

What is meant by the family farm? In its simplest terms it is a farm which is operated, and preferably owned, by a farmer and his family, with possibly some seasonal part-time help. It is impossible to generalize as to how many acres it should comprise, for this will vary a great deal according to such factors as soil fertility, climate, and the type of crops or livestock produced.

In regard to size, however, there is one important point that is often overlooked in these days of farm consolidation. Agricultural price levels should be kept high enough to enable a farmer to have an income at a par with that of an industrial worker, without having to farm so many acres that he must work many more hours than the factory worker. The increased productivity of the industrial worker is leading to a shorter workweek for urban people. Increased agricultural productivity, on the other hand, has led only to greater profit for middlemen and less income for farmers. In an effort to hold up his income the farmer has been increasing his land holdings, but all the while his pay has been less and less. Production is not reduced by the mere method of driving farmers off the land. Someone else comes in and adds to his holdings and production continues. The land left by those forced out of farming is absorbed and kept in production by the neighbors who survive and who are compelled to add to their holdings, and thus to their work, in an effort to make a living. Or this land is kept in production by corporations which buy it in order to diversify their investments. These corporations operate their huge land holdings as factories in the field.

The trend toward the concentration of agricultural land in the hands of fewer and fewer owners must be stopped. The Magna Charta has been hailed in history as a great document. One of its most significant provisions stripped feudal landowners of much of the power which they had enjoyed for centuries over the economy and life of the surrounding countryside. They were lord of the land and, hence, the entire country. For a more recent case in point we have only to look at Japan to know what can take place. We have lauded General MacArthur for going into Japan immediately following World War II and breaking up those tremendous landholdings. And yet, the farm policy now being administered will bring about the same conditions here that we had to break up in Japan. If we are not able to stop this concentration of landownership the day will come when most farmers will be laborers working for absentee landlords.

Today, American farmers are becoming a pauperized people in the land of plenty. The farmer is the only economic group which sells everything at wholesale, buys everything at retail, and pays the freight both ways.

Whether it is in an organization, a philosophical ideal, an economic theory, or a piece of legislation, the people of this land look to find the constructive element. America has been made great on the basis of constructive building. We are not content with the employment of tearing down other peoples and nations. We believe in the basic good of all people and we have based our Government on the principle that it would be the servant of all, protecting the basic rights and safeguarding the welfare of our entire citizenry.

In order to serve the best interests of the people we must put forth workable programs to stabilize the economy of agriculture. This program must be positive and one of action. I should like to suggest the following:

First. It is obvious that the Government is now supporting the entire feedgrain market in the general area of 70 percent of parity. If this can be done at this level, then it can be done at a higher level. In order to get agriculture back on its feet we must have supports at least at the 90 percent of parity level based on a fair parity formula using 1946–49 as the base period.

Second. The 90 percent of parity support program should be limited to production based on the best soil conservation practices for each farm, along with reasonable cross-compliance measures.

Third. A vast new program to seek out and establish new nutritional and industrial uses for farm products should be set up and implemented on the most urgent basis.

Fourth. In order to serve the vital needs of civil defense, it is proposed that a national emergency food storage program be set up to transform surplus agricultural commodities into edible storables.

Fifth. It is imperative that the President become fully knowledgeable of the facts relating to our rural economy and take an enlightened stand to make certain that this situation does not continue in its present demoralized condition.

Sixth. We have an abundance in the United States of the things which are necessary to man. Ninety percent of the world's people do not have enough. Let us command the courage to make the wisest use of our wealth to benefit not only our own people but also to pull the free world up to a higher standard of living, that they may see for themselves that democracy is to be preferred as a way of life over communism.

Surely, it is not in our concept of democracy that farmers are to be held as simple economic factors in the computation of the gross national product. Farmers are people. Farmers are first class American citizens, entitled to full participation in the prosperity and well being which our dynamic and expanding economy can produce. Surely, it is not in our concept of democracy that we can accept the cold materialistic philosophy of those whose only answer to the problems of the family farmer is to get off the farm and let agriculture become big business. The family farm operation is a way of life but more than this, it is the most efficient method of farming. It is this way of life and this efficient manner of farming which are threatened with

economic destruction. In the absence of the farmer's ability to control his own market to maintain a level with the rest of the economy, then it becomes the duty of Government to do that which he cannot do for himself.

This nation stands upon the threshold of an age of plenty, the like of which the world has never dreamed. The energy of the atom and the powers of the sun are about to be harnessed to do the labor of tomorrow. The machines of automation are about to be harnessed to do the labor of tomorrow. The machines of automation are already taking over the monotonous and demanding tasks of industrial production and office work. The back-breaking tasks of the farm are being taken over by machines of all types. But, this age of plenty will never come to full reality if these machines become Frankenstein monsters which make economic slaves of our people. But if, through our resourcefulness and our ingenuity, we can expand our economy to all the people by utilizing these inventions for good, then for the first time there are prospects of plenty not only for the fortunate, but for all. There will be leisure, not only for the rich, but for all. There will be full education and cultural opportunities, not only for the well-born, but for the son and daughter of the factory worker, the storekeeper and the sharecropper.

This is the mighty challenge of the future. As Americans we must rise to meet the challenge and progress in the freedoms of a democratic nation.

This must be the America of today—confident and unafraid, ready to try new solutions to new problems, full of faith in the future, with faith in the people and with faith in God.

CHANTILLY AIRPORT

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know who is to be most accommodated, but I want to commend the decision locating the new airport at Chantilly. I have looked that point up on the map and I find it is about as close to West Virginia as it could possibly be placed.

May I say that if the Baltimore airport is not suitable for interim use, we cordially invite Washington visitors to land at the Cleveland airport and come here by bus or by train. It is only a little bit farther away than the Chantilly airport site.

PROTECTION OF ALASKA-SPAWNED SALMON

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce a resolution requesting the Secretary of State to secure an agreement with Japan to protect Alaska-spawned salmon. I would not want by inference to give the idea that the Japanese have not lived up to the letter of their previous agreement with us, nor that Japan has not cooperated with us by free interchange of statistics and scientific data. But the spirit of our agreement with Japan requires an adjustment based on new evidence and scientific knowledge which has come to light recently. The result is our red-salmon resource of the Bristol Bay area is in serious danger of almost complete depletion due to the Japanese high-seas fishing fleet.

I hope our Government will request the Government of Japan prior to the 1958 fishing season to impose restraint upon their fishing fleet in order to protect and preserve salmon of American origin for American fishermen.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to commend the President's statement on the agricultural situation. I should also like to call attention to the studies that the Joint Economic Committee recently completed which went into the economic features of the commercial agricultural problems. Whether or not you agree with the conclusions for a remedy, I think that everyone must face up to the economic factors that exist in this problem. I want to call attention particularly to one statement: It has not been adequately modified, that is, our previous policies, to deal with the effects of the technological revolution in agriculture, and that is the underlying economic factor. There are many things in this recommendation, I might say, that I think many of us can agree with.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HILL) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in considering the President's nine-point program as outlined in his special message on agriculture, I feel certain these recommendations will, when carefully considered and written into legislation, assist our farmers to adjust their operations to the rapid changes taking place in agriculture. These changes should lead to expanded markets, make our agriculture stronger, and provide economic equality for the farmer.

I support the President's recommendation that the acreage-reserve feature of the soil bank be abandoned after the harvest of this year's crops. The acreage-reserve section of the soil bank is an emergency program and has served a useful purpose. The real strength in the soil bank is in the long-range program of the conservation reserve. I agree with the President that the conservation reserve should be broadened and strengthened. I am hopeful that great benefits will accrue to the Nation from the long-range operation of the conservation-reserve program. While it is aimed, as the President said, at overall crop-production adjustments, it carries limitless possibilities for the future. I believe the conservation reserve should have every penny of the $450 million recommended by the President.

Recommendations that the Secretary of Agriculture be given authority to increase acreage allotments for cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts will provide the machinery for correcting one of the serious defects in the operation of present programs. Present law has required the establishment of smaller and smaller quotas until many small family-sized farms are forced into an uneconomic operation. Quotas in themselves have not solved our surplus problems.

The proposal that acreage allotments for corn should be eliminated is squarely in line with the facts. The acreage allotment program simply has not worked. Only about one-seventh of the corn produced in the commercial corn area in 1957 was eligible for the full price support. Most corn farmers simply could not afford to restrict themselves to their allotments. A year ago, moreover, 62 percent of the corn farmers who voted in the referendum favored the elimination of corn acreage allotments.

Removing some of the acreage controls would simply result in bigger surpluses under the existing basic price-support legislation. Numbers 4, 5, and 6 of the President's recommendations, therefore, are concerned with the price-support laws. He urges that the escalator clauses under which the level of price support rises as the surpluses decline should be eliminated. Certainly it is not commonsense to spend billions of dollars in surplus disposal only to allow incentive supports to take over and set the stage for new surpluses. That is precisely the case under the prevailing escalator clauses. They must be eliminated if the surplus disposal programs and the soil bank are to achieve their purpose.

The President urges that price support for cotton should be based on the average quality of the crop rather than on seven-eighths Middling, which is a grade far below average quality. He urges that the law be corrected to put cotton price supports on the same basis as all other crops. This is sensible.

Because the proposed changes in the approach for determining acreage allotments and price-support levels will make additional administrative discretion necessary, the President proposes that the membership of the Commodity Credit

Corporation Advisory Board should be enlarged from 5 to 7.

Our exports of agricultural products in fiscal 1957 reached an all-time high of $4.7 billion. About two-fifths of these exports were moved through Government programs—and particularly through the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, or Public Law 480. Our agricultural exports in the past fiscal year were equivalent to the production of 1 acre of United States cropland out of every 5. It is very largely because of our export programs that the Government holdings of surplus farm products have been reduced by one-sixth in the past year and a half. In view of these accomplishments, I feel sure that few, if any, Members of Congress will challenge the wisdom of a 1 year's extension for Public Law 480 and the authorization of an additional $1.5 billion for sales for foreign currencies.

Finally, I most heartily endorse the recommendation that research efforts aimed at increasing industrial uses of farm products should be expanded. Our farms and forests are a major source of our raw materials. Yet only a very small part of agricultural production is channeled into industrial uses. We can and we must develop new uses and new markets for our surplus crops. To do this, increased research is needed. I concur also in increased emphasis for the rural development program envisioned by the President in his message.

The program presented by the President seems to be an eminently sound approach to our farm problems. I have today introduced the necessary legislation to carry out the recommendations of the President.

TAX RELIEF FOR COLLEGE TUITION

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, I introduced a bill to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children. At that time, I stated on the floor of this House that many of our young people were being deprived of a proper education because parents could not afford the expense of maintaining and educating them. I urged at that time passage of my bill because it would have provided tax relief for the proud parent who wanted to educate his child but could not because of financial hardship.

The following year, Congress amended the law permitting a parent to continue to claim the $600 dependency allowance for a child over 18 attending college. This legislation, although a step in the right direction, fell far short of my legislative goal.

Mr. Speaker, in 1955, I reintroduced my bill. In urging favorable consideration, I said:

> It is difficult to understand why deductions are now allowed for medical expenses, child-care expenses, charitable donations, death benefits, and other expenses, and yet, when it comes to educating one's own child, the barrier is raised. The present $600 allowance has become obsolete because we know that to maintain and educate a child in college costs more than twice as much as the allowance permitted by our tax law.

Needless to say, this measure died a natural death in the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, last year, I again reintroduced the same bill.

On this occasion, I said:

> The need for college-trained people has greatly increased. The future technological development, health, and welfare of our country is greatly dependent upon the scientists, engineers, and other professional people. In most instances, the average parent finds it beyond his financial means to educate his child in the professions.
>
> Tax relief for a parent who wants to educate his child represents a sound and wise investment in the youth of America. It is not only vital to our young people but important to the future of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, if my bill had received favorable consideration 5 years ago when first introduced, many a young man would have followed the hard intellectual road to science. We certainly would not find ourselves in the present predicament.

It took the dramatic launching of Russia's sputniks and other challenges to make us realize that we have done very little in encouraging the utilization of the intellectual capacities of our young people. We had to suffer a damaging blow to our scientific and technological prestige to awaken us to the urgent need for more scientists and engineers.

Mr. Speaker, let us once and for all times remove the barriers and open the gates to education. Let us no longer deprive our young ones of a proper education because of the current fallacy in our tax laws.

CONDITIONS IN COPPER INDUSTRY

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Congressmen from the copper-producing States have introduced today legislation designed to place a floor under the copper industry which would halt a downward price spiral which threatens to force many producers to shut down their operations. Last year nearly 50 percent of the copper in the United States was produced in my Congressional district, and it is already apparent that the drastic curtailment of production will create serious economic problems unless action is taken by the Federal Government to keep our domestic producers in business.

The pertinent facts are these:

First. Copper prices have been in a sharp decline for the past year, and on Monday of this week the price dropped from 27 cents a pound to 25 cents—a price which is too low to permit producers to operate at a profit.

Second. Copper is a basic and in some cases irreplaceable raw material for national defense purposes.

Third. For reasons of national security, since the onset of the Korean war the United States Government has underwritten new production which it is estimated has added 250,000 tons of copper annually to American production—an expansion which represents about the same figure as the surplus production which has depressed prices to their present level.

Fourth. Competition for the domestic market from low-cost foreign producers has been a major factor in producing a glutted market and an abnormally low price—the best comparative figures which I can get at the moment indicate that while the average hourly wage paid to Arizona miners last year was about $2.43, the total daily wage paid by many foreign producers does not exceed twice that amount.

Fifth. American copper producers are mining the lowest grade ore and paying the highest wages in the world today.

Mr. Speaker, recent history indicates that the American copper industry has preferred to operate under free market conditions, and this industry has only turned to the Federal Government for aid now as a last resort measure when confronted with a serious crisis. I think there is good reason to anticipate that if the industry can receive temporary shelter against disaster, expanding market conditions will soon produce a healthier economic climate and a return to normal operations.

In my opinion, the copper industry does not want and is not now asking for the protection of a high tariff. However, due to decided advantages held by low-cost foreign producers, while the market is at the bottom of its present cycle, the industry is asking for a floor and import tax which will tend to balance out competition between the foreign and domestic producer.

In fairness to the copper industry it should be pointed out that since the beginning of World War II—when copper prices were placed under strict Government controls—copper has been sold on the free market in this country except for a period of 4 months in 1949. The truth of the matter is that in the intervening years spokesmen for the copper industry have actually urged Congress to suspend the import tax the industry was entitled to under our reciprocal trade program. As near as I can ascertain, the wisest spokesmen for the copper industry would prefer to go through a period of low prices—which will permit large producers to at least show a slight profit—and expanding markets, rather than press for legislation which would mean a high tariff, artificial high prices, and shrinking markets for copper.

I think I should also point out that if our Government felt it was necessary to expand our productive capacity for national security reasons under the Defense Production Act, then these same reasons of national security require at the very least the maintenance of this expanded capacity.

It is also significant since the most reliable statistics demonstrate that the

cost of producing copper has increased about one-third since a 24-cent peril point for copper was established by Congress in 1951, simple equity requires that the peril point be updated and upgraded so that it reflects current economic realities. In essence, this is all that the copper industry is requesting of the Congress at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a general outline of the facts which have compelled members from copper-producing areas to present this legislation today. Copper mining is one of the 2 or 3 largest extractive industries in our country today. In many ways it is a unique industry. In copper producing sections of our country entire communities have been built where these copper deposits are located, and once mining operations are shut down these communities wither on the vine. An extractive industry like copper or steel is not a tap which can be turned on and off overnight.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the reasons why we have requested a new floor for the copper industry at this time.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF BILL RELATING TO IMPORT TAX ON COPPER

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today, together with several other Members on both sides of the aisle, I have introduced a bill to amend the existing copper import tax legislation so as to enable the copper mining industry of the United States to survive.

This is attempted by changing the present peril point of 24 cents per pound to 30 cents per pound and by imposing a 4-cent-per-pound import tax which shall not be in effect when the domestic market price is 30 cents per pound or more. The bill thus seeks to achieve needed protection for the domestic copper industry and at the same time keep to a minimum any interference with foreign trade. It would leave the domestic market wholly free to all copper producers when the price is above the peril point.

BACKGROUND

The Internal Revenue Code has, since 1932, provided for an import tax on articles of imported copper—4 cents per pound on most items. That import tax, however, has been severely cut by Presidential proclamations under foreign trade agreements—GATT—specifically, the 4-cent tax was cut to 2 cents in 1949, further cut to 1.8 cents in 1957, and is now scheduled to be cut to 1.7 cents on June 30, 1958. And, since 1951, by act of Congress, the tax has been suspended altogether, with the support of the domestic copper producing industry. The suspension enactments in 1951, 1953, 1954, and 1955, each contained a proviso to the effect that the suspension would end if the domestic market price of copper fell below 24 cents for a calendar month. The 1955 suspension, which is still in effect and contains such proviso, will terminate on June 30, 1958.

Since the 1955 suspension, far-reaching changes have occurred in the copper producing industry. Substantial increases in foreign production, coupled with constantly increasing wage and other costs in the United States, have rendered precarious the position of the domestic producing industry. The domestic copper price has fallen from a high of 43 cents per pound in 1955 and 46 cents in 1956 to 27 cents per pound, and even lower for custom smelters, at present. The price in Europe has fallen even further, the London metal exchange price being now the equivalent of approximately 22 cents. The result has been shutdowns and important curtailments at practically all domestic copper mines, with substantial loss of employment and damage to the communities and States involved.

These changes and their consequences indicate the necessity both for a reestablishment of the import tax on copper at 4 cents per pound, and for a revision of the so-called peril point, that is, the price below which the import tax becomes effective. This peril point should be set at a level which will encourage and maintain an active, healthy domestic copper mining industry. Reestablishment of the import tax at 4 cents per pound will afford some real measure of protection when the price falls below that peril point.

EXPLANATION OF SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

RATES OF IMPORT TAX (SEC. 4541)

The rates of import tax set forth in the present bill are the same as originally enacted in 1932, as follows:

On copper-bearing ores and concentrates, and on copper in various specified forms, such as bars, ingots, rods, sheets, tubes, wire, and plates, the rate is 4 cents per pound.

On all other articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930 in which copper is the component material of chief value, the rate is 3 cents per pound.

On all other articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930 which contain 4 percent or more of copper by weight, the rate of tax is 3 percent ad valorem or three-fourths of 1 cent per pound, whichever is lower.

WHEN TAX WOULD BE APPLICABLE (SEC. 4542(A))

The bill provides that import taxes at the above rates will become applicable if the average domestic price of copper has fallen below the 30 cents per pound peril point for a period of 1 month. But, if in any succeeding period of 1 month, such price has risen to 30 cents per pound or more, the tax will be suspended. Determination of the domestic market price of copper will be made monthly by the Tariff Commission.

These provisions will result in an alternating "on" and "off" application of the import tax depending on the domestic market price of copper, and thus the relief afforded by the bill will be automatic and prompt. It is believed that these provisions are feasible and capable of easy administration.

The provision—section 4542 (b)—of the bill which prescribes how the average market price shall be determined by the Commission is the same as the provisions for such determination contained in the suspension legislation of 1951, 1953, 1954, and 1955.

"ENTRY INTO WAREHOUSE" PROVISION (SEC. 4543(A))

Provisions of existing law relating to customs clearance, and bonded warehouse entry and withdrawal, were not designed for dealing with an article subject to an import tax which is applicable only part of the time.

Paragraph (a) of section 4543 of the bill, dealing with the entry of certain imported copper material into bonded warehouse, has been inserted to close an obvious loophole which would otherwise exist. Without this provision, it would be possible, under existing law, to bring into the country unlimited amounts of copper, free of import tax, at times when it was known, or known to be probable, that the import tax would soon be in effect, that is, soon be "on." That could substantially nullify the effects of the tax.

To prevent such a result, section 4543 (a) provides that, at times when the import tax is not in effect, that is, is "off," copper in the specified forms can be entered through customs, or withdrawn from bonded warehouse, only when accompanied by a certification that it is "imported for use" or "sold for use," that is, imported by a person, or sold to a purchaser, who intends to manufacture a different article from it.

The provision is thus intended to prevent the entry through customs, or withdrawal from bond, of tax-free copper, unless it is to go into consumption.

REPEAL OF LAW SUSPENDING IMPORT TAX (SEC. 4543 (C))

The provision for repealing the present copper import tax suspension law—Public Law 38 of the 82d Congress, 1st session—is necessary because such law now suspends the very sections of the Internal Revenue Code which the present bill would amend, and there thus might be confusion as to whether the later or earlier enactment should prevail.

"TREATMENT PROVIDED FOR IMPORTS" PROVISION (SEC. 4543 (D))

The first part of this provision, prior to the proviso, in effect provides that the import tax rates on copper—for example, 4 cents per pound on most items—reestablished by the present bill, shall for purposes of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 be considered as having been in effect continuously since 1932. Unless this provision is inserted, the rate in effect on January 1, 1955—which rate on such date the President can, pursuant to such section 350, cut by not more than 15 percent in order to carry out trade agreements entered into on or after June 12, 1955—would necessarily have to be considered to be 2 cents per pound, rather than 4 cents.

The second part of the provision, consisting of the proviso, is designed primarily to permit administrative officials to reestablish, in existing trade agreements, the import-tax rates imposed by the bill, and to make other changes

therein, without going through certain formal requirements of the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

The above provision, and indeed the entire bill, is designed to operate whether or not the Congress sees fit to vote, during the present session, a further extension of the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today, along with several other Members of Congress from the West, I introduced legislation to halt the importation of excessive amounts of foreign-mined copper. The legislation will also halt the comcomitant of this excessive importation—the exportation of the jobs of our miners to foreign lands.

The seriousness of the current copper situation cannot be exaggerated. Despite drastic curtailment of domestic production—in my district alone nearly 900 copper miners have been laid off—the price of the metal continues to drop. This week it hit a new low of 25 cents per pound. At this figure, our domestic mines cannot operate profitably.

Mr. Speaker, I have little sympathy with those who maintain that an increase in the import tax on copper will ruin the economy of some of our friends in South America. It has been due in large measure to the short-sighted policies of these governments that the current copper crisis is upon us.

The Chilean Government, for example, rigidly regulates the production of the American-owned copper mines within its borders. To date, I am informed, it has refused to permit these countries to cut copper production. As a result, foreign-mined copper continues to add to the world surplus, further contributing to price declines.

I do not intend to stand idly by while the miners in Utah and other parts of the West bear the full brunt of the cutback in world copper production. Nor do I intend to keep quiet while the Chilean Government continues to reap revenue from copper production, while the local government units and schools in Utah lose one of their major revenue sources—the tax income from copper properties.

In closing, I would like to quote with approval a recent statement by the gentleman from New York, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, who needs no introduction to this body.

Representative REED said recently:

> Our industry should not be required to survive in the United States by sufferance of the American State Department. * * * We must bring to a halt the prevailing practice of legislative amendment by Federal bureaus and return to Congress the primary responsibility for the establishment and conduct of our tariff policy.

Representative REED is 100 percent correct. There is something wrong with a national trade policy that promotes boom towns in French Morocco and leaves ghost towns in Utah and the rest of the mining districts in the West.

I hope the House Ways and Means Committee will schedule an early hearing on this legislation to afford our domestic copper mining industry the protection it must have to survive.

REASSIGNING SCIENCE ATTACHÉS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed gratifying to hear that the Department of State has at long last seen fit to recognize the importance of scientific developments by filling the long-vacant position of science adviser by the appointment of Dr. Wallace R. Brode.

I trust that Dr. Brode's first order of business will be to recruit an efficient staff of science attachés to implement a uniform interflow of scientific information.

I am sure that my colleague, the gentleman from California, JOHN MOSS, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations dealing with the dissemination of Government information, was one of the prime motivating forces in this action in support of my request of January 3, 1956, in which I demanded the reimplementation of the science adviser program which had been discontinued by the withdrawal of science attachés from stations abroad.

I feel confident that if this program had been competently staffed and maintained since its inception in 1951, it is doubtful if our international scientific posture would be as embarrassing as it is today.

Finally, it is interesting to note that the failure to continue the science attaché program as I requested in 1956 was not due to a lack of funds in the Department of State. As a matter of fact, the Department of State has admitted in a letter to the gentleman from California, Congressman Moss, dated January 13, 1958, that it never requested funds for this program from Congress.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a great deal could be said about the message on agriculture that we received from the White House this morning, particularly with reference to the features of the message which deal with price supports. I think the most significant thing that can be said about it is that this Congress is not going to put these recommendations into effect.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I concur in what the gentleman has just said.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. The House is fully aware of the gentleman's keen interest in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the second observation I would like to make is that if the recommendations of the administration were adopted, it would have the effect of making the Secretary of Agriculture an economic czar over the American farmer. This message not only recommends that we change the level of the flexible price support system further downward to a minimum of 60 percent on basic commodities instead of the present 75-percent minimum, but it would also abolish the factors that give the farmer any protection. Thus the fourth recommendation states:

> The escalator clauses in the basic law should be abolished.

If we adopt the recommendations in this message we will be saying to the Secretary of Agriculture, "For any reason or for no reason you can set the level of supports at 60 percent of parity." Every farmer in America knows what Benson would do with that. This Congress is not going to give him that power over the farm people of this country.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE AND PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, to accept the recommendations sent down here today relative to price supports will mean a further decline in the agricultural economy of the United States of America. I felt very much heartened to hear the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], state that in his opinion the House of Representatives will not approve any such recommendations on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, who has demonstrated no sympathy whatsoever with the price support program, to be put into effect.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my feeble voice to the comments just made by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and by my colleague from Oklohama [Mr. ALBERT] relative to the President's message. I think everyone knows and would readily concede that American agriculture has not shared in the pros-

perity that the country as a whole has enjoyed for the past few years. In fact, the President's message concedes that our farmers have not enjoyed that prosperity. But what does the message propose to do about it? Does it suggest more income? Does it promise more income? It does not. It simply offers more work, more acres to be farmed, in return for lower prices. In other words, it offers more work for less pay. Such does not bear the prospects of increasing farm income or of giving farmers a fairer share of the Nation's current prosperity.

The administration has up until now received every single thing it has requested of Congress to bring the farmers of the country parity at the market place. That was its campaign promise of 1952—"parity at the market place." It first sought flexible supports and got it. It next sought the Surplus Property Disposal Act, and got that. It next sought the rural development program and got that. Then they sought the soil bank, which was represented as a cure-all, and Congress gave them that. Now they concede defeat and propose to throw most of what they sought and got out the window. Now they seek something else. They seem to be groping in the dark with no assurance of where they are going or when they will get there. It all adds up to 5 years of utter failure and broken promises.

I do not want to be political about this thing. We have already had too much of that. I think the Secretary should be given a fair hearing in the Committee on Agriculture, and I am sure he will be. I think the Members on both sides ought to listen to him attentively, and both sides ought to be willing to listen to the views of the other. Neither should be so rigid and firm in their actions and thinking as they sometimes have been in the past. I do not know how the President and Secretary Benson are going to be able to convince the Congress and our farmers that the thing farmers need is more work and less pay; but I am willing to listen. However, they are going to have to come up with much better proof and argument than has been offered up until now.

For 5 years now we have been waiting on the program which they promised would give our farmers parity at the market place. In fact, we are well on into the sixth year of waiting. Instead of things getting better under Eisenhower and Benson, they have gotten worse. And this is true even though they have gotten from the Congress everything they have asked for.

We are getting somewhat used to these annual messages. We are offered a new program every 12 months. As the new programs have been enacted the economy of the American farmer gets worse, the surpluses get larger, and the agricultural budget grows and grows and grows. We just do not get anywhere under the administration's new programs. It is very discouraging.

But again, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the Secretary should have a fair hearing. And I want him to have it. I should warn however that when considering the failure of the administration's various programs up until now the Secretary is going to have to be mighty convincing in order to sell this latest program to the farmers and the Congress.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE GAS BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the American people must be alerted to the fact that the gas and oil lobby again proposes to make a raid on the pocketbook of American families using gas for cooking and heating. The gas bill which was vetoed during the 84th Congress, because of the unscrupulous lobbying practices of the gas and oil people, is again to be brought before Congress this session, probably early in February.

So that there will be no misunderstanding it should be made clear that this bill will cost each American family using gas for domestic purposes between $40 and $80 per year in additional gas bills, and will result in a windfall of over $1 billion per year for the greedy, unconscionable group that seeks its passage. Unless this legislation is defeated the hard-earned paycheck of the American family is going to be raided to fatten the income of the gas and oil people.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, although the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is not on the floor at the moment, I have consulted with him, and I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to report on Tuesday for consideration on Tuesday the first supplemental defense appropriation bill, any record votes to go over until Wednesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE BOTH REALISTIC AND CONSTRUCTIVE

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the recommendations of President Eisenhower's farm message, and I have introduced a bill designed to place the President's program in operation. It is a realistic appraisal of the problem. The technological revolution in agriculture enables a farmer today to produce as much in 1 hour as his father produced in 2 hours back in 1940.

The President points out very plainly that the solution to the surplus problem is not ever more stringent acreage controls. Acreage allotments are already so small that they have made it impossible for many farmers and ranchers to operate efficiently under them.

Nor are price supports and acreage controls the answer to the difficulties of the millions of farmers whose operations are already too limited to provide them a decent living.

I say again that this is a realistic message. It urges expansion of the rural delevopment program to help the people of underdeveloped areas and the operators of small low-income farms. I support that program vigorously.

The President makes sound recommendations that will help farm families adjust to present-day conditions. He urges termination of the acreage reserve of the soil bank with the 1958 crops and greater emphasis on the conservation reserve. This makes sense. The acreage reserve has done much of the job it was set up to do. It is a short-term program. The conservation reserve in 1959 can take over the longer time job of land-use adjustment—and return benefits to all our people in wiser use of our soil, water, and timber resources.

I support the President's recommendations that the Secretary of Agriculture have discretionary authority to raise acreage allotments for wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco.

It makes no sense to continue a program that is a proven failure. Relatively few corn producers comply with acreage allotments for corn. It is just realistic therefore to abolish the corn allotments as the message recommends and give corn producers the greater freedom they desire.

Similarly, it makes no sense to engage in huge surplus disposal programs while at the same time retaining price support formulas that tend to result in new surpluses. I support the proposal to abolish the escalator clauses.

I also endorse the recommendations that price support for cotton should be based on the average quality of the crop and that the membership of the Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board be enlarged.

One of agriculture's greatest needs is market expansion. The President urges that Public Law 480 under which many of our surpluses are being moved should be extended. He urges also that research efforts should be expanded for widening markets and finding new uses for agricultural production. I heartily concur in these proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I say again this is a realistic appraisal of the agricultural situation. Adoption of these recommendations will help make our agriculture stronger and will give our farm and ranch families more freedom to make their own decisions.

WIDOWS, MOTHERS, AND RETIRED WOMEN

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, 3 of the 9 bills which I introduced on January 8 to amend the Social Security Act merit particularly close attention because they reach into questions that are basic to our whole concept of public welfare and that effect, in a very real way, the well-being of the Nation.

No one can question that the widowed mother who has been enabled through the survivors insurance program to hold her family together and to provide for the needs of her children until they are grown has performed a task that demands courage and strength. Of the many categories of social security beneficiaries, she is among the most deserving in that her social security payments can make it possible for her to care for her children, to train and educate them, and so to contribute—in this personal way—to the country's strength through its youth.

When her youngest child becomes 18, and her responsibilities effectively come then to an end, her social security payments stop until such time as she becomes eligible for benefits in her own right. Frequently this occurs when she is too old to find adequate employment for her own support. Particularly in light of the struggle that she has gone through to maintain her family, the hardship that this reduction in income works is severe in the extreme. For what we are really saying to her now is, "True, we agree that you deserve assistance for the worthy purpose of raising your children. Now that you have performed your function, however, your job is done as far as we are concerned, and you must shift for yourself as best you can."

I submit that this attitude, even though not announced in so many words, runs exactly counter to an enlightened philosophy of social welfare. We must, it seems to me, continue to assist those women as my bill, H. R. 9841, will do, who are forced to enter the labor market at an age when little or no hope of securing work exists.

H. R. 9841 will continue benefits to women who are 50 years old when their youngest child reaches 18. I firmly believe that in all humanity and justice, we can do no less than this.

The same principle applies to the widow of an insured worker who had during her husband's lifetime been receiving with him OASI benefits. While, of course, her payments are not stopped, as in the previous case, they are now cut in half on the death of her husband.

This time we are concerned with women who are too old to be expected to earn a living, even if jobs for them existed. And yet, in what is frequently the last years of their lives, they must adjust to a social-security income that is reduced by 50 percent. Adjustment must too often mean giving up a home and familiar surroundings, dependency on relatives or reduction to substandard living conditions.

In H. R. 9837, I provide that a widow's benefit be the same as her husband's primary insurance amount. While this still represents a 25-percent reduction from the previous family benefit, it will at least help to insure a minimal decent living standard. Again, can we in good conscience do less?

Finally, I believe that it is of great importance to provide full benefits to women at the retirement age of 62, rather than the reduced benefits they now receive at that age.

When the Social Security Act was amended in 1956 to make women workers and survivors insurance beneficiaries eligible for benefits at 62, it was recognized that for older women, employment is difficult to find and to retain on a basis that is regular enough to provide for their needs. In going this far toward recognizing the economic facts of life affecting women workers, the amendment was a progressive step. But in stopping short of providing full benefits at 62, the intent of the amendment was, in my opinion, perverted.

In actual practice, this is what too often happens: A woman who has earned the right to OASI benefits finds that well before she has reached retirement age, illness or infirmity, or prejudice in the labor market against older women workers is forcing her into a dependent or marginal condition. The only hope for her independence, or often, for her very subsistence lies in her coming social-security benefit. Her 62d birthday frequently represents salvation.

Finally, she is presented with the alternative, on reaching 62, of accepting reduced benefits then, or of waiting 3 more years for full benefits. Although she knows that she must be satisfied with reduced benefits for the rest of her life if she elects them before 65, it is nonetheless not likely that she will wait those 3 years. The act now says she is eligible for benefits at 62. The present reduction made for accepting benefits then can only be construed as discriminatory, if not actually punitive. H. R. 9839, in providing full benefits to women at 62, will restore the intent of Congress to the act.

I firmly believe that these proposed amendments are necessary; they are just; and they are consistent with the basic humanitarian principles that gave birth to the social-security program. I urge that my colleagues give each of them their careful thought, and that they communicate their views to the chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee.

MEETING THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the text of President Eisenhower's reply to the two proposals of Bulganin was published in the newspapers of January 13. He made three major proposals. I believe they were constructive in principle and I shall support the best program of implementation which the executive and legislative branches of Government can develop.

I plan to comment today on the part of his proposal which he stated and I quote "to be the most important problem which faces the world today." I quote the point designated in his reply as 3 (a):

> 3. I now make, Mr. Chairman, a proposal to solve what I consider to be the most important problem which faces the world today:
>
> (a) I propose that we agree that outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes. We face a decisive moment in history in relation to this matter. Both the Soviet Union and the United States are now using outer space for the testing of missiles designed for military purposes. The time to stop is now.
>
> I recall to you that a decade ago, when the United States had a monopoly of atomic weapons and of atomic experience, we offered to renounce the making of atomic weapons and to make the use of atomic energy an international asset for peaceful purposes only. If only that offer had been accepted by the Soviet Union, there would not now be the danger from nuclear weapons which you describe.
>
> The nations of the world face today another choice perhaps even more momentous than that of 1948. That relates to the use of outer space. Let us this time, and in time, make the right choice, the peaceful choice.
>
> There are about to be perfected and produced powerful new weapons which, availing of outer space, will greatly increase the capacity of the human race to destroy itself.

And this is the President speaking on his own responsibility—the Commander in Chief of all the defense forces of the United States.

> If indeed it be the view of the Soviet Union that we should not go on producing ever-newer types of weapons, can we not stop the production of such weapons which would use or, more accurately, misuse, outer space, now for the first time opening up as a field for man's exploration? Should not outer space be dedicated to the peaceful uses of mankind and denied to the purposes of war? That is my proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I could not be in closer agreement with the President's words as quoted. The problem we face is, How can we persuade the Soviets to agree to cooperate in bringing into being a guaranteed arrangement that will insure the people of the world that outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes?

The Soviets have proven by their actions, during the years when they were far behind us in almost every phase of military power, that they would not cooperate with the family of nations in establishing a peaceful world. I need not recount the record of Soviet uncompromising obstructions both within and without the United Nations.

Now that we have witnessed their forward surge in space weapon capabilities based on demonstrated advanced missile propulsion power, are there any among us who believe that this added power will cause them to become more conciliatory? Can we as reasonable men expect a new

humility to govern their actions? The President has many times before and now once again pleads for deeds instead of words.

Until those peaceful deeds demonstrate a sincere desire for universal peace on the part of the Soviets, we of the free world would be fools indeed as well as traitors to our birthright of freedom if we falter for a minute in our vigilance in the preservation of liberty.

While we explore therefore every avenue, every opportunity for constructive negotiations in the direction of peace—we must prudently pursue the goal of military strength—strength which can be used if negotiations fail—strength to protect the freedom of our own country and the strength to help our allies in the free world against the Communist aggressor if he decides to strike for world domination.

I want to stress the point.

Every attempt should be made to work through the United Nations organization, but due to the delay which is inherent in that organization and the obstructive power of the veto—we must initiate protective research and development prior to and pending such possible collective action.

What is our military strength today? Has the Soviet suddenly relegated our former military superiority to one of inferiority to theirs? What is the significance from a military standpoint of the two sputniks and their vigorous and apparently well advanced intercontinental ballistic missile program? These and many other questions must be resolved in the interest of national survival and they demand a clear cut national policy followed by a national program to implement that policy.

This Congress will hear much about our missile defeat. This will be good. It is a time for speech and debate, for the congress to show its greatness and to prove the wisdom of granting powers to elected officials.

This is a particular burden on those among us who are assigned to certain committees. For one, I feel the duty of being a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—the duty to express my deep convictions—convictions based on a variety of information pertaining to scientific information now in being and in prospect. As we start this year we find the United States in a new role—playing "follow the leader" behind the Soviet Union.

A few short years ago the Soviet Union was racing to duplicate our technical supremacy.

For 4 years they engaged in a crash effort to duplicate our atomic bomb. After several years of effort they duplicated our hydrogen bomb explosion—9 months later than ours. For 5 to 8 years they extended themselves to make jet bombers and fighters to equal ours. They now have jet engines with an estimated thrust 30 percent greater than ours.

In these and other fields they came from behind. During the time when we were ahead, we sat in smugness saying they would not catch up. We were fatally occupied with the harassment of scientific leaders and in the name of security destroyed some of them.

But today everything is reversed. It is we who are trying to catch up. It is we who are now playing "follow the leader," an awkward and dangerous game.

Our foreign and military policy is fixed on deterring aggression through fear of hydrogen retaliation. This policy of deterrence will not work if the Soviet Union can control outer space and from it destroy our striking or delivery power, if it is dependent upon planes or upon missiles which are solely land based.

Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union has even hinted at repudiation of hydrogen weapons. In fact, each week finds both powers becoming more committed to their wartime use. It is possible that a minor international incident might be the cause of their employment in strategic warfare. Such a strategic war of the near future may be decided only by control of outer space and the area under the oceans. Many scientists believe that in the foreseeable future, strategic attacks on our country will be launched from under the surface of the oceans contiguous to our land mass or from space vehicles stationed in outer space orbits.

If, as the years progress, we fail to control and master these areas, we will default from world leadership and become a second class power. The Gaither and Rockefeller reports may say this in detail, but as a fact simply stated, our decline in the world will follow Soviet mastery of the strategic avenues of attack.

Without this control we face future positions of weakness as we did at the NATO Conference where we gave concessions to compensate for our lack of technical superiority in the missile field. We may never again be the leader in conferences with nations or groups of nations in the free or Communist world, if we sit as a second rate scientific power in conference with nations who are ahead of us in techniques and weapons.

And we will be a second rate power, I tell my colleagues today, as long as we play follow the leader—for just as long as the Soviets set the scientific pace, and we only try to catch up in the areas where they are ahead.

We will be bringing our energies and spending our energies on duplicating that which is passé.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that no new and imaginative program is being advocated by the Atomic Energy Commission or the Department of Defense. Nothing startling is on the drawing boards or in the computers.

Instead there is too much complacency and the inadequate suggestion that we need only spend a few billions of dollars more for missiles to follow the leader and afterward all will be well.

One technical defeat will follow another if we do not look beyond that which is feasible today and make bold and adventurous plans. Any technical leadership we enjoyed in the past was accomplished by trying for things deemed by many to be impossible. It was done with courage and without fear of failure.

The success of the Manhattan project of World War II, which developed the atomic bomb, was hardly promising at its inception. It was a calculated risk.

My colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, knows very well the mathematics of chance that were involved in appropriating the money that his committee made available under his skilled direction. It was a calculated risk. Even Admiral Leahy told President Truman that as an ordnance proposition he knew an atom bomb would not work. That was the climate at the time.

The decision to make the hydrogen bomb was a tremendous gamble. It was taken by President Truman against the advice of 3 of the 5-man Atomic Energy Commission and against the advice of the 15-man Scientific General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission. I know, because I was the chairman of the special subcommittee that studied the feasibility of the hydrogen project, and which recommended that it would be started.

The decision to make an atom powered submarine—the *Nautilus*—was made with scant assurance of success, short of knowledge that Admiral Rickover was hard to defeat. The Navy thought so little of this project that they gave him a converted ladies' powder room for an office. But for the support of the Congress I doubt if the project would have been supported to successful completion. Practically every component in the *Nautilus* was a new creation for which scientists and engineers had to "invent on schedule," a Rickover phrase describing his developmental philosophy.

Admiral Rickover deserves the warm thanks of the Nation for it is evident that his development work in submarines is ahead of the Soviets. We believe also that the Shippingport civilian power reactor is at this time ahead of their reactors in being. Many of us recall the fight against Navy tradition waged by the Congress to have the then Captain Rickover promoted and retained to serve his country. The country has gained immeasurably from this action.

It is only initiative and bold decisions such as these which will bring us back to the forefront of nations. It is only this kind of courage which will guarantee us time to develop the peace and preserve our civilization.

Remember this, when the Soviets were racing to copy our achievements they did not neglect other bold ideas, or else there would be no sputnik, and we would not have suffered the missile defeat.

It would be wrong just to recite these needs. I will be specific and offer a program.

I have said earlier that to win a strategic war we would have to control space and the area under the ocean. There should be concurrent projects to produce vehicles for this purpose.

My colleague on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, has spoken with great clarity on the need for "underwater satellites".

A major program should now be started to bring them into being. The underwater satellite would be an advanced, large size nuclear powered submarine with the capability of launching long range missiles.

It would be very difficult to attack these vessels from space, and in periods of great crisis they could be secreted under the polar ice cap as was recently shown feasible by the *Nautilus*.

I ask my colleagues to get a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post and read that story. It opens up a complete new vista in the abilities to protect our Nation.

There are open pools of water in the polar iceberg sea that allow submarines to rise within 1,500 miles of the city of Moscow. It would be very difficult to attack these vessels from space. The satellite would only be vulnerable to other submersibles and there should be a concurrent development of attack submarines capable of protecting a mother ship.

The one area of technical military work where our lead over the Soviet Union is clearly pronounced is in the nuclear-powered submersible. We should exploit this advanced technique by increasing the numbers and quality of nuclear submarines and by immediately starting the project to build the advanced underwater satellite heretofore mentioned. Remember the Russians have already concentrated their naval effort in underwater fighting craft and are reported to have over 500 submarines, most of which are of the long-range snorkel type.

It is also estimated that they are building 100 additional submarines each year. The United States possesses a few over 100 submarines, many of which are obsolete World War II holdovers. Do you recall the havoc which Hitler's fleet of less than 100 submarines made in allied shipping during World War II?

It would be criminal and just short of treacherous to allow this type of naval program to lag and allow the Soviet to lull us into playing "follow the leader" for control under the seas.

We have asked our allies for intermediate-range missile-launching sites in Europe even though we do not have the missiles. The request has been met with worried response, but far worse, it threatens Soviet duplication—they will be ringing the borders of Europe with like weapons—perhaps sooner than we produce the missiles. Such would lead to a precarious situation—endangering world peace almost to the breaking point. It threatens the good will of our friends abroad and assists the primary Soviet objective of splitting our alliances and, indeed, they are splitting. The problem of locating missile bases in NATO nations is so desperate that political parties in several countries must risk their political life on this one point. If we bring the large submarines armed with missiles into being quickly, the necessity for the highly vulnerable IRBM sites in Europe would lessen and our friends would breathe easier while world tensions soften.

CONTROL OF SPACE

I am now turning my attention to the other challenge we face, that is the control of outer space. Make no mistake—we are faced with the challenge—the 118-pound Sputnik I was the opening notice and the 1,100-pound Sputnik II was the clincher. Are there skeptics who believe this chapter of science is ended?

I can tell you that many of the scientists who developed the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb are not skeptics.

I can tell you that many of the scientists and engineers who built the *Nautilus* are not skeptics.

There were many skeptics who would have blocked the Manhattan atomic bomb project. But, thank God, there were a great number of scientists and engineers who thought it could be done. And, there was a limited number of men in the Congress of the United States, including our Speaker, of course, and our majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who knew about this, and they were not skeptics. Yes, we also had a Commander in Chief who had the courage to order it started.

There were many skeptics who tried to block the hydrogen project. A wave of opposition passed over the country: We shall not do this, we should not do this. But, thank God, we had many scientists and engineers who thought it could be done, and the Atomic Energy Committee, with the exception of 2 members of the 18-man committee, thought it ought to be done, and once again we had a Commander in Chief who had the courage to order it done. America, the free world, had a narrow squeak that time. Nine months later, after we exploded the first hydrogen device in the South Pacific, the Soviets exploded a hydrogen device. We bought freedom by 9 months.

You answer the question, what would have happened if President Truman had vetoed the hydrogen gamble, or appointed a commission to make a long-range study lasting 2 or 3 years?

Once again we face a momentous decision. This time we are not the leader in a new field of science. We are a follower. The challenge is more urgent. The decision takes less courage because the door of outer space has been opened. The second Soviet-made sputnik is orbiting in outer space this very minute.

We are still earthbound with our 4-pounder and our 21-pounder.

Once again many of our foremost scientists and engineers are chafing at the bit. They are anxious to tackle the job. Will the Congress and the Commander in Chief accept the challenge and make the courageous decisions demanded now—today?

I do not know. As for me, not as an individual but as a United States Representative, I want it recorded now—today—that I advocate action, action without delay.

I am willing to pay more taxes and willing to take the political chance, if there be one, in the forthcoming election. In the past 12 years I've seen many scientific miracles accomplished, and many times I've seen the routing and discomfiture of the skeptics.

If we lose, we only lose dollars. If we win, we buy time to achieve peace.

The control of space will not come from the possession of missiles alone. We should have a major project, the size of the Manhattan project, if necessary, to develop a space vehicle.

A space vehicle might even be a craft which would carry humans outside of the earth's atmosphere and gravitational force. Once outside, it would have power sources for travel and conceivably could go to the moon or to other planets.

While nuclear power may have only limited advantages in propelling intercontinental ballistic missiles, it appears to offer great hopes for travel in space. Such phenomena as the use of the particles of the atoms themselves to drive the vehicle after the atoms split, could possibly come into play.

The sputnik and the ICBM are but missiles, distant cousins of the artillery shell. Rocketry is not new to the world. And, except for some areas of the Soviet technology, there had been few advances beyond the German V–2 rocket of World War II. But I do not demean the ICBM as a weapon. In today's world it can well be called the ultimate weapon.

However, were we to develop space vehicles, the ICBM would not necessarily be the decisive factor, because control of space would restore the threat of retaliation and restore the power of deterrence.

From space, ICBM launching sites could be destroyed.

Perhaps interception in flight would be feasible. Above all, the development of such a vehicle would restore our world leadership.

Let us consider the source of propulsion for our missiles today and probably that of the Soviet missiles and their sputniks. We only know of two classes of missile fuel, that is, liquids and solids. Both require oxygen, or its equivalent, during the few seconds or minutes in which they burn.

This need of oxygen causes very difficult problems and can only be furnished for a few moments. In those moments, energy must be expended at a fantastic rate in order to achieve an altitude of 300 to 600 miles and a speed of approximately 18,000 miles per hour.

When the initial propulsive power of the fuel ceases, the orbital factor takes over. The sputnik vehicle no longer contains inherent propulsive power. If we had a continuing propulsive power, lasting weeks or months, tremendous vistas of altitude, range, and independent directional ability seem to be possible.

The energy released in a large atomic-hydrogen bomb explosion is many times greater than we or the Soviets will use in propelling ICBM's or sputniks.

The nuclear power in the *Nautilus* reactor core is released gradually. The nuclear core is extremely small, when compared with other fuels of like energy content. It lasts a long time. It does not require oxygen for energy release. Neither does nuclear fuel.

Do these interesting facts prove the feasibility of nuclear propulsion for space vehicles? Decidedly not. But they are very intriguing to scientists and engineers.

They seem to offer great possibilities to many scientists and engineers in the nuclear field. Many problems accompany these possibilities, but no more than faced the scientists who made the atomic and hydrogen bombs and the *Nautilus*. Many of these scientists and engineers believe the problems can be solved if we go at it the same way we went at these other problems.

Today's atomic reactor is a very heavy mass, mainly because of its heavy shielding to protect human life. Some scientists believe an unmanned, nuclear propelled, space vehicle can leave most of its shielding at the launching platform and expend its radiation from the chain reaction in limitless space.

With the solution of shielding and medical problems, some day man might occupy a space vehicle and, through the factor of continuing propulsive power, direct the vehicle into a safe return to earth.

Think for a moment of the great possibilities of continuing nuclear propulsive power in a space vehicle. We know of the thousands of miles the *Nautilus* has traveled on one loading of fuel and the potential such a ship could cruise up to 4 years on one nuclear core. A new 100,000 miles estimate will allow the *Nautilus* to cruise for 4 years on 1 loading of fuel.

Just think of this potential if it could be transferred to space. Just think of a *Nautilus* in outer space rather than in the ocean. Of course, it would be a vastly different craft. But with the use of the tremendous and long-lived fuels of atomic energy, a space vehicle could travel over great distances and for long periods of time.

The physics of space travel are such that each added thrust of energy affects the vehicle's speed and direction. This principle and the almost unlimited power potential of nuclear energy suggests flights staggering to the imagination.

While it is quite apparent that we lag behind the Soviets in the development of missiles, we do appear to have a lead in the uses of atomic power for propulsion. We have accumulated much knowledge in this field and our major laboratories have been working for years on propulsion for ships, planes and other things. It is for these reasons that I believe we should project our plans into the future. We should, after proper consultation with some of the same scientists and engineers that have brought other dreams into reality, inaugurate a space project.

We have the capacity for such a project. We have the scientists and engineers. In hearings before the Joint Committee we have learned that some major atomic reactor development laboratories are not scheduled to work capacity.

I suggest that Admiral Rickover be assigned to the job of developing the space vehicle. I believe he is the one man with the greatest background of combined experience in the various fields of engineering, physics, and atomic propulsion development. He has the best record of industrial-military atomic project development. He was the driving force that gave us the *Nautilus* submarine and its sisters. He built the first large electric power-producing atomic reactor, at Shippingport, Pa. He is the type of man that could produce results in either the atomic underwater satellite or atomic propelled space vehicle. His services should be used to the utmost and any resource he would need in dollars, men, or facilities should be furnished by a Nation—grateful for past accomplishments and hopeful for future deeds. I do not think that the developmental costs for either project would be too great. We have learned that such revolutionary developments as the *Nautilus* cost but a small fraction of our overall defense expenditures.

OTHER IMPORTANT PROJECTS

Of course, the two major projects I cited are not enough. There must be production and development across the board. The Joint Committee has published a program designed to give us overall scientific, technical, and production supremacy in the atomic field.

The committee, under the able chairman, CARL DURHAM, and he is an able chairman, and he has been a great guiding force on that committee, has called for a speedup in the development of the nuclear powered aircraft and the fixing of a completion date.

The program includes an increase in our production of fissionable materials for small yield atomic weapons which would be necessary in limited war—in so-called brush type wars.

The committee has constantly advocated acceleration of the atomic power program to follow through on an atoms-for-peace policy, knowing that weapons alone will never win the minds of men, a bill that failed in this House by only a few votes just last year.

The program for taming the thermonuclear reaction for peaceful purposes, and I am talking about the hydrogen reactions now, has enjoyed the committee's encouragement and support.

I understand the British atomic scientists will announce, in fact, on January 24, will announce an important laboratory breakthrough in the hydrogen fusion field. This discovery may lead to peacetime use of energy derived from the fusion of inexhaustible hydrogen. My colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], has ably spearheaded the advocacy of further experiments of this type.

I would therefore emphasize that my proposal for two major projects to control the space and the area under the seas is a program that is complementary to the joint committee program.

The committee's program is a sound program and should be carefully studied by each Member of the Congress.

I have the privilege of reporting that our chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], will today appoint a special committee to study this space problem in its relation to the one fuel which seems to offer the most promise for the greatest use in a vehicle in space—nuclear energy. That committee will be announced today.

In connection with many of these scientific and technical programs I would like to state some simple axioms which have developed during my experience in atomic energy matters. They are:

First. Scientific projects are successful only when there is unified direction and command in the hands of one person, and I am speaking about the *Nautilus* type of project. Collective leadership works poorly in the technical world on specific projects.

Second. Creativeness and accomplishment comes from the concentration of numbers of scientists and engineers rather than from their dispersal, as is occurring under the so-called partnership program of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Recently a group of experts told us that our scientists and engineers in the atomic program are spread out in what they called subcritical masses—groups too small to function—too small to have an opportunity to whet their ideas against each other, to discuss the problems, and to suggest to each other the solutions thereof.

I agree with those who speak of a shortage of scientists and engineers, but I look upon this as a more urgent need of the future. We must have an educational system today which will produce scientists for future years. For today's crisis we have an adequate number for the projects I mentioned and other vital work. Talent should be concentrated into major laboratory centers for work on challenging new projects.

Third. The expenditure of dollars alone is no answer.

The efficiencies which evolve from unified direction and concentration of expert manpower produces savings. One need only compare the defense value we have received from Atomic Energy Commission projects where some of these concepts were used, to the overall defense expenditures, to see that very few dollars buy much more defense when major laboratories work on important projects under unified direction.

Every Member of this Congress must ask himself if he is beginning to see the decline of Western civilization. Have we lost the spirit, the courage, and the will to be the center of world power, freedom, and culture? Will we make the moves now to insure time for securing the peace?

In but a few years we have become dedicated to a kind of standpat philosophy whose cliches and mottoes fail to define it. It is a school of thought which permits vital programs to be halted, top scientists to be discouraged, and the balanced budget to be a sacred cow.

In the face of a challenge for survival, without courage, imagination, and the will to survive our Western civilization will decline—each of us who does not face his responsibility will help make a truism of the Marx-Lenin prediction that the capitalist system will fail.

In closing, let me say this Congress has greatness within its grasp.

If we have the courage to meet the challenge which has been hurled at us from the science laboratories of the Soviets—our liberties will be preserved and future generations of the Free World will rise up to call us blessed.

THE RAYBURN LIBRARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, former President Harry S Truman, in accepting an invitation to be present last fall at the dedication of the Sam Rayburn Library at Bonham, Tex., wrote to Mr. Aubrey L. McAlister, publisher of the Bonham Daily Favorite:

> My good friend SAM RAYBURN has been Speaker of the House longer than any other man in the history of our country, and, in my opinion, he is the greatest Speaker of them all.

And from across the aisle in this Chamber came a moving tribute from the office of your opposite number and good friend of many years, the minority leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.:

> It has been your privilege to serve our country for many years, and the country is richer for your services. The fact that you have been Speaker of the House of Representatives for more years than any man in history indicates the extent of that great service you have rendered the American people.

And I cannot forbear to add the splendid tribute of Edward R. Murrow, renowned political commentator and world-famed reporter:

> I have never known a man in public life—

Wrote Mr. Murrow—

> who enjoyed more universal respect than Mr. SAM. Not only his party but his country is in his debt, for he has so frequently devoted himself to the Nation's destiny rather than partisan political interest. His candor, his tolerance of everything, save hypocrisy, have made him one of the real ornaments of American statesmanship.

Your magnificent record, sir, bore visible and fitting fruition in the dedication, on October 9 last, of the Sam Rayburn Library in your own hometown of Bonham. No one who has read of the outpouring of respect and affection by your Texan friends and neighbors on that happy occasion could fail to be deeply impressed by so hearty and spontaneous a tribute. It was, in truth, a great popular ovation and, as such, perhaps even more moving than the no less sincere tributes of the Nation's leaders. After all, next to his own family, it is a man's boyhood friends and neighbors who know him best.

The splendid building which will henceforth house the invaluable books and documents you have gathered together over the years is massive testimony of the universal regard and esteem in which you are held, and it will in time to come—a very long time to come, let us hope—eventually enshrine your memory. You have frequently been heard to remark that the way to study history is read the lives of men and Carlyle says somewhere that "biography is the only true history."

As the recipient in 1948 of the Collier's award for outstanding service, you invested the very substantial honorarium which accompanied it in the purchase of the land upon which the Sam Rayburn Library now stands. I quote from the Bonham Daily Favorite at the time of the dedication last autumn:

> When word got around that Mr. SAM was building a library, the money began to come in. * * *
>
> Since then some 8,500 individuals and firms from throughout the Nation—friends and associates, rich and not so rich, all with a desire to have a part in making Mr. SAM's dream come true, have sent in contributions. They have ranged from a dime upward into the thousands of dollars. A vast majority of the schoolchildren in Fannin County joined in the dimes for Mr. SAM campaign in 1955.
>
> Whether the gift was a dime or $10,000, the giver's name is recorded with the same prominence in the permanent record of contributors now on display in the library.

And so, dear Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to set forth in the RECORD of the proceedings of this House this splendid tribute of the love and esteem in which you are held, and will ever be held, by your neighbors back home. We, too, pay affectionate tribute, not merely to the character and personality which has been an inspiration to us all, but to the long, brilliant, and steadfast career unexcelled in the history of this body.

THE PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have not, of course, had the time or opportunity to carefully study the President's special farm message or the contents of the proposed legislation to effectuate its recommendations, but it does not take much study on my part for me to express a fundamental disagreement with the proposals relative to our price support programs.

First, Mr. Speaker, may I say that no responsible Republican Congressman from the Midwest was, to my knowledge, called into consultation in the development of these proposals. With certainty, I can say that I was not only not consulted but was not even advised as to the contents prior to today. This, in my opinion, is a grievous error on the part of the executive branch. I have said before and will say again today that we have more intelligence, more knowledge, more experience, and better judgment represented in the membership of our Committee on Agriculture and Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture than can be found anyplace in the leadership of the United States Department of Agriculture. That is why I must say that it is unfortunate in the extreme that someone downtown did not have the wisdom or the foresight to draw upon the experienced farm leaders in the Congress in the drafting of such an important message as this.

Before I get into any discussion of the proposals now laid before us, may I say one thing more. It is common knowledge that we have had some divisions evident within the ranks of agriculture in the Congress. Those divisions have followed sectional, commodity, and political lines and no one has deplored those divisions more than I have. I have said this before and it bears repeating today—I have never been party to these divisions and will not do so today nor tomorrow. I will support good cotton, tobacco, peanut, or other southern commodity legislation just as readily and as vigorously as I will similar proposals which deal with commodities produced in my own district. That is as it should be and is in accord with a policy I have followed for 20 years. I commend that policy to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and from all parts of the Nation who just might be inclined to go their separate ways. Face up to it—we are decidedly in the minority and we need to muster our full strength in the Congress to pass worthwhile farm legislation.

Now, let us look briefly at some of the recommendations placed before us for consideration. There is the proposal that the Secretary of Agriculture be given authority to increase, up to 50 percent, national marketing quotas or acreage allotments. That is one point we should consider with extreme caution. We are all agreed that the principal cause of low farm commodity prices is a supply in excess of demand. It might be a very dangerous instrument to place in any man's hands this proposed authority to increase by 50 percent the potential production of any commodity without due regard to market and supply conditions.

Then, there is the proposal to discontinue the corn acreage-allotment program. That, in my judgment, would be like canceling out our satellite program just because we did not get a satellite in orbit ahead of Russia. It is unthinkable that we should abandon any program of good purpose just because it has not for one reason or another done the entire job expected of it. To me, this seems merely a continuation of the fight by the Secretary for cheap feed grains which he has carried on since his first month in office. Cheap corn and cheap feed grains ultimately mean cheap livestock and it would be foolhardy in the extreme to abandon completely a program designed to stabilize such a major segment of our agricultural economy.

The President's message, which undoubtedly speaks for the Secretary of Agriculture and sets forth his views on these matters, points up the inadequacies of the present corn program. I readily agree that the present program is not working well and that it has had little or no appeal to corn producers. I come from a major corn producing district and this is a subject I know something about. There are 2 good reasons why only about 14 percent of the 1957 corn crop was produced in compliance with acreage allotments. The first reason is

the comparatively low price support announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. There was little or no incentive for compliance and we are all now paying for his lack of foresight.

There is another very important reason for this failure and we cannot lay the blame at the doorstep of the Secretary of Agriculture. I refer to the failure of the Congress last year to enact legislation providing a realistic acreage base for the national corn allotment. In one of the most unpleasant displays of sectionalism I have ever witnessed in connection with farm legislation, my good friends from the South whom I have never failed to support in their emergencies joined forces to defeat the proposed bill to increase the corn allotment. You simply must have fifty-six to sixty million acres of corn allotted nationally if you are going to have any measure of compliance, and last year we had only 37 million due to the failure of Congress to take constructive action.

The message also proposes that price supports be flexed still further down with minimum supports ranging as low as 60 percent of parity. Someone said to me a few moments ago: "CARL, why are you so displeased with this? Certainly a floor of 60 percent of parity is far better than the zero range of flexibility proposed last year." The answer to that is that a drowning man needs to be saved, not just thrown something to keep his head barely above water and then left to sink or swim. Minimum support levels of 60 percent of parity may look better than zero to some, but as far as I am concerned one is just as unacceptable as the other. We who share a responsible interest in agriculture seek to repair the damage to our farm economy, and we certainly will not be party to any further deflation.

There are, of course, some commendable recommendations. I am glad to see the extension of the special milk program suggested. This has proved to be a very worthwhile program to make dairy products available to our schoolchildren, members of the Armed Forces, and our hospitalized war veterans. It should by all means be extended and expanded if possible.

I am also personally very much in accord with the recommendation for the extension of the Public Law 480 program. For many years I have urged an effective program to share our blessings of abundance with less fortunate people both at home and abroad. Public Law 480 and related domestic programs have proven that we were right in asking for these programs and I urge prompt action by the Congress to carry out this recommendation. In my judgment, we can win more lasting friends all over the world with our surplus food than with guns, planes, bombs, or dollars. This is the humanitarian, the Christian way, to help our neighbors and we certainly have no competition from the Soviet when it comes to making food available to hungry people. They might match us in money, in weapons, and in scientific achievements—but they cannot even get into the race with us when it comes to food and fiber. Let us exploit this great advantage to the utmost and strengthen the free world where it will count the most.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I favor extension of the National Wool Act and am introducing legislation to accomplish that. I am also heartily in favor of the proposed improvements in the conservation reserve. I have criticized the Secretary on his stand on price supports, but I want to commend him for his support of an emphasized conservation reserve.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I reject completely the proposed reductions in farm commodity price supports. It is not enough, however, to merely criticize without suggesting alternatives. Time will not permit a detailed presentation, but I do want in the remaining moments to lay before the House my own proposals for constructive action to meet the urgent needs of American agriculture.

What are the basic problems we seek to solve. First and foremost is the problem of commodity prices and low farm income. If you do not have a fair price, nothing else has much significance. Second, we have the problem of temporary surpluses which are depressing our commodity markets. Third, we have the problem of production which is today slightly in excess of consumption and thus contributes to our surpluses. Finally, we have the problem of what best to do with the surpluses on hand in elevators and warehouses all over the Nation.

There is no partial or piecemeal solution. We either attack on all fronts and overcome the difficulties, or we keep running around in circles the way we have for a number of years. Here is what I propose in the way of remedies.

To meet both the evident need and to overcome deficiencies and criticism of the present price-support operations, I propose a new approach to the whole price-support question. I have recommended to the Committee on Agriculture legislation to provide price supports at a minimum of 90 percent of parity on the commodities produced on average or family-size farms. For example, under my proposal we would support at 90 percent of parity the price on the first 4,000 bushels of corn per farm, 3,000 bushels of wheat, 25 bales of cotton, and so forth. By this means we would meet the need of our average or family farmers, we would protect their income, and we would place an umbrella of protection over the entire agricultural economy at much less cost and without piling up such huge accumulations of surpluses. At the same time we would eliminate the criticism of present programs as being of primary benefit to large producers. In addition, necessary adjustments in supply would be made by these large producers who are best equipped to make such adjustments. The family farm, which we all seek to protect, would, under my program, receive the maximum of protection.

The next step in my program is the improvement and expansion of the conservation reserve, which is the real Soil Bank as initially proposed by myself several years ago. As far as I am concerned, we can terminate the acreage reserve program as it has not demonstrated sufficient merit or value. In so doing, we should double the national average payment under the conservation reserve, remove the present restrictive requirement of compliance with acreage allotments, and bring 50 million or 60 million acres of good cropland into the soil bank. This will quickly bring production into reasonable balance with consumption and thus solve our temporary problem of surpluses, not to mention the immeasurable value of conservation practices applied to this land.

While we are doing these things to achieve economic stability and balance of supply and demand in agriculture, we should expand our market development and surplus food distribution programs. Let us make good use of our abundance and let us feed hungry people both at home and abroad. I predict that these food distribution programs will prove so effective and so valuable that we may be looking for supplies in a few years to meet the demand.

Let us reject a negative approach and move boldly in the direction of constructive programs to stimulate and stabilize our agricultural economy and make purposeful use of our surpluses.

Let us set aside any partisan, sectional, or other differences and get the job done which all of us agree must be done.

We in the Congress have no apologies to make for our demonstrations of interest in and concern for the farm people of this Nation. Neither should we accept without challenge recommendations from any source which in our own good judgment are not in accord with the fundamental interests of American agriculture. Personally, I have fought a long time against heavy odds but as far as I am concerned the fight will not be over until we have gained our objectives and have seen programs effectuated which will assure our farm people their rightful place in the economic sun. To my way of thinking they are fully entitled to and must have full income parity with other segments of our economy. I am unwilling, as I have always been, to settle for anything less.

THE PRESIDENT PRESENTS BENSON'S BLUEPRINT TO BANKRUPT FARMERS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the special message just delivered to the House.

The President has submitted to the Congress a program to drive many thousands more of our farm families off the land. With the earnings of agriculture now at a lower rate, compared to the rest of the economy, than for any year since the great depression, the President now proposes a further and deeper slash in farm income.

It is a program to solve the agricultural problems by forcing families off the farm by threat of bankruptcy.

It is the further activation of Secretary Benson's advice to farmers that they "seek other employment." That philosophy already is looking quite silly to our city friends, as industrial unemployment edges close to the 5 million mark and our Government encourages more farmers to leave the land and increase the jobless rolls in the cities.

The farm program is not working because Mr. Benson will not let it work.

In response to the President's message, I simply would like to remind him that agriculture is the one element of America's free-enterprise system, above all others, that has defied the best efforts of the Communist world to match or even approach its production and performance. Yet, under his policies of the last 5 years, our farm families are the least rewarded for their labors, among all the important economic groups of America.

The President points out that during the last 2 years net farm income has stabilized. It has stabilized the same way a ship stabilizes when it has sunk. It is on the bottom. The Department of Agriculture's figures show that farm net income for 1955 and 1956 was at the lowest level since 1943. The percentage of the national income represented by farm net income is substantially lower than even the depression years of the early 1930's.

The President points out that exports of farm products reached an alltime high in the year ending last June 30, but he does not point out that about a billion dollars worth of these exports were made under the barter program directed by Congress which the Secretary of Agriculture has discontinued. Nor did he explain that it cost the Government more than a billion dollars to reduce surpluses by $1 billion.

The Commodity Credit Corporation supported the price of major storable crops for 20 years prior to 1953, not at a loss but at an actual profit of $13 million. For these two decades, the Commodity Credit Corporation price supports on these basic crops, on the nonbasics, perishables, storables, and nonstorables—potatoes, eggs, wool, and everything else—amounted to only $1,064,000,000, but the losses in the last 5 years, 1953 through 1957, were approximately 4 times the combined total of the previous 20 years—slightly over $1 billion in 20 years—around $4 billion in 5 years.

Notwithstanding these gigantic losses, Commodity Credit Corporation investments in surpluses have increased from less than $2½ billion in 1953 to more than $7 billion as we go into 1958.

The President admits that the soil-bank program is a failure and advocates the outright repeal of the acreage-reserve part of the program.

The President continues to complain about surpluses but holds out the vague promise of increased acreage allotments, with no indication of what he intends to do with the increased surpluses resulting therefrom.

The public has not been given the true picture with reference to the operation of the farm program. These figures that I have used are figures taken from Mr. Benson's own records, and I challenge him or anyone else to deny the accuracy of the statements I have just made. Mr. Benson's program will lead this Nation into bankruptcy at a very rapid rate. This blueprint for bankruptcy that he has presented here today is the same old thing that he has been advocating ever since he has been in office; that is, to constantly lower commodity prices to disastrously low levels, and drive thousands and hundreds of thousands more farm families off the farms into the city streets looking for jobs that are not there.

I am perfectly willing to repeal the acreage reserve program. I am likewise willing to continue the conservation reserve program; and to expand and strengthen it, but I doubt very much whether this program will go very far in solving our surplus problem.

I am perfectly willing to give him the $1,500,000,000 that he asks for to continue the program of selling our surpluses for foreign currencies. When we come to look at this message we will all realize that Mr. Benson is just saying over and over again one thing. That is, "Give me more discretion, give me more control over the destiny and over the livelihoods of the farmers of America. Make me a complete and absolute czar over the price support program." And, you and I know what will happen if he gets that authority. And, I want to say here and now immediately on the delivery of this message that I have no idea that this Congress will be silly enough or foolish enough to give Mr. Ezra Taft Benson any more authority over the destiny of American agriculture than he already now has.

I am willing to give the Secretary authority to increase acreage allotments if the formulas in existing law result in decreasing acreage too drastically, but not if commodity prices are to be driven down to disastrously low levels. If commodity prices are to be driven to drastically low levels, the Secretary should submit some plan which will maintain farm income at a level which will enable farmers to maintain an American standard of living.

I wonder whether the President is speaking for corn farmers, when he advocates the repeal of acreage allotments and mandatory price supports which in effect would remove corn from the list of basic commodities. Although we have tried to provide a better farm program for corn farmers, we have not yet to date been able to find out just what kind of a corn program the farmers want.

I am in favor of extending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for 1 year and authorizing an additional $1,500,000,000 for sales for foreign currencies. At the same time, I think the Secretary should reinstate the barter program which he abruptly terminated last May.

I am in favor of increasing our agricultural research, in the hope that we might find more industrial uses for farm and forestry products.

Points 4, 5, and 6 are the part of Benson's program for reducing farm prices and farm price supports with which the Congress has disagreed ever since Mr. Benson first presented them.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON GUIDED MISSILES

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, early last fall I announced in the press that upon the reconvening of Congress in January, I would introduce a very important measure.

Among the very first measures introduced during this session was a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Guided Missiles. My bill—H. R. 9613—would provide for the establishment of a joint committee of the House and Senate to study the problems relating to the navigation, use, and control of outer space. This committee would be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In no instance would there be more than four members of the same political party on the committee from each House of Congress.

The committee would make continuing studies of the activities of the various Government departments, services, commissions, and the activities of private agencies, relating to the development, use, and control of guided missiles, ballistic missiles, earth satellites, and other mechanisms designed for the navigation, use, and control of outer space and the conditions beyond present human navigational air limits.

The bill also provides that all legislation of this nature would be referred to this joint committee for action.

The chairmanship of this joint committee would alternate from year to year between the House and the Senate with the vice chairman being elected from Members of the opposite House.

In view of the recent advances made by the Russian Government in the missile and earth satellite fields and the apparent lag in our own missile development due to interservice bickering, I feel that this legislation is extremely necessary at this time. We need to establish through legislation legal authority for one specific committee of Congress to study these tremendous problems relative to the navigation, use, and control of outer space.

The American people, now more than ever before, do not know who to believe concerning our national defense and the security of our Nation. In the face of petty interservice squabbles, the Russians rocketed an artificial moon into an orbit around the earth. Our people, as a result of this and other reported scientific developments by the Russians, now are apprehensive and greatly concerned about this Nation's scientific programs

and developments. They are losing faith with and scarcely believe spokesmen of our military departments concerning their efforts and abilities in safeguarding our country against an attack from without.

This is not difficult to understand when recent events are reviewed in light of the testimony of Colonel Nickerson, General Gavin, Admiral Rickover, and more recently the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General White. It is even rumored that due to the lack of a definite and unified missile program in the Pentagon, Mr. William M. Holaday, the so-called czar, of the Department of Defense missile program is about to resign. There can be little doubt that our missile and satellite programs are in bad need of close scrutiny when men of this stature and integrity speak out openly against the progress being made by our missile program and they do so knowing full well the risk they are taking.

It is my firm belief that only a joint committee of Congress can properly delve into this melee in the Pentagon and get our Nation back on the road to real security in the scientific, missile, and earth satellite fields. It is true that the Congress now has committees which have or are attempting to take on this work as an added field of endeavor. This I feel will not suffice. The members of these committees are now overworked, their staffs are overburdened, and they do not have adequate time to search deep into this program as would this joint committee which I propose.

There is no doubt that the present situation we face is as great, if not greater, than the quandary in which Congress found itself prior to the establishment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. We are now on the threshhold of a new era and the solution of the complex problems of this era require an adequate and practical approach The proper approach, in my mind, is one the Congress has always taken when a completely new field of problems has been presented to it—the establishment of a special or particular committee to handle those problems exclusively. This can only be accomplished by legislative act setting up a joint committee similar to that established to study the realm of atomic energy. The bill I have introduced is patterned after the bill which constituted the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and presents the only practical solution for the proper supervision of these programs so vital to our national security and defense.

Recently I noted in the press that the Pentagon is in the process of organizing its own space agency which will have its own director and budget. Although I do not have full details of this move it appears to be a move in the right direction. I hear that this plan would give a top-level civilian official control of the purse strings and the authority to initiate projects rather than simply reviewing plans of the Armed Forces. This, if it is put into effect, will go a long way toward getting our missile and satellite programs back on the track. It is more important to note that the Pentagon itself recognizes the need for an agency to deal with these space problems exclusively. I feel that it is time that the Congress recognizes this fact also. We should have a joint committee of Congress continually studying the activities of the various Government agencies relating to the use, control, and development of guided missiles, ballistic missiles, earth satellites, and other mechanisms for the navigation, use, and control of outer space. Such a committee would at all times know the progress of these various programs and be ready to recommend to the Congress legislation to assure that our Nation will remain strong and the leader among nations of the world.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge the most careful consideration of my bill—H. R 9613—by the House Members. I will personally make this request to the members of the Rules Committee.

THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion in light of the remarks just made by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in regard to the President's agricultural message. I am sorry the gentleman seems to have left the Chamber, because I would like him to hear my remarks.

The main thing that I was interested in was that there were no affirmative recommendations on his part as to what can be done and needs to be done to meet this very serious agricultural problem that faces the entire Nation. I previously, in a 1-minute address, pointed out one factor of the President's address which I think we all must recognize, and that is the forepart of the remarks which try to lay out the economic problems involved in the agricultural program. I think it is most important that we agree, if we can agree, on what are the basic economic problems that lie there.

Now, the Joint Economic Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator SPARKMAN, of which I was a member, just recently completed about 2 weeks of hearings on a group of panel papers prepared by outstanding agricultural economists throughout the country going into these problems that seem to face us in this area of national endeavor. This was an objective study and there was no attempt to come up with any particular preconceived idea of how to solve these problems. The thing I am pleading for now is not necessarily for the answers that Secretary Benson may be advocating but rather that we direct our attention to what the problems are and recognize that they exist and the fact that what we have been doing in the past, since 1946, indeed, has not been solving the basic problem. Essentially, it seems to me that the President has struck the keynote when he says, referring to the agricultural problem in the past, that it has not been adequately modified to deal with the effects of the technological revolution in agriculture. And, indeed, we have had a technological revolution in agriculture which is not completed, and we are going to continue to see a rapid change in agricultural technology for the next few years.

I again emphasize that I am not sure myself whether the programs that have been advocated by the President are suited to meet this problem. I think I am satisfied that the programs in the past certainly have not and to have a preconceived idea as expressed by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that is all along the negative line—and, I might say, too, advisedly, it seems to me along the political line—is not the way you are going to solve these problems. If the Committee on Agriculture will do as I heard the gentleman from Mississippi, I believe it was, say, when he discussed this matter, and will keep an open mind on these things when they go into the hearings in the ensuing months and get down to the base of the economic problems without any preconceived notion as to what might be the way to solve them, indeed we might come up with the answers. And, in my judgment, indeed we must come up with the answers, because agriculture is a very basic and important industry in our national economy.

I might say one other thing. One of our problems is the fact that agriculture has been the main source of income for our people in the rural areas, so much so and almost exclusively so that we have come to look upon the rural economy and the agricultural economy as synonymous. But the situation today is apparently, judging by the reports of objective economists—who, incidentally, disagree with each other as to solutions, but according to their analysis of the situation, the agriculture industry is insufficient in these days to provide the livelihood for the number of people in the rural communities. So the question lies, What other source of income can be provided for the people in the rural communities? This is one alternative. The other alternative would be, of course, Is some of the rural community going to continue to move toward the suburbs and the centers of the cities?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman agree with Mr. Benson that we should drive these farmers off the farm without any consideration given to their future?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would answer the gentleman's question quite quickly because the implication is that the gentleman is saying that he would drive them off the farm.

Mr. COOLEY. That is what he is doing.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. He is not. It is the economic situation that is doing it. And I say to the gentleman, if he does not face up to those economic problems then he will be driving them off the farm. No American wants to drive anybody anywhere.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought the gentleman was just advocating that we had

too many people on the farm and that they must go to the suburbs.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I did not advocate anything. I was calling attention to the economic factors and I was saying that it is the economic factors that are doing it. I am saying that if you do not meet up with those economic factors and come up with a solution you, in effect, will be the one who is responsible. Does the gentleman follow the logic there?

Mr. COOLEY. No, I have not been able to follow any of the gentleman's logic.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am sorry.

Mr. COOLEY. For 11 consecutive years prior to the time Mr. Benson took over, commodity prices were at or above 100 percent of parity. We had a profit in the program. Now we have gigantic losses. Then we had surpluses, now we have more surpluses.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Those surpluses have continued to grow since World War II ended.

Mr. COOLEY. Since Korea, since the middle of 1953.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I regret to say that this problem has been with us since about the end of World War II.

Mr. COOLEY. July 1953.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. One other point. The gentleman in his talk on the agricultural situation fails to point out one primary thing. We are concerned here with human beings. And that is the per capita farm income.

Mr. COOLEY. And that is down. That is less than half of what the man in the city is getting.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me give the gentleman another figure. The first figures we have, beginning with 1934 for agriculture people and nonagriculture people are these. The percentage of increase even today of per capita income has been greater for people on the farm and in agriculture than it has been in industry.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman has not read the President's message.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am not referring to the President's message.

Mr. COOLEY. He said exactly the opposite of that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am talking about the economic situation.

Mr. COOLEY. The President said that the things that the farmer was buying were going up in price at a more rapid rate than the price of the things he was selling.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What I was pointing out was this, that as far as the per capita income of the individual is concerned, the reason that has not declined in the same fashion is that the population in the rural areas has declined, so all the money there is is divided up among fewer people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close my remarks again by urging the Committee on Agriculture to review the papers and the economic factors that lie behind this problem. I think by grappling with the situation, but avoiding the inclination to accuse someone of doing this or doing that, but rather of appraising what the economics are going to produce we may get results. Unless we do something about it in that fashion and with that approach we will not come up with the correct answers.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS, for 45 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. FLOOD, for 1 hour, on February 13, commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. MCCORMACK, for 5 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CELLER in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. CELLER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABERNETHY.

Mr. BREEDING.

Mr. IKARD (at the request of Mr. JARMAN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NEAL.

Mr. GRIFFIN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 20, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1461. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1958 in the amount of $2,054,000 for the President's special international program (H. Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1462. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to better adapt the price support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1463. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report pertaining to an agreement between the Department of the Navy and the Standard Oil Company of California entered into during the calendar year 1957, under which a program of water injection was instituted, pursuant to section 7424 (b) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1464. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress, and Public Law 548, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1465. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the reports and the proceedings of the Disabled American Veterans national gathering, held in Buffalo, N. Y., August 19 through 23, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Seventeenth report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to General Accounting Office operations in Europe (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 10043. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 10044. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat or imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 10045. A bill to provide for the sale of all of the real property acquired by the Secretary of Commerce for the construction of the Burke Airport, Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 10046. A bill to prohibit officers and employees of the United States, Territories of the United States, and the District of Columbia from treating water supplies with fluoride compounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10047. A bill to provide for the redistricting of the judicial district of North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 10048. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such program on grounds of conscience or religious belief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10049. A bill to extend the National Wool Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 910); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10050. A bill to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10051. A bill to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 10052. A bill to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 10053. A bill to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 10054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat or imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 10055. A bill to provide for the control of certain advertising on federally owned or controlled lands adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to encourage such control on other lands adjacent to such National System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 10056. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to assure more equitable allotments of cotton acreage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 10057. A bill to protect the right of the blind of self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10058. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat or imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 10059. A bill to enable the Federal intermediate credit banks to limit endorsers' liability on loans in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 10060. A bill to provide for a national self-help dairy stabilization program and to provide for an adequate balanced and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 10061. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 10062. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat or imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 10063. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10064. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 10065. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $13,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct-loan program for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10066. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain industrial manufacturing plants owned by the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 10067. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Science Academy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10068. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education in certain fields of science; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 10069. A bill to amend the act of August 5, 1953, creating the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 10070. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat or imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 10071. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain persons to permanent positions in hospital management and administration in the competitive civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10072. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain persons to permanent positions in hospital management and administration in the competitive civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 10073. A bill to provide minimum price-support levels for whole milk and butterfat during the 2-year period beginning April 1, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 10074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 10075. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 10076. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 10077. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 10078. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 10079. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 10080. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10081. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10082. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 10083 A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 10084 A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 10085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 10086. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 10087. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10088. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 10089. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. J. Res. 501. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. J. Res. 502. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. J. Res. 503. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a Federal Academy of Science; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. Con. Res. 239. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in the vicinity of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 240. Concurrent resolution to conduct an investigation covering attempts on the part of the United Nations to organize a world government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 241. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Res. 442. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the convoking of a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the refugee problem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Res. 443. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses incurred by the House Committee on Banking and Currency in conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 86; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 10090. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Botta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 10091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Jeske; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. R. 10092. A bill for the relief of Theresa Asphar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 10093. A bill for the relief of Taeko Takamura Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10094. A bill for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 10095. A bill for the relief of Helen Michalea and Konstantinos E. Skopeteas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 10096. A bill for the relief of Olin Fred Rundlett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

What Is Government's Responsibility to American Agriculture?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "What Is Government's Responsibility to American Agriculture?" which was delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] at the annual meeting of the Illinois Agricultural Association on November 13, 1957.

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

WHAT IS GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO AMERICAN AGRICULTURE?

(Address by Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND)

I think it was Henry Mencken who once said, "Any generalization on any subject, including this one, is inevitably wrong." This is certainly true of the subject assigned to me. It would be easy, but dangerous, to generalize on the subject of government's responsibility to American agriculture.

Nevertheless, there are a few generalizations we need to make before proceeding.

I'm speaking to you as one who has devoted his entire life, with the exception of the duties of being a Senator, to farming. My principal farming enterprise has been the production and marketing of cotton. However, the continued operation of the Government's cotton program has caused me to change my business so that I am now devoting over two-thirds of my acreage to the production of soybeans, feed grains, and livestock. Even though I recognize my responsibility as a Member of the United States Senate and as a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I wish to address my remarks today as one farmer to another.

In our concentration upon the immediate problems of our time it is well to remind ourselves that there are some basic overriding principles which have made America what it is today. We are inclined to take these principles for granted—but we cannot afford this luxury. They are constantly under fire, not by frontal attack, but by the process of chipping away a little here and a little there. One of these basic principles is the principle of private ownership in a competitive economy. A second is the maintenance of strong and responsible government at the State and local level. The basic concept of the American society, as I see it, is the dispersal of economic power by the institution of private ownership, and the dispersal of political power by dividing such power between the three branches of the Federal Government and between the Federal Government and the States and the people. These are the arches that hold up the capstone of liberty.

At any point where a breach is made in one of the walls to divide and separate these powers, the fundamental rights and freedom of all the people are endangered. We in the south deeply and sincerely believe that the control and operation of public schools is and always has been a State and local matter. When the Central Government breaches the division of powers and orders a crack combat division into a State to force the entry of Negro children into a white public school, it is a matter of vital concern to each and every individual in every State in the Union. When the constitutional balance of political power is destroyed in one place it is just as effectively destroyed in every other, although any new overt acts may not have been committed.

Rural people have had a clearer insight into the significance of these basic principles of freedom and prosperity than many of our urban friends—and it is to rural people that many of us who hold these principles dear, look to, to support and maintain the basic concepts without which all else would be bitter fruit.

The Farm Bureau of Illinois, which I understand has upward of 200,000 farm family members, has a tremendous responsibility in making sure that farmers understand clearly government's responsibility to agriculture. Let me say that the Illinois Agricultural Association, which is the Farm Bureau affiliate, together with the Farm Bureaus in the other 47 States, offer the greatest hope for determining government's proper responsibility to agriculture. I hope you will not fail in this responsibility.

One of the paramount contributions that Government can make to the welfare of farm people is to take such measures as may be appropriate to avoid excessive fluctuations in the general level of business activity and the general price level.

There are certain fundamental truths that we should always keep before us. I'd like to list a few of these for you, and I am sorry that time will not permit a complete discussion because each one of these points, if correctly developed, would take all the time that has been allotted me. These are as follows:

(1) You cannot multiply wealth by dividing it.

(2) You cannot legislate the poor into freedom and wealth by legislating the wealthy out of it.

(3) Governments cannot give to people what they do not first take away from the people. (The power to tax misused is the power of destruction.)

(4) That which one man receives without working for, another man must work for without receiving it.

(5) The Government cannot guarantee you a fair price or income without all-out controls, with their great limitations in opportunity to create the goods that constitute real wealth.

(6) Uncle Sam must finally dish out money on the basis of equal shares—and to a politician this is 1 share, 1 vote.

(7) The Socialists and the Communists, those who would divide the wealth, never get tired. We do.

As we discuss Government's responsibility to American agriculture, let us keep these fundamental truths in mind.

No matter how difficult the problems of farmers may be at this time, I think few would deny that they would be immeasurably worse if the level of business activity were to slacken off substantially.

We seem to have developed a situation in this country in which the orthodox remedies of fiscal and monetary action have demonstrated their capacity to level off a boom, but not as yet been effective in stopping the upward trend in prices.

This, too, is harmful to farmers, because undercurrent conditions of actual and potential overproduction of farm products, price inflation does not significantly increase farm prices, but does significantly increase the price of things that farmers buy.

Currently, the general price level is 21 percent higher than the 1947-49 average. This means that the value of the dollar as a medium of exchange has declined a fifth during the past decade.

During 19 of the past 20 months the price level has increased. This is like saying that in 19 of the past 20 months the value of the dollar has been reduced.

We in Congress who have, under the Constitution, an obligation to regulate the value of money, need to find out why, and to take action to prevent the continuing deterioration in the value of our currency. I have my own ideas on this that time does not permit me to develop. Suffice it to say that in my view this is a responsibility that government has to farmers, as to other groups, and that the manner in which this responsibility is handled is of paramount importance to farmers—even more so than some of the other activities more directly related to agriculture.

I think, too, that government has a responsibility to keep open the channels of international trade for the disposition of farm products. Farmers have a big stake, bigger than they often appreciate, in a high level of trade between nations. The agricultural situation today would be immeasur-

ably more critical had it not been for the expansion in farm exports in recent years.

Exports of farm products are several times as high as imports of competitive products. The average commercial farmer sells about $1,000 worth of farm products to foreign markets. Not only is this important in itself but if any significant portion of this production had to be disposed of in domestic markets the impact upon domestic prices would be catastrophic. Even farmers who do not produce commodities that move into export outlets have a major stake in a high level of foreign trade, because most farms are suitable for the production of many commodities. If cotton exports decline, for example, much of the land now used for cotton will go into the production of grain, feed and livestock products, with harmful consequences to farmers in other areas.

Unfortunately, much of the current high level of farm exports is artificially induced by one or more Government programs. For example, farm exports would be far lower were it not for what is generally called the Public Law 480 program—the program of exporting farm products for foreign currencies. I know that this program originated in the Farm Bureau. I think we must continue this program at least temporarily because, assuming the existence of surplus stocks, it makes good sense to make use of them to aid in the progress of undeveloped countries. Nevertheless, I look forward to the day when such programs can be curtailed or eliminated, because it does not appear they provide an adequate underpinning for a permament farm export program. It would not be wise for agriculture to come to depend too much on an artificial inducement to high farm exports.

In the fields of research, extension, the preservation and wise use of our land and water resources, farm credit and farm marketing services—I expect there would be almost unanimous agreement that these are programs that are well justified, not only in the interest of farm people, but in the interest of the general public as well.

I suppose that the subject assigned to me presupposes that I would talk primarily about national farm price policy—and I have now gotten to that point. I felt that it was necessary to begin with the more general comments that I have made in order to make it perfectly clear that in my mind these are the fundamental overriding issues that are the important things to farmers and to their real and long-run prosperity.

Among my colleagues opinion runs the full gamut on this question of national farm price policy—from those who believe that every governmental intervention into the price system is fundamentally inconsistent with our economic system with harmful long-run effects upon those supposedly benefited—to those who think that farmers cannot survive economically without Government price fixing on all or most commodities. And this variance in viewpoint is but a reflection of the diversity of opinion that exists among farmers with respect to this most difficult and perplexing of public policy issues.

Part of the answer to the question of my subject—what is Government's responsibility to American agriculture—is that those of us who have been placed in a position to do so by the electorate have a tremendous responsibility to look carefully and honestly and intelligently at the economics of the problem, and particularly at the long-run results and consequences of any proposal. In this endeavor we should give appropriate consideration to any conclusions that may be drawn from the experience to date with national farm programs. There is just no excuse for not learning from experience. They say the reason history repeats itself is that no one was listening the first time.

If we do look at the experience of the past we cannot, I think, avoid certain conclusions.

The price-support programs of the past, and specifically the policy of setting price supports at or close to 90 percent of parity may have helped some farmers in a given year.

But such programs have set in motion certain long-range developments which have turned out to be harmful to the ability of farm people to earn satisfactory incomes.

We have artificially encouraged production beyond what the market can take.

We have promoted competitive production in other countries.

We have expanded the use of synthetic substitutes.

We have lost markets that often, tragically, cannot be regained.

We have tended to fragmentize the right to produce.

We have built up surpluses, expensive to the public to maintain, and depressing in their impact upon farm incomes.

We have imposed restrictions upon the ability of individual producers to improve the efficiency of their operations.

We have diverted acreage from controlled crops to other commodities, in particular into feed and livestock production.

Mississippi has increased livestock by 93 percent in the last 5 years, and irrigated corn is producing fantastic yields in my State Small cotton allotments are putting small farmers in the dairy and poultry production business throughout the South.

The program and the consequences of the program have indeed become a part of the problem—have made the problem more difficult to deal with.

I wish time would permit me to review for you the history of the agricultural adjustment program as applied to cotton. I am sure that there is a lesson in this experience for the farmers of the Midwest and for that matter the entire country. As a producer of cotton, I have seen my right to produce, steadily but surely, eroded away. I have been forced to reduce the cotton production on my farm by more than 40 percent. I have watched synthetic fiber production increase and take over my market. I have seen during this period production of cotton in other countries increase more than 10 times because of the protective umbrella we held over price in this country.

At this point in history we will go inevitably in one direction or in another. We shall go in the direction of more comprehensive intervention of Government in the price and marketing of farm products—or—we shall seek to reverse the trend and gradually reduce the dependence of farm people upon political management of the farm economy.

The general situation in Washington with respect to farm programs recalls the story about the two boys who so admired a heavyweight boxer that they bet all their money that he would beat the champion.

But their fighter was knocked out in the third round.

"You know," said one of the boys ruefully, "I don't think Sam is as good as he used to be."

"Yeah," replied the other. "And I don't think he ever was."

In the general disillusionment with the panaceas of the past, it is but natural that we should explore new avenues—and perhaps some old or unused avenues.

Someone told me recently, and I am sure it is so because of my own contacts, that farmer opinion is somewhat in a state of flux, that farmers are looking for new answers. I can assure you the same situation prevails on Capitol Hill.

This is all to the good. Such analysis and resurvey is the stuff of which progress is made.

But I hope that all of us, myself included, will look carefully and honestly at the economics and the long-run consequences of any proposal. Will it really help farmers in the long run, or does it involve jumping from the frying pan into the fire?

In the writing of the present farm-program legislation we have written certain definitions or formulas for determining supply, demand, quotas, and the level of price supports. These formulas have not worked too well because no static formula will fit a dynamic, constantly changing economy. Even though the formula is right today, it is wrong tomorrow.

Secretary Benson's answer to this is to eliminate formulas and leave the determination to administrative discretion.

This I cannot buy. It leaves too much authority in the hands of one man. Even though some people might be willing to leave such authority in the hands of the present occupant of the office, no one can know how some future occupant might use or abuse the authority vested in him.

It seems to me that we still have a job to do in finding a way to establish standards by legislative action, particularly as to the level of price support, which contains sufficient recognition of the current market situation to be realistic and workable and yet which avoids the delegation of complete discretion to the—or to any—Secretary of Agriculture.

Among the welter of proposals currently being debated is the question of supporting farm incomes by direct payments to farmers. Such proposals usually involve payments on units of production to bring the total return per unit up to a specified level. And such proposals usually involve an extension of the payment feature to include many other commodities such as livestock, eggs, fruit, vegetables, hogs, in addition to those now supported.

If we are to use the payment approach there is no valid reason to limit price support to a few storable commodities.

A guaranteed return per unit of production would provide a strong incentive for farmers to increase the number of units produced. Financing would be facilitated. The payments themselves would be in part reinvested. The net effect would be to increase capitalization in an industry that is already overcapitalized—to expand the agricultural plant which is already expanded to produce beyond what the market will absorb.

The increased production thus created would move to market at lower prices. The farmer's return from the market would decline; the farmers return in the form of a payment from Government would increase.

In a recently published study, the Department of Agriculture reached the conclusion that within a few years after the institution of a payment program at 90 percent of parity for all major commodities, the annual cost would run between seven and ten billion dollars per year. In 1957 total net farm income is estimated at $11.7 billion.

I think their estimate is too low. Regardless of cost, if we go this route, we will make peasants out of every farmer in America.

Unless we are to assume that the general public, through its representatives in Congress, is willing to support unlimited expenditures for agriculture, we must assume that the costs of a payment program would result eventually in the adoption of measures to limit the Government's commitment. Such measures would increase a limitation upon the amount to be paid to any one farmer; or production quotas, or both.

The institution of production quotas of the kind that would be necessary to minimize Government liability, and for the commodities it is proposed be covered by payment programs, would subject agriculture to a degree of centralized control of farm

production and marketing operations far beyond anything heretofore envisaged or dreamed of.

The history of Government programs would indicate that limitations on payments would be invoked at a relatively early state in the program. Note the reduction in the maximum payment under the agricultural conservation program from $10,000 per farm to $1,500.

Or in most recent history—when the soil bank program was under consideration, Congress rejected limitations on soil bank payments on the grounds that the purpose of the soil bank was to reduce production of surpluses and the cooperation of the larger producers was needed. Yet, 1 year later, a limitation of $3,000 for the acreage reserve program was approved.

In any Government program involving the payment of public money to individuals, the inevitable tendency is to work toward a uniform basis—and what is more uniform, more equitable, than an equal payment to each farmer?

So, in a period of a relatively few years it would appear the inevitable consequences of a payment program would be:

1. Increased production.
2. Lower market prices.
3. Farmers would hope to get most of their net income in the form of Government payments.
4. Limitations on the number of dollars each farmer could receive.

The most efficient farm operators would be squeezed between the low market prices induced by guaranteed returns and the limits on the amount that might be paid to any individual.

The result would be a complete dependence of farmers on government, and the leveling off of opportunity in agriculture at a comparatively low level.

Farmers, who would thus become essentially wards of government, could not likely retain the independence and self-reliance that have made farmers the bulwark of responsible self-government.

Personally, I have a higher ambition for those who are and will be farmers.

I do not believe there is any panacea for the income problem in agriculture. Any government that is big enough to give us all we want is also big enough to take all we've got—including our freedom.

I'm sure that you are aware of the rapid decrease in the proportion of farmers to the rest of the population in America. It seems to me as a farmer that we must be stupid if we put our whole dependence and economic welfare into the hands of the Congress or the administrative agencies of government. It is estimated, for example, that by 1975 only 6 percent of the population of America will be producing more than 90 percent of the food and fiber. Are we naive enough to believe that in such a situation that we can continue to pile up huge surpluses of agricultural commodities—let alone think about the Government dipping into the Treasury and paying us at a rate of $10 to $15 billion annually.

There are some things that government can do to alleviate the situation. These, government should do. But I think we should be instinctively suspicious of any proposal that leads in the direction of more comprehensive Government direction of and responsibility for the business of producing and marketing farm products. Let us subject such proposals to a most rigorous scrutiny. Let's not jump before we know where we are jumping. Let's be sure we know what the long-run consequences of any proposal may be, before, rather than after, we buy it.

It is a real pleasure to have the opportunity of discussing this subject with you—because I know that what the future holds for agriculture will not be determined by what the present occupants of legislative chairs may think—but rather by what you and millions of others like you think. Most Members of Congress vote in part in accordance with their personal convictions and in part according to the way they think their constituents want them to vote. Most Congressmen are just average people who have more problems and responsibilities than they know what to do with. Most of them want to do what's right. But they are not much wiser than their constituents urge or permit them to be. As one of my friends tells me, "He has heard the clamorment of the people."

I think, too, I would be remiss, if, while discussing Government's responsibility to agriculture, I did not touch at least briefly upon the reciprocal responsibility of farmers to themselves, to the Government, and to the public generally.

I am sure you would agree with me that farmers need to do a lot more than cast a hopeful eye in the direction of Washington. Farmers have a responsibility as individuals to do what they can to improve their own economic position, to work individually and in their community and through the organizations they have created and which they control, to expand markets and increase the efficiency of production and marketing. They have a responsibility to Government and the general public to call for genuinely helpful action, but to avoid proposals that are impractical, excessive in cost, or harmful to the public. Preservation of your right to take individual, local, and private action is a responsibility of government.

Let me close by expressing my confidence that I am speaking to an audience that is conscious of and dedicated to the great heritage of political and economic principles bequeathed to us—and by confidence that each of you in his own way in his own sphere has the capacity to make a contribution toward finding sound answers consistent with those principles—and that in doing so you will be promoting progress and freedom in America. And it is important that you do so. "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle."

I wish I could recall the name of the man who said, "The conditions upon which God has given liberty to man is eternal vigilance, which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt." In the run of history this quotation is not unrelated to the topic you asked me to discuss.

H. R. 4662, the King-Jenkins Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in a letter sent to the chairman, I have urged members of the House Ways and Means Committee to report favorably H. R. 4662, known as the King-Jenkins bill, so that this important bill may receive early action by the Congress.

H. R. 4662 would permit teachers—including college teachers—to deduct from gross income up to $600 for tuition, books, other equipment, travel and living expenses while away from home—to the extent that these expenses exceed normal living costs—while pursuing advanced educational objectives relating to their professional qualifications.

H. R. 4662 and its many companion bills should not be construed as special treatment for teachers. Other professional groups already are permitted to deduct from gross income similar expenses. To deny teachers this equal right is to discourage them from improving their abilities at a time when our Government is proposing vitally important step-ups in our educational system.

Teachers give up their vacations to go to summer school and drive long distances in winter over hazardous roads to attend extension classes because they want to become better teachers. They should be encouraged, not discouraged.

Under present regulations, a teacher cannot deduct these educational expenses unless he would have lost his position had he not taken the courses.

Many teachers and professional groups within my district have written me urging support of H. R. 4662, which I have pledged. I now urge that this bill be reported from committee and passed as soon as possible.

Deducting Amounts Paid for Tuition, Fees, and Books to Certain Public and Private Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, while it is true that the recent sensational scientific and technological advances of the Soviet Government have given point and a much needed sense of urgency to the need for a searching reappraisal of our educational system and the way in which it is tending, and focused renewed emphasis on the sciences, it is my belief that we should be mindful of the overall needs of our educational system lest we forget the fact that democracy such as ours has need for a broad base of aptitudes and skills which must not neglect any field of human endeavor.

With this thought in mind, I have introduced H. R. 9971, which will permit a Federal income-tax deduction for amounts paid to any accredited institution of higher education for tuition, fees, or books in connection with the education at a level above the 12th grade of the taxpayer or for any individual for whom the taxpayer is entitled to claim an exemption.

My bill is unique in that it takes account of, and makes provision for, the education of the taxpayer himself, in addition to those who look to him for their support and education. This is important in two respects. First, it provides an incentive for those many young men and women of our country who because of financial condition of their families must undertake to educate

themselves by hard work and an individual struggle, in short, to support themselves and to acquire an education at the same time, and, second, it will provide a deduction to the taxpayer who is a teacher and who, to the ultimate benefit of the country as a whole and his community in particular, seeks to further his individual skills as a teacher. I am sure that we are all mindful of the fact that the product of our education system can be no better than the skills concentrated in the hands of those who train, guide, and develop the young minds that we entrust to their skills.

The deduction permitted by my bill can be availed of only if the educational institution is an accredited institution which qualifies for deductible contributions under the Internal Revenue Code. The point of so limiting the bill lies in the belief that no useful purpose is served in providing an incentive for matriculation in substandard institutions which ultimately can do harm to the career of a student, and because I believe that recognition should be given to the many contributions made to the American way of life by those nonprofit private and public educational institutions which, without rewards, endeavor to equip and man our Nation to meet the challenges of a constantly changing world.

President Eisenhower's Agricultural Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, although I approve of many of the recommendations contained in President Eisenhower's agricultural message, delivered to the Congress today, I cannot agree that it represents a progress program that can make a substantial contribution to the well-being of America's farm families.

Personally, I want no part of a price-support structure set at 60 to 90 percent of parity. I note that the President has called for flexing price supports downward in order to open the door to market expansion. Mr. Speaker, even if the consumer price for farm production was reduced, I fail to see how the already glutted world market could be expanded. Domestically, figures indicate that the American people, despite rapid population increases, are eating less than ever before; in fact, it would seem, to the point where almost everybody is on a diet.

I question further the wisdom of a more flexible support pattern: How can a farmer produce on the basis of 60 percent of parity when the farm equipment and machinery he buys today is being sold for 160 percent of parity?

It is my opinion that the solution to our farm problems still is to be found in a formula composed of 100 percent of parity, acreage controls, cross-compliance, and full participation. It is my understanding that there are statutes on the books already which would permit the creation of just such a formula.

The Minority Is Not Always Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult problems a Member of Congress must from time to time face occurs when, after extensive study and objective consideration, he discovers that his convictions on the merits of a vital issue do not accord with the convictions of an overwhelming majority of his colleagues. I am sure that all of the Members of this body have, at one time or another, been beset with agonizing doubts when what appears to be essential truths demand that you counter the popular trend.

I found myself in just such a situation in 1952, during the consideration by the 82d Congress of fair trade legislation. In this instance, however, evidence in the subsequent 6 short years, clearly demonstrate that what was then contrary to the majority and the popular stand nevertheless was right. I am gratified that in State after State the courts are ruling that so-called fair trade is contrary to fundamental guaranties of American society. Their decisions underscore the validity of objections to Federal enabling legislation for resale price maintenance, a pernicious system of price fixing which is contrary to basic American competitive and contractual concepts.

You all recall the situation that existed in 1952. By that time, advocates of fair trade had secured enactment in 45 States of laws prohibiting deviations from prices that had been established by a manufacturer for his trademarked goods. Those laws prohibited price deviations, not only by those who had by contract agreed with the manufacturer to maintain resale prices, but also, in the infamous nonsigner clauses, prohibited deviations by those who had never agreed to maintain resale prices and who might not even have knowledge of such a contract.

The United States Supreme Court in 1951 in the Schwegmann case effectively emasculated fair trade and the burden it imposes on interstate commerce in its ruling that prices set by manufacturers were not enforcible against nonsigners. Immediately fair trade advocates introduced bills to overrule the Supreme Court's temperate and wise decision.

Certain of these bills were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I was then chairman. Other bills were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Both committees held exhaustive hearings on all phases of this problem, and both committees reported out bills to overrule the Supreme Court and to reinstate fair trade.

Only three members of the Judiciary Committee, of which I was one, signed the minority report—House Report No. 1516—in opposition to fair trade. The report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—House Report No. 1437—contains no minority views in opposition to resale price maintenance. Subsequent action in the House was equally one sided. On May 8, 1952, by a vote of 196 to 10, the House after vigorous debate, adopted the McGuire bill that had been recommended by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

In both the Judiciary Committee's minority report in opposition to resale price maintenance and on the floor of the House, I opposed fair trade on a number of grounds. Extensive evidence was marshaled to show the history of fair trade included the following results:

It promotes concentration of economic power.

It injures the competitive status of independent retailers.

It fosters violations of the antitrust laws.

It is unfair to the consumer.

The nonsigner clause that makes a man responsible for the terms of a contract he did not sign, and of which he has no knowledge, and which he does not approve, offends treasured principles of American ethics and is contrary to the entire system of commercial law that is the fabric of our economic well-being. Subsequent events have sustained these arguments. Whereas in 1952, 45 States had fair-trade legislation, today only 31 State fair-trade laws are undisturbed by the State judiciaries. In two States, Virginia and Nebraska, the courts have voided their entire Fair Trade Acts. In 12 other States, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina and Utah, the courts have voided the State laws as to nonsigners and thereby have rendered fair trade in those States virtually ineffective. I am confident that, as time goes on, the complete elimination of fair-trade price fixing will demonstrate the historical truism that time converts many a minority position into the majority one.

Presentation of Cordell Hull Award for Leadership in Building United States Foreign Economic Policy to the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, much has already been said by some of my colleagues about the presentation of the Cordell Hull Award for Leadership

in Building United States Foreign Economic Policy to the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce on December 10, 1957, by the Committee on Forign Trade Education.

At the request of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that a message sent to the award meeting by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, together with one I sent, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS FROM THE MESSAGE OF THE HONORABLE ADLAI E. STEVENSON, DECEMBER 10, 1957

I have long been a supporter of the reciprocal trade agreements program and I intend to do all in my power to see that this program is renewed and liberalized when it comes before Congress early next year. I think an intensive effort must be made to explain to Congress and to the country precisely why it is in the national interest that this program be extended. And I am sure that the administration will have the support of many leading citizens and voluntary organizations on a nonpartisan basis provided it is prepared to lead the way and stay on the course.

EXCERPT FROM THE MESSAGE OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, UNITED STATES SENATOR, DECEMBER 6, 1957

You are certainly right about the growing threat to our reciprocal trade program, and the urgent need for greater effort to stimulate public understanding as to our stake in foreign trade. Perhaps no issue before the coming Congress will be of more importance to our future, yet it will be difficult to mobilize the support we need for a realistic trade program unless the public can be awakened to how closely it is linked with successful international relations.

It seems to me that the American business community can and must accept this challenge of asserting some vigorous leadership toward public education in the direction of expanded foreign trade and strengthened foreign economic policy, putting aside short-term self-interest where necessary in the realization that all of us have a tremendous stake in the long-range goal of building a more secure world and more peaceful society in which all humanity can enjoy the blessings of progress and improved economic conditions.

Rollcall for Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of the principal address at the annual dinner of the National Reclamation Association at Phoenix, Ariz., on November 7, 1957, which was delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It is entitled "Rollcall for Reclamation."

The attention of the Senate is invited to this masterful, factual presentation of the situation confronting the Nation, and particularly the West, with respect to the reclamation program as a result of the financial policies of the present administration, especially regarding the urgent need for a reappraisal of the program and policies.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a former Secretary of Agriculture before coming to the Senate, is now the able chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee and senior majority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He is also a former Member of the House of Representatives.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] gave the Reclamation Association and the country facts that must be taken to heart if the economic stability of the Nation and the West is to be maintained. He warned of the threats to the ability of the United States in the not too distant future to provide food for its rapidly expanding population. He pointed out that had the current high interest policies of the Eisenhower administration for reclamation projects been in effect earlier, the Nation would be without many great conservation and multiple-purpose reclamation projects, producing water for irrigation, hydroelectric power, flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife protection.

I considered the ANDERSON speech of such high value to the country that I asked the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his permission to have his presentation printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is vital that the country be alerted to the problems that confront reclamation.

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

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

ROLLCALL FOR RECLAMATION

(Address by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON)

Six hundred years ago, the Hohokam Indians irrigated their crops in the Salt River Valley, perhaps on this very spot.

Four hundred years ago, Francisco Vasquez de Coronado followed the San Pedro River, then a broad, fast-flowing stream and now a dry stretch of dust, into the Southwest in search of the seven cities of Cibola. He was led on by the story that the walls of the houses were formed of pure gold, but when he came to Hawikuh, he learned to his early disappointment and eventual dispair that what Fray Marcos de Niza took to be gold was only corn shining in the blaze of a desert sun.

Like the conquistador of four centuries ago, the modern seeker of agricultural wealth has heard of the riches that pour forth from acres reclaimed from the desert by giant dams behind which are stored the waters of winter snows and summer rains. One by one these dams dot the landscape, while below and beyond them, new farms blossom with food and fiber. The pattern has been much the same: High dams to provide a strong head of water which can be released through whirling turbines to generate the white gold of electricity—the breadwinner for the irrigation of the fields.

REAPPRAISAL OF RECLAMATION

But there may be a new rollcall of reclamation—a reappraisal of possibilities. The white gold of a decade ago may not settle to the bottom of our prospector's pan. Higher construction indexes, reduced agricultural prices, and spiraling interest costs may combine to end for a time the successful search for feasible reclamation projects. It is this unwelcome prospect that I would discuss with you tonight.

May we take it for granted that there are a dozen interesting excursions into history that we might make before we talk about our present problem.

There was the West of the Indian when the beavers were the persistent builders of dams and the chief contributors to conservation by slowing down the rate of early spring runoff.

There was the West of Kit Carson, Bill Williams and Jedediah Smith where only the occasional traveler would disturb the prairie dogs or watch the whirlwinds of dust.

There was the West that General Kearney claimed from Mexico and out of which was carved this State and my own. The general found beautiful irrigated valleys, but there were no elaborate engineering works—merely brush dams built into the stream by the Spanish don who owned the land from the river to the hills. There was no need of soil analysis, no study of stream aggradation, no bonded debt. The water served only the acres where the simple ditch would carry it. Thus it had been flowing for a century across the fields of what I now call my farm before Kearney came into the valley of the Rio Grande.

But the turn of the century saw the picture changing. The railroad had hurried the development of centers from which cattle and ore could be shipped, and these had turned into towns or were becoming cities. The vast stretch of pasture was not enough; the diversification of crops was started. Farming on irrigated land became more of a task than the individual could handle, so there were formed associations of water users aided by the lawyer and the banker from a nearby town. Private finance was too limited; farm prices were too low. Thus, by 1900, men were looking to the Government for help.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT ON RECLAMATION

President Theodore Roosevelt in 1901 sent a special message to the Congress. In it were these words:

"The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country just as the settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States."

Then he stated the case for the West:

"It is as right for the National Government to make the streams and rivers of the arid region useful by engineering works for the storage of water as to make useful the rivers and harbors of the humid regions by engineering works of another character."

During the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt the Reclamation Act of 1902 was passed. It provided a 10-year repayment period for irrigation works. At that time, the generation of power was not considered in arriving at project feasibility. Those who used the water—the farmers, ranchers, and orchardmen—would pay the bill and pay it quickly.

REPAYMENT PERIOD EXTENDED

Twelve years later, after it became apparent that the 10-year period was too short, the Extension Act of 1914 stretched the repayment period to 20 years. Another 12 years demonstrated that still more time would be required, and in 1926 the Fact Finders Act extended the repayment period to 40 years. At the end of another 10 years it was necessary to stretch the repayment period to 50 years by adding a development period of 10 years ahead of the 40-year repayment program. Congress was trying to keep step with the growing cost of making land and the increasing problem of paying installments as they came due.

For our purposes tonight, we need not review the early sources of financing. There has been a reclamation fund, supplemented

by Treasury loans, by revenues from the Oil and Mineral Leasing Acts and some other sources including repayments from the water users.

SALT RIVER VALLEY PROJECT AND PUBLIC POWER

Of more interest to us is the 1906 change in the revenue picture—by coincidence brought about by the situation in this Salt River Valley.

During the construction of Roosevelt Dam it was found that electric energy was needed to operate construction machinery. So a very small hydropower plant was built. When the dam was completed the Government found that it had power to sell.

During the period, 1906 to 1922, the Government sold the power on a lease basis of up to 10 years. In 1922, the lease period was extended to 50 years. The extension probably is the basis for the present 50-year payout test for feasibility of reclamation power installations.

At any rate, as the realization grew that construction and operating costs of irrigation projects exceeded the ability of water users to repay, more and more attention was being shifted to the hydropower phases of proposed projects.

FACT FINDERS REPORT

In addition, a group known as the Fact Finders, under the chairmanship of the late Governor Campbell, of Arizona, succeeded in establishing a rigid land classification system which eliminated many bad projects. At first, reclamation advocates had assumed that almost any combination of land and water would produce crops. But a shrinking in total irrigable acres as a result of the land classifications threw an increased per-acre project cost upon the remaining irrigated acres. Farming, already unable to cope with the financial aspects of the projects, was being further penalized and power was called in to make up the deficit.

Other factors came along to add to the troubles. In the 1940's it was admitted that the cost of drainage facilities must be included in estimating total project costs. This meant that still more projects had to be rejected.

POWER REVENUES AID IRRIGATION

Then a sixfold rise in construction costs struck another blow to projects dependent upon water users for repayment. The undertakings became so enormously expensive that every remaining irrigation proposal in the West became automatically unfeasible if revenues from hydropower were unavailable.

During the period we have been reviewing, Hoover Dam, the first major reclamation power development, was authorized. Feasibility of the project hinged on obtaining power contracts prior to start of construction. The contracts were to be in sufficient amount to repay the cost of the structure within the 50-year period. The authorizing legislation made a further provision—no costs of the dam were to be allocated to the release of water for irrigation purposes, although such water was given high priority in the operation of the project.

So we had two contrasts by the mid-1930's Irrigation works alone were pretty largely a failure. Power structures, though, seemed to be endowed with a golden future, even with irrigation as a partner.

IRRIGATION-POWER ASPECTS MERGED

It was but a matter of time until the irrigation-power aspects of the reclamation program were being merged deliberately.

Perhaps the first such effort involved the Central Valley project in California. Here roughly one-fourth of the costs of this giant irrigation system are to be repaid from power revenues.

Having taken this step, Congress in 1938 authorized the Colorado Big Thompson project, limiting repayable costs by water users to 28.7 percent and providing that the balance of the Federal outlay would be reimbursed through the sale of power.

The following year, 1939, the Columbia Basin project, the largest multiple-purpose project ever undertaken anywhere, was authorized and more than 84 percent of the cost will be reimbursed by power sales.

The Missouri River Basin project, another large undertaking, requires irrigators to repay only one-fifth of the irrigation costs. On the upper Colorado River storage project the irrigation repayment requirement drops to 13.5 percent.

POWER ASPECTS WELL ESTABLISHED

Thus, the power-generation aspect of the reclamation program has become well established. If time could stand still, the remainder of the reclamation and irrigation program might be patterned after these multiple-purpose prototypes.

But time does not stand still. Just when we had found—in power—the solution to the problem of how to irrigate the desert, three new factors intruded to make difficult if not impossible the scheduling of future irrigation construction. They were: The higher cost of construction, the higher cost of money, and the postwar drop in agricultural prices. Since power from falling water is the real breadwinner and must pay four-fifths to seven-eighths of the total cost, the interest charged on the amount allocated to power holds the key to the future of all your dreams.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Suppose we call the roll of reclamation prospects and examine our future case by case.

To me, no area development is more important than the upper Colorado River storage project. Under general reclamation law, most reclamation projects pay 3 percent interest on the portion of cost allocated to power. REA gets money at 2 percent, but reclamation is expected to pay 3 percent. Why, I don't know; but the upper Colorado project is on a still different basis.

Senate bill 1555 of the 83d Congress was introduced to authorize the project. In section 2 it provided that:

"Interest on the unamortized balance of the investment in the commercial power features of the said project shall be returnable at a rate not less than the average rate paid by the United States on its long term bonds outstanding at the date of authorization of the project."

INTEREST RATE ESTABLISHED BY LAW

On April 1, 1954, the then Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, sent a draft bill covering changes in S. 1555 desired by his department and the Bureau of the Budget. That draft provided for repayment of unamortized balances at a rate—and I quote now from paragraph (e) of section 4:

"To be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year for which said appropriation is enacted, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date 15 or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent."

The intent of that language was incorporated into the version of S. 1555 reported to the 83d Congress. The provision as reported was carried forward in S. 500 of the 84th Congress and became the provision of Public Law 485 of the 84th Congress. I include the language again to make the reference complete. It is in paragraph (f) of section 5, as follows:

"(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public-debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum."

EFFECT OF CHANGE IN INTEREST RATE

What is the effect of changing from interest rate to market yield on long-term Government bonds? The bill was signed into law April 11, 1956, and the first money for Glen Canyon was made available. The market yield on long-term bonds during the month of June 1956 was 2⅞ percent. If appropriations had not been promptly sought and received, the interest charge against Glen Canyon would have been pegged at the rate effective during June of 1957 which was 3⅝ percent. That difference in rate would apply to any participating project started in fiscal 1958 and could be the difference in determining whether such a project would ever pay out and hence whether an appropriation to commence it would ever be justified.

We could have less concern if the project was being asked to pay what money costs the Government. On August 13, 1957, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, Randolph Burgess, sent me a letter in reply to mine of August 3 showing that while the average rate on the interest-bearing debt as of July 31, 1956, was 2.605 percent and as of July 1, 1957, was 2.742 percent, the rate applicable to any participating project started after July 1, 1957, or during fiscal 1958 will be 3⅝ percent. I will attach to my address a table illustrating that fact. It is from a technical analysis of the public debt released by the Treasury Department July 1957.

Now what is the effect of a 3⅝ percent interest rate? And what will happen to other projects if their costs continue to climb and they have to be started under 3⅝ percent rate? Let's look again at Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams. Interest against them is charged at the average yield of long term bonds on June 30, 1956, which was 2⅞ percent. At that rate these projects will pay out in 47 years. If there had been 1 year's delay either in passing the authorizing legislation on the original upper Colorado River storage bill or the appropriation to start work on the dams, the interest rate would rise to 3⅝ percent and 80 years would have been required to pay out these 2 structures.

POWER COSTS ASSURED FIRST

Now the Colorado River storage project law requires that the power costs of these dams must be assured before any funds can become available from the sale of power to pay for the irrigation works associated with them under the act. Therefore, if 1 more year had intervened, money for participating projects would have been scheduled not in 47 years but in 80 years.

The Congress has many times had before it the central Arizona project including the Bridge Canyon Dam. Suppose the Congress were to authorize it the first day of the next session and the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House checked into its feasibility. A letter from Mr. Dexheimer, dated August 23, 1957, points out that at present prices the estimated cost allocable to power

at Bridge Canyon is about $340,600,000. If we used the same annual gross revenues of $11,880,000 estimated in House Document No. 136 of the 81st Congress and estimated net annual revenues of $7,586,000, the project can look feasible if money is cheap, but at 3⅞ percent interest which would be effective during fiscal year 1958, the average annual cost would be $19,146,000 and interest only would be $12,347,000 or nearly $5 million more than the net annual revenues from the Bridge Canyon project.

TRINITY PROJECT IN CALIFORNIA

Let's continue our rollcall of reclamation projects by taking a look at the Central Valley project in California, with the Trinity division. If expenditures to date on that project were indexed to reflect January 1957 costs, the total estimated construction cost, if undertaken at present prices, would increase about 27 percent. If that project had had to be constructed at these higher costs and at an interest rate of 3⅝ percent, the rough studies made by the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that payout of the increased costs allocable to the power investment plus interest during construction would not have been possible since the annual net power revenues would be approximately $10,482,000 and would not be sufficient to meet the necessary annual interest charges.

Suppose we want to see what happens if we wanted to make a project of this nature feasible. The Bureau of Reclamation has computed that to achieve payout of the power investment in a 50-year period at an interest rate of 3⅝ percent, the annual net power revenues would have to be increased to about $18,300,000. Average firm power rates of about 7.6 mills per kilowatt-hour would be required to produce such annual net revenues. The present revenues from firm commercial energy average 4.5 mills per kilowatt-hour.

I do not say that current could not be marketable at 7.6 mills. I do say that to change the firm commercial energy average rate from 4.5 mills to 7.6 mills would cause something in the nature of a revolution.

EFFECT ON MISSOURI BASIN PROJECT

The Missouri River Basin project at 3 percent interest can pay off in 61 years, but at 3⅝ percent it could never pay off because the interest costs on the power facilities exceed the net revenues.

The Colorado Big Thompson project will pay out in 41 years at 3 percent. But it would require 74 years at 3⅝ percent. If the rate should go to 4 percent, as some bankers think it will by next June 30 and if that rate were to be applied to it, the Colorado Big Thompson project could not pay out at all.

I have mentioned Hoover Dam, which will pay out within the 50-year limitation at the present 3 percent interest and existing power rates, but it would never pay out at 3⅝ percent since interest costs would exceed power revenues.

I have not mentioned the Columbia Basin project (Grand Coulee Dam) up to this point for a special reason. Power generated there is sold through the Bonneville Power Administration to be mixed with other power in the region. The arrangement is such that the Bonneville agency pays whatever the cost of the power may be. Even though Grand Coulee power may be very costly, the impact of its cost can be lessened when it is mingled with lower cost power if that need ever arises.

However, not even the Grand Coulee powerplant could have been expected to pay out at 3⅝ percent interest.

NEW PROJECTS FACE PROBLEMS

I have reviewed these projects well known to all of us to indicate the difficulty there will be in trying to put through additional reclamation projects when the Nation requires more food and fiber. Most of the great projects we have built in the past—Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee powerplant, whose projects on the Missouri Basin—would have been difficult if not impossible had the 3⅝ percent interest rate been applicable for the repayment of costs allocated to power. If we believe, as I am sure we do, that construction costs are going to continue to advance and that more and more reclamation projects will depend upon power revenues to bring irrigation costs within the capacity of farmers to repay, then we must recognize that if reclamation is to go on, the interest charge must come down, at least to a flat 3 percent figure and possibly lower.

The questions we are likely to be asked are: Do we need more irrigation? Do we need to develop more farmland when the Department of Agriculture is paying to have farmland taken out of cultivation and put into a soil bank?

IRRIGATION QUESTIONS ANSWERED

Two and a half years ago, actually April 19, 1955, in an address to the Senate of the United States on the subject "Reclamation—Food for the Future," I tried to answer these questions. I asserted that the population of the United States was on the loose, that we were having what I termed "a great baby boom." I tried to calculate how long it would take for our increasing population and our shrinking farmland to catch up fully with the then surplus production of food and fiber.

Tonight the population figures could be brought up to date. In my Senate talk, I had quoted the experts who estimated a 1975 population of 175 million persons. Against that I had given another estimate that went as high as 190 million persons. The U. S. News & World Report for October 4, 1957, gave the surprising figures that in 1957 there were 171 million people in the United States and that by 1967 there would be 202 million persons. In other words, by 1957 we had reached the population figure of 171 million, whereas the rather conservative figures which I had used only 2 years before had estimated a 1975 population of 175 million people.

GREAT POPULATION INCREASE FORECAST

The Census Bureau, according to Business Week of August 31, 1957, sees a 57.6 million increase in population by 1970. Add that to 171 million now and we can foresee a population of about 230 million. With the West as the fastest growing area, the need for many new reclamation projects to keep pace with rising population is now being demonstrated.

With the need for more irrigated acres easy to demonstrate and with money rates making project feasibility harder and harder to establish, the friends of reclamation must be ready to battle for their cause in the next Congress.

For there are enemies abroad in the land. The Wall Street Journal, in an article on August 19 and an editorial on August 23 last, took a double-barrel shot at reclamation. Their story by Ray Vicker said that one bureau of our Government—Reclamation—was planning to bring in 150,700 acres of new cropland and add supplementary water to another 93,000 acres, while a different agency—the Department of Agriculture—tabulated the farmland idled by the soil bank at 28.4 million acres. Mr. Vicker wondered why one agency is bringing new land into production while another is taking it out.

It is a fair question that we must meet and answer. Of course, I go into a barber shop and pay a barber to cut my hair and then give him an extra half dollar to rub into my scalp a tonic to make it grow again. Each spring and fall I put fertilizer on my lawn to make the grass grow higher and then go around with a power mower to cut it down. This, in the language of the Wall Street Journal editorial, is "fantastic and a bureaucratic extravaganza."

But the cold, hard facts are not fantastic. Abe Martin used to say, "It is funny how a man with facts can break up an argument." Before I made any claim that the increase in production per acre would not and could not keep pace with the steady decline in cropland and the amazing boom in population, I consulted the Department of Agriculture, where I am not entirely a stranger.

NEED FOR IRRIGATION FORECAST

The Department in a letter to me last September 24 dealt with this question. It anticipated a population of 230 million by 1975. Its studies indicated that with high level employment we might experience a 40-percent increase in market demand from 1955 to 1975. "While we now have overproduction and burdensome surpluses of agricultural products, total output," says the Department, "seems to be at an annual rate equal to that which may be needed 4 or 5 years hence." No irrigation project approved in 1956 or later can possibly be in a state of production by that time to cause any worry over its possible contribution to an already swollen agriculture storehouse.

The careful studies of the Department, giving full credibility to presently known improvements and later results of new research, indicate that there will be a need for new cropland. The production per acre index shows this. In 1942 the index stands at 100 and by 1954 it was only 101. The great increases in production per acre are behind us. The first use of hybrid corn, the first lavish spreading of high-powered fertilizer shot the index up 25 percent in a few years; but these days are over now and we are not likely to see any equivalent new force even from atomic development.

I look at the prospect of 3 million new mouths to be fed in America every year. I look at a million acres of cropland being lost to shopping centers, highways, and airports every year. I then draw but a single conclusion: our fight must be intensified; pending projects must be approved; new projects must come off the drawing boards and go before the Congress for ultimate approval; reclamation must go on.

Designation of Alexander Hamilton Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, I am happy to report that at ceremonies on the south plaza of the Treasury Building, on last Saturday—the 201st anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton—the short street south of that building, formerly known as Treasury Place, was officially designated by its new name, Alexander Hamilton Place.

I feel that the naming of a street in our National Capital after our first Secretary of the Treasury, who contributed perhaps more than any other single American to the development and adoption of our cherished American Constitution, is highly appropriate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

the addresses delivered on that occasion by Fred C. Scribner, Jr., the Under Secretary of the Treasury; by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; and by me.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MUNDT

Today we ring down the curtain on the year-long observance of Alexander Hamilton's bicentennial. In recommending the establishment of an Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission the Judiciary Committee had this to say in its report to the Senate:

"The Commission shall have the duty of preparing plans and a program for signalizing the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton.

"Alexander Hamilton was born on the island of Nevis in the British West Indies on January 11, 1757. It was in the American Revolution that Alexander Hamilton stood with Washington and Franklin in developing the basis of what is today our great Federal Republic. Hamilton was the fertile mind and organizing genius of President Washington's administrations. For this great work he has been described as the architect of the American Union. Hamilton represented the conservative mind in its most brilliant and useful form. His devotion to the free press, to free speech, and to the institutions of freemen is too little appreciated. The finest monument that could be erected would be an adequate edition of his writings. Such an edition would not be merely a monument to Hamilton—it would be a genuine and enduring contribution to the Nation which he labored so ardently to create. The committee is of the opinion that the works of Hamilton would be particularly appropriate in this era of world history, when so many countries throughout the world are struggling with the problem of self-government or trying to find a proper formula to use in adopting for themselves the self-government best suited to their environment, capabilities, and abilities, and the making available to those people the complete works of Alexander Hamilton will serve not only this Republic, but the world."

I am happy to tell you that this monument is being erected with private funds. Columbia University has received an initial grant of $200,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation and Time, Inc., to edit and publish The Papers of Alexander Hamilton. This work is in the hands of a distinguished editorial board headed by Dr. John A. Krout, vice president and provost of Columbia University and a member of the Hamilton commission. The editor is Dr. Harold C. Syrett and the assistant editor is Jacob E. Cooke. The Hamilton commission has aided this project by a worldwide search for letters and documents that had long been lost or hidden from view.

The commission's approach has been to stimulate others into activity and to guide their efforts. In this we have had considerable success. A large one-volume edition of Hamilton's writings was published by Dial Press. Somewhat abbreviated, this same work was published by Pocket Books, and sells for 35 cents. A one-volume biography was published by McGraw-Hill; and the first volume of a two-volume biography has been published by Macmillan. The Liberal Arts Press has published two Hamilton books, each in cloth and in paper covers—mainly for students.

The commission also developed programs for the high schools and for the colleges and universities. Many of the latter had special lectures on Hamilton, emphasized his work in history and government classes and seminars, and had library exhibits. In the high schools contests were held for Alexander Hamilton scholarships—one in each State, Territory, possession, and the District of Columbia. The 55 winners were brought to Independence Hall in Philadelphia to take part in a 4-day students constitutional convention where 13 national winners were selected for additional scholarships. This entire scholarship program was financed by private funds which were raised by a special committee headed by Frederick C. Crawford, of Cleveland, Ohio.

These are but some of the Hamilton commission's achievements. Together with others, which I do not have time to describe, we believe we have contributed much to a better understanding of Alexander Hamilton's great work in getting the Constitution written, in getting it ratified, and in getting the Federal Government organized under that instrument of government under which we live today.

In closing the year-long observance of Hamilton's bicentennial, I am happy to announce that, at the commission's request, the National Park Service will change the name of the street on which the Treasury Building faces from Treasury Place to Alexander Hamilton Place.

This will be a fitting tribute to the man who, more than any other, thought out the Constitution of the United States and the Government of the Union organized under it; and, out of the chaos and utter confusion after the Revolution, raised a structure of government, every part of which is imbued with his ideas and principles. These ideas and principles—the eternal truths of government—have, we hope, become better known and understood through the efforts of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

I now read you the letter from Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton designating the renaming of Treasury Place as Alexander Hamilton Place:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1958.

Hon. KARL MUNDT,
Chairman, Alexander Hamilton
Bicentennial Commission,
4026 Main Treasury Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KARL: With further reference to your very fine suggestion of December 23, 1957, on behalf of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, recommending the change of the name of Treasury Place—which runs between 15th Street and Executive Avenue East—to Alexander Hamilton Place, I am glad to inform you that we feel the suggestion is a very worthy one. It is hereby approved.

We have made no announcement of this change as we feel it would be only fitting that the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission make the announcement in such manner and at such time as they may wish.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON ADDRESS BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

My home State of Massachusetts has a special interest in Alexander Hamilton. It was at the port of Boston that young Hamilton landed in October of 1772 when he came to the mainland for his education and, as it turned out, to make a permanent home. And it was after a trip to Boston in early 1774 that he returned to New York convinced of the righteousness of the colonial cause, so convinced that he promptly began writing and speaking in behalf of freedom.

In reflecting on the achievements of Alexander Hamilton, it is impossible to escape recognition of the great contribution which he made to our Nation in its infancy. He has left his imprint in the institutions of our Government and in the philosophies and ideals by which we work. As our first Secretary of the Treasury, his policies and actions laid vital blocks in the foundation upon which our Federal Government and our Nation has grown. His strong belief in a federalized nation and in a strong Central Government were of immense importance in bringing together the resources of our Nation for a common purpose. Even today, although we retain the sovereignty of our States, we realize more and more the fundamental importance of what he told us—the necessity for fiscal integrity—the necessity for a Federal Government with the power to marshal the resources of this vast country, of ever-increasing importance in the missile age we are now entering.

Though we look with great pride to these significant achievements and contributions, we should by no means overlook the brilliance of his military career. In 1776 he commanded a New York artillery company which he had equipped largely from his own resources. He fought with General Washington in the battles of New York and across New Jersey. From 1777 to 1881 he served on General Washington's staff. Not only did he perform many sensitive and delicate missions for Washington, but he won great distinction on the battlefield.

In fact, in Yorktown in 1781 Hamilton led the final American charge, capturing the vital position that brought about the surrender of Cornwallis.

As a Member of the Continental Congress, Hamilton worked in behalf of the young Republic. He did much to bring about the Annapolis Convention which, in turn, led to the calling of the Constitutional Convention in 1787. At this Convention as New York's delegate, he vigorously worked for a strong and stable government. The Federalist Papers which he wrote in collaboration with James Madison and John Jay still are among the most important documents in amplification of the formation of the Constitution of the United States.

Throughout his life Hamilton maintained an intense interest in military affairs. He was the first advocate of a national military academy for officer corps training. Not only did he draft a detailed curriculum for such an institute, but in mid-1799 he formally recommended to President Washington the establishment of a naval academy. Though Washington, just before his death, strongly endorsed this project it was some years before Congress established first the Military and later the Naval Academies. Hamilton instituted the United States Coast Guard, always an arm of the Treasury.

In 1798 he rejected a United States Senate seat to serve as a major general in the Army. He was in command of all our military forces north of the Potomac, in the Northwest, and along the Mississippi. Upon Washington's death, Hamilton became the commanding general of the United States Army. He worked unceasingly to strengthen the Armed Forces and our coastal defenses. When the danger of war with France subsided, he made a final inspection tour that satisfied him that our defenses had been greatly strengthened. He then resigned his military command.

Our country and its government owe much to this great soldier, this creative, foresighted statesman, able author, and loyal patriotic citizen. We honor his memory with gratitude for what he did for us and with pride in his accomplishments.

ADDRESS BY HON. FRED C. SCRIBNER, JR., UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT CEREMONIES MARKING CLOSING OF THE HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL

Mr. Gordon, President Platt, Senators Mundt, Saltonstall, fellow Americans, this

morning's ceremony marks the 201st anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton the first Secretary of the Treasury. It is also the concluding ceremony of the year-long observance of the 200th anniversary of Hamilton's birthday, a program planned and directed with great effectiveness by the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission under the chairmanship of Senator MUNDT.

It is a privilege and honor for me, as a representative of the Treasury Department, to join in this ceremony sponsored by one of our great national patriotic organizations, the Sons of the Revolution.

Americans are busy people. We are vitally concerned with the present and the future. Because of these concerns, we are as a nation frequently remiss in honoring the great men of past generations whose leadership and abilities have contributed so much to the strength and character of our country. We should more frequently pause in our daily tasks to note and learn from the works of those who provided leadership during the early days of this Nation. Through knowledge of the challenges met by these leaders and through study of their contributions, we would find inspiration and strength as we seek solutions for the problems and concerns which are ours today.

The Sons of the Revolution, by this ceremony, participated in by representatives of the Armed Forces, the church and two of the most distinguished Members of the Senate of the United States, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, speak the gratitude and appreciation of all of the people of this country as we pause for a few brief moments this morning to place a wreath on this statue of Hamilton which stands here before the Treasury and in sight of the Capitol and the White House.

As a young man of 32, Alexander Hamilton became the first Secretary of the Treasury. He had been a bold and vigorous military leader in the Revolution. As a Representative of the State of New York, he had participated in the Constitutional Convention. Upon the completion of the drafting of the Constitution, he led a vigorous campaign to secure its ratification by his State. He was the leader of the Federalist group which in the New York ratifying convention secured approval of the Constitution by three votes. His voice and his pen were mighty forces in securing the acceptance by the young Nation of the Constitution which became the charter of our great country.

When Alexander Hamilton took office as Secretary of the Treasury, there was no public credit. Hamilton created it. It was he who insisted on funding the national debt and planned the creation of a sinking fund to satisfy the Government's bonds as they became due. It was he who insisted that certain obligations incurred by the States in the cause of the Union should be paid by the new Central Government. The credit of the new Government became firmly established under Hamilton's careful planning.

Each day in the Treasury we honor Alexander Hamilton. His portrait occupies a place of honor in the private office of the Secretary. We honor Hamilton by following in many areas programs and practices which he instituted so many years ago. We honor him through the continuation in the Treasury of many of the functions of the department which he wisely established in the first days of the Treasury's existence. He conceived and organized the United States Coast Guard to help enforce our customs laws and protect the revenue, and this fine service remains to this day under Treasury jurisdiction. He established the United States Mint. He organized under the Treasury a hospital for seamen, which developed into the United States Public Health Service, now in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

But Hamilton's real greatness lies in the contribution which he made in giving life and vitality to a paper Constitution. We can agree with Dean Louis Hacker in his estimate of Hamilton:

"A theoretical frame of government is one thing; the creation of an administrative machinery under which such high hopes can be translated into reality is another. This latter was Hamilton's accomplishment; and that is why, when men gather to reflect on the governmental process, which, with justice, can maintain order and yet encourage the individual in the full play of his creative powers to reflect, work, and produce, they must honor Alexander Hamilton."

We cannot, however, sum up Hamilton's contribution in the Treasury better than was done by Henry Cabot Lodge in his study of Alexander Hamilton, when he said, "Hamilton exercised the powers granted by the Constitution, pointed out those which lay hidden in its dry clauses, and gave vitality to the lifeless instrument. He drew out the resources of the country, he exercised the powers of the Constitution, he gave courage to the people, he laid the foundations of the National Government—and this was the meaning and result of the financial policy."

It is entirely fitting that the close of the very successful Hamilton bicentennial should be observed here today under the auspices of the Sons of the Revolution and with the participation of the Bicentennial Commission. Both have added materially to public awareness and knowledge of one of our great national leaders. Hamilton's greatness lives on in the Treasury and in the Nation.

The Splendid Role of Educational Television and of Station WHA–TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, education has always been important in America, from the days of the frontier settlements in the Thirteen Colonies, through modern times. But today, in the age of sputnik and intercontinental missiles, in the age of the United Nations and the World Atomic Energy Agency, education is more of a necessity than ever before in our history. I mean education in right ideas, as well as in machines, education in the intangibles as well as the tangibles.

Inevitably, the American people are taking a close look at their educational system. They seek to determine its strength and its weaknesses, in order to better serve the needs of our country and of our youngsters themselves.

Even the wearers of rose-colored glasses would admit that there are a good many things wrong with American education, but there is plenty that is right and constructive and wholesome in American education, as well.

It is our task to build upon the solid foundations which have already been laid by the devoted teaching profession in our land, and by parents, as well. One such solid foundation is the miracle medium of educational television. It is a part of the broader foundation of increased overall use of audio-visual materials.

This represents one of the most exciting new chapters in the history of United States education. In particular, the growing use of television has emerged as one of the most distinguishing characteristics on the American teaching scene.

Illustrative of this situation, I have been pleased to prepare a statement on the subject of the splendid role which one educational television station plays—the fifth such educational TV station to go on the air in the Nation—the award-winning station, WHA–TV, Madison. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the CONSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

A deep interest in communications has long been a distinguishing characteristic of the people of Wisconsin and of their State university.

It is no accident that WHA, Madison, the University of Wisconsin's radio station, enjoys the title of "The Oldest Station in the Nation." It had its origins in experimental "wireless telephone" transmissions over station 9–XM in 1917, followed by scheduled program service which began in 1919.

The Wisconsin School of the Air, founded in 1931, is the oldest continuing broadcast service on a statewide basis. It provides programs in creative art, music, science, nature study, history, language, arts and other subjects, to add to, and enrich, classroom teaching in elementary schools.

Since September, 1933, station WHA has provided, as well, organized, systematic instruction at the college level through the College of the Air.

In 1945, came the development of a State FM radio network to augment and extend the services of station WHA. The 8 FM stations, as well as station WLBL, the AM outlet in the central part of the State, are operated by the State Radio Council.

BIRTH OF EDUCATIONAL TV IN MADISON

Inevitably, with the onset of television, Wisconsin pioneering, once more, came to the fore. A closed-circuit TV laboratory was provided in the university in 1952. In 1953, the far-sighted Wisconsin legislature authorized the university and the other agencies of the State Radio Council to construct and operate an experimental television station. This action paved the way for the establishment of WHA–TV. On May 3, 1954, it began programed operations.

In the almost 4 years which have elapsed, station WHA–TV has provided some of the brightest chapters in nationwide educational television.

As elsewhere, the record has not been without its problems—birth pains and growing pains, financial and otherwise.

Taxpayer controversy has raged over the question of the further extent to which public funds should be used in educational television in Wisconsin or, for that matter, the rest of the Nation.

But the solid record of achievement of WHA–TV speaks for itself in terms of tremendous contributions to all phases of Wisconsin life.

We have, indeed, been fortunate in the high caliber of men and women associated with WHA–TV. The State university's division of radio-television education handles not only the broadcasting phase, but instruction and research. The overall mission is to produce graduates with a broad

competence in the many specific skills in these fields, as well as to produce a growing body of pioneering experimental findings.

TRIBUTE TO FUND FOR ADULT EDUCATION

This very brief review of the background and contributions of WHA–TV could not be complete without paying tribute to the Ford Foundation's Fund for Adult Education which provided the grant-in-aid of $100,000 which made it possible for the station to be constructed in the first place. Few seeds have ever grown to such fruition as has the Ford Foundation's splendid aid to educational TV in this country.

Nor can even so brief a report be complete without reference to the splendid contributions of the Educational Television and Radio Center at Ann Arbor, Mich., which, for example, provides approximately one-third of WHA's filmed programs.

FINE AID BY COMMERCIAL TV

Let this point be noted, too. In discussing educational television in the 48 States, I do not believe that anyone should commit the error of failing to observe the very important role played in educational activities by commercial television in our land. After all, commercial television is the fundamental type of TV in America. American sponsors have not only paid the bills of the vast TV industry, they have made it possible—directly and indirectly—for commercial TV to aid educational TV.

I might mention at this point that the other day I was pleased to receive a very beautifully illustrated and eloquent book entitled "Educational Television and Groucho Marx" published by the National Broadcasting Co. It describes what I regard as a most enheartening story of the contributions made by commercial television; in this instance, by the NBC network, to educational television.

I like the thoughts expressed by Mr. Robert W. Sarnoff, president of NBC, who said: "Every citizen has a stake in the success with which these stations carry out their mission. The drastic shortage of teachers and classrooms lends special urgency to their efforts to build themselves into a major educational force. Those of us in television have an interest beyond that of the average citizen to lend such support as we can in solving these problems."

He has faithfully put his words into deeds by, for example, the splendid live programs produced by NBC in cooperation with the Educational Television and Radio Center.

But WHA–TV is my basic theme today. For it symbolizes what I regard as some of the very best work in educational television anywhere.

But now let the station tell its own story. I include now excerpts from a report which it filed last midyear, describing the type of program which it carries. At the conclusion is a list of the able members of the university's radio-television committee, together with its radio-TV instructional staff.

EXCERPTS FROM WHA–TV REPORT IN JUNE 1957

B. TYPES OF PROGRAMS

Following are brief descriptions of the major program areas and examples, indicating the range, scope, and variety of programs produced by WHA–TV during its first 3 years of experimentation.

1. Organized instruction for adults

These were programs planned as continuing series or courses for out-of-school listening on the adult level. Some were rather informal; others closely paralleled traditional course offerings.

The university extension division produced telecourses in foreign languages, piano playing, music appreciation, and psychology. The latter course, consisting of 54 half-hour programs, was offered for college credit along with the correspondence course requirements.

A list of courses broadcast is given subsequently, and information about research which accompanied the broadcasts is to be found in section IV.

Two informal telecourses on the college level should be noted:

(a) And the World Listened: 13 half-hour programs presented dramatic reenactments of memorable speeches by world-famous orators whose words reflected and shaped the times in which they lived and spoke. Prof. Frederick W. Haberman, chairman of the department of speech, served as consultant and narrator for the series.

(b) The National Government: 12 half-hour programs designed to further understanding of the structure and workings of our Federal system of government. The TV teacher was Ralph Huitt, professor of political science, who used a variety of visual materials, including newsreel clips and film footage shot especially for the series. This series evolved from a correspondence course developed by Professor Huitt for the extension division under its contract with United States Armed Forces Institute. The Department of Defense urged the development of the television series, kines of which it purchased for use in military installations around the world as instructional films and for broadcast to troops overseas through its system of television transmitters.

Kinescope recordings of both of these series have been placed in the film library of the bureau of audiovisual instruction and are available for schools and study groups as well as for broadcast by commercial stations in Wisconsin.

Many other telecourses, originating at other universities and colleges, were broadcast by WHA–TV by means of kinescopes and films supplied by the educational television and radio center. These are listed in appendix A.

2. Vocational information and instruction

The department of agricultural journalism of the university, which produces the farm and home radio features over the State radio facilities, was among the first agencies to participate in WHA–TV's programing. From the first week until October 4, 1956, it presented two programs a week in each of two areas:

(a) Today's Home: Quarter-hour programs presenting authentic information and demonstrations on homemaking methods and practices—consumer information, child care, nutrition, etc. The program featured specialists from the school of home economics and Agricultural Extension Service.

(b) Today's Farm: Quarter-hour programs serving farmer interests with latest findings in vocational agriculture: market information, livestock management, farm equipment, soil conservation, etc. The program utilized specialists from the college of agriculture and the Agricultural Extension Service.

The two series gave agricultural and home economics specialists opportunity to acquire considerable training and experience in television. In 1956, because of budget reductions and the need to reach wider audiences, the Department of Agricultural Journalism terminated its television production and confined its work in the medium to developing 5-minute films.

During 1954 the State Department of Agriculture produced a series aimed at farming interests, the Wisconsin Farm Picture, which emphasized crop reporting and predictions.

For housewives a series of special interest was Let's Go Shopping, presented in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture. It provided latest consumer information, shopping tips, and data on the best buys in foods and textiles.

Living and Learning, produced by the Madison Vocational and Adult School, presented over a 2-year period a great variety of vocational material. Notable series concerned the Heart Kitchen, child care, driver education, and home safety.

3. News and discussion

(a) Spot news: From the beginning WHA–TV carried a daily quarter-hour newscast presented in cooperation with the school of journalism. The newscasts were planned to give news of significance to viewers in the area and to go behind the news for pertinent background information, supplied usually by interviews with authorities and visiting specialists. The United Press wire provided news reports, and visuals were derived from the United Press photo service, the U. W. News Service, and other sources. Some feature materials and pictures were supplied by students in the courses in Radio-Television News.

(b) Discussion: This is an area in which WHA–TV has done some of its most significant programing. The station feels that it has a special responsibility for critical inquiry into problems of public concern; accordingly, it has presented a continuing schedule of forums, debates, press conferences, and discussion programs.

* * * * *

4. Programs for children and youth

(a) Out-of-school programs: In this area WHA-TV has achieved recognized success. Before the start of operations, parents and teachers indicated that they felt WHA–TV could make a valuable contribution to children's programs for home viewing; accordingly, considerable effort was directed at fulfilling this expectation. Developments included:

(1) The Friendly Giant: This program, created by Robert Homme, was first broadcast on the inaugural program of WHA–TV, May 3, 1954, and has continued on a five-per-week basis ever since. A quiet, relaxed bedtime program for young children, it presents musical games and a reading of children's books in an appealing setting of a castle inhabited by a friendly giant with various puppet friends. The program has won three first awards in national competition at the Institute for Education by Radio-Television, and kinescope films of the program have been distributed nationally for broadcast by other educational stations and commercial stations as well.

(2) Play Tree: This was a puppet-show series presented for late afternoon viewing, emphasizing songs and the teaching of social values for children.

(3) The Play Wagon: This series of 13 experimental programs made use of television to stimulate young people's participation in creative dramatics.

(4) Views of Youth: This was an extended series providing information and ideas about social behavior and recreation for teen-agers. Subjects ranged from hints on grooming and fashions to suggestions on how to study and how to build a "hi-fi" set. Guidance for the series was provided by a board comprising students and faculty advisers from the area high school.

b. In-school programs: Early efforts in this area were directed at testing the television effectiveness of certain radio programs and teachers known to be successful on the Wisconsin School of the Air. Brief experimental series included programs in drawing, science, nature study, and rhythmic games. Subsequent programs for schools were developed especially for television. They included series in conservation, American history through folksongs and pictures, Wisconsin history as related in children's books, social studies, and arithmetic. Distinctive among these was Figure It Out, planned and presented by Prof. Sara A. Rhue, elementary

teaching specialist in the University of Wisconsin School of Education. A trial series was broadcast in 1955, followed by a revised and expanded series in 1956. The programs were designed to enrich the study of arithmetic by relating the story of the development of our number system through many years and many lands.

Program viewing in the classrooms was arranged in cooperation with the Madison public school system and supervising teachers of Dane County. A total of 36 schools participated in the experiments over the 3-year period.

5. Special features

In this group were a number of one-time-only broadcasts which were not a part of the regular schedule. Such programs included several special dramatic productions and a great number of "remote" programs originated outside the studios.

The first "remote" special feature was a broadcast of Governor Kohler's message to the joint session of the Wisconsin Legislature, January 13, 1955. This broadcast was originated in the assembly chamber of the State capitol and was fed to the WHA–TV transmitter by microwave relay.

As the station acquired more "remote" facilities, it increased its broadcast of programs originating outside of the studios. Coaxial cables leading from the studios to various points on the campus and the conversion of a used truck into a mobile unit permitted the origination of programs directly from the scene. Play rehearsals, concerts, and convocations were given from the Wisconsin Union Theater, and tours of art exhibits were presented from the Memorial Union galleries. A regular series of university symphony orchestra rehearsals was broadcast from Music Hall, and several tours were made of exhibits in the first-floor galleries of the State Historical Society and of its museum. In several instances the station was able to make temporary cable installations to enable it to pick up programs from buildings and grounds in proximity to the studios. Such on-the-spot programs were presented from the printing laboratory of the journalism school, the hydraulics laboratory, and the Lake laboratory, as well as from the union terrace and the lakeshore area.

The 30 special events remotes broadcast by WHA–TV, in addition to the January 1955 broadcast from the State capitol, included the La Follette Centennial Address by Chief Justice Warren, June 19, 1955, State Historical Library; the "Sifting and Winnowing" Plaque Rededication Ceremonies, February 15, 1957, Bascom Hall, and Lincoln Terrace; University of Wisconsin Honors Convocation, June 14, 1957, Wisconsin Union Theater.

6. General programs

(a) Drama: A good deal of effort was devoted to experiments in finding simple, inexpensive ways to present dramatic materials on television for educational needs.

Medea, the first full-scale drama, was completely staged in costume in a studio 15 x 30 feet with a cast of 16. The total effort involved 1,600 hours by 60 people and involved an out-of-pocket cost of $147.37, of which $55 went for composition board to cover the studio floors so cameras could be rolled smoothly.

Festival for Easter was a full-hour production telling the Easter story as interpreted in music, painting, and drama. It included participation of a 30-voice a capella choir and the staging of a medieval blank-verse drama of the Resurrection. Other full-hour drama presentations included Premiers (three original one-acts), The Imaginary Invalid, and The Shoemaker's House.

A number of student plays originally given in the Play Circle Theater of the Memorial Union were transferred to the TV studio and with some compression and modification presented as television plays.

Dress rehearsals of the Wisconsin Player's productions of Trial by Jury and School for Scandal were broadcast directly from the stage of the Wisconsin Union Theater.

* * * * * * *

In rehearsal, Twelfth Night. This was a series of five hour-long readings utilizing the rehearsal technique, including comments by the director and questions from the cast, to illuminate Shakespeare's play. The series progressed from the first reading, through blocking and stage business, to a final full-dress performance of one scene.

Drama of Poetry. Readers were used to illustrate points made in Prof. Harry Glicksman's lectures on poetic literature.

The TV Drama Quartet, presented on alternate weeks during the winter of 1956–57, was designed to explore the TV possibilities of readings of a variety of dramatic literature. Programs included Antigone, Electra, The Wasteland, and Prometheus Bound.

(b) Dance: Members of Orchesis, the dance organization of the university, participated in a variety of WHA–TV programs. They played a prominent role in the production of Medea, in which original dance sequences were used to separate the scenes; produced In Season, a special program of original dances and music interpreting poetry of E. E. Cummings; presented a series of lecture demonstrations on elements of the dance; and produced a weekly quarter-hour program called Dance Impromptu consisting of dance improvisations set to classical and modern music.

(c) Music: Music offerings have been greatly varied. They ranged from performances by artists on the School of Music faculty (Pro Arte Quartet, Gunnar Johansen, Leo Steffens) and concerts by choruses and instrumental groups, to quiz programs and courses in playing the piano and music appreciation. Included were:

Looking at Music—telecourse in music appreciation by Prof. Sigfrid Prager.

Key to Music—a series of 32 half-hour illustrated talks by Prof. Hilmar Luckhardt on the elements of music.

Playing the Piano—beginning piano lessons taught on television by Prof. Leon Iltis.

Do You Know Music?—an informal quiz program utilizing a panel of experts to answer a variety of questions about music and composers.

Symphony Rehearsal—a remote pickup from Music Hall of actual rehearsals of the University of Wisconsin Symphony Orchestra. Conductor Richard Church stopped and started the orchestra in accordance with developments and occasionally turned to the TV audience to discuss some phase of the music.

Rather extensive use was made of folk music, in such series as Wisconsin Is My Doorstep, The Play Tree, Song Pictures of America, and America in Verse and Song.

The Art of Listening was an informal music appreciation series in which fine recorded music was played, with the host and viewer listening together.

(d) Literature: In addition to the dramatic literature previously mentioned, other types of literature—stories and poetry—have been the subject of experimentation. Prof. Raymond Stanley, working with Professors Pooley and Glicksman, presented a number of poetry programs (Drama in Poetry, Drama of Poetry), and with Balladier Ed Sprague, presented a combination of poetry, picture, and song (America in Verse and Song).

During June 1957, Of Books and Such, a series of experimental programs using the informal panel quiz approach to literature was presented with promising results.

(e) Art: WHA–TV has made extensive use of television to bring current area art exhibits into the home. Program series known as Gallery and Arts in Revue presented portions of major exhibitions held in Madison. Paintings, ceramics, sculpture, and graphics were brought to the studio for televising, accompanied by comment by the artists or art experts. Exhibits have been transported to the studio from the Madison Free Library, Vocational School, School of Education, Memorial Library, and the Madison Savings & Loan Building. In some instances cameras have been taken directly to the galleries in the memorial union or historical library for on-the-spot television tours of the exhibits.

C. PROGRAM RESOURCES AND PARTICIPANTS

Another aspect of the experimental nature of WHA–TV has been reflected in a very active exploration of program resources of the State, university, and community, and a search for personnel who can effectively communicate on television. As indicated below, there has been extensive and widespread participation by many agencies and institutions.

1. State agencies

(a) University: The university serves as the main source of program originations for WHA–TV in accordance with its obligation to develop improved learning tools and techniques and to extend its benefits to the people of the State. Approximately 35 percent of the WHA–TV program originations during the first 3 years came from the university. Many departments and divisions participated, with the extension division as the main contributor. Other instructional units which made extensive contributions are: college of agriculture, school of home economics, school of music, department of speech, school of medicine, the department of athletics, the school of journalism, and the department of physical education—women.

Many faculty members participated in the form of occasional appearances and, in some cases, in sustained series. Such participation, with the exception of two series produced by the extension division, was on a voluntary basis without extra compensation or reduced teaching load.

University students participated by serving on camera crews, as panelists (Quiz the Professor), and as actors, musicians, readers, and dancers in a variety of broadcasts.

(b) State boards, commissions, departments: State agencies participated extensively, particularly during the first year, in exploring the potentials of television for their purposes. The Department of Agriculture and the Conservation Commission presented program series, and others presented several periodic broadcasts. Most of the participation was in a program entitled "At Your Service," a series designed to promote a better understanding of the functions and services of our State government.

* * * * *

2. Civic groups, quasi-official agencies, etc.

A variety of organizations and public service agencies contributed to the program service. These ranged from municipal institutions such as schools and libraries to local chapters of organizations such as the Red Cross, Boy Scouts of America, and the Association for Mental Health. The Men's Service Clubs of Madison took part in a series of seven programs under the title of "Civic Service." Some agencies produced complete series: State Medical Society (March of Medicine), and American Automobile Association (Wisconsin Weekend). The Madison Vocational and Adult School presented a continuing series of weekly half-hour programs throughout the school years 1955–56 and 1956–57 under the general title of "Living and Learning."

3. Federal agencies

Representatives of Government agencies, particularly agents of various agricultural branches, were frequent guests on WHA–TV programs. One series, Let's Go Shopping, was presented under the auspices of the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture.

A generous number of public service announcements, slides, and film clips were used in behalf of such agencies as Navy, Army, Air Force, and Marine recruitment, United States Treasury Department, Social Security Administration, Veterans' Administration, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

4. National and international agencies

Spot announcements and film clips were presented for many charitable and social service agency promotions: muscular dystrophy, mental health, crippled children, March of Dimes, etc.

Film program sources included the British Information Service, United Nations, India Information Service, and the National Film Board of Canada.

5. Educational television and radio center

The main source of educational TV programs is the Educational Television and Radio Center at Ann Arbor, Mich. The center acquires and distributes kinescopes and films to affiliated educational television stations across the Nation. It provided WHA–TV with an average of 5 hours of filmed programs per week (approximately a third of the schedule) and thus gave Madison area viewers the opportunity of seeing the best of the educational TV programs produced across the Nation. Many programs featured distinguished scholars, artists, musicians, and scientists who would otherwise be unavailable to the community.

In 1957, the center cooperated with the National Broadcasting Co. to present a live network program service to educational stations on the basis of 5 programs a week for 13 weeks. These and other center programs are listed in appendix A.

D. ADDITIONAL USES OF WHA–TV PROGRAMS

1. National distribution

Through the making and distribution of kinescope recordings (TV films) certain WHA–TV programs are given lasting value and extended use A notable example is the Friendly Giant, popular children's program originated by WHA–TV and currently broadcast by 18 educational stations throughout the country. Under a special arrangement with the Educational Television and Radio Center, the university laboratory has made 156 kinescopes of the Friendly Giant, thereby enabling other educational stations to broadcast the feature three times weekly for a year without repetition.

2. To Armed Forces overseas

During 1956 WHA–TV produced 12 programs in a series, the National Government, designed to show how our Government functions and to build better understanding of American democracy. The programs, produced in cooperation with the university extension division and the United States Department of Defense, are to be broadcast by television stations at military installations overseas and used as films for special study purposes by Armed Forces elsewhere.

3. Commercial stations

From the beginning the university extension division has made kinesope recordings of its television productions for distribution by the bureau of audiovisual instruction. These are available to commercial stations and have been broadcast by stations in Eau Claire, Green Bay, La Crosse, Madison, Marinette, Milwaukee, and Wausau.

4. Schools and study groups

Since a kinescope recording is actually a 16 mm. film, it can be used in classrooms and for adult group study wherever a projector is available. The bureau of audiovisual instruction lists eight series of WHA–TV programs in its 1957 film catalog.

E. AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Two WHA–TV-produced programs have been accorded recognition at the Annual Exhibition of Educational Radio and Television Programs conducted by Ohio State University at Columbus, Ohio.

The Friendly Giant won a first award in the children's out-of-school classification for 3 consecutive years, 1955-57. Quiz the Professor won an honorable mention in 1956 in the classification of public affairs programs.

Further recognition for WHA–TV came in the form of a contract from the Educational Television and Radio Center to produce 13 full-hour dramatic programs, Great Plays in Rehearsal, based on a trial series of four programs presented during the spring of 1956. This should result in a series of significant programs in an area hitherto unexplored by educational television stations.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN DIVISION OF RADIO-TELEVISION EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY RADIO-TELEVISION COMMITTEE

Henry L. Ewbank, department of speech (chairman).

Henry L. Ahlgren, associate director of agricultural extension.

Frederick W. Haberman, department of speech.

Glenn Koehler, department of electrical engineering.

Allan W. Ostar, university extension division.

Robert C. Pooley, department of integrated liberal studies.

Lindley J. Stiles, dean, school of education.

Robert Taylor, director, university news service.

Walter A. Wittich, school of education.

RADIO-TELEVISION INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

Harold B. McCarty, professor of radio-television education and director, division of radio-television education.

Robert N. Dick, coordinator, radio-television, university extension division.

S. Watson Dunn, associate professor of journalism and commerce.

Harold A. Engel, professor of radio-television education.

Henry L. Ewbank, professor of speech.

William G. Harley, professor of radio-television education.

Mrs. Aline W. Hazard, assistant professor of agricultural journalism.

Arlene McKellar, associate professor of radio-television education.

Jerry C. McNeely, assistant professor of speech.

Ordean G. Ness, assistant professor of speech.

Karl F. Schmidt, assistant professor of radio-television education.

James A. Schwalbach, associate professor of agricultural and extension education.

Raymond J. Stanley, associate professor of radio-television education.

John H. Stiehl, associate professor of radio-television education.

Robert Taylor, director, university news service; associate professor of journalism.

Donald J. Voegeli, assistant professor of radio-television education.

Roy C. Vogelman, associate professor of radio-television education.

Maurice E. White, associate professor of agricultural journalism.

Tight Money Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, during the year 1957 the Federal Reserve Board rapidly—and in my opinion recklessly—applied the tight money policy to the economy of the United States. Again Members of Congress called attention to the dangers which the policy invited. As a result, we are now in a recession. Unemployment is at its highest point in 8 years. Farm problems which have been severe have been made worse and the trek of farm families away from the farms where they can no longer make a living has been increased.

Housing construction, one of the greatest of the employers of labor, hit a postwar low in 1957. Capital expansion of industry is down. In many communities necessary schools could not be built. More and more small businesses have gone to the wall. In the last five months or more billions of dollars have been cut from the value of stocks listed on the stock exchanges.

The Federal Reserve System has made one belated cut in the rediscount rate. I notice recently that the interest rate on prime commercial paper has been reduced one small notch. Yet the basic interest rates have not come down enough nor fast enough to undo the damage which the tight money policy caused last year.

It is time, in my judgment, for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to admit that it went too far and too fast in committing this Nation to a system of scarce and high-priced money.

It has never seemed to me that the basic causes of the inflation which we have been going through would be cured by any tight-money policy. This has been proved by recent events. Money has been made tight and costly yet prices have not come down. On the contrary they have rapidly increased.

I doubt that there is a Member of the House who has returned to Washington free of concern about the current recession and its effect on the people the country over. In this connection I wish to quote briefly from an article by Richard A. Lester, professor of economics at Princeton University. In discussing the proposals by labor unions for wage increases this year as a tonic against recession, Professor Lester has this to say, and I quote:

> To organized labor, wage increases are taken as an economic cure-all for almost everything. The recent AFL–CIO convention passed a resolution declaring that "the very fact of an economic slackening makes it doubly imperative that unions gain sizable wage increases to bolster consumer buying power" and stimulate an upturn in the economy. That negotiation of substantial boosts

for labor would prevent and overcome a recession like the current one is, however, questionable. The growth of consumption has been a rather steady factor in our postwar economy. The big spurts and relapses have occurred mainly in capital outlays—for new plants and equipment, manufacturers' inventories, and housing. The high-interest, tight-money policy, badly overdone in the past year, has been particularly destructive here. And changing the tight-money policy is therefore likely to be a better cure than boosting wages.

This is the opinion of a seasoned expert. I commend it to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I suggest the times and the economic situation of the Nation demand a slackening of this "destructive" and "badly overdone" tight-money policy. It is within the power of the Federal Reserve Board to bring down interest rates at any time it pleases. That time is right now.

Free Trade or Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, commerce among nations is a very great and involved subject. It challenges even the experts. Even experts disagree. This, however, does not exempt or excuse any Member of Congress from giving the subject his most careful study and full consideration. Since trade with other nations may affect the very livelihood of many of our constituents, indeed the very economic well-being of the Nation, it becomes a subject that we must consider. The fact that it is difficult and involved does not excuse us from giving it our very best. We are going to determine during this session whether or not change is needed in our laws relating to trade with other countries, what those changes should be, and legislation that will effect them. Since the reciprocal-trade law is expiring, Congressional action is imperative.

TRADE WITH FRIENDLY COUNTRIES IS DESIRABLE

In the world we live in today, friendly nations, particularly those outside the Iron Curtain, should be more than ever eager to aid and assist each other. The strength and well-being of one is of interest to all. Our record in recent years bears abundant proof of our Nation's desire to be helpful to our neighbor nations. No nation in history can even approach our magnificent record in aiding, often at great sacrifice to ourselves, the nations that have been allied with us where we have had common cause in world affairs. Many feel that we have even gone too far along these lines. However, I know of no one in the Congress who would not be most willing to give aid to friendly nations if at the same time we were incurring no disadvantage to ourselves. I feel that our trade relations with other nations can and should be so conducted. Trade among nations is not different from trade among families. When families trade each party is convinced that the trade is surely not against the best interest of either; in fact, it is the rule that trade, when engaged in, is to the best interests of all parties. Such trade is truly desirable.

FREE TRADE IS UNFAIR

Trade may be of very great advantage to some but at the great disadvantage of others. Production costs vary in different countries. Currency values by which goods exchange and for which goods are produced, also vary in different countries. Living standards of workers, and also employers, also vary greatly in different countries. For these reasons there cannot be free trade and fair trade to all parties at the same time. The party in disadvantage is the nation with the highest standard of living, and as the nations are now constituted, this means our own. It is easy to see that American producers cannot compete in a free market, with a nation with lower living standards, lower labor costs, lower price levels, and hope to survive.

Some of the greatest potentially industrial nations now have a wage level even as low as one-tenth of that in the United States. Labor costs represent a substantial part of the cost of production. Obviously, the United States producer could not pay $100 for labor on a product where its competitor in a free market pays only $10. One does not need to be an expert to see this. Either America must lose that market, reduce its production costs, including the wages paid workers in order to meet the competition, or provide import controls to protect our own workers and our own industries. This fact is self-evident. It has been the same since the time when American business and American workers became better paid than the businesses and workers in these other nations. We have built this higher standard. We have proven it can be done. We have lived with it and by it for many years. We can, we should, and I trust we will maintain it.

We should trade freely as long as the imports coming into our markets do not harm a domestic industry. If and when an import item harms a domestic industry, then and there that import should be stopped. It seems to me that the national interest demands that this simple rule be applied. Those who cry for free trade, if they have their way will be commemorated by the graves of American industries that have been sacrificed. The way will be crowded with displaced American workers and their families who could not exist in free competition with those whose living standards were as low as one-tenth of their own.

THERE ARE MANY THINGS WE NEED TO IMPORT

There is a huge demand for many products that are not produced at all in the United States. There are other products where the production here is far short of our needs. Imports of such products are to our great advantage. They run into very great volume. To sell them here is a benefit to our neighbor country from whence they come. To be able to acquire and enjoy them is of great benefit to our people. Such international trade is most desirable. I believe every Member of Congress will agree. To this extent, then, I believe we might well—all of us—be termed pro-international trade. The strength of our economy and that of our friends may measure our ability to survive in this very highly competitive world. It may also measure the extent that we may continue to hold our high standard of living, and, if so, to what extent we may be able to increase and expand it. Trade among the nations to the extent that it is fair and beneficial to all parties is good and should be encouraged.

HOW ABOUT TRADE WITH THOSE WHO MAY NOT BE FRIENDLY?

Should we trade with our friends only? Or should trade be extended to include those nations which are not friends? If we should trade with our friendly neighbors, to what extent? How far should we go in an effort to influence our friends with regard to their trade with nations that are now somewhat unfriendly?

We hear so much these days about how necessary it is for our friendly neighbor, Japan, to export and that if we do not open our markets for more and more of her products, then, of necessity, she must sell to Communist Russia, or to Communist China. Well, just why should she not sell to Communist Russia? We do. Why should she not sell to Communist China? England does. We sell to England; England sells to Communist China. Why should we not sell also to Communist China? Why should not Japan sell to her near, though unfriendly, neighbor? Surely, if it is all right for England it should not be so wrong for Japan. Surely, also, it would be far better for us to see Japan selling to Communist Russia and China rather than to see imports from Japan destroying healthy industries and taking away thousands of well-paid jobs for American workers.

If we are to sacrifice, say a number of our own industries in order to support the economy of a friendly ally, we are being manifestly unfair with our own people. Why should one factory be doomed and its hundreds or even thousands of workers be forced into an existence on a Government sale?

Do the free traders think they can destroy important segments of our economy without endangering the general welfare? We may think we can operate or cause this injustice without affecting other industries, but things just do not work out that way. They tell us that industries like plywood, pottery, clothespins, textiles, chemicals, to name only a portion of them, are all expendable; that the workers in these industries should be taken under the protection of the Government and trained for other kinds of work and that the factories should be either let go or be converted into other types of production. They do not tell us, however, what other work the workers will be trained to perform.

They offer no hope for those workers who are somewhat advanced in years and are too old to be trained again to start out new in some other field. Who

will take the place of these millions of workers in the expendable plants in the lines of customers for homes, appliances, clothing, food, automobiles, and all of our other industries?

If the free traders have their way, we shall move into an economic debacle that will not only ruin those industries and workers which have so far been marked as expendable, but others will be drawn into the maelstrom and all will be definitely, and soon, very adversely affected.

IMPORTS SHOULD BE DEFINITELY LIMITED

Our market should be wide open to imports of all items that it will take which are not available from domestic producers. They should also be open to imports in those lines where domestic production does not meet the demand, up to the point where the imports do not adversely affect our domestic producers. Our market should be closed to all items that are produced in abundance by domestic producers.

Laws to protect our domestic economy are necessary. Such laws are fair. They permit us to engage in trade that is good for the United States of America. This should be our first and foremost consideration. If it is to our intelligent self-interest to aid the economies of friendly neighbor nations, then that aid does not penalize a segment of native industry by importing cheap substitutes to destroy them. This is what I mean by fair trade versus free trade. If our foreign trade is to be a part of our overall foreign policy, let it be fair to the hundreds of small industries that mean so much to our own citizens. Let it be tailored to serve the best interests of the United States as well as the interests of the nations with whom she trades. Let our commerce with the nations, our political arrangements, and our cultural activities, in fact all of our relationships with neighbor nations—friendly or otherwise—be tailored to be helpful to others but first, last, and all the time, be done to promote the general welfare of everyone in the United States of America. We can be the good neighbor to others. We can also be true to our own.

Ordeal by Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, hunger is still an immediate threat to the happiness, to the very survival, of millions of people in many parts of the world. I am convinced that our Government in the United States, which is uniquely blessed with a superabundance of food, has fallen far short of its opportunities to make our food really count in the efforts of humanity to establish the peaceful and prosperous world which ordinary people everywhere desire.

No one, in my estimation, better understands the opportunities which our agricultural abundance offers to this Nation than the able junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. He has written an article entitled "Ordeal by Hunger," for the fall 1957 issue of the Co-op Grain Quarterly, published by the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. Because of the extremely important observations the Senator makes regarding the national interest in wiser use of our agricultural resources, I ask unanimous consent to have the article published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ORDEAL BY HUNGER

(By Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY)

Food and fiber is a great potential force for freedom in the world today, an influential instrument with which we are blessed in abundance if we are only wise enough to use it for building toward friendship and peace.

That conclusion is inescapable after my recent tour of Italy, Egypt, Lebanon, Israel, Greece, and Spain.

Food is the common denominator of international life.

Lack of adequate food is the underlying factor in many of the economic and political problems bringing trouble to this area of the world.

The answer is in our hands. It rests in our own abundance, and our potential to produce in even more abundance if we have the vision and imagination to use it for human good.

I am convinced that Government policy has been too shortsighted about how powerful a factor sharing of our abundance of food and fiber can be in our foreign relations. A disserve has been done the American people by creating the impression our abundance was just an unwanted headache, a problem instead of a blessing.

We need to do an about-face. We need to look upon our great agricultural production and productive capacity as a source of strength in the world scene. Instead of telling farm families to quit producing—or forcing them to do so by deliberately depressing farm prices and income to seek scarcity as a cold economic answer to a human problem—we as a nation should say "thank God" for the farmers who have kept us from the deprivation and hunger facing vast areas of the world. We should see that our farm people are properly rewarded for making available to our Nation not only the means of visibly expressing our humanitarian concern for fellow mankind everywhere—but also giving us a tremendous bargaining power in growing economic warfare against Communist Russia.

American food and fiber is vital to the very existence of millions of undernourished people—and the brightest ray of hope for building stronger economies and greater political stability in most of the countries I visited.

I wish every American farmer who has been told he must drastically cut down his production could have walked with me through the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon, the orphanages in Greece, or among the masses of unemployed huddled in shanty towns in Spain. I wish they could have seen the young hands outstretched for food.

I wish our farmers could have been with me in Italy to hear our own Embassy officials flatly declare that our country's most effective weapon against communism in that area had been the distribution of American food directly to the people by our church and other voluntary agencies.

I wish, too, they could have been along to hear Spanish officials explain how they had been trying in vain to buy 500,000 tons of wheat from America and now faced bread rationing as a result of our inaction. I wish all of you could have heard that story repeated in Israel, Greece, and other lands.

But most of all I wish one could have been along to give me a better answer than I could provide to this question I encountered at every turn:

How can a great nation like the United States justify spending a billion dollars paying farmers not to produce, and yet quibble about paying them to produce for our friends and allies who so urgently need that food?

No one who has walked in the midst of mass want and deprivation as I did, could ever face the American farmers and talk about surplus.

Believe me, there is no surplus—unless it is a surplus of people who need the life-giving benefits of the blessings of food we have to bestow.

It isn't a question of just a gigantic give-away.

Most of the food and fiber can be marketed for foreign currencies, if we expand and extend Public Law 480. Countries want to buy—but they lack American dollars.

We have uses for foreign currencies to finance economic development loans to other countries, to pay our own obligations abroad, for military procurement, and for many other purposes. We can do more for peace by using such funds obtained with American food to finance vocational education, for example, than we can by just shipping guns or handing over American dollars.

We can use our foods to form the foundation of an entire new foreign and economic trade policy for American business and industry—and achieve many of our foreign policy objectives at less cost.

We have had lots of lipservice to trade, not aid, but little concrete action. One of the objectives of our foreign policy has been to encourage American business and industry to invest abroad, to use its know-how, to help build economies of other free countries—and to keep the Soviet orbit from making neutral countries dependent on them for industrial products.

Our business firms tell us they have problems borrowing foreign currencies for capital investments and operating expenses abroad. Why doesn't it make good sense to earmark a part of the funds received from sale of American farm products, for loans to American business enterprises with branches or affiliates abroad?

Such a policy serves dual purposes: It broadens America's economic and trade influence in the world, and it throws the support of American business and industry behind a farm program based on abundance instead of scarcity.

I talked with American businessmen abroad, and with more since my return. They would welcome such a plan, and would vigorously support expansion of farm marketing for foreign currencies.

In effect, we would be turning our farm abundance, beyond our domestic needs and normal dollar exports, into a big revolving loan fund to finance most of our foreign-aid operations as well as American business expansion abroad. We would be loaning the money, and drawing interest on it, instead of giving outright dollar grants. The dollars we as a nation invested to create such a program, would be going to American producers of farm products—but the benefits would be shared by everyone, at home and abroad.

On the humanitarian side, beyond food sales, we can and should do more to support the work of our great church and philanthropic agencies such as CARE.

Whether we give or sell our food abundance, let's not cheapen it by labeling it surplus, calling it a problem, and advertising to the world that we really do not care about

hungry people—we just want to get rid of something we do not want.

Even Russia is smarter than that. After we had refused to sell Egypt any of our wheat, despite all our talk about surplus, they turned to Russia. At first Moscow said they doubted they could do it—they needed all the wheat they had. Then they came back to the Egyptians saying, in effect, "Here—we haven't much, but we will share it with you." They sent a shipload or so of wheat—and ballyhooed it into a major propaganda victory.

We have allies overseas who we are depending upon, under NATO, to hold the line of freedom in event of another all-out war. Yet these are in food deficit countries, where armies would collapse without continuing supplies of food from abroad.

Everywhere you turn—among diplomats, among military leaders, among businessmen, among social and welfare workers—the answer comes back the same: food. Food can be a vital key to success or failure in our foreign relations.

Are we recognizing that fact?

Jewish Contributions to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered before the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York at a dinner in my honor on December 15, 1957:

ADDRESS BY HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES, DECEMBER 15, 1957

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very grateful for the opportunity to be here with you today. I am also grateful for the opportunity to see so many of my friends, as well as the opportunity to exchange a few thoughts and opinions with you.

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies and its scope of activities is well known to me for many years. Many of my Jewish friends have spoken to me with great pride of your work and achievements in human welfare. And you have much to be proud of in this work of unselfish service to others. Charity is one of the basic foundations of a free and humane civilization. The great sages and the inspiring works of your faith, as of mine, have emphasized it strongly.

The late Albert Einstein once said: "Only a life lived for others is a life worth while." And someone else put this thought in these words: "Give to the world the best you have, and the best will come back to you." The ideal of service to others, aside from its practical purposes, is sometimes more rewarding to the spirit of the giver than to the recipient. So in this sense, I wish to extend to all of you my deep appreciation for the service you are rendering to the less fortunate of your kinsmen. And with the approach of a new year, I pray that the year ahead may be a successful one for your endeavors, and may you go from strength to strength.

In times such as these, when the free world is threatened by tyranny and the enslavement of humanity, I believe it is of utmost importance for us to underscore the spirit of American freedom and the part played by the various minority and nationality groups in strengthening our freedoms and building America to its present greatness. At the moment, of course, I am thinking of the honorable role played by the Jews of this country in helping to make America strong and to enrich American democracy.

In the past 300 years, since that day in September of 1654 when the first group of Jews numbering 23 souls in search of freedom landed at New Amsterdam, Jews have helped to build this country and have helped it attain its position of leadership in nearly all human endeavors. Together with their neighbors, Jews have worked to attain freedom of religion, to establish their rights to citizenship, to share in building and defending the communities in which they lived. Throughout these three centuries, they have been part and parcel of America, just as have all other who sought refuge along these friendly shores.

The record, for anyone who cares to consult it, is one of remarkable contributions on the part of American Jews to the well-being, the growth, and the preservation of the United States as the foremost democratic nation in the world. In countless ways have the Jews helped to advance this Nation on the road to a strong and secure bulwark of freedom. The American Jewish community, numbering some 5½ million people, is proud of the role that the Jews of today and their forebears in the past have played in the arts and sciences, in industry and commerce, in cultural and intellectual enlightenment, in religious toleration, in politics and statesmanship, and last but not least on the field of battle in defense of American honor and security.

We have been taught from our earliest days that democracy is the rule of the majority. That is true, but I prefer to see it in another way. To me, democracy also represents the zealous protection of the rights of the minority—and basically each one of us in this country belongs to some minority: because of racial descent, national origin, religious belief, economic position, political adherence, social status, or geographic location. The founders of this Nation recognized this situation and, therefore, they adopted the Bill of Rights which is the basis for all our civil rights and civil liberties.

Whether we be rich or poor, foreign-born or native, white or Negro, Christian, or Jew, northerner or southerner, Democrat, or Republican, we enjoy these rights alike. Destroy the rights of any one American, and the rights of all Americans are at once jeopardized. We all have certain inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To make it more specific, I would say we all have the right to worship God according to our conscience, the right to earn a livelihood and live in dignity, the right to an education that will develop our talents and capacities to serve our country and fellowmen. These are minimum rights and privileges. Anyone who attempts to deny those rights to any American is betraying our past and present, and undermining our future.

America means unity, not divisive activity. We must have unity of purpose, as well as unity of the people. In the world in which we live we must see our goals ahead with clarity and understanding, otherwise we shall all be doomed. We cannot afford the luxury of casting aspersions on one group or another in our midst, whether it be Negroes, Jews, Italians, Irish, or any other group. This is a time when we must stand together, shoulder to shoulder, under the banner of liberty, in defense of our way of life as opposed to Communist enslavement.

The Jews of America have throughout our Nation's history been a force for unity. American history is replete with many examples of Jewish men and women who have rendered dedicated and unselfish service to this country in times of war and peace. I do not want to overburden you with many names, but allow me to mention just a few who helped write golden pages in American history:

Isaac Franks, who was aide de camp to Gen. George Washington during the Revolutionary War with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Haym Salomon, a Polish Jew, who helped finance Washington's army.

Judah P. Benjamin, a Senator from Louisiana and an outstanding leader of the Confederacy during the Civil War.

Emma Lazarus, the great poetess, whose poem The New Colossus is engraved on the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty.

David Belasco, the pioneer of the American theater.

Joseph Pulitzer and Adolph S. Ochs, who by their achievements in journalism have helped to fully realize the freedom of the press in this country.

Samuel Gompers, who built the American labor movement to its present position of influence.

Supreme Court Justices Louis D. Brandeis, Benjamin N. Cardozo, and Felix Frankfurter, who have rendered great service in our highest tribunal in the land.

Bernard Baruch, the elder statesman and adviser of American Presidents.

And, of course, our very beloved former Governor of New York and former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, whose record of public service is unmatched.

Need I mention more such names? You know them as well as I do. You can find them in any book on American history. But what does all this prove? Simply this: That in a democracy such as ours, where the rights of all citizens are recognized and protected, the Jews have made significant contributions in every field of human endeavor. Where given the opportunity, the Jews contributed of their brain and brawn and have helped make America what it is today—the greatest democratic nation on earth and the spokesman for freemen everywhere. What is true regarding the role of the Jews is also true regarding every other minority group in this country. All of them share alike in their efforts and responsibilities, in their duties and achievements, in their loyalty and patriotism.

Bigotry against one group is a threat to all others. Practicing discrimination and intolerance against Jews, will eventually affect Catholics and Negroes, Italians and Poles. It will affect us all and will poison our hearts and minds at a time when we need unity most, in order to form a common front against a common enemy who is threatening our land, our way of life, our whole future.

Ours is a plural democracy. It is perhaps one of the greatest sources of strength for this country which consists of so many different and varied groups, each of them contributing of its best, culturally, economically, politically, morally, and in every other way. Those who preach racial and religious intolerance do not understand the meaning and the goals of America—genuine understanding, mutual cooperation, and common brotherhood.

Let me conclude with this little story. It is told that when God made the oyster, He provided him with absolute economic security. He built the oyster a house, a shell, to protect him against his enemies. When the oyster is hungry, he simply opens his shell and food rushes in for him. But when God made the eagle, He told him: "The blue sky is your limit. Go, find your own shelter and build your own home." And so the eagle builds his nest on the highest mountain crag, where wind and storm threaten him all the time. For food he has to fly long distances through rain, snow, wind, and cold.

My friends, when America had to select a national emblem, it selected the eagle, not

the oyster. And since then our limit, too, has been the sky. Like the eagle, we are not frightened by winds and storms. We have found shelter and food, we have built this land to its present glory, we even have enough to share with other nations. But all this was achieved only through cooperation and unity and understanding. It would not have been possible otherwise. Let us continue in that same spirit. Let each of us contribute to the best of his ability as in the past toward a strong, a safe, and a secure America for all.

An Immigration Policy for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 16, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I will make before the American Council of Jewish Women, Friday, January 17, 1958:

AN IMMIGRATION POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

Please do not ascribe to me any wish to flatter when I tell you, with utmost sincerity, that I consider the Council of Jewish Women one of the most intelligent, perceptive, and forward-looking groups on the American scene today. I know how painstakingly the council's representatives—and this I know from my own personal experience—keep abreast of affairs in Washington, scrutinize the bills, educate themselves on the pros and cons of the vital issues before the Congress. The council could never be accused—as so many groups can easily be accused—of trying to squeeze or stretch the facts to fit a preconceived notion.

That is why, knowing that the opinions of the council are informed opinions, I welcome this opportunity to talk to you freely, without the sense of being irked by the necessity to please.

The subject of an immigration policy for the United States is one, I sometimes feel, that has been drowned by a deluge of words. There is none of us who has been intimately concerned with the liberalization of our immigration policy who has not, at one time or another, felt that whatever observations we can make have long since become trite and platitudinous. Emma Lazarus' inscription on the Statue of Liberty has been quoted so often that even the most ardent supporters of good immigration legislation must cringe at its sound.

Let us make no mistake; this is a danger. Too many of us get weary of the old subjects, tired of the old tune, not realizing, of course, that we must go on talking, must go on agitating, must go on sponsoring, because the remedy—the just and right remedy—has not as yet been supplied. This is precisely what has happened in the whole area of refugee relief. People grew weary of the refrain. Then we enter into a new phase of the battle: To battle the apathy that follows the weariness.

This is always the danger point: The flagging of enthusiasm that ends inevitably in retreat. And yet the fact of the refugee is an inescapable fact of contemporary history. Geographical partition produces refugees. Political divisions produce refugees. Supernationalist movements produce refugees. And, tired as we may be of the story, the refugee exists, and to turn aside in weariness will not erase the fact of his existence.

This Congress enacted, in the first session, a modest immigration law which will benefit, it is estimated roughly, some 80,000 aliens, among them orphans, close relatives of United States citizens, those afflicted with tuberculosis, those who were guilty of misrepresentation of facts, and a small measure of relief for those escaping from Communist or Communist-dominated countries and the Middle East. The question then remains, having taken this step forward, How much further will the Congress go?

I am not clairvoyant and do not presume to know. But I do know what is unfavorable and what is favorable in the climate which could or could not produce changes in the immigration law. I know that approximately two-thirds of the Congress are against change; particularly, they are opposed to any change in the national origins system.

I know, too, that there will be a different argument used this time to uphold the national origins system. Spokesmen against change will move away from its heaviest emphasis on possible subversives, and even away from the argument of inability of southern Europeans to assimilate easily into our culture. The argument is shifting to what will undoubtedly be termed "problems of overpopulation." It will be pointed out that we already have a population of some 170 million; that in about 20 years the population of the United States will increase by some 60 million; that the pattern of large families will continue; that our schools are overcrowded, to put it mildly; that our hospitals are already inadequate for our growing population; that automation is and will continue at accelerating pace to displace American workers; that increased population—either through natural increase or through immigration—will increase demands which, in turn, will increase inflation because productivity will not catch up with such demands.

It will be argued that immigrants almost invariably settle in cities already populated beyond the point of comfort, adding to congestion and, hence, contributing to delinquency. It will be argued that immigrants do not settle on farms where population is decreasing.

These, I believe, will be the main burden of the refrain. These arguments will have to be answered and I maintain that all these assertions can be rationally met.

I would like to make one modification. I have seen growing evidence of the adoption of these arguments by former proponents of liberal immigration. I have been told that some groups would be willing to settle for the change from a 1920 census base to a 1950 census base, a redistribution of unused quotas, and a modification of some of the deportation provisions. They have based their conclusions on the arguments I have just given you. I have been advised that they will stop pressing for the departure from the national origins system.

What I cannot understand is the perfectly obvious flaw in this kind of reasoning. Assuming for a moment—and I, for one, do not make such assumption—that increased immigration is at this time against the best national interests, what in the name of sanity has that to do with discrimination in public law? If the United States admits 2, 5, 25, or 250,000, must they not be admitted on an equality of selection? Must they not be admitted on criteria that apply to all peoples, regardless of race, color, or creed? We must be prepared to meet these arguments, not with heat, but with light.

Hearings on my bill, H. R. 3364, will be held early in this session. It may be that the council will be among the groups to testify. I ask you to depart from exhortation and generalization and denunciation, and to concentrate on meeting the arguments I have given above. The arguments must be based on America's imperative need to be, above all, just to all people. The argument must be based on America's absorptive capacity. The argument must be lodged in facts and figures on America's new industry, on our decreasing pool of skilled and unskilled workers. The American image has been badly damaged upon our insistence on the retention of the national origins system.

If sputnik has caused us to lose face and threatens to drive noncommitted nations into the eastern camp, then how many years have we had of losing face among the noncommitted nations when America's basic immigration law says that one group of people is more desirable than another?

I believe that what we have to seek to establish at this point is not so much an unrealistic increase in numbers permitted to enter the United States, but the reassertion in our immigration law of the American principle of equality of opportunity for all, regardless of race, color, or creed. I believe it can be shown that the rigid quota system applied to Europe, Asia, or Africa, yet removed from the Western Hemisphere, has resulted in weakening the argument that some persons assimilate easily and others not at all.

Some 49,000 Mexicans enter the United States each year, as against approximately 210,000 from Europe, Asia, and Africa all together. I have seen no injury to America from the Mexican influx, nor has it been a subject for comment by any of our immigration restrictionists. I merely point this out to show the fallacy of the restrictionists' thinking when it is based on a pretended homogeneity of the American people.

Around the sixth century, A. D., when few Europeans could write, the Chinese had already invented paper. Later, they invented the printing press. There is no such thing as white race supremacy. Centuries before America was discovered, when Europe was still a continent of barbarians, other peoples of many races found better ways of living. Arabs invented numerals, the Phoenicians the alphabet and money, the Chaldeans astronomy. The Celts invented the wheel plow. The Chinese invented the compass, and porcelain. Yet, strangely, these very races are unfairly dealt with in our immigration statutes.

This is the kind of testimony we will need, indeed, must have. Let the facts speak rather than emotion, for emotion only engenders emotion in turn, and consequently we go around and around the same circle as we have done these many years.

You will agree that limits must be set; not all will agree as to what those limits should be. For my part, I seek to have established a total annual quota of 250,000. I have based this on the average number of immigrants actually admitted into the United States within the last decade. My new bill, in most aspects, is similar to the legislation introduced in the 84th Congress and known as the Celler-Lehman bill, but I have extensively revised the earlier bill in its two most significant areas.

In retaining the basic features of the Celler-Lehman bill, I am, of course, proposing the elimination of the discriminatory features of the present law. Under my proposal, there will be no discrimination based on national origin or race, and there will be no classification of United States citizens into two categories, native-born and naturalized. There will be no additional grounds for loss of United States citizenship by naturalized citizens except those that apply to native-born citizens.

All provisions of the present law which permit its retroactive application in deportation proceedings have been eliminated in my

bill. Similarly, all of the unduly harsh provisions applicable now in exclusion proceedings have been humanized in my proposal. I have provided for a full and unlimited judicial review of administrative decisions made in all immigration and naturalization processes, including deportation and entry, and I have retained all the humanitarian provisions of the Celler-Lehman bill designed to prevent the separation of families. I have made the provisions applicable to suspension of deportation more human by eliminating the stiff restrictions of the present law in removing the requirement that suspension of deportation could be granted only if it would cause what the present law refers to as "exceptionally and extremely unusual hardship."

The revised features of my new bill pertain to what I believe is the heart of our immigration policy, namely (1) our quota system, and (2) jurisdiction over immigration.

The bill I am offering contains a new formula for the distribution of quota immigrant visas. This is a new formula devised for the first time since 1921, not based on national origins and not depending on any "nose count" of the United States population.

Wives, husbands, and minor children of United States citizens will continue to be admitted as nonquota immigrants, but I have added to the non-quota-class parents of United States citizens and professors of academic schools.

In an attempt to make the new quota flexible in order to permit the United States to adjust its intake of immigrants in enlightened self-interest to the fast changing political, economic, and social situation of the world, under my new proposal our annual quota will be distributed among five classes of immigrants without regard to national origin, race, or any results of the United States census, as follows: (1) Family unification, (2) occupational class, (3) refugee asylum class, (4) national interest class, and (5) resettlement class.

Within each of the 5 classes, no more than 15 percent of the annual allocation could be issued to inhabitants of any single country. Here is how the annual distribution of the overall immigration quota will be established: Each year the President of the United States, after consulting with the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, and with the Attorney General, would submit to the Congress, prior to March 1, the proposed allocation for each of the 5 classes, and Congress will have 60 days following the submission of the President's proposal to disapprove it by passing a concurrent resolution. If the proposal is not disapproved by the Congress, it would take effect on the first day of the fiscal year immediately following. If the Congress disagrees with the President, the allocation effective in the preceding fiscal year would automatically become effective.

In order to get the joint executive-legislative responsibility for the annual distribution of the total immigration quota started, I propose that the first Presidential allocation plan shall reach the Congress within 6 months immediately following the enactment of my bill and if agreement is not reached on this first Presidential proposal, the total annual quota of 250,000 would be simply cut across the board so as to give each of the 5 classes 20 percent of the total. This interim allocation would, of course, be valid for the first fiscal year of operations, pending the submission of the next Presidental proposal which, again, will be subject to Congressional disapproval.

My main purpose in proposing this flexible distribution of a permanently fixed annual quota is to permit the President to decide—on a year-to-year basis—with Congressional concurrence, whether it is desirable in any particular year to grant more immigrant visas to relatives of United States citizens or to, say, refugees, or to, perhaps, immigrants possessing special skills needed in the United States at that particular time, or to any of the other classes.

The 15 percent permanent limitation affecting the participation of any single country in the distribution of the fivefold allocation is, in my opinion, a sufficient guaranty that no unfair distribution of visas for the benefit of inhabitants of one particular country would be practicable.

The second revised feature of my bill affects the administration of the law. Under the present law, we have a two-headed system where officials of the Department of State issue visas to both immigrants and nonimmigrants abroad, while officials of the Department of Justice determine at ports of entry whether the holders of visas are admissible to the United States. This is an antiquated, cumbersome, and expensive system. It creates anxiety and uncertainty in the minds of the immigrants and nonimmigrants alike, and it causes friction between two governmental agencies operating independently in the same field and stepping on each other's toes.

Under my proposal, the entire administration of our immigration and nationality laws will be placed in the hands of a Director of Bureau of Immigration and Citizenship, who will be an Assistant Attorney General, subject to confirmation by the Senate. His officers, acting as immigration attachés, will be stationed at our consulates abroad and will issue immigrant and nonimmigrant visas after a finding is made that the recipient of a visa is found to be eligible actually to enter the United States.

In addition to simplification of procedures and elimination of dual standards, as well as uncertainty in the minds of immigrants or foreign visitors, my proposal will automatically open visa issuance to administrative review in the Department of Justice by the well-qualified and trusted Board of Immigration Appeals. The issuance of diplomatic visas will, of course, remain a function of diplomatic officers of the Department of State.

I believe that the administrative system which I propose will not only provide for a more efficient and more equitable issuance of visas abroad, but that it will also bring a great saving to the American taxpayer.

I have every reason to believe that the hearings on immigration will be both intensive and extensive. Twenty-eight Members of Congress have followed me in the introduction of this bill, which is, in itself, a most heartening fact. However, be it noted that the greatest majority of those who introduced identical legislation come from the heavily populated States. While it is reasonable to expect that these States, having benefited from immigration, would be most liberal in immigration matters, it is an indication of the educational work that must be done in the Midwest, Western, and Southern States.

If we, the proponents of liberalized immigration law, do our homework, defer to reason and not passion, drop the name calling which only serves to antagonize and strengthen the opposition, we can, through the forthcoming hearings, if nothing more, at least start the ball rolling toward an immigration law that will do honor to us and proclaim an effective and working democracy to those abroad.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1958

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

God of the living and of the living dead, amid all the tensions of these days which, with their vast issues, demand our utmost that freedom may endure, there come to us constant reminders, as comrades vanish from our side and sight, that swift to its close ebbs out life's little day.

We think gratefully today of a colleague who has passed through the door called death to a larger room of service and progress. As a Member of this body for a long span by our reckoning, he served his State and the Nation and this Capital City. Thou knowest that with faith undimmed, with valor and unbowed head, he met the inroads of bodily affliction.

We remember today his vivid personality; his rugged belief in government not of the elect, but of the elected; his uncompromising candor; his hatred of cant and hypocrisy; his unbroken loyalty to the welfare of the toilers for more abundant life. We are conscious, now that his voice is stilled, of those qualities which bound him as with bands of steel to those who labored by his side.

Emulating our fallen comrade, in a dark day when so many lights have gone out, may we join those who, refusing to curse the darkness, light the candles of faith and hope. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 16, 1958, was dispensed with.

JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order, and I request its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed order will be read.

The order was read, as follows:

Ordered, That in the event the Economic Report of the President is transmitted to the Senate today prior to the adjournment, the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD without reading and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Economic Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is entered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.