

rose as they actually did during this 10-year period. Where would the steel industry stand today?

"Well, on the basis of official, published figures, it would be more than \$21 billion in the red.

"The steel industry would have operated in the red in 9 out of the 10 years. Its losses in 1955 and 1956, taken together, would have been at least equal to the entire sum spent by the industry for its postwar expansion.

"Of course, none of this could have actually happened, since the whole industry would have been bankrupt long before it could have accumulated a deficit of this size. The shipments could never have been made since the plants which made the shipments possible could never have been built. Failure to recover costs would have prevented expansion.

"Steel prices, like any other prices, must reflect increases in the cost of doing business, including wages—or you go out of business."

To show up the absurdity of any significant wage increase coming out of profits you need only compare the size of a 5-percent increase in wages with total corporate profits. In the highest year on record, 1950, such a wage increase would take about 20 percent of all corporate profits before taxes.

A squeeze like that on profits would have three inevitable effects: It would stop investment cold, lower productivity, and increase unemployment. And that, I submit, is hardly the pattern of progress or the way to strengthen our economy.

The mystery is why anyone would think wages should come out of profits in the first place. The result is to pinch off a

principal source of additions to productive power. And, since the only way we can hope to live better is if we produce more for our national warehouse, then the minute we take from profits we are, in effect, subtracting from living standards.

So, I think it is time we replace confusion with understanding of the real source of our economic strength. And the time is over-ripe for us to end the squabble over dividing what we have and get on about the business of multiplying more for the great number of our people.

For one thing, we can cease trying to get more by taking it from someone else. In particular, I mean trying to take from profits to put into wage envelopes. No one really gains in that attempt—least of all the workman. As unemployment increases, production drops and progress halts. Instead of raising costs, prices, and the cost of living, let us rather raise productivity, progress, and the standard of living.

That is what we all want. A balanced overall movement forward with wages, profits, and productivity going up in and not out of step. And I am confident that this is well within our abilities, despite the marking time we may have to do this year as inventories are pared down.

Ahead of us is a new era—a space age as some call it. It will be a time of tremendous technological change. In my opinion we are just now at the doorstep of a new warehouse for America. One that can be filled with greater wealth, more new things from more new processes in the next 5 years than we have ever seen before in our history.

As the result of research and development financed by American industry because profits made it possible to do so, there is a

great backlog of new ideas, theories, and principles building up in our Nation's laboratories. To translate them into new jobs, factories, machines, and finished products will require tremendous new investments.

Those investments, however, will not be forthcoming unless a real incentive—a prospect of profit—entices investment. And, unless those investments are made we will, indeed, slip behind the Russians. Not just in single, spectacular scientific achievements, but in the real race we are running and in which our free system far excels their slave system. I mean our success in providing better living standards and an opportunity for a better life for more people.

Let us admit and have done with it that the Russians have impressed the world. But, let us also recognize that they have done so with a policy of fear and an instrument of terror. I think we would much rather be what we are, the encouragement of a world yearning for freedom and for a better life in peace to enjoy useful progress.

Lincoln said it for us a long time ago. Speaking on Washington's birthday in 1861 at Independence Hall, he referred to the inner meaning of the Declaration of Independence as "giving liberty not alone to the people of this country but hope to the world for all future time."

That hope was never needed more than in the year 1958. We provide it as we stand together, adhere to and apply those economic principles which can make America stronger than ever in a greater age of progress than any so far known. For that goal and to keep alive that hope of all men for a free, undivided world at peace, we stand together—or fall.

Thank you.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1958

(Legislative day of Monday, February 10, 1958)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Bishop V. J. Brizgys, auxiliary of Kauanas, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the common father of all people, we praise Thee and give thanks for the dignity bestowed on men created in Thy likeness and who call themselves Thy children and each other's brothers.

We pray for all those who, understanding this dignity, were and are harbingers of culture, peace, mutual love, and respect among people and nations. Today we wish to pay tribute to all those who, having understood the dignity of man, were and are pioneers of freedom for people and nations.

Today, too, we remember a nation whose name has been mentioned among European nations from days beyond recall, and which time and again has served Europe's Christianity and civilization by crushing dangerous forces that threatened to destroy it. We remember Lithuania, which in her long history has tasted of glory and misfortune, and which today has lost her freedom. She hopes and strives to regain this freedom. In her sufferings, she has not been left alone. A whole world of good will sympathizes with Lithuania and other unfortunate nations. Lithuania thanks

Thee, O Lord, especially for the friendship of the United States of America, whose motto is In God We Trust, whose way of life is freedom, and who, being the most progressive and dynamic nation, is at the same time a pioneer of true peace and freedom for other nations. Almighty God, we beseech Thee to bless and protect this Nation, that it might be a servant of Thy divine providence in establishing in the world an order worthy of the dignity which Thou hast bestowed on man.

We pray to Thee for the Lithuanian nation, which for centuries has held dear and has protected Thy greatest gift—freedom; and which today, bowed under the yoke of bondage, cries to Thee and to all people of good will for help. She wishes to live and work in a family of free nations for her own and mankind's welfare.

O Lord, bless America, bless Lithuania, and bless all other nations who trust in Thee and strive to create life in Thy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Monday, February 10, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

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

on February 12, 1958, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1408) to provide allowances for transportation of house trailers to civilian employees of the United States who are transferred from one official station to another.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore 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 Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States: In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 1958.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7300. An act to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act;

H. R. 9271. An act to authorize the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to use certain real estate in the

District of Columbia as the national headquarters of such society; and

H. R. 9304. An act to amend section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916, as amended.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 7300. An act to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act;

H. R. 9271. An act to authorize the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to use certain real estate in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of such society; and

H. R. 9304. An act to amend section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916, as amended.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, with statements in connection therewith limited to 3 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

CONSERVATION OF WATER RESOURCES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the insurance of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and the act of August 28, 1937, as amended (relating to the conservation of water resources), and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Cooperative Extension Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON RESERVE FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of training of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the progress made in strengthening of the Reserve components during the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight training program, covering the period August 1, 1956 to January 1, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (with an ac-

companying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND

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

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the effects of defense expansion of machine tool supply upon the competitive status of the machine tool industry, dated February 10, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION (IN LIQUIDATION) AND DEFENSE LENDING DIVISION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation) and Defense Lending Division, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS RELATING TO RESTORATION OF BALANCES OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prior to restoration of balances, Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, as of January 14, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, four reports prior to restoration of balances under the appropriation and fund accounts "Salaries and expenses, Commodity Exchange Authority, 1957", "Salaries and expenses, Farmers' Home Administration, 1957", "Salaries and expenses, Farmers' Home Administration, 1956", and "Salaries and expenses, Farmers' Home Administration, prior years" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prior to restoration of balances requesting restoration of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and Expenses" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN STATUTES UNDER THE NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD AND MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration, for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that committee, for the period January 1-December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

A letter from the Under Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR 1961 MEETING OF PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF NAVIGATION CONGRESSES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation of funds to finance the 1961 meeting of the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"Assembly Joint Resolution 1

"Relating to memorializing the Congress of the United States to undertake immediate action to make upward adjustments in the pay scales of key personnel in the Armed Forces in the interest of national defense

"Whereas the events of recent months and particularly those involving the extraordinary advances, by the potential enemies of our country and of the Free World, in the development of the most terrifying of military destructive weapons including thermonuclear bombs, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and other devices, clearly point up the need for immediate action to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of our military defense forces; and

"Whereas it is a matter of common knowledge that the inability of the various branches of the Armed Forces to retain highly trained personnel in the services has for many years been a key factor in reducing the effectiveness of such forces in providing both the United States of America and the Free World with efficient and effective defensive forces; and

"Whereas the inability of the Armed Forces of the United States to operate to provide an efficient defense where highly trained personnel are not given the remunerative incentive to remain in the service for a period beyond that of their original enlistment is illustrated by published statistical data including the fact that in 1955 the Air Force lost men who cost \$2 billion to train; that the cost of training an electronics expert is \$20,000, that the time needed to train him is 3 years, and that 90 percent of these individuals leave the service after their 4-year enlistments, having given the Government but 1 year of expert service during their enlistment; and the fact that such turnover has resulted in a disproportionate expenditure of available moneys on the training of a continuous stream of newly recruited personnel at the expense of having to

forgo concentration on the development of new weapons and techniques; and

"Whereas the need for increased efficiency in the Armed Forces and the peril created by deficiencies in that regard is particularly apparent to the people of the State of California, which is the most vulnerable of all the States of the Union, with its great population centers bottled up by natural barriers, where prompt escape is virtually impossible; and

"Whereas this State is the cradle of the electronics, missile, and airframe industries; and

"Whereas it is common knowledge that the greatest potential enemy of this Nation now possesses at least 400 missile-launching submarines capable of completely annihilating this State in the matter of a few minutes; and

"Whereas the legislature of this State deems the matter of such importance and urgency that no further delay of any kind can be countenanced; and

"Whereas the legislature is informed that the military establishment is in desperate need of a means to attract and retain scientific, professional, combat leadership, and management to maintain its deterrent power, and cannot presently compete for trained personnel, and that these deficiencies can best be removed by the passage of Federal legislation such as that proposed by S. 2014 and H. R. 7475, introduced at the first session of the 85th Congress, and H. R. 9979 which has been introduced at the second session of the 85th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That because of the gross vulnerability of the State of California and the fact that time is of the essence, that the President and the Congress of the United States make consideration of the necessary steps to increase the salaries of servicemen a matter of top priority and bring about the necessary changes at the earliest possible time; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to prepare and transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 20

"Memorializing Congress concerning establishment in California of a soil and water conservation laboratory

"Whereas the Congress of the United States will be considering the establishment of soil and water conservation laboratories in the irrigated areas of the United States; and

"Whereas there is a great interest throughout California's extensive agricultural community in research into problems relating to soil and water management and conservation; and

"Whereas an excellent location for such a conservation laboratory exists at the Davis Campus of the University of California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the State of California, That Congress is again respectfully memorialized to consider the great need for such laboratories; and be it further

"Resolved, That Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture are urged to provide necessary land at or near the Davis Campus of the University of California upon which a conservation laboratory may be established and maintained; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of

this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate in the Congress of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 19

"Resolution memorializing Congress concerning establishment in California of a soil and water conservation laboratory

"Whereas the Congress of the United States will be considering the establishment of soil and water conservation laboratories in the irrigated areas of the United States; and

"Whereas there is a great interest throughout California's extensive agricultural community in research into problems relating to soil and water management and conservation; and

"Whereas, an excellent location for such a conservation laboratory exists at the Davis Campus of the University of California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Assembly of the State of California, That Congress is again respectfully memorialized to consider the great need for such laboratories; and be it further

"Resolved, That Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture are urged to provide necessary land at or near the Davis Campus of the University of California upon which a conservation laboratory may be established and maintained; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate in the Congress of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture."

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Works.

"House Resolution 30

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to expedite plans for a flood-control program along the Big Sandy River

"Whereas January 29, 1958, marks the anniversary of the most disastrous flood along the Big Sandy River within recorded history;

"Whereas the frequent recurrence of devastating floods along said river over a period of years has caused abject and inexpressible misery and despair to citizens of the area;

"Whereas such floods have occasioned not only physical suffering and deprivation but have resulted in loss of or damage to inestimable millions of dollars worth of property;

"Whereas the health, safety, and general welfare of many citizens of the Commonwealth of Kentucky and adjacent States are in constant danger from future depredation of said river and the economic welfare of every citizen of the surrounding area is affected by such depredations; and

"Whereas the damage to be expected from future floods can only be averted or mitigated by a coordinated comprehensive program of flood control along said river: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the Senate concurring therein)—

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is urged to act in the exercise of its broad legislative powers to provide a means of flood control along the Big Sandy

River and to cause such a program to be put into effect at the earliest possible time.

"SEC. 2. That the Congress act in this regard by making provision for a system of dams and floodwalls along said river and the utilization of any other measures which it deems necessary to accomplish the desired end.

"SEC. 3. That the clerk of the senate be and is hereby directed to send copies of this memorial, duly authenticated to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each of the Senators and Representatives from the Commonwealth now serving in the Congress, and to the Secretary of the Interior."

The petition of Samuel A. Levy, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 7141) to amend title 2 of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Long Island General Assembly, Fourth Degree (Patriotic), Knights of Columbus, Kings County, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the DAV-Philians Social Security Organization, Rizal, Philippine Islands, relating to House bills 8029 and 8167, to provide for the payment of claims for supplies and services furnished the irregular, or guerrilla forces of the former Commonwealth of the Philippines during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Livermore Elementary Teachers Association, Livermore, Calif., favoring the extension of Public Laws 815 and 874, relating to Federal aid to impacted school districts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, County of Maui, T. H., relating to the erection and maintenance of a post office at Hooilehua, T. H.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Federation of Civic Associations, Inc., Washington, D. C., relating to the death of the late Senator Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 2233. A bill to further amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1285).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 2224. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding advertised and negotiated disposals of surplus property (Rept. No. 1284); and

S. 2231. A bill to amend section 203 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the exercise of options contained in certain leases of Government property (Rept. No. 1288).

ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS IN CONNECTION WITH VISITING FOREIGN DIGNITARIES

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

resolution (S. Res. 259), and submitted a report (No. 1287) thereon, which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in order to assist the Senate properly to discharge and coordinate its activities and responsibilities in connection with participation in various interparliamentary institutions and to facilitate the interchange and reception in the United States of members of foreign legislative bodies and prominent officials of foreign governments, the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, to employ one additional professional staff member to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of section 202 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay the actual and necessary expenses incurred by Senators and the aforementioned employee in connection with activities authorized by this resolution and approved in advance by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which shall not exceed \$5,000 from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers certified by the Senator incurring such expenses and approved by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ENTITLED "INCREASED COST OF ISSUING AND RENEWING PASSPORTS" (S. REPT. NO. 1288)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations I submit a report entitled "Increased Cost of Issuing and Renewing Passports," and ask that it be printed. I believe the report will be of great interest to every Member of this body.

This report, based upon a year's study conducted by the Comptroller General of the United States at the request of the committee, recommends that the appropriate jurisdictional committees of the Congress reevaluate the existing fee schedules relating to passports. The report shows that the total unit cost for passport issuance and renewal is estimated at \$8.20—\$3.75 for costs incurred in the United States and \$4.49 for costs incurred at foreign service posts.

As Senators will note, the Comptroller General makes several suggestions for improving the issuance of passports. Major recommendations are: First, that passports issued to Federal employees at foreign service posts be for the entire tour of duty, thereby obviating the need for renewals, which would result in savings in costs of issuing passports; second, that the duration of passports be related more directly to the actual length of time travelers expect to be overseas, rather than to a fixed period of time, as at present.

In connection with the latter recommendation, the Comptroller General suggests three time categories: First, 6 months to 1 year with no renewal; second, 3 years on issuance and renewal for 2 years; third, 5 years on issuance with no renewal.

Separate fees would be fixed for each of the above categories, which amounts

would relate to the duration and renewal privilege of the passport.

The Comptroller General points out that the fee for the issuance of a passport, of \$9, exceeds the cost thereof, \$8.20, by 80 cents, whereas the fee for renewal, of \$5, is \$3.20 less than the cost—the cost of issuance and renewal being considered equal.

He also points out that the question of whether the fee for a passport is a source of revenue, and thus not necessarily related to cost, or a charge for a Government service, for which the fee should be set at an amount sufficient to recover costs, is a matter of policy to be determined by the Congress.

Mr. President, I recommend this report to the attention of every Member of Congress. As Members are aware, the issuance of passports has been a subject of lengthy examination by the Committee on Government Operations for the past 3 years.

As a result of extensive staff studies in the 84th Congress, the Passport Office was completely reorganized to provide improved service to the public. The matter of an adjustment in fees and other recommendations made by the Comptroller General in his report to the committee should be given consideration by the appropriate jurisdictional committees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

REPORT ENTITLED "ACTION BY THE CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT ON THE SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS, 1955-57" (S. REPT. NO. 1289)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit a report made by its Subcommittee on Reorganization, entitled "Action by the Congress and the Executive Branch of the Government on the Second Hoover Commission Reports, 1955-57."

This report, prepared at my direction by the staff of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, of which I have the privilege of serving as chairman, is a factual compilation of all action taken to date upon the recommendations of the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of which former President Herbert Hoover was Chairman, and two distinguished Members of this body, Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, and Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, were members.

A full measure of credit for the achievement made so far in implementation of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, as indicated hereafter in my remarks, should go to my illustrious colleague, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, who served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization during the 84th Congress. Also, I pay the highest tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Maine, the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee

on Reorganization, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, who, along with the other members of the subcommittee, worked in true bipartisan spirit to enact good reorganization legislation into law.

And, finally, Mr. President, I cannot speak too highly of the splendid cooperation given the Subcommittee on Reorganization by the chairman of the main Government Operations Committee, the senior Senator from Arkansas, Senator McCLELLAN, who for years has been a bulwark of support at every step along the rocky reorganization road.

In my opinion, Mr. President, this report will prove of inestimable value to Members of the Congress, the general public, and historians because it contains, to my knowledge, the first published tabulation of action upon each of the Hoover Commission's 519 recommendations, showing those recommendations implemented, those partially implemented, and those upon which no action has been taken. To my knowledge, nowhere else in the Government does this information exist in its present form.

For the information of Senators, I would like to briefly summarize the subcommittee's findings upon the 519 Hoover Commission's recommendations. Two hundred seventy-four, or 53 percent, have been implemented, or partially implemented, or are in the process of being implemented at this time. Forty-four recommendations, or an additional 8 percent, have been accepted by the executive branch of the Government, but implementation has not begun upon them. Thus, of the 519 recommendations, 318, or 61 percent, either have been implemented or accepted for implementation—a record of some substance in the relatively short period of time since the Hoover Commission reports were filed in 1955. Two hundred and one recommendations are still under review by the Congress or the executive branch or have been rejected for various reasons.

As may be noted, through perusal of this document, many proposals of the Second Hoover Commission which would provide for revolutionary changes in many important Government programs, such as Federal lending rates, public power development, the civil-service system, military procurement and legal procedures, among others, are still under consideration by the executive branch of the Government and appropriate Congressional committees. The 53 percent implementation figure, therefore, does not mean, substantively speaking, that from the viewpoint of major changes in the Government's operations, 53 percent of the Hoover Commission's overall product has been implemented. The bulk of the action taken to date has been in the administrative or organizational areas rather than in the controversial policymaking areas which would alter basically major Government programs, to which reference is made above.

Mr. President, I recognize full well the limitations upon all of us, particularly in these times of stress and strain; but, I commend this report to each Senator's attention, even if only during his infrequent moments of leisure he can give a

few minutes to it. I am sure each Member of this body will find valuable information relating to the Hoover Commission reports with which he can respond to the many inquiries from constituents which I know he receives daily, as do I. A limited number of copies will be available in the subcommittee office for distribution by Senators as they may see fit.

The report I now send to the desk is divided into three sections. I would like at this point in my remarks to include a brief summary of each section for the convenience of Senators in studying it.

Section I; status of the Second Hoover Commission reports; Section I contains an overall summary, report by report, together with a separate analysis of each of the 20 Hoover Commission reports, showing action taken, recommendation by recommendation.

Section II, action by the 85th Congress, 1st session, to implement the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission: Section II contains a detailed analysis tracing the legislative history of each of the 297 bills introduced in the 85th Congress, 1st session, to implement the Hoover Commission's recommendations. This section is a supplement to Senate Report No. 95, 85th Congress, 1st session, published February 21, 1957, which traces the legislative history of the more than 500 Hoover Commission bills introduced in the 84th Congress.

Section III, action on reorganization plans submitted to the Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1949: Section III contains a brief history of the Reorganization Act of 1949, plus a statistical tabulation of each of the 56 reorganization plans submitted to the Congress under the authority of that act, beginning with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949 and concluding with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957.

Mr. President, I submit the report, and ask that it be printed as an official Senate report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Walter K. Scott, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Isaac W. Carpenter, Jr., resigned;

Everett F. Drumright, of Oklahoma, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to China, vice Karl L. Rankin;

Philip D. Reed, of New York, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information; and

Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information.

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Abbot L. Mills, Jr., of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3265. A bill for the relief of Juan Jose Elorriaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 3266. A bill to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on mining claims heretofore located for the development and production of fissionable source material; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN (by request):

S. 3267. A bill for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 3268. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3269. A bill for the relief of Mildred (Milka Krivec) Chester;

S. 3270. A bill for the relief of Nick Tsallikis;

S. 3271. A bill for the relief of Souhail Massad;

S. 3272. A bill for the relief of Janez (Garantini) Bradek and Franciska (Garantini) Bradek; and

S. 3273. A bill for the relief of Irene Korponay and Rita Korponay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3274. A bill for the relief of Claude S. Reeder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 3275. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; 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. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3276. A bill for the relief of Carl Ebert and his wife, Gertrude Ebert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3277. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 3278. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, by providing for the correlation of diplomatic action and defense preparation and action in the National Security Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 3279. A bill for the relief of Charles P. Childs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for Mr. COOPER):

S. 3280. A bill to authorize the full acreage reserve program for the 1958 crops provided for by section 105 (c) of the Soil Bank Act;

to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

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

S. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to stay any reduction in support prices for dairy products until Congress can make appropriate provision for such support prices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

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

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to stay any reduction in support prices or acreage allotments until Congress can make appropriate changes in the price-support and acreage-allotment laws; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

GREATER COOPERATION AMONG NATO NATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I submit a concurrent resolution bringing to the attention of the President of the United States a resolution adopted at the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference held last November in Paris.

The concurrent resolution requests the President to use his best efforts to bring about a meeting of representative citizens from all the NATO nations to examine ways in which greater cooperation among the Atlantic nations may be promoted.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the United States Congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, and it is in that capacity that I introduce this Senate concurrent resolution.

Several other Members of the Senate indicated that they desired to join in the submission of this concurrent resolution. It was my feeling, however, that I should speak only for members of the Senate delegation to the Paris conference.

So that others may join, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that before this concurrent resolution is referred to the appropriate committee it be held at the desk until the next session of the Senate.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) to request the President to use his best efforts to bring about a meeting of representative citizens from all the North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations to examine ways to promote greater cooperation among those nations, submitted by Mr. GREEN (for himself and other Senators), was referred

to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, at the third annual conference held in Paris, in November 1957, adopted unanimously a resolution, part of which required implementation by the governments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

Whereas that portion of the resolution containing such recommendation and disposal for action, reads as follows:

"This Third Annual Conference of NATO Parliamentarians—

"Recommends that their governments, in consultation with the Standing Committee and Political Committee of the Conference, bring about, in accordance with the constitutional and governmental processes of their countries, a conference composed of leading representative citizens selected on a nonpartisan basis and directed to convene as often as necessary in order to examine exhaustively and to recommend how greater cooperation and unity of purpose, as envisioned by the North Atlantic Treaty, within the Atlantic community may best be developed,

"Proposes that to fulfill this purpose the members of the conference should, as far as possible, be officially appointed but should act in accordance with their individual convictions and that the findings and recommendations . . . of the conference proposed be reported to the appropriate committees of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, to the North Atlantic Council and to member governments for consideration and appropriate action in accordance with the constitutional processes of each member country": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to use his best efforts to implement, in cooperation with other governments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the recommendation and proposal of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, as set forth in the above resolution adopted at the third annual conference in Paris on November 16, 1957.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 259), relating to assistance to Senators in connection with visiting dignitaries, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

Mr. HAYDEN submitted Senate Resolution 260, printing as a Senate Document and additional copies of report entitled "A Review of United States Foreign Policy and Operations," submitted by Senator ELLENDER to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a thorough investigation into the operation of Federal agencies is long overdue, in my opinion.

Recent events underline the urgency of making such an investigation, and

serving to focus attention upon mounting misgivings of several years regarding these agencies.

As I announced yesterday, I now submit a resolution to establish a select committee "to determine whether the independent agencies of the Government have been carrying out their functions in a manner which accords with the public interest."

The resolution itself best describes the problems which require investigation and analysis. The resolution states:

Such inquiry shall seek to establish, among other things—

(1) whether such agencies have been improperly influenced by industries with respect to which they exercise regulatory or other functions;

(2) whether ethical standards consistent with the duties vested in such agencies have been maintained in the execution of those duties;

(3) whether such agencies have exercised the powers delegated to them by the Congress in conformity with Congressional policy;

(4) whether the independence of such agencies has been impaired by Executive interference; and

(5) whether the laws relating to conflicts of interest are adequate to protect the public interest in those areas of governmental activity which are under the jurisdiction of such agencies;

(6) whether agency procedures and existing law are adequate to safeguard the public, the parties, and to prevent favoritism.

Mr. President, it is my belief that the Senate has an independent obligation to undertake such an investigation. Regardless of what may be done by the other body, the Senate can be fully advised as to the need for remedial legislation, if any, only by an inquiry of its own. The resolution does not duplicate the mandate which the Moulder subcommittee, now the Harris subcommittee, received. There may be an area of overlap. All the indications are, however, that there is more than enough for committees of both bodies to do.

As I said yesterday, I believe the Congress should make a two-barreled approach to this matter, so as to be able to shoot to the American people the facts regarding the actual situation in the case of the conduct of these administrative agencies.

So far as the Senate is concerned, it should be observed that the agencies and problems involved come within the jurisdiction of several different committees. In order to have a unified, across-the-board inquiry, a select committee will be required, in my judgment; the job would be fragmented if it were parcelled out along the jurisdictional lines of the standing committees.

There is only one answer to the growing public distrust of the supposedly independent Federal agencies: a thorough inquiry conducted in accordance with rules of fair procedure. Whatever others may do, the Senate should set up a select committee to do the job.

I am fully aware of the fact that there may be those who think my proposal violates some rule of comity with the House, but I have looked into this matter sufficiently to satisfy myself that it is the clear public duty of the Senate of

the United States to proceed on its own, independently, with an investigation of conditions in the Federal agencies. I am satisfied that many of the allegations we have been reading about in the press make a prima facie case to support such an investigation. I am satisfied that with regard to other allegations there is sufficient evidence to make it a matter of public trust, owed the people of the United States, that the Senate pursue such an investigation, without fear or favor, and let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be received and that the resolution be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 261), submitted by Mr. MORSE, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a select committee to be composed of 7 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, of whom 3 shall be members of the minority party.

SEC. 2 (a) The committee shall conduct a full inquiry and investigation to determine whether the independent agencies of the Government have been carrying out their functions in a manner which accords with the public interest. Such inquiry shall seek to establish, among other things—

(1) whether such agencies have been improperly influenced by industries or other interests with respect to which they exercise regulatory or other functions;

(2) whether ethical standards consistent with the duties vested in such agencies have been maintained in the execution of those duties;

(3) whether such agencies have exercised the powers delegated to them by the Congress in conformity with Congressional policy;

(4) whether the independence of such agencies has been impaired by Executive interference; and

(5) whether the laws relating to conflicts of interest are adequate to protect the public interest in those areas of governmental activity which are under the jurisdiction of such agencies.

(6) whether agency procedures and existing law are adequate to safeguard the public, the parties and to prevent favoritism.

(b) The committee shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the President of the Senate, select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members. Any vacancy in the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) As used in this section, the term "independent agencies of the Government" means those agencies in the executive branch of the Government which were established by act of Congress and vested with functions, regulatory or otherwise, to be exercised independently of the regularly constituted departments of the Government.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to (1) hold such hearings; (2) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; (3) require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants

and consultants, and, 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.

(b) A quorum of the committee shall consist of 4 members, except that the committee may provide that, for the purpose of taking testimony, 2 members, 1 from the majority party and 1 from the minority party, shall constitute a quorum.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$250,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 5. (a) The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations for legislation or other action as it may deem advisable, to the Senate not later than January 31, 1959.

(b) Upon the filing of its report, the committee shall cease to exist.

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

Mr. MORSE. For what purpose?

Mr. HUMPHREY. For a comment on the Senator's statement.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think I can. I think the Senator from Vermont is waiting to take the floor in his own right. I want the Senator from Minnesota to know that I appreciate very much his desire to make a comment on my statement. I hope he will make it after the morning hour.

GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ICELAND

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to provide for payment to the Government of the Republic of Iceland, the sum of \$5,402.09, and such additional sum as may be necessary because of increases in exchange rates, in settlement of claims against the United States amounting to 83,000 kronur. Payment of the amount contemplated in the bill will constitute a final settlement of claims arising out of acts involving United States Armed Forces during their presence in Iceland from 1941 to 1947.

The obligation which the United States seeks to discharge under the bill, Mr. President, arises under an agreement concluded between the United States and Iceland on July 1, 1941. Paragraph 5 of that agreement provided:

[The] United States [will] undertake defense of the country without expense to Iceland [and] promise compensation for all damage occasioned to the inhabitants by their military activities.

When the United States withdrew from Iceland there were outstanding approximately 374 accident claims of 2 Icelandic insurance companies which could not be settled due to restrictive provisions of the Foreign Claims Act. A number of claims against policyholders also remained unpaid. An agreement negotiated between the 2 governments on November 23, 1956, provided that Iceland would accept the dollar equivalent of 83,000 kronur in final settlement of all these claims. At the exchange rate of 16.29 to the dollar, the

amounts to be paid to Iceland under the bill now being introduced, amounts to approximately \$5,402.09.

As I have already indicated, Mr. President, I am introducing this bill at the request of the executive branch. In so doing, I reserve my right to oppose or to support it later, as well as any amendments that might be proposed. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and the letter of transmittal from the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3267) for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland, introduced by Mr. GREEN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Government of the Republic of Iceland, the sum of \$5,402.09, and such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay this claim in foreign currency, in full satisfaction and final settlement of its claim against the United States in the amount of 83,000 Icelandic kronur, arising out of accidents involving United States Armed Forces during their presence in Iceland from July 7, 1941, to April 5, 1947, under the terms of the agreements between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Iceland, respecting the defense of Iceland, dated July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 1547), and regarding the settlement of claims of Icelandic insurance companies, dated November 23, 1956.

The letter presented by Mr. GREEN is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1957.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is inclosed herewith a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland.

The submission of this legislation is in accordance with procedures approved by the Secretary of Defense. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress, and the Department of the Army recommends its enactment.

The purpose of this proposed bill is to effect final settlement of claims of the Government of the Republic of Iceland in the amount of 83,000 kronur, arising out of accidents involving United States Armed Forces during their presence in Iceland from 1941 to 1947 under the terms of the agreement between the United States and Iceland dated July 1, 1941.

The agreement between the United States of America and Iceland respecting the defense of Iceland by United States forces, effected July 1, 1951; ratified by the Icelandic Regent in Council July 10, 1941 (55 Stat. 1547), specifically states:

"5. United States undertake defense of the country without expense to Iceland and promise compensation for all damage occasioned to the inhabitants by their military activities."

During the period July 7, 1941, to April 5, 1947, units of the Armed Forces of the United States were present in Iceland by virtue of the terms of the above agreement. When the Armed Forces of the United States

departed Iceland there remained outstanding approximately 374 accident claims of two Icelandic insurance companies, Sjóvætryggingarfélag Islands h. f. and Trolle and Rothe h. f., which were not satisfied. These claims, in most part, remained unsettled because of the excluding provisions of the Foreign Claims Act (55 Stat. 880 and 57 Stat. 66). There were also a number of claims against policyholders of the two Icelandic insurance companies in favor of the United States which were unpaid. The Icelandic Government, through diplomatic channels requested action on these claims.

On June 9, 1953, this Department notified the Department of State:

"It appears that no funds are available to the Department of the Army under present claims statutes for payment of the proposed settlement and that it will be necessary to request the introduction of a private relief bill to the Congress when agreement has been reached with the Republic of Iceland.

"A settlement covering the claims under consideration, and any other claims of these same insurance companies which may have arisen out of the agreement, dated July 1, 1941, between the United States and Iceland, as you suggest, will be satisfactory. A proposed agreement is inclosed. When negotiations with the Republic of Iceland in this matter have been concluded this Department will request the necessary legislation."

In order to arrive at a possible satisfactory conclusion on the matter, the following agreement was reached:

"AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ICELAND REGARDING THE SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF ICELANDIC INSURANCE COMPANIES

"The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Iceland have reached agreement as set forth below regarding final settlement of certain claims of the Icelandic insurance companies, Sjóvætryggingarfélag Islands h. f. and Trolle and Rothe h. f. (agent for Baltica, a Danish company), against the Government of the United States; and similar claims, or counterclaims, of the Government of the United States of America against these same insurance companies.

"Article I

"The two Governments agree that the claim of Sjóvætryggingarfélag Islands h. f. is meritorious in the sum of 84,703.19 kronur. Claims of the United States against policyholders of that company are meritorious in the sum of 27,982.58 kronur, which latter amount is set off against the former. There remains a net amount of 56,720.61 kronur due Sjóvætryggingarfélag Islands h. f.

"The two Governments agree that the claim of Trolle and Rothe h. f. (Baltica) is meritorious in the sum of 60,291.36 kronur. Claims of the United States against policyholders of that company are meritorious in the sum of 29,011.97 kronur, which latter amount is set off against the former. There remains a net amount of 31,279.39 kronur due Trolle and Rothe h. f. (Baltica).

"The sum of the net amounts due is 88,000 kronur.

"Article II

"The Congress of the United States will be requested to appropriate the necessary funds to effect payment of this settlement.

"Article III

"During the course of negotiations leading to this agreement, representatives of the two Governments have considered claims of the aforementioned insurance companies which grew out of accidents or incidents involving military personnel and equipment of the Armed Forces of the United States, and policyholders, and vehicles owned by policyholders, of the two Icelandic insurance companies, during the period July 7, 1941, to

April 5, 1947, when United States Armed Forces were present in Iceland under the terms of the agreement between the United States and Iceland, dated July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 1547).

"Claims of the Government of the United States of America against policyholders of these same insurance companies which resulted from the same or similar incidents, have been evaluated, and set off, as shown in article I of this agreement.

"Article IV

"During the course of negotiations leading to this agreement, the representatives of the two Governments considered, but excluded from the setoff, those claims of the United States against policyholders of these insurance companies for expenses incurred relating to medical expenses, loss of services, burial expenses, and gratuity payment in cases involving injury or death of military personnel; which claims are to be regarded as having been taken into account, but waived, under the terms of this agreement.

"Claims of the insurance companies arising out of the agreement dated July 1, 1941, between the United States and Iceland, supra, which have not hitherto been presented and included in this settlement are to be regarded as having been waived.

"Article V

"Upon payment of the amount heretofore agreed upon in settlement of the claims described herein, the Government of the Republic of Iceland discharges and agrees to save harmless the Government of the United States of America, its officials, employees, or agencies and instrumentalities, its nationals or other individuals and organizations, for these and all other claims of these same claimants, which may have arisen out of the agreement dated July 1, 1941, between the United States and Iceland, supra.

"In witness whereof, the undersigned representatives duly authorized thereto by their respective governments have signed this agreement.

"Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 23d day of November 1956.

"For the Government of the United States of America:

"C. BURKE ELBRICK,

"[Department of State].

"For the Government of the Republic of Iceland:

"THOR THORS."

The cost of this proposal, if enacted, will be the dollar equivalent of 88,000 Icelandic kronur, which, at the rate of exchange of 16.29 kronur to 1 dollar, is \$5,402.09.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,

Secretary of the Army.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the National Science Foundation has now been operating under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950—Public Law 507, 81st Congress, 2d session—for almost 7 years with only 2 minor amendments. During this time, it has grown from an organization with an operating budget of \$3.5 million to one with a budget request for \$140 million. This growth has been paralleled by a growing realization of the importance of science and the full dissemination of new knowledge uncovered by research.

While the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, has served the Foundation well in carrying out its responsibilities, we are today keenly aware of the importance to the furtherance of our own scientific progress of

closer cooperation between scientists in this country and those of other nations. This bill, which I am introducing on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, will, therefore, authorize the Foundation, with the approval of the Secretary of State, to award scholarships and fellowships to foreign nationals and to facilitate such scientific activities abroad as may be deemed to be in the interest of the United States. We must not isolate our scientific activities but must work ever closer with appropriate scientists elsewhere who are extending the frontiers of knowledge.

In addition to this amendment, the bill would make various minor amendments in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 which the past 7 years have proved necessary and desirable.

The particular changes included in the bill are described in the analysis which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3268) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The analysis presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

There is set forth below an analysis of each section of the proposed legislation to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950:

Section 1: The changes proposed for section 4 (d) and section 4 (e) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 relate to the annual meeting of the Board and are requested because of the fact that at the present time elections of officers of the Board for 2 years must take place at the annual meeting in December, whereas the terms of one-third of the members of the Board expire every second year on May 10. Accordingly, elections must presently be held 5 months before there is a change in the Board membership and, among the candidates for office, there often are those whose terms are expiring in the subsequent May. It would be desirable, therefore, to have the annual meeting after the new members are appointed and confirmed by the Senate so that the Board may elect its officers with knowledge of its composition for the ensuing 2 years. The latitude in setting the actual date is to permit the accommodation of as many members as possible in order to assure the fullest possible attendance at the annual meeting.

Section 2 and section 3: The changes proposed for section 5 (b), section 6 (a) and section 6 (b) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 are related to the same purpose. At the present time, the Board must approve the award of each fellowship and each grant or contract for basic research. This rigid requirement has posed serious problems for efficient operation in several instances. For example, when grants were being made for supplies for the scientific expedition to Antarctica in connection with the International Geophysical Year, time was of the essence. The lack of a Board meeting at which a contract or grant could

be approved at the proper moment was an obstacle to assuring the timely arrival of equipment for the scientists. Under the proposed change, it is contemplated that the Board might delegate specific authority to its executive committee or to the Director to approve grants for contracts between meetings of the Board in certain situations. The change in the required size of the executive committee is suggested for the purpose of giving the Board authority to constitute a smaller executive committee which could more easily be assembled for emergency action. In any event, the Board would still retain complete power to grant such authority or not as the whole Board saw fit.

Section 4: The deletion of the words "accredited" and "of higher education" in section 10 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is intended to take care of the relatively rare situation where the successful competitor for a fellowship wishes to study or work at a research institution in his field which is not an educational institution, for instance, at one of the National Institutes of Health. It is felt that, where the scientists judging the merit of the prospective fellow and his course of study or work believe that the applicant's proposal is sound, it is undesirable to limit his choice of institution in every case to an educational institution. The addition of the words "demonstrated and potential" in section 10 is for purposes of clarification.

Section 5: The changes proposed in section 11 (c) and section 11 (d) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 are technical and are intended to bring these sections in accord with the changes proposed for section 13. The change proposed in section 11 (e) is for purposes of clarification. At the present time, the law does not, for instance, specifically authorize the acquisition of property by condemnation or disposition of property, such as a scientific facility, by grant. These powers, however, seem to be inherent in the act so that the Foundation would have authority to support the conduct of basic research by acquiring property through condemnation or through assisting an institution to acquire a necessary facility held by the Foundation. It is, however, suggested that this section be clarified to make the authority explicit.

Section 6, section 7, and section 8: The changes proposed in section 13 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 are intended to permit the Foundation, with the approval of the Secretary of State, to support or to facilitate international scientific activities rather than merely to cooperate in research activities, and to award scholarships and fellowships or make other arrangements with foreign nationals for scientific study or scientific work. At the present time, the Foundation cannot grant scholarships or fellowships to foreign nationals and this amendment would remove this disability. The new section 13 (b) is designed to give the Foundation statutory authority to carry out scientific activities abroad in the interest not only of science but of our foreign relations. This authority would only be exercised where such undertakings are deemed to be in the interest of the United States, and with the approval of the Secretary of State. In the present era, no one country can have any monopoly of scientific talent and it is essential that we place ourselves in a position to cooperate more effectively with scientists abroad.

Section 9: The new section 14 (j) proposed to be added to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is designed to make it possible for the staff of the Foundation to keep up with the latest developments in their fields. At times, additional training or attendance at meetings may be required to assure that the Foundation's employees can maintain the highest competence and knowledge in their fields.

REPRESENTATION OF CERTAIN INDIGENT DEFENDANTS IN DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a nationwide system of public defenders for indigent defendants in criminal court cases, with provision for grants to bar associations, legal aid societies, and similar voluntary organizations providing free legal services to indigent defendants.

One of our basic constitutional guarantees is that in all criminal prosecutions in the Federal courts the accused shall have the assistance of counsel in his defense. Long study has convinced me of the need for Federal legislation in this area to supplement the work being done by private organizations and to provide this legal service in cases where there is no private organization undertaking the task.

As attorney general of New York State, I developed a program to provide public defenders, initially for youths under 21 but later to be expanded to everyone needing the service. Research both into the need for such a program within my own New York State and also throughout the Nation disclosed that there is substantial lack in many regions of adequate legal counsel for indigent defendants. In introducing this bill, we are seeking to fill the existing gap.

The true administration of justice requires that the rich and the powerful and the poor and the weak hold equal claims in the eyes of the law. When an indigent person, without counsel, is charged with crime and left to fend for himself against the organized authority of our whole society—the police departments, the district attorney's offices and the courts—the possibility of the miscarriage of justice is ever present.

The duty of a district attorney or United States attorney is to prosecute the guilty but also to save the innocent from conviction. In practice, zeal in the prosecutor's job—which is in the public interest—often makes the public prosecutor an advocate and justice requires an opposition as effective as the prosecution. A public defender is a public official, paid out of the public treasury, serving as counsel for a defendant financially unable to employ private counsel. He is, in effect, the counterpart of the prosecutor and like him serves the cause of justice in our society. Injustice breeds divisiveness and constitutes a continuing threat to a free society. When people lose their faith in the impartiality of the machinery of justice, they also lose faith in their government. We should ask ourselves whether we can afford the consequences of maintaining a system which purports to guarantee the equal protection of the laws to rich and poor alike, but in actual practice places a premium upon the financial ability of a person to defend himself in a criminal prosecution.

The scope of the problem can be seen in the fact that 6 out of every 10 persons cannot afford to engage counsel of their own choosing. In metropolitan

areas the proportion is higher. As many as 8 out of 10 require public or voluntary legal aid. And in New York State alone, criminal courts each year dispose of cases involving almost 250,000 defendants accused of all manner of crime, not including traffic and local ordinance violations.

A recent survey showed that of indigent defendants accused of crime, 40 percent received no form of legal aid whatsoever. Of the remaining 60 percent who did get legal aid—by public defenders, voluntary defender organizations such as the legal-aid societies, or counsel assigned by the courts—no more than 25 percent had been given an effective defense.

The idea of a private defender has its origins in antiquity, but the idea of a public defender is relatively new. It was suggested by a woman lawyer from San Francisco at the Chicago World's Fair in 1893. It was not until 1913, however, that any community in this country established a public defender office, the honor going to Los Angeles.

The public defender concept is no longer a novelty. Nine States: California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and Virginia—as well as Puerto Rico and the Canal Zone have adopted the system. In addition, public defenders exist in some municipalities: in Columbus, Ohio; Memphis, Tenn.; and St. Louis, Mo. In many other cities private organizations, such as the National Legal Aid Association, the Philadelphia Voluntary Defender Association, bar associations, and others, furnish representation to indigent defendants in criminal cases. In some places, as in Rochester, N. Y., limited public funds are available.

The bill provides that each United States District Court may appoint a public defender to be paid out of Federal funds. Whenever the district court decides that a defendant is financially unable to employ counsel, the court assigns the public defender. The bill also retains the present power of the court to assign counsel other than the public defender; in that case the bill provides that such special counsel shall be paid by Federal funds on a case-by-case basis. The bill further provides that:

Upon the recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may make grants to legal-aid societies, bar associations, or other similar groups providing free legal services to indigent defendants.

Maximum salary for the public defenders is set by the bill at \$16,000, based upon the service to be performed, which shall be fixed by the Judicial Conference. In instances where grants are made to legal-aid societies or bar associations, the aggregate amount of any such grants made annually in any judicial district shall not exceed \$30,000.

Legislation providing a public defender was recommended to this Congress by the United States Attorney General, who said in part:

There is a community responsibility, consonant with the constitutional requirement, to provide full-time paid counsel, trained in the techniques of criminal law, to represent

the poor who are charged with crime. It is the business of all of us who are charged with maintaining our form of government within the framework of the Constitution to provide an adequate means of assuring every person of the assistance of counsel for his defense without regard to whether he has the means to pay for such counsel.

The general program also has the support of the American Bar Association.

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

The bill (S. 3275) to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training which will provide the means for reducing the high accident rate of this employment.

It is not generally realized that the accident rate of the stevedoring industry is the highest of all our industries, and results in great suffering and hardship to the workers and their families, and necessitates an annual expenditure of nearly \$9 million, exclusive of medical costs. This intolerable situation clearly calls for a preventive program to reduce this shameful waste of human life and assets.

The Department of Labor, in keeping with the Eisenhower administration's legislative program to protect the interests and welfare of the workingmen of this country, has developed such a plan. It is proposed that the Secretary of Labor be given authority to issue and enforce safety standards in the longshore and ship-repair industry. Furthermore, there would be placed on the contractors a definite obligation to cooperate with the Department of Labor in furnishing safe employment in this industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter on this subject, addressed to me by the Honorable James T. O'Connell, Under Secretary of Labor, and an explanatory statement from the Labor Department, which accompanied the bill, be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1958.
The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I am transmitting copies of a draft bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training and for other fur-

poses. I am also enclosing copies of a summary statement explaining the need for the legislation and the purpose and effect of the bill.

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor. The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this bill for the consideration of the Congress, and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Your cooperation and assistance are appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES T. O'CONNELL,
Under Secretary of Labor.

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE EFFECTIVE SAFETY STANDARDS IN EMPLOYMENT COVERED BY THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

PURPOSE

This bill would amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, which relates to private longshore and ship repair operations within the Federal jurisdiction, to establish means for reducing the high accident rate in this employment. It would impose an obligation on stevedoring and ship-repair contractors to furnish safe employment and would authorize the Secretary of Labor to issue and enforce safety standards pertaining to their operations aboard ships and in drydocks.

The Secretary of Labor in connection with his supervision of the compensation provisions of the Longshore Act is presently authorized to make studies and investigations of the cause of injuries in employment covered by the act, and he may make recommendations to Congress and to interested employers and employees of means for reducing accidents. No authority exists, however, to issue or to enforce safety standards pertaining expressly to such employment. The proposal would give the Secretary such authority, but it would not extend to matters within the scope of statutes administered by the Coast Guard or regulations issued pursuant to such statutes.

The extremely hazardous nature of longshore employment is reflected in the latest figures compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The data which is available, while incomplete in scope, show an injury frequency rate in the stevedoring industry of 88.5 disabling injuries per million man-hours worked in 1956 (the last year for which safety information is available). In comparison, the average injury frequency rate in manufacturing was 12 in that year. The accident frequency rate in logging had for a number of years been the highest for any industry included in reports by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1956, however, the stevedoring rate of 88.5 substantially exceeded the 65 figure for logging. In operations under the Longshore Act in fiscal year 1957 (not reflecting operations under State compensation laws) 79,826 injuries were reported, 122 of which were fatal. In that year compensation expenditures under the act, which did not include medical costs, were \$8,780,437.

The varying conditions of safety which exist in stevedoring operations aboard ship in the numerous ports and with different employers can be effectively improved only through the medium of a Federal law.

Provisions of proposed legislation

An affirmative obligation would be placed on employers covered by the act to furnish safe employment. The Secretary of Labor would be authorized to establish regulations specifying measures essential to conditions of safety after interested persons had been given an opportunity to express their views on the proposed regulations.

The Secretary also would be authorized to:

1. Grant variations from prescribed safety standards, in his discretion, upon a showing of practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship if the safety of the employees concerned would be secured by such variation;

2. Provide for the establishment and supervision of safety training programs and consult with and advise employers regarding injury prevention;

3. Inspect places of employment and equipment and interview employees to ascertain whether the safety regulations adopted and published in accordance with the proposal are being applied;

4. Hold hearings and make decisions, based upon findings of fact, and for such purposes he and the district courts would have the authority and jurisdiction provided by section 5 of the Walsh-Healey Act (this section provides, in part, that the Secretary's findings shall be conclusive in any court of the United States if supported by a preponderance of the evidence);

5. Seek injunctions against continuing violations by employers; when violations of an employer are willful or when any person willfully hinders the administration of the act, the penalty of a fine through criminal action may be imposed.

The proposed safety authority would be inapplicable to private employees in the District of Columbia and to employees of Government contractors on defense bases and in foreign areas to which the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act have been generally extended. The District of Columbia has its own safety law.

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

The bill (S. 3277) to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, by providing for the correlation of diplomatic action and defense preparation and action in the National Security Council.

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

The bill (S. 3278) to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, by providing for the correlation of diplomatic action and defense preparation and action in the National Security Council, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, there has been, over the years, an immense amount of discussion of the subject of the reorganization of the Department of Defense. That discussion has been heightened by the interest in the development of missiles and satellites and by the knowledge that interservice rivalries have played some part in slowing up developments in these advanced fields.

The administration has had reports on this problem from private sources. It has received the Gaither report which is classified so that its recommendations are not publicly known. It has received the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation report produced by private enterprise and publicly distributed. This report was likewise set forth by Mr. Nelson Rockefeller at one of the hearings of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee.

Many other suggestions were made to the Preparedness Subcommittee in those hearings. Mr. President, none of those suggestions appealed so strongly to me as did those of Admiral Nimitz.

Remembering that the President has taken on the responsibility for developing plans of reorganization and remembering that he has deputed this responsibility to Secretary McElroy, it might seem unwise and unnecessary for anyone to make suggestions during the interim. Nevertheless I feel that special attention should be drawn to certain of the proposals made by Admiral Nimitz.

There are two of his proposals that I feel may well be left for the consideration and recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. One of these is that the position of a separate nonvoting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be abolished and that the chairmanship should rotate successively through the Chiefs of Staff of the three services. A second suggestion of his is that the structure of the Defense Department should be simplified by doing away with the multitude of new Assistant Secretaries, removing them from the chain of command and reassigning them to the Secretary of Defense as advisers.

Mr. President, these are internal measures completely within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense, and I do not feel disposed to do anything more than to bring them to the attention of the Secretary through such means as this brief mention of them on the floor of the Senate.

There is, however, another of the admiral's suggestions which is not in the same category and which, I strongly believe, warrants discussion on the Senate floor. More than that, I believe it needs to be brought to the attention of the Congress and of the administration by such effective means as the introduction of a bill amending the National Security Act of 1947. Such amendments I am proposing.

The purpose of these amendments is to concentrate the President's authority for overall strategy in the National Security Council. The admiral makes a very proper distinction between strategic and tactical decisions. The latter he would leave with the services. The former he would put with the National Security Council under the chairmanship of the President. He said on page 3073 of the transcript of the proceedings:

The decisions that are made in the field are tactical. The fundamental difference between strategy and tactics is that tactics is what you do after you are in contact with the enemy. Strategy is what you do before you come in contact with the enemy or even before you come into a war with him.

Now, the tactical matters are settled very promptly by a single source of decision. Strategic matters involve such things as the preparation of great forces, the planning of bases overseas, the aid to allies or even it goes to the point of strategic decision to a recommendation to the President might be 'We had better do something about Spain and get them in on our side as allies' and then it passes out of the hands of the military planner.

Strategic decisions are the principal ones that are made in Washington, and those are—they are of such a nature that time is not so important.

Admiral Nimitz' most definite assignment of strategy to the National Security Council was in answer to a question of mine. I now quote from page 3085 of the transcript.

Senator FLANDERS. Admiral, you have made a very clear distinction, it seemed clear to me, between tactical questions or problems and strategic problems, and you have, as I have understood you, made a clear case for leaving the tactical problems in the hands of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Do I understand that strategic problems would, in general, be within the area of the Secretary of Defense and the President?

Where does the responsibility for the solution of strategic problems rest?

Admiral Nimitz. Senator, I think you have put your finger on a very important point that was foreseen in the writing of the National Security Act of 1947.

Strategic problems affect not only the military services, but the people of the country as a whole. They affect the Treasury, they affect the industry generally, they affect labor.

It was for that purpose to consider those problems that the National Security Act wrote as one of its first instruments, the National Security Council which was to be presided over by the President as frequently as he could, and—or by the Vice President, and it was to be composed of the Secretary of Defense, the chiefs of the armed services, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Security Resources, National Security Resources Board.

Now that has disappeared from our act. The National Security Resources Board was set up to associate all of the alphabetical agencies that existed during World War II engaged in the production of material, in the production of food, in the distribution of manpower, and all of that.

Those are—that man would be a very important person but it was never—that Security Council for the National Resources was never used.

But the strategic problems that you have in mind should be settled by discussion in the National Security Council with the Treasury represented, and any other Cabinet head whose business is affected so that strategic decisions affect every part of the country.

Mr. President, at the time I heard those words of the Admiral it seemed to me that we here had the basic clue to reorganizing the Department of Defense. That conviction has grown with the intervening weeks. It is for that reason that I am here offering amendments to assign to the Council definitely the function of determining strategy under the President's direction, leaving tactical matters in the hands of the Chiefs of Staff of the three services with their interrelations coordinated by the Joint Chiefs. These tactical programs would be worked out in strict agreement with the strategic decisions handed down from the President through the National

Security Council to the Secretary of Defense.

Before referring to the amendments in detail let me say that when I came to investigate Public Law 253, which was the National Security Act of 1947, I was astonished to find how little change was needed to effect this reorganization. In fact, it was almost as if that had been the intent of the act, which intent had failed simply by not having it expressed clearly enough. Let me now proceed to go over the proposed amendments point by point so as to show how little needs to be done if we accept the plans offered by Admiral Nimitz in his testimony before the Preparedness Subcommittee.

First of all, there needs to be an addition to the duties assigned the National Security Council. The proposed amendment adds the Council should "determine defense strategy in its widest sense whether for cold war or active military operations, and whether in the military, political, or economic field of action, and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith."

The next change suggested is in the membership of the National Security Council which sets up the Assistant Secretary of State for Policy Planning as an aid to the Secretary of State in his duties as a member of the Council. Since the major matters of strategy combine those of diplomacy and defense, the responsibility for diplomatic planning must be represented directly in the Council meetings.

Similarly, with the Secretary of Defense is included the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as aide. This is to bring the military experience and point of view directly into the same consultations.

There is added to the duties of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the requirement that he shall represent the Chiefs of Staff as aide to the Secretary of Defense in meetings of the National Security Council.

Mr. President, that seems to be the end of the changes required in the National Security Act. Each one of them is minor. But the accumulated effect of these minor changes makes a major change in the responsibilities for determining and carrying out national strategic policies. The National Security Council becomes the President's instrument for that purpose. The responsibility is located nowhere else. There is further added the responsibility in the Council for seeing to it that diplomacy and defense work to the same end.

Personally I feel exceedingly grateful to Admiral Nimitz for having brought this possibility to the attention of the Preparedness Subcommittee and thus to the Congress and to the administration. In presenting this amendment I am glad to play my individual part in assuring that it shall have considered attention.

FULL ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM FOR 1958 CROPS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the

full acreage reserve program for the 1958 crops provided for by section 105 (c) of the Soil Bank Act.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by the Senator from Kentucky, relating to the bill, be printed in the Record.

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

The bill (S. 3280) to authorize the full acreage reserve program for the 1958 crops provided for by section 105 (c) of the Soil Bank Act, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for Mr. COOPER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, IN CONNECTION WITH HIS BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE FULL ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM OF THE SOIL BANK FOR 1958

Mr. President, briefly, the purpose of my bill is to restore the full acreage-reserve program of the soil bank for 1958 crops. It would do so by removing the limitation imposed last year, thereby authorizing the full amount of \$750 million provided in the basic act establishing the soil bank.

In the last session of Congress, a limitation of \$500 million was placed on the funds that the Secretary of Agriculture may use in carrying out the acreage reserve program of the soil bank for 1958 crops. I recall that this came about after the House of Representatives had voted to eliminate the acreage reserve program altogether, and to allow it no funds for the 1958 crop year. I believe it was at the insistence of the Senate that the program was continued, and that \$500 million—although less than the \$750 million that Congress authorized in the Soil Bank Act of 1956 for each of the following 4 years—was made available for 1958. I recall that on the evening the Senate passed the Agricultural Appropriations Act for 1958, I spoke on the floor of the Senate in support of the soil bank and adequate funds for it.

I believe neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Congress anticipated the widespread interest among farmers wishing to take part in the acreage reserve program this year—or the extent to which thousands of farmers would sign up for the soil bank. The Department of Agriculture can well be gratified by this enthusiastic, if unexpected, response. And it is my impression that, given adequate funds, the acreage reserve program may well show this year what it can accomplish toward fulfilling the hopes originally held for it by the Secretary of Agriculture and by the Congress.

It is already clear that in my own State and in many other States, for corn as well as for several other basic crops to which this program applies, the demand for soil-bank funds will far exceed the amount now available.

In recent weeks I have been in close touch with farm leaders, with the officials in my State and in the Department of Agriculture charged with the operation of this program, and with a great many farmers themselves, concerning this matter. I believe the problem is a serious one requiring immediate action by the Congress if the best interests of farmers and of our agricultural economy are to be safeguarded—and if thousands of farmers who have already signed up for this program, but for whom funds are not now available, are to be treated fairly and equitably under this major effort of our total farm program.

I hope that the Congress will act quickly to provide the additional funds which it is now apparent are needed.

More than half of Kentucky is in the commercial corn area, and farmers in 52 central and western Kentucky counties are entitled under the act to participate in the corn soil bank. I know that thousands of farmers expected to sign up for the corn soil bank this year and especially wish to do so in view of last year's crop failures and excessive rains which drowned out many of their crops and which in many cases resulted in soft or wet corn for which price support is not available.

I understand that hundreds of farmers lined up at county offices beginning at midnight on January 13, but many others believed that adequate funds were available and that they would have 8 weeks in which to sign up their cornlands for the soil bank. However, the sign-up had to be closed rather abruptly after only 1 week because of lack of funds.

Even so, nearly \$11 million would be required to fulfill the contracts already offered Kentucky farmers in these few days. But the State allocation for corn in Kentucky is now only a little more than \$6 million. I know that a similar situation exists in a great many other States and in some to an even more serious degree.

Unless the Congress acts, thousands of farmers will be unable to take advantage of this helpful program. Furthermore, I am concerned that many of them will fail to understand why their neighbors' contracts have been accepted, whereas their own cannot be.

It is natural that a new program of this scope would take a year or two to become generally accepted and that it would need to pass its shakedown trials. It may be that this year will show the real value of the acreage reserve, particularly in view of the fact that the great majority of participating farmers are now soil banking their entire allotment. I believe this new approach will go far toward significantly reducing overproduction. In previous years the farmer often could put only part of his allotment into the soil bank and yields on the remaining portions may have turned out favorably. I suggest that the Congress may wish to look closely at the success of the acreage reserve this year before coming to any final decision as to how long it should be continued.

We know that a sound agricultural economy is essential to a growing and prosperous national economy. In connection with the President's economic statement yesterday, I suggest that the soil bank may also be a good place for additional efforts at this time, both in support of farmers' income and their long-range interests and in the interest of the Nation as a whole. An additional \$250 million in soil-bank funds this year might well have an important effect in combating the cost-price squeeze with which farmers are faced and in supporting our whole economy, which is still so closely related to a healthy agricultural economy.

In any event, I believe it is important that all our farmers be treated equitably under this and every farm program, and that all have a fair chance to participate in it.

SUPPORT PRICES FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two joint resolutions. One of them is on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] and myself, to prevent reduction in support prices of dairy products prior to consideration by Congress of such changes in price support laws as may be necessary at this time.

Mr. President, the Nation's dairy farmers are crying out to Congress to prevent Secretary Benson from further cutting dairy support prices April 1, under the misleading and unfounded pretext that it would lower milk prices to city consumers.

I want the record to show that the concern is nationwide, not just from great dairy States like Minnesota and Wisconsin. It is likewise bipartisan. Deep concern along the eastern seaboard has been reflected in statements of the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] opposing the cuts. Similar evidence of concern now comes from the west coast.

California's Legislature opened its session on Monday, February 3. The first order of business was Senate Resolution No. 1—sponsored by 39 senators, calling upon Congress to block the dairy price cut. That resolution passed the California State Senate unanimously, and was concurred in by the assembly with only six dissenting votes. That is a tremendous mobilization of bipartisan sentiment from a great State. I hope Congress heeds its appeal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of the California Senate Joint Resolution 1, as sent to me by John S. Watson of Petaluma, president of the Consolidated Milk Producers Association for San Francisco.

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

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1, RELATIVE TO MILK PRICE SUPPORTS

Whereas Secretary Benson of the United States Department of Agriculture has announced his intention on April 1, 1958, to lower the dairy price support to 75 percent of parity; and

Whereas such action will result in a reduction of income to our Nation's dairy farmers of \$250 million at a time when many are already facing grave economic conditions; and

Whereas California dairy farmers receive 40 percent of their income from milk on the basis of factory milk prices and the proposed lowering of supports will reduce dairy farm income in California by more than \$7 million in 1958 with the reduction affecting 40 percent of the milk supply produced in California; and

Whereas 70 percent of dairy producers in the State would be directly affected by such a change and the resultant consequences would also seriously affect the other 30 percent of the producers in this State; and

Whereas since 1954, dairy farmers at their own expense have greatly increased programs of research for new outlets and engaged in trade promotion of dairy products and the dairy industry and allied organizations have worked out a program of self-help for the dairy farmer; and

Whereas legislation is now being proposed for consideration by Congress which would to a large extent eliminate the dairy farmers' problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That Secretary Benson of the United States Department of Agriculture be respectfully memorialized to withhold putting into effect any change in the existing dairy price supports until such time as the United States Congress has had an opportunity to study the problems of the dairy farmers and to consider and act upon proposed legislation to solve these problems; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to each Member of Congress representing the State of California.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as an indication of the feelings in the Midwest, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Gov. Orville Freeman, of Minnesota, voicing a similar appeal.

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

STATE OF MINNESOTA,

St. Paul, Minn., January 31, 1958.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: I have been deeply disturbed by two recent developments in the field of dairy farming and earnestly hope that the Congress will see fit to take remedial action concerning these developments. On December 18, 1957, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson announced that dairy price supports for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1958, would be at 75 percent of parity. This reduction of support prices to 75 percent of parity would mean a decrease in price for milk of 25 cents per hundredweight, or a decrease in dairy income for Minnesota farmers during the next marketing year of approximately \$20 million. In addition to the fact of a direct market cut on next April 1, the Secretary's announcement at a date more than 4 months in advance of the proposed effective date for the support cut has had a depressing effect on current prices for milk and dairy products.

On January 16, 1958, the President of the United States in his message to the Congress on agricultural programs recommended that the dairy price support should be set by the Secretary of Agriculture through administrative order at a price level between 60 and 90 percent of parity. This recommended minimum of 60 percent of parity would result in a price cut of about 75 cents per hundredweight for Minnesota milk, or a total reduction in dairy income in the State of Minnesota during the next marketing year of \$48 million.

In 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture made his first reduction in dairy support prices. This reduction was justified by Mr. Benson on the grounds that a lower price level would reduce total production of milk and increase income to the dairy farmer. The experience of the past 4 years demonstrates conclusively the bankruptcy of this policy. In the intervening period, production has increased every successive year and income to the dairy farmer has not improved. I believe we must have a new program for the dairy farmers of the Nation. I believe further that while Congress is working out this program, cuts in dairy price supports such as proposed by Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower should not be made. We must, at the very least, hold the line on dairy price supports until a new program to stabilize the dairy industry is worked out.

Therefore, I urge each of you to work for the enactment of legislation to hold dairy price supports at their current level until such time as a new program for dairy farmers has been adopted by the Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,

Governor.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 149) to stay any reduction in support prices for dairy products until Congress can make appropriate provision for such support prices, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. AIKEN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STAY OF REDUCTION IN SUPPORT PRICES OR ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the second joint resolution, introduced on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and myself, would prevent:

Reductions in support prices or acreage allotments prior to consideration by Congress of such changes in the price support and acreage allotment laws as may be necessary as this time:

1. The support price (in terms of dollars and cents) for any commodity shall not be less than that available for such commodity during the marketing year or season which began in 1957; and

2. The total acreage allotted for any commodity shall not be less than that allotted for the 1957 crop of such commodity.

This joint resolution shall be effective only until such time as Congress shall make other provision for price supports and acreage allotments and provide for the repeal of this resolution.

This is the kind of action needed to stem the tide of recession, along with other proposals mentioned today by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The purpose of the joint resolution is to give the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry time that may be required for long-term legislative action in the field of agricultural policy.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 150) to stay any reduction in support prices or acreage allotments until Congress can make appropriate changes in the price support and acreage allotment laws, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 8381) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO CERTAIN UNINTENDED BENEFITS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on July 23, 1957, I called the attention of the Senate to a Treasury Department ruling wherein American corporations in

computing their income-tax returns were being permitted to deduct as legitimate business expenses the payments of bribes or kickbacks to officials or employees of foreign governments when doing business in their countries.

The particular case which was called to my attention to illustrate this practice is as follows:

The Lock Joint Pipe Co., 150 Rutledge Avenue, East Orange, N. J., had bid on several contracts for construction work in the Dominican Republic. Their bids were recognized as satisfactory and the company was approved for the work; however, before being awarded the contracts they were requested to and acquiesced in the payment of bribes or kickbacks to officials of that Government amounting in the aggregate to approximately \$1,800,000.

These bribes or kickbacks were added to the original bids submitted, and presumably upon being paid by the Dominican Republic for the work, the company converted this extra payment into cash and turned it over to an agent for distribution to the officials. All of these kickbacks or bribes were turned over to a Mr. Rogers in the form of cash with the exception of one check for \$100,000 which was paid to him in New York City.

For example, in one instance the Lock Joint Pipe Co. submitted a proposed bid of \$11,775,000 for a certain contract. A representative of the Dominican Republic, Mr. William Rogers—a British subject—who at that time was Chief of the Division of Aqueducts in the Dominican Republic, advised the company that their bid was acceptable provided that they included in the figure an additional \$100,000, which was to be paid over to him. Accordingly, the figure of the contract was revised to \$11,875,000.

Shortly thereafter Mr. Rogers stated that their bid as revised was acceptable but instructed the company to add another \$600,000 to the bid, bringing the total to \$12,475,000, with the understanding that the additional \$600,000 was also to be rebated to Mr. Rogers, who said that the additional item was being collected for the benefit of the dictatorship, and that \$500,000 of this amount was being paid over for the generalissimo. This left Mr. Rogers' take on this contract \$200,000.

Altogether, during the life of this particular contract a total of \$700,000 was distributed in kickbacks and bribes over the 4-year period 1949–52.

Again, in 1951, the company was advised that further installations were contemplated by the Dominican Republic, and this time the company offered to do the work for \$5,920,000, but, again, upon the suggestion of the same Mr. Rogers, they revised their contract price to \$6,030,000 with the understanding that the additional \$110,000 was to be collected and paid over to Mr. Rogers. Presumably after Mr. Rogers took the matter up with the generalissimo he returned to the company and instructed them to add another \$250,000, which he described as being for Trujillo.

This brought the revised contract price to \$6,280,000, with the bid including \$360,000 for kickbacks.

Later additional work on the project was proposed, and the contract was extended. The company's bid on this extension was \$7,162,000, and this time they were instructed to include two additional amounts: (1) \$500,000, and (2) \$150,000; bringing the revised bid to \$7,812,000, again with the understanding that the \$650,000 would be used as kickbacks to officials of the dictatorship. Mr. Rogers told the company that this \$650,000 was to be distributed, \$500,000 for the chief—\$100,000 for his own benefit, and \$50,000 for special purposes.

The payment of \$1,710,000 in kickbacks and bribes was apparently made in the Dominican Republic which added to another \$100,000 paid to Mr. Rogers in New York City in 1952 brought the total paid by the company in bribes or kickbacks to officials of the Dominican Republic to \$1,810,000.

It is interesting to note that the United States Government allowed all of these kickbacks and bribes as ordinary and necessary business expenses, and thereby deductible for Federal income tax purposes, with the exception of 1 payment of \$100,000 to Mr. Rogers in the State of New York, and disallowance of this item was based on the fact that bribery, even in commercial transactions among private persons, is unlawful in the State of New York.

The United States Government reasoned that "the payment of \$100,000 to Mr. Rogers in New York in 1952 violated that law and to allow a deduction for that payment would frustrate the policy of that State as evidenced by its laws."

It has always been my understanding that the payment of a bribe or kickback under any circumstances is wrong and that under no circumstances can its recognition as a legitimate expense of doing business be justified.

The actual distribution of the bribes and kickbacks as recognized by the Treasury Department as having been paid by this company to Mr. Rogers for his own personal use and for distribution to the dictatorship is as follows:

First contract:	
1949.....	\$436,000
1950.....	136,000
1951.....	28,000
1952.....	100,000
Total.....	700,000
Second contract and extension:	
1951.....	\$275,000
1952.....	544,000
1953.....	121,000
1954.....	148,000
1955.....	21,000
Total.....	1,109,000

Unquestionably the overwhelming majority of American corporations doing business abroad would refuse to cooperate in such holdup practices even if the demands were made of them.

Nevertheless, as in the instance outlined here, the situation does exist in which this practice has been followed, and we are advised that as the courts place interpretation upon the existing law such payments, either as kickbacks or bribes, can be deducted for income-

tax purposes as ordinary and necessary expenses of doing business.

Therefore, the burden now comes back to the Congress and the Treasury Department to support the necessary corrective legislation, thereby definitely both rejecting the principle and correcting the law.

All of the above referred to amounts were allowed by the Treasury Department as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses and thereby deductible for income tax purposes.

In the Treasury Department's letter, as incorporated in the RECORD on July 23, 1957, they stated:

Where . . . it is the foreign government itself which demands or acquiesces in the payment, so that legal recourse is not available to the taxpayer in the operation of his legal business, the Service would find it difficult to sustain the position that the expenses were not ordinary and necessary to the taxpayer's business.

In subsequent conversations with the Department and with the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation it has been agreed that in order to stop this practice additional legislation is required.

I am therefore today proposing an amendment to H. R. 8381, the purpose of which amendment is to prohibit the allowance as legitimate business deductions the payment of any bribe or kickback to officials or employees of foreign governments. There is already a law which prohibits such allowances on bribes or kickbacks paid to anyone within our country.

I ask that the amendment be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

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

On page 6 after line 9 insert the following new section:

"That section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to trade or business expenses) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d), and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) Improper payments to officials or employees of foreign countries: No deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for any expense paid or incurred if the payment thereof is made, directly or indirectly, to an official or employee of a foreign country, and if the receipt of the payment would be unlawful under the laws of the United States if such laws were applicable to such payment and to such official or employee."

"Sec. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to expenses paid or incurred after the date of the enactment of this act. The determination as to whether any expense paid or incurred prior to the date of the enactment of this act shall be deductible shall be made as if this act had not been enacted and without inference drawn from the fact that this section is not expressly made applicable with respect to expenses paid or incurred prior to the date of the enactment of this act."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, to recognize these bribes or kickbacks as legitimate business deductions under the guise of ordinary and necessary busi-

ness expenses is in effect to condone the practice.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee I shall urge the prompt adoption and acceptance of this amendment by Congress. Certainly our Government cannot afford to be on record as recognizing under any circumstances the legitimacy or the propriety of an American corporation or individual bribing an official or employee of a foreign government when soliciting contracts with that country.

It is my understanding that the Dominican Republic officials referred to as having received the bribes or kickbacks have upon inquiry denied the payments; however, company officials insist that the payments were made and describe them as being for the officials as outlined.

This contradiction further emphasizes my contention that under no circumstances should the United States Government ever recognize or condone the payment of bribes or kickbacks since obviously even if the moral character of the transaction were ignored, no company or individual can certify or prove the payment of cash bribes. No one would be fool enough to give receipts for bribery which was paid in cash.

Certainly, to say the least, the allowance of such cash bribes as legitimate business expenses for income-tax purposes is a far cry from the recent Treasury announcement demanding from the average taxpayer a complete itemized breakdown of every expense item.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as cosponsor of the bill (S. 3194) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to establish an initial program of tax adjustment for small and independent business and for persons engaged in small and independent business, which bill was introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in behalf of himself and other Senators on January 30, 1958.

First of all, let me congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business for this excellent bill which in its 49 pages makes a frontal attack on some pressing problems of small business.

The bill, as its sponsors indicate, is not intended as a comprehensive and complete solution of all the difficulties of small business which should be the concern of the Congress.

I say it is our concern because with bipartisan accord we have promised in our party platforms to study and solve the handicaps of new and small business.

I say it is our concern because the Congress, through its studies, is impressed with the compelling reasons for adjustment of tax burdens on new and small business.

And now the committee under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], from its travels of thousands of miles and its

consultation with hundreds and hundreds of small-business men in their home areas in every part of our land, has adduced the evidence and information which serves as the basis for this practical and profitable legislation.

The bill is practical because it helps to meet the need of small business to retain some part of its earnings to insure stability and growth. The bill is profitable to our country because this help to small business is truly an investment in our economy—strengthening our communities in peace—improving our ability to meet the demands of defense.

If I enumerate, in brief, some of the factors of this bill, it is not in explanation but in appreciation of the workmanship of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The bill permits an exemption from Federal income tax of a specific amount of net income before taxes, which exemption will be plowed back into the business for stability and expansion.

It extends retirement provisions to persons not now included.

It permits installment payments on Federal estate taxes so that the resources of a small business would not be drained in a single year.

It extends to used equipment the depreciation rates now applicable to new equipment; it being considered that small business with its limited capital cannot buy high-priced new equipment.

It permits corporations an election to be taxed as partnerships avoiding the inequity of double income taxation.

It increases the minimum accumulated earnings credit from \$60,000 to \$100,000 which is a recognition of inflation. And it avoids conflicting decisions in tax cases by making the findings of the Tax Court of the United States or the United States courts of appeals binding upon the Secretary of the Treasury unless the Treasury chose to appeal.

Perfection is not claimed for this bill nor is the small-business job completed, but surely a major and a master step has been taken and it is a privilege to be permitted to be a cosponsor of the most praiseworthy product of the work of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

I thank my colleagues.

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

PROPOSED TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1958—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 10, 1958, the names of Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. NEUBERGER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3263) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to reduce the rate applicable to the first \$1,000 of taxable income for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. CARROLL), on February 10, 1958.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 10, 1958, the names of Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. NEUBERGER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3264) to amend

the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase the amount of the personal exemption for taxable year 1958 and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes, introduced on February 10, 1958, by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. CARROLL).

ACTIVITIES OF INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION IN FIELD OF AIRPORT ECONOMICS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 6, 1958, the names of Mr. LONG, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. MAGNUSON were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 258) relating to the participation of the United States in the activities of the International Civil Aviation Organization in the field of airport economics, submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. KENNEDY) on February 6, 1958.

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

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Lincoln Day address delivered by him at Los Angeles, Calif., on February 12, 1958.

By Mr. BEALL:

Address delivered by him on January 23, 1958, upon receipt of the first Distinguished Service Award of the Washington Junior Chamber of Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address by Senator CASE of New Jersey, delivered at dedication of a new building at Union Junior College, Cranford, N. J., on February 9, 1958.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address entitled "America's Abundance and World Needs," by Senator PROXMIER before the Church World Service luncheon, Statler Hotel, December 5, 1957.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Transcript of proceedings of Dedicatory Prayer Breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on February 6, 1958.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CONFESSIONS AND POLICE DETENTION BY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, has to be out of the city this week on other official Senate business, but has requested that an announcement be made at this time on forthcoming public hearings by the subcommittee.

The Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee will conduct public hearings on the subject, Confessions and Police Detention, on Friday, March 7, 1958, and Tuesday, March 11, 1958, beginning at 10:30 a. m., in room 457, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. This subject has been studied for some time by the subcommittee, as noted in Senate Report No. 23 last year and Senate Re-

port No. 1203 this year, and these are the first practicable dates for holding hearings.

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARINGS ON S. 1870, RELATING TO THE RENDITION OF MUSICAL COMPOSITIONS ON COIN-OPERATED MACHINES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the hearings previously scheduled to commence on Wednesday, February 19, and to continue through Friday, February 21, 1958, on S. 1870, a bill to amend section 1 (e) of title 17 of the United States Code with regard to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines, have been rescheduled to commence at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Wednesday, April 9, and to continue through Friday, April 11, 1958.

The necessity for the rescheduling of these hearings is occasioned by a conflict in dates. The Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, has already commenced hearings which are now scheduled to run into the time when the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights was to have held hearings on S. 1870. It is believed, therefore, that the hearings already commenced should be concluded prior to entering upon hearings not actually begun.

At the hearings on S. 1870 all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, chairman.

THE FRENCH ATTACK UPON SAKIET-SIDI-YOUSSEF

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bombing attack on the Tunisian village of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef was shocking. It was wholly unworthy of the great traditions of France. I cannot believe that it was an act of the French people, a people whose sense of humanity and decency is as high as that of any other people in the world. I cannot believe that it was a responsible act of the present French Republic. For all its difficulties, French officials in Paris cannot have lost their awareness of right and wrong. They cannot have so forgotten their righteous wrath at the reprisals taken against France during World War II as now to sanction the use of the same methods against others.

This attack on the helpless in a Tunisian village was not an act of France and the French people. It was an act of madness perpetrated by a handful of irresponsible men who have splattered the very flag they purport to represent, the very uniform they wear.

No matter what is done now, it will not restore the innocent dead in Tunisia. To be sure, we can and should deplore the incident. To be sure, this country can and should express deep regrets, the

more so since some of the planes that carried out the attack were of American manufacture.

Even more, however, we can act. We can adjust our policies in a manner which will help to move the situation in north Africa from the brink of chaos to a position of peace. The question now is to find a means out of the impasse in which this grave incident has placed France and Tunisia, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the whole Western World in its relations with Arab peoples, especially with those of north Africa who are closest to the West in outlook.

The key to the difficulty, and the basic cause of the present incident, is Algeria. Recent statements issued by the Algerian national liberation front show a growing hostility to the United States. The front now demands that our bases be reassessed—in other words, be removed from north Africa. This means, of course, the bases in Libya and Morocco. If this demand were to be fulfilled, it would mean that NATO would be in grave danger of encirclement; it would mean that Cairo would become the dominant Arab base in north Africa; and it would mean that the way for further intensive Soviet penetration would be paved.

In these circumstances, we cannot divorce ourselves from what is occurring in north Africa. So long as the dispute in that region involved only France and the Algerian nationalists, that might have been possible. It is no longer possible. The bombing incident in Tunisia has turned the dispute into a situation with worldwide implications which involve us and our policies in many ways.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the United States must align its policies on north Africa, not with the policies of those who have committed this act in Tunisia, but with the finest sentiments of the French people and those of other free people throughout the world. In the case of the immediate incident, this means that if the matter is referred to the United Nations, and once the facts are established: First, this country should support, in the United Nations, and by diplomacy, the claims of the innocent against those who bombed, for damages to property and persons, as a result of the raid on Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef, as well as other appropriate remedies; second, this country should support the establishment along both the Tunisian-Algerian and the Moroccan-Algerian border of limited nations emergency patrols, similar to those which have functioned so effectively on the Israeli-Egyptian frontier.

These are, at best, suggestions designed to prevent a further deterioration of the situation in north Africa. The need is deeper. The need still is for peace in Algeria—a peace that satisfies the decent people of that region and of France, even if it does not please those who rain death with the terrorist grenade or the bombing plane. Such a settlement could be based on acceptance of the principle that all who live permanently in Algeria have equal rights and equal obligations. At this late date, it may well be that it will take more than the French and the Al-

gerians to work out that kind of solution in Algeria. It may well take the good offices of those who, disinterested in the immediate situation, desire the friendship of both, and whose friendship is sought by both.

If this can be done, I express the hope that the Franco-Tunisian affair and the question of Algeria can be settled outside the United Nations, by the interested parties themselves. If this hope can become a fact, it will be in the best interests of those immediately concerned, as well as the best interests of those at a distance who are concerned. Time is of the essence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, tragedy befell Tunisia and the cause of freedom last Saturday. In a single act of idiocy, the Tunisian market town of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef was the victim of a premeditated attack by French fliers using American-made planes, raining death and destruction on the town hall, the post office, a school, 84 shops, and 2 Red Cross trucks carrying Swiss license plates. A total of 68 persons dead, including women and children, and a hundred wounded were left when the B-26's and Corsairs retired across the border into that other scene of terror and death, Algeria.

We have been wringing our hands over French colonial policies for years. We wrung our hands over them during the bloody holocaust of Indochina, and there proved to be no solution for that problem until the French themselves gradually tired of the accumulation of bitterness and bloodshed, tears, and treasure, which that fruitless holding operation cost.

But the lessons of Indochina apparently have not been learned in north Africa. Many of us for months have hoped against hope that a decent basis of close and enduring relations could be forged by the French and her former north African possessions. The natural interests of Morocco and Tunisia still lie in a close association with France. The chances of salvaging anything constructive from the Algerian crisis also lie, or lay until last weekend, with enlightened compromise from Paris.

The quagmire of Algeria has seemed unending enough. Against increasing pressure of world opinion, including liberal opinion in France itself, the French Government has insisted on treating Algeria as a domestic matter. But the desperate and hotheaded action of the French Air Force last Saturday is almost a transparent indication that the French are determined to act against their own best interests.

The Tunisian market day bombing has done more than anything before to internationalize the Algerian problem, precisely the thing Paris has been trying to avoid.

Like a stone dropped into a huge pond, the ever-widening ripples from the Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef bombing are spreading out to ever greater catastrophe for the entire western position and to ever greater possibilities for Soviet diplomacy.

The President of Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba, has been desperately trying to maintain his friendship for the West in recent months. A week ago, before

the bombing, he said that he needed something more than the pretty eyes of Mr. Dulles to maintain that relationship. Tuesday, Mr. Bourguiba's Destour Party newspaper said:

Hard reality is teaching us each day that to hang on to the West only produces a harvest of rebuffs and humiliations and, between gestures of charity, bombs. For the B-26's and Corsairs which sowed death Saturday morning were American as much as they were French. One thing is clear. To be respected in 1958 means one must no longer be a friend of the West.

We cannot wring our hands on such matters forever, disagreeable as it always is to talk man to man with one of our closest allies about a problem as explosive and sensitive as this one. Nevertheless, it is time for such a man-to-man talk with our French friends. What we must tell them is also, I think, quite clear:

It is always a cruel process to relinquish an empire, but some ways of doing it are better than others. Indochina proved a tragic military holocaust. Algeria has already become another.

France is not the only western power which has an interest in the development of stable, peaceful governments in north Africa. The interests of NATO, and more than that, the interests of the Free World, demand positive, constructive steps to solve the north African colonial controversy. We in the United States, and the other good friends of France in the West, do not intend to allow ourselves to be drawn along with French policy into a descending spiral of hatred and hopelessness in north Africa. That is what needs to be said to our French allies.

A famous Frenchman, Clemenceau, once said that war was too serious an affair to be entrusted to generals. French generals have just proved this once more.

The strategic, political, and moral position of the West is far too important to be tied to the kite of French military decisions for which even the French Foreign Office disclaims responsibility. We are not prepared to sacrifice the friendship of a Bourguiba at the whim of a handful of French pilots with lethal weapons in their hands.

The world is not interested in explanations from Paris at the moment. It is interested in amends.

The United States, in its own best interests and in the interests of the Free World, will no longer pull French chestnuts out of the fire at the United Nations on the Algerian question.

Mr. President, just as we are interested in amends for the Tunisian attack, so we are interested in a fair and constructive settlement of the Algerian issue. We should support inclusion of this item on the United Nations agenda, and redouble our efforts to conciliate and mediate.

I would go further. Under our NATO arrangements with France, France has no right to use equipment furnished for NATO defense in the manner in which the planes were used last Saturday. I have checked at the State Department, only to learn that the B-26's used in the attack were apparently purchased by France, without any strings attached.

The F4U7 Corsairs, however, were apparently donated to France under our mutual defense assistance program, which provides that the equipment shall be used for NATO purposes.

I am one of those who feel we should have raised with the French long ago this question of the use of NATO equipment in Algeria. The French have always claimed that Algeria was within the NATO sphere, however, and for that reason the State Department has never protested. But Tunisia is not in the NATO area, and I think the question should now be raised.

Under section 511 (c) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the United States has reserved the right to request the return of NATO equipment donated by us when it is no longer needed for the purpose intended. The use of the Corsairs in the Tunisian attack is prima facie evidence, as far as I am concerned, that this equipment is not considered by the French to be needed for NATO purposes. I respectfully suggest that the President, through the Secretary of State, inform the French Government that the NATO equipment used in last Saturday's attack be returned to the United States for disposition elsewhere in conformance with NATO objectives.

I also hope, Mr. President, we have conveyed our heartfelt sympathy to the people of Tunisia, and, may I say, renewed our bonds of friendship to the President of Tunisia.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have listened with the greatest interest, because of my own concern with our Nation's foreign policy, to the remarks this morning of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], on the subject of the French bombing of a village in Tunisia.

I believe we must be very precise on this subject, as my colleagues have tried to be. We must be precise in this way, namely, that we need a specific policy for our country.

There appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, on February 11, an editorial entitled "A Sad Error," which I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

A SAD ERROR

The whole Free World will agree with French Foreign Minister Pineau that the bombing of a Tunisian village was a "sad error." It is an error that cost the lives of 74 civilians and injured 102 others. Moreover, the Foreign Minister himself now concedes that General Salan's communique—claiming that only military objectives were hit—"does not correspond to the facts."

"There is no doubt, I'm afraid," Mr. Pineau told Joseph Alsop, "that almost the whole village was destroyed."

President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have expressed the deep concern that all Americans feel over this tragedy, particularly since United States-built planes were used in the raids. Senator KNOWLAND, noting that Tunisia is a member of the U. N., spoke the feeling of many in saying: "The U. N. cannot have one rule for small aggressors and another for the large ones."

The one cheering note in what is otherwise a ghastly mess is that the French Government itself was apparently not aware of the planned operation. It may seem unlikely that this could happen, but actually it did occur in a situation as confused as the Tunisian war.

Because French forces are frequently attacked by rebels who flee into Tunisia as a "protected sanctuary," the French some time ago authorized "hot pursuit" in Tunisian border areas. A French patrol was shot up 3 weeks ago near Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef with 15 dead and 4 kidnaped. An electrified barbed wire fence was set up at the border; in the past 10 days 3 planes patrolling it have been struck, over Algeria, by heavy machinegun fire from inside Tunisia. What may have happened is that a mission was authorized to wipe out the machinegun nest, but that the men who carried it out exceeded their orders. It must be borne in mind that some of them have been fighting for 10 years, have bitter memories of the Chinese "sanctuary" which protected Ho Chi Minh's forces in Indochina, and also have an understandable hatred toward those who have killed so many of their comrades. This, of course, does not justify what was done; it does help explain it.

The wisest thing for the French Government to do now is to admit its error, to make public apologies for it, and to take swift action to pay damages to Tunisia and to provide other relief for the survivors. By the same token President Bourguiba should police his own borders more effectively, halt the shooting at French planes, and stop giving sanctuary to rebels.

The President has already dispatched our Ambassador to Tunisia, G. Lewis Jones, to inspect the bombed village. He and Secretary Dulles have discussed, among other things, a U. N. observation team to police this troubled border. Something of this sort certainly ought to be attempted, and soon.

The most tragic aspect of this business is the free ride it gives to Nasser and all other hate-the-west propagandists being manipulated by Soviet experts.

Because of this it would be well for the United States to do everything in its power to help the stricken people of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef. We urge the President to send planes with food, clothing and medical supplies, and treat it as a disaster area. For what happened there was certainly a disaster—for the people of the village, and for the whole Free World.

Mr. JAVITS. As the editorial states, we should at least show our sympathy by direct aid to the people who have been bereaved.

The other way to do it is this—and again I say we must be precise in this regard: Whatever the American policy has been in the past, it must now be changed to provide that we use every organization of Government to bring about mediation of this dispute in the United Nations.

I still think the United Nations, which was effective in Indonesia, which was effective in Palestine, and which was effective in other areas of the world, can be effective in this Tunisian situation here.

At one time we voted against the consideration of this issue by the General Assembly. We have to be foursquare about it. We have to make as a major item of Government policy the fact that every organ of the United Nations should be used to bring about the end of this dispute.

This is a clear and precise precedent, and demands an orderly policy on the part of the United States. Nothing else will do. There seems to be, in my opinion, no quicker or better method of approach.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE PROCLAMATION OF LITHUANIA

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, nearly 18 years have passed since the barbaric hordes of Soviet Russia swept through Lithuania, a small but significant land of freedom, and reduced it to a slave state incorporated into the Communist empire. At this time, however, let us note a happier occasion in the history of Lithuania, for it was 40 years ago that her freedom-loving peoples proclaimed their independence.

There is a tie between these two events, a most important tie. For the spirit which prompted the event of 40 years ago, the proclamation of independence, daily threatens the more recent development, that of enslavement by Russia. Sooner or later, that spirit will again prevail, and Lithuanians will once again know liberty's blessings.

The United States has never recognized the illegal seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. Thus, as we pause to commemorate the 40th anniversary of Lithuania's independence declaration, let us remind the world that this great Nation continues to regard the Baltic States as sovereign nations, looking to the day when they will again be as independent in fact as they are today in the hearts of their peoples.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on the 16th of February millions of American hearts will turn with a longing toward Lithuania. That date will be an anniversary of independence of a country no longer free, but of a people who, having known suffering and subjugation through dark pages of history, have faith and hope that the justice of a brighter hour will return again.

The same history proves the Lithuanians a race of character, culture, and courage. They cling to the glories of their language and they maintain the traditions that have been theirs since before the Christian era.

Americans of every race share both the sorrow and the aspirations of the people of Lithuania. For America is grateful for the contributions that men and women of Lithuanian blood have made to our common strength.

In the first and succeeding generations, in our schools and sports, our professions and our Armed Forces, every State has a proud record of the boys and girls who have achieved fame for themselves and for America.

We salute Lithuania, which became an independent land four centuries before America was discovered. We sympathize with Lithuania, which lost its independence in 1795, even as these United States started on their journey. We look back to February 16, 1918, when Lithuania stood forth an independent nation once again. And again we sorrow in the distress of these past 18 years,

when the heel of the conqueror and the broken promises of great nations bring oppression to a great people.

They have a faith that the Soviet can never destroy. They have a courage that the Soviet can never vanquish. Lithuania has a character that will survive when all the fraud and force and fear of Godless tyrants will have vanished from the face of the earth. Loyal Lithuania, we salute you on your independence day, and we pray for the day when you shall truly be free.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the year 1918 gave birth to a large number of new national states. Many of these were subdued long ago and were submerged within large and inclusive empires, and for centuries they had ceased to be independent and sovereign nations. In Europe alone there were half of a dozen such national groups: the Czechs, Poles, and Ukrainians, Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were among these. And, as the First World War was drawing to its close, many of these national groups proclaimed their independence, attained their freedom, and became sovereign states. Among them was the Republic of Lithuania.

Prior to that date, for more than a hundred years, Lithuanians were brought under the rule of Russia, and as subjects of autocratic czars they suffered all sorts of hardships, yet under most oppressive conditions they managed to preserve many of their national traditions and clung steadfastly to the idea of national freedom and independence. In 1918, when that autocratic regime was shattered, they proclaimed their independence on February 16.

Today, we paid tribute to Lithuania and the 40th anniversary of that great historic event. Even though, and most unfortunately, that independence is no more and liberty-loving Lithuanians have been suffering, for more than 17 years, under totalitarian tyranny, yet that day remains as a living symbol for all Lithuanians, particularly for those living under Communist bondage in their native land. Under tyranny and indescribable hardships they cannot observe this memorable day, but they all pray for the regaining of their freedom. In observing this day, the Lithuanian Independence Day, we echo their genuine sentiments and ardently hope that some day and soon they will celebrate their independence day in their beloved homeland.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to add my comments to those of other Senators in paying tribute to the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, an independence relatively short lived in fact, but long lived and living forever in the hearts of those who cherish liberty above enslavement, and freedom above the tyranny imposed by imperialistic masters. Those who, like my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], and my other colleagues, who commemorate this event in the United States are performing a dual service—they keep fresh in the memory of Americans a small country whose liberty was forfeited through agreement between Nazi and Communist totalitarian powers, and they remind the world

that Lithuanian independence is a real expectation for the future more than a mere memory of the past.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, Sunday, February 16, is the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania. We in America are proud to join with free Lithuanians everywhere in the celebration of this glorious day. Although their nation was treacherously seized by Russia, the courageous Lithuanian people have not conceded that the Soviet tyranny is anything more than a temporary phenomenon.

To these brave people, who made such magnificent strides as a free nation, we extend our deepest sympathy and friendship; and we hope with all of them that the day when once again they will be welcomed into the family of free nations will soon dawn.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, February 16, 1958, marks the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It is a sad day of commemoration, for the light of liberty, rekindled just 40 years ago, and shining so brightly, was extinguished once more on June 15, 1940. It was then that brave Lithuania was occupied by Soviet Russian forces. This was in direct violation of the treaty of 1926. This was in direct violation of all treaties—the peace pact, the nonaggression pact, and the mutual assistance pact with Russia with a guarantee of Lithuanian independence and of Russian noninterference in the domestic, social, and economic order of that country—a treaty which is still in force between Lithuania and Soviet Russia.

Since that dark day of June in 1940, literally hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women, and children have been either brutally deported to Soviet labor camps or have been annihilated. The population of Lithuania, through these inhuman methods, has been reduced from around 3,000,000 to half of that number.

Lithuanian statehood dates back to the year 1200 A. D. It has a magnificent historical record of tolerance, of individual and cultural liberty. Throughout the centuries the heroic sacrifices of the Lithuanian people have been made for basic human rights, for human dignity, for freedom of the press and religion.

First under Nazi domination and then under Soviet oppression, the light of liberty has been dimmed. It still flickers, however, and will some day flare into brilliance as it has in the past. Lithuanian history is rife with a constant war for freedom. During the Middle Ages Lithuania was a powerful state. She successfully defended herself against the Germans, the Mongols, and the Tartars. Finally in 1795, Lithuania lost her freedom to czarist Russia. From that date until 1918 Lithuania was at constant war with Russia and Germany to regain her lost liberty and freedom.

On February 16, 1918, the United States, Russia, Germany, and other nations recognized the independence of Lithuania, with Russia giving up all claims to that nation.

It was during these few short years of freedom that Lithuania contributed so

much of culture and industry to the world. Today her industries have been depleted and ravaged. Her culture lies prostrate under the heel of a cruel dictatorship which hopes to stamp out her national life forever. Her young people are forced into Communist schools. Her young men are impressed into the Russian armed forces. Her religious life is all but extinct.

But despite this sad and shocking picture, all hope is not lost for these brave people. History has shown that any regime built on a foundation of the murder, pillage, and misery of innocent people cannot and will not endure.

As we join today with all Lithuanian-Americans in commemorating this 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we give thanks for the enrichment of our own beloved country by the fierce love for liberty each has inherited and by the skills which they have so generously contributed to our own welfare.

May all of us join our prayers to their own that the day of deliverance for Lithuania will soon be realized and that the light of freedom will glow once more over that land.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Sunday, February 16, will mark the 40th anniversary of the formation of a free and independent government in Lithuania. This liberty-loving nation is now under Soviet domination and its people are unable to observe this anniversary, and it is fitting that the Congress of the United States should remind the Free World nations of the bravery and courage of the Lithuanian people.

The free government of the Republic of Lithuania was established February 16, 1918, as a direct result of President Woodrow Wilson's famous Declaration of 14 Points, which expressed the principle of national self-determination.

The establishment of the republic marked the end of 123 years of Lithuanian servitude to Imperial Russian rule. However, the republic enjoyed only 22 years of free national creative expression, and then was cruelly invaded by the Soviet Army, bringing a new Russian imperialism and Communist tyranny to this struggling nation.

As freedom-loving people, we Americans have an obligation to insist that Soviet Russia restore the independence and national sovereignty of the Republic, and I urge that the Department of State remain steadfast in refusing recognition to the Soviet annexation of Lithuania.

Also, here in America we are proud of the high cultural attainments and contributions to the Nation's welfare by Lithuanian Americans and their preservation of the cultural heritage of Lithuania, whose language and literature are among the oldest in the Western World. We extend to them and to Lithuanians everywhere our sincere best wishes and hopes that once again the Republic of Lithuania will take its rightful place in the ranks of the free nations of the world.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared commemorating the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Sunday, February 16, will mark the 40th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. This anniversary serves to focus our attention once again on the fact that since 1940 Lithuania has been unable to enjoy the rights and privileges of a free nation.

Lithuania's tragedy is representative of the great plight of our time—the sinister domination of small and independent nations by an imperialistic Soviet conspiracy, a conspiracy which is subtle because it is masked by the perverted ideals of international communism, but a conspiracy which is also all too overt, as was demonstrated over a year ago in Hungary.

May we never forget that the Lithuanian people were once free. To forget would be inviting disaster. To forget would be preparing the way for a similar tragedy of our own. Instead, let us in America always remember that the spirit of liberty continues to live in the hearts of these valiant people.

It is only fitting that we join with the million Americans of Lithuanian descent in commemorating this anniversary of their independence. It is with heavy heart that we take cognizance of the present plight of their homeland, but it is with hope and determination that we dedicate ourselves to a future which will witness the rebirth of independence in Lithuania and the other enslaved nations of the world.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, it is with a heavy but also a hopeful heart that I rise today to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Sunday, February 16, will mark the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

My heart is heavy, because the independence of that gallant nation was so short lived. But at the same time, my heart is hopeful, because history teaches us that slavery will not endure forever.

History also teaches us, Mr. President, that freedom is indivisible. So long as any part of the human race is denied its freedom, the rest of the human race will not be entirely secure in its freedom.

The spirit is stronger than the sword. Although the Lithuanian nation is today in the grip of a foreign tyrant, the Lithuanian spirit is as undaunted and untrammled as ever.

So long as this spirit survives, so long as faith lasts, there will be grounds for hope, regardless of how distant the day of liberation may be.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is felicitous that Bishop Brizgys, of the Lithuanian Church, should have been with us this morning to open the Senate session with prayer.

This week marks the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Though the Lithuanian people have not known freedom for 18 years, their claim to independence has never been broken by the long interval of Russian oppression. The United States has never accorded diplomatic acknowledgment to the Russian annexation of this Baltic State. Through the Voice of America and our refugee programs, we have continued to recognize the distinctive national heritage and existence of Lithuania. Long as have been the years of Lithuanian submergence, we cannot slacken in our determination that the national and cultural ideals of Lithuania be reinforced

by a political restoration. On February 16, 1918, more than one century of Russian domination came to an end. Forty years later we must once again remember that the vital spark of freedom has not been extinguished among Lithuanians. Their cause remains our cause and their hopes more than ever remain our responsibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point the text of a letter recently delivered to President Eisenhower on behalf of the national Lithuanian-American student and youth organizations.

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

FEBRUARY 16, 1958.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: On the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the restoration of the Lithuanian independence we wish respectfully to point out the lesson of the experience of the Baltic States in general and of Lithuania in particular in their relations with the Soviet Union during the interwar period. This experience conclusively shows the vain hopes of the possibility of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union. It gives incontrovertible evidence of the continuous disregard by the Soviet Union of its solemn international commitments and agreements. Despite the treaties of peace and friendship and of non-aggression concluded with the Baltic States and solemn assurances of noninterference in their domestic affairs, the Soviet Union, in flagrant violation of these treaties, obligations, and pledges invaded the Baltic countries and forcibly incorporated them into the U. S. S. R.

Neither the United States nor any other free country has ever recognized this act of violence. On the contrary they denounced it for what it actually was—and act of brutal aggression in complete disregard of international law and Soviet commitments. The policy of nonrecognition by the leaders of the Free World of these illegal acts of the Soviet Union continues to give a ray of hope to all of the Soviet enslaved nations and maintains their spirit of resistance to the Soviet oppression.

On our part we clearly see the close relationship which exists between the United States policy not to recognize the effects of these acts of aggression committed by the Soviet Union in the Baltic States and the possibility of the restoration of their independence. We hold that any recognition of the present status quo in the Baltic countries by the United States could imply the recognition of the results of a flagrant violation of international law and justice. This should not be done inasmuch as the length of oppression does not change the illegal nature of the Soviet crime, nor make it acceptable to the enslaved peoples, nor finally provide any legal or moral grounds to justify an act of violence.

There is no doubt in our minds that the United States, as the leading power in the Free World is not going to change its longstanding position in regard to the perfidious actions of the Soviet Union in the Baltic area. To the contrary we firmly believe that the United States as the moral leader of the Free World will support by all possible means the struggle of many millions of the enslaved peoples for freedom and for the righting of the international wrongs done by the Soviet Union.

It is also our firm conviction that the present position of leadership of the United States would be best strengthened through an unequivocal, clear, and positive restatement of the principles of freedom and of

the longstanding policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet domination in Eastern Europe in general and the occupation of the Baltic States in particular. The U. S. S. R. furthermore should be induced to withdraw its occupying forces and agents from the Baltic States and permit free elections under international control.

One of the effective ways to counteract the newest Soviet cold war offensive would be the intensification of a consistent, positive, and courageous policy of support of the struggle for freedom of the captive countries by the United States. Such policy should expose the real motives of the present Soviet peace offensive, reveal the true objectives of communism in the uncommitted countries, and remind the members of NATO the fate of the countries whose relations with the Soviet Union were not based on the position of strength and unity, backed by a well-organized collective defense. But most of all such United States policy would keep alive the hope and aspirations of the captive nations to regain their independence thereby weakening the political and economic power of the Soviet empire.

The 40th anniversary of the restoration of the Lithuanian independence and stanch fights of the Lithuanian people for their survival are important reminders to everyone that despite the foreign oppression liberty and justice under law are the most cherished principles and moral values. It is an excellent opportunity to all peoples to review their belief and struggle for the immediate implementation of human rights and freedom and due respect for treaties concluded under the international law. We hope that these principles would continue to be uncompromisingly adhered to by the governments of the Free World and established everywhere through the efforts of the free nations under the leadership of the United States.

We wholeheartedly support, Mr. President, your attitude toward the present situation in Eastern Europe, as expressed in your letter of January 12, 1958, to the Soviet Government. We respectfully ask you, Mr. President, to stand firmly on your proposals as stated in this letter, and to refuse to participate in a conference with the Soviet leaders, unless they agree to place on the conference agenda and to discuss the question of the independence of the Soviet captured countries of Eastern Europe, and particularly of the Baltic States.

Most respectfully yours,
THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NATIONAL
LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN STUDENT
AND YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, after more than a century of Russian occupation and three unsuccessful attempts at insurrection against the alien occupiers, the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence at Vilna on February 16, 1918—40 short years ago.

The life of Lithuania as a free republic was uncommonly short. In the wake of the infamous Nazi-Soviet pact, Lithuania was engulfed by the Red tide of Communist power.

The United States has steadfastly refused to recognize the cowardly usurpation of the sovereignty of the Lithuanian Republic by the Soviet Union; thus, officially, Lithuania lives on in spite of its fate at the hands of a brutal oppressor.

In a historical sense, it would be difficult to match Lithuania's tribulations with those of any other country on earth. Yet, despite all the suffering and misery, the Lithuanian spirit remained unbroken. Even today, under the tyrannical

ny of the most cruel of all oppressors, the Lithuanian nation manages to keep the precious light of liberty aflame in the bosoms of her sons and daughters.

It is only fitting that the people of United States join free Lithuanians everywhere in commemorating the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of the Lithuanian Republic. I believe I express the conviction of us all that the tribulations of the Lithuanian people will soon come to an end and that an independent and sovereign Republic of Lithuania will again be able to take its rightful position among the free nations of this world.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the million Americans of Lithuanian descent and, indeed, with freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, in paying tribute to the 40th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. We who enjoy the priceless gift of freedom must speak on this occasion for a nation which has been silenced by tyranny.

A tragic twist of history has made Lithuanian independence short-lived. In the 13th century a dozen or so principalities were united into a small nation which, in the following centuries, endured the almost constant encroachments of other, far larger countries. Throughout this dark period the hope of eventual independence burned brightly, and finally, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania's dream of a free independent state came true.

For a period of some 22 years Lithuania proudly occupied a place of honor among the free nations of the world. For the first time, her political, social, economic and cultural institutions were permitted to flower without interference or subjection. Lithuania's land reform law of 1922 was the first in all Europe. Universal compulsory education reduced illiteracy, the ally of all oppressors, from 64 to 15 percent.

Her standards of commerce, agriculture and industry rose. The arts flourished in an atmosphere of peace and liberty.

And then, in 1940, Soviet Russia annexed Lithuania and her neighboring Baltic States. Rigid censorship has blacked out the struggles of Lithuania against oppression. But we know that since the incorporation of this tiny nation within the U. S. S. R., more than half a million Lithuanians have become the victims of Soviet mass murder, and thousands more go each month into exile or slave labor camps. These grim statistics point to the determination of Lithuanians to resist oppression and to their indomitable courage in the face of terrible odds. The 3 million silent Lithuanians still in their homeland may not hear us directly today. But perhaps some, through the broadcasts of a free world, will know that we fervently hope that one day Lithuanians everywhere may live again under a system of humanity and justice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, February 16 will mark the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania. Since that memorable event we have seen this brave

country enslaved and the dream of its people of a free and independent republic crushed by the Soviets. In these dark and cynical times many fail to appreciate the effect that the continuing struggle of the Lithuanian people has on the world and, indeed, it may appear that they are struggling against insuperable odds. However, dictators may come and go but where the love of freedom exists in the hearts of men it is the dictator that must eventually fall. It is essential to the preservation of our free society that we do not overlook the suffering and privations of the Lithuanian people.

The illegal seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviets can never be condoned and that black page in history can never be made clean unless and until those states are made free again. We fervently pray that that day will come soon.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE CENTRAL PORTION OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been very much encouraged by the shafts of light which recently have been focused on the little-known plans which would substantially alter the most outstanding architectural structure in this country—the original Capitol Building. I am constantly amazed at the number of people who are completely ignorant of the proposed project. I may add that they include a goodly number of the Members of Congress. For this reason, I am particularly pleased when the citizenry are alerted to the fact that the historic east front of the Capitol is in jeopardy; and I am very glad that on February 17, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is to hold hearings which will enable some of our outstanding architects and citizens to outline for us the nature of the jeopardy.

Because of my concern over this matter, I introduced on August 29, 1957, a bill (S. 2883) to amend the Legislative Appropriations Act of 1956, to eliminate the requirement that the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the Capitol be in substantial accord with scheme B of the architectural plan of March 3, 1905. Cosponsoring this bill with me was my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Therefore, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a letter, which appeared in the New York Times on February 10, 1958, written by one of this country's most distinguished architects, Mr. Lorimer Rich, F. A. I. A., architect of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the monumental approaches to the Amphitheater in Arlington National Cemetery. Because it is my feeling that my colleagues in the Senate, the Members of the House of Representatives, and the citizens in general would oppose any scheme which would destroy the east front of the Capitol, if they were aware of the plans to do so, I ask unanimous

consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times of February 10, 1958]

TO PRESERVE THE CAPITOL—NEW LEGISLATION TO SAVE FACADE OF EAST FRONT IS BACKED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

One hundred and sixty-five years ago George Washington laid the foundation stone for our National Capitol. General Washington said "It has grandeur, simplicity, and beauty." It was completed in 1829, the result of the genius of three of our early architects. Thornton, Latrobe, and Bulfinch. This central building stands today as approved by the Founders of the Republic.

This facade has looked down upon history. These stones have been the background for the inauguration of every President since Andrew Jackson. These steps have known the footprints of our early great—Webster, Clay, Calhoun. This portico has received the remains of our martyred Presidents—Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley. These are the walls viewed by our grandfathers as they assembled in the great plaza for the stirring Grand Army review of 1865. Surely, this setting should be preserved.

Today this symbol of our past is in danger of destruction. The Architect of the Capitol, who is not an architect, has recommended that the east front of the old Capitol be destroyed and a reproduction, in a different material, be built out from the present location. The reason given is that the Congress needed more space for committee rooms and dining halls.

ALTERNATE PLAN

Architects have devised a plan which provides for practically all the new requirements without moving out and destroying the east front. They propose to put the dining halls, committee rooms, and such, on the west side. However, the legislation as passed forbids this as the only new work to be done. It is a directive to provide space by the destruction of this historic memento.

The report of the consultants states that they were unable, because of the legislation, to do other than destroy the east front. They say it is "our considered belief that: the present beauty of the Capitol can be kept only by moving out the whole east front, wings and all, and not the central part alone." Unless the Congress can be persuaded to do otherwise, we will witness the destruction of the finest portion of this venerated building.

The legislation just mentioned was introduced and passed surreptitiously, without hearings. Authorization and appropriation were in the same bill. The American Institute of Architects has repeatedly protested this desecration.

Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH, CLIFFORD P. CASE, HUBERT HUMPHREY, and JOSEPH CLARK have introduced a bill, S. 2883, which will free the architects from the requirement that they destroy these walls.

S. 2883 has been referred to the Subcommittee on Public Buildings of the Senate Committee on Public Works. Senator PAT McNAMARA is chairman of the subcommittee. Public hearings on this vital bill will be held on February 17.

The east front of the Capitol is historic. The first architectural structure of this Nation, it is a milestone in our history. The American people cherish it and wish it to be preserved.

LORIMER RICH, F. A. I. A.,
The Committee to Preserve the National Capitol.

WASHINGTON, February 5, 1958.

COMMEMORATION OF BIRTHDAY OF GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO, FEBRUARY 12

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in Lafayette Park in this city of Washington stands the statue of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko.

In that single sentence we do honor to three great comrades of our War for Independence. In that single sentence we tell of the challenge that the word "freedom" has for all men. And in that single sentence we begin to tell something of the debt that our America owes to the many races which gave their very lives for her freedom's cause.

Washington, Lafayette, and Kosciusko became comrades when the Declaration of Independence meant a declaration of war. Lafayette was only 19 years of age when he heard both declarations. Kosciusko was 28. Washington was 44. Lafayette brought the enthusiasm of youth. Kosciusko brought the fighting experience of a soldier and an engineer. Under the leadership of Washington the talents of the three reached a climax in the Battle of Monmouth, the turning point of the Revolution.

Kosciusko had something in common with another great American—Abraham Lincoln. Yesterday we marked the birthday of both.

The day does not lose any of its reverence for the Emancipator if we praise the Polish warrior for freedom. Kosciusko served throughout the Revolution. Then he returned to his native land to fight against Russia. Wounded, captured, imprisoned, and liberated, he returned to America in 1797 and the Congress acknowledged our debt with a pension and a grant of land. Upon his death he found an honored resting place in the Cathedral of Cracow. But the many memorials in America will constantly remind us how this son of Poland and the sons and daughters of Poland throughout all the years have done so much to prove these United States the land of the free and the home of the brave.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have noticed in the newspapers, having just returned to Washington today, that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [HARRY F. BYRD], is to retire from the Senate, and will not seek reelection this year. We shall have an opportunity later, I am sure, to express our appreciation of HARRY BYRD; to state what a monument he has been and what an ornament he has been in the Senate of the United States, as well as what an example he has set for all of us in the way of public service. At this moment I only express my personal feeling of great admiration and affection for this great Senator and great statesman, and express my regret that we are nearing the end of the line so far as his service in the Senate of the United States is concerned.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it was with a sense of profound sadness

that I learned yesterday that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] had reached a decision to retire from the Senate at the end of this year.

During the brief time I have been privileged to serve in this body, I have had many occasions to observe the brilliance of his intellect, the wisdom of his counsel, and his great devotion to our constitutional form of government.

It has been my good fortune to have had a close personal relationship with the Senator. His philosophy of government is a sound one, based on the fundamental principles that have guided this Nation since its earliest days. He has always been dedicated to clean, honest government, and his career stands as a monument to the highest principles of good government.

I fully appreciate the reasons why the Senator feels impelled to retire from public life. He has had a full career of public service and is surely entitled to a period of rest. Nevertheless, I cannot help hoping that the Senator will reconsider his decision. We do not have enough men like him in public life.

Assuming that his decision is irrevocable, I think I may also assume that he will continue to maintain his keen interest in public affairs and that, from time to time, he will give the country the benefit of his views.

History will record that the Senator was one of the greatest of 20th century Americans. Certainly he is second to none in his grasp of the intricate economics of government, the field which he has chosen to make his primary specialty. It is even more impressive, in my opinion, that he has become such a notable specialist while remaining so well informed in all areas of government.

The retirement of the Senator will leave a gap in the Senate that will be exceedingly hard to fill.

Former President Truman once remarked that there were "too many Byrds" on Capitol Hill. I am convinced that the country would be better off with more Byrds in the Senate and in other positions of high public responsibility.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as the minority leader, I would not want this occasion to pass without saying that I read with great regret the announcement by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that he would retire from the Senate at the end of his term.

Senator HARRY BYRD has had a long and distinguished career in the interest of his State of Virginia and of the Nation.

He is at present the chairman of the very important and powerful Committee on Finance of the Senate, and for many years he has been one of the senior members of the Committee on Armed Services.

Senator BYRD has commanded the respect of Senators on both sides of the aisle, who have recognized him as a devoted public servant, a man of high personal integrity, and a man of great patriotism.

I know that Senator BYRD, when his term has finally been concluded, will be missed by all of his colleagues in the United States Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a letter written by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], expressing regret upon the announcement by Senator BYRD of his retirement from the United States Senate. The Senator from Colorado who is out of town, asked that his letter be included in the RECORD.

In placing this letter in the RECORD I join with the Senator from Colorado and other Senators in expressing regret that the Senator from Virginia will be retiring after this year.

Senator BYRD is recognized as the Senate's leading authority on Government finance. His integrity and high principles are examples for all of us to follow. Senator BYRD's retirement from the Senate represents a great loss to the Senate Finance Committee, of which he is chairman, as well as a loss to the Senate, his State, and our country. He will go down in history as one of America's great men.

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

FEBRUARY 13, 1958.

The Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I have just read the announcement of your plan to retire and find it difficult to imagine the days ahead in the Senate without our most eminent colleague. It is unfair, of course, for any of us to begrudge you and your family a more leisurely life after so many, many years of dedicated public service.

I shall always count it among my greatest privileges to have served with you. I shall long remember your courage and integrity.

Best wishes for good health, happiness, and enjoyment of the years ahead for you and Mrs. Byrd.

Sincerely,

GORDON ALLOTT,
United States Senate.

MORALE IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, many of us remember that, of all the men who wore the American uniform in World War II, one managed more than any other to convey how our servicemen really felt. I refer to Bill Mauldin, the great GI cartoonist.

This week Bill Mauldin is back with a cartoon about our servicemen of today. It appears on the cover of Newsweek magazine; and it is a picture which, with the story, should disturb us all.

We remember Willie and Joe, the dirty, often discouraged, soldiers of Bill Mauldin's war cartoons. Well, Willie and Joe are not in this picture. Instead, there is simply a rifle stuck in the ground and on the rifle there is a sign that says: "Fed Up". Willie and Joe have finally just walked off the job; and so have most of their successors.

Morale in our Armed Forces has seldom, if ever, been lower; and the facts and figures prove it.

Fully one-third of our servicemen turn their backs on the service every year. Unless we act quickly, so many more will quit that we will face a crisis unparalleled in our history.

We will have missiles, planes, submarines, and other complicated war equipment, but nowhere near enough trained men to operate these machines.

We have forgotten the men behind our modern weapons. They have been turned into neglected citizens.

The time has come for us to ask ourselves whether we are wise, let alone have the right, to permit our servicemen to put up with conditions as they now exist in the Armed Forces.

All too often we are prone to look at this problem in terms of budgets and statistics. We know, for instance, that each day the Air Force and the Navy lose \$2 million in accidents, many of which can only result in unnecessary deaths.

Now I ask Senators to turn to the detailed worldwide survey of service morale in the current issue of Newsweek, and see these statistics as we should see them: in terms of men, American boys, our sons, and the sons of our friends and neighbors.

A fighter pilot talked about the mechanic working on his plane: "At \$160 a month he is not going to give it his best. He can kill me."

A radarman supports his family by driving a bulldozer from 7:30 a. m. to 4 p. m.; and then goes on his radar watch from 4:30 p. m. to 1 a. m.

In this article are documented examples of housing where rats chew buttons off the uniforms; of skilled mechanics pleading for heat in their hangars so they can continue vital maintenance work on planes without freezing their fingers; of men surrounded by so much untrained personnel, and so much skimping, they know they can never do their job if this country is attacked.

These are not men of any foreign legion. These are our own, the ones who carry the shield of deterrence against possible Communist aggression. They are underpaid, undertrained, and under-equipped. We take these young men from our farms, our towns, and our cities. We expect them to defend us, but ask them to do the job with, in effect, one hand tied behind their backs.

If they have the duty to do the job—one of the most important in the world today—we have the duty to see that they have the best training and the best equipment so as in turn to have the best chance of returning home.

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE MASS-PRODUCED MIND—ADDRESS BY LOUIS P. LOCHNER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it will be recalled that on January 29 I mentioned on the Senate floor the establishment of the mass communications history center by the Wisconsin State Historical Society—the very first such center in the Nation.

I have been pleased now to receive from Dr. Clifford Lord, the society's president, the text of the address which was delivered by one of America's most distinguished correspondents, Mr. Louis P. Lochner, on the occasion of the formal opening of the center.

Mr. Lochner, it will be recalled, was from 1928 to 1942 chief of the Berlin

and Central European Bureau of the Associated Press.

His news dispatches, during the National Socialist regime in Germany, constituted some of the most remarkable contributions to the understanding of that evil period in history.

Mr. Lochner, now retired, was a graduate of the University of Wisconsin in 1909. He began his journalistic career as an editor of the Wisconsin Alumni Magazine. Thereafter, he became a foreign correspondent, winning a great many honors for his articles, as well as his books.

His comments on January 25 upon the effect of mass communications—newspapers, radio, and television—on the minds of the people constitute very fine food for thought, whether or not one agrees with him completely.

What he has to say, moreover, about the tremendous importance of freedom of the press will, I am sure, strike a resonant chord in the minds and in the hearts of readers. Of all the great bulwarks of freedom, our right to read these conflicting viewpoints in information media is one of the greatest of all pillars of liberty. The commentator plays an indispensable role in this process. May the commentator's basic freedom always be protected.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lochner's frank and helpful address be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE MASS-PRODUCED MIND

(By Louis P. Lochner)

When Clifford Lord and Donald McNeil suggested some weeks ago that I speak to you tonight on the subject of Communications and the Mass Produced Mind, I was instantly reminded of a talk I had back in 1953 with that wise sage of central Europe and staunch friend of the United States, venerable Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of the Federal Republic of Germany.

His greatest concern, he said, was the fact that we were living in an age in which what he called *die Vermassung des Menschen* is progressing so alarmingly that individualism is in danger of being submerged. Now, there is no single word in the English language, as far as I know, that will express *Vermassung* accurately. It is difficult to translate concisely as *Gemueticlichkeit* or *Weltschmerz*.

Ever since that 1953 chat I have been groping for an adequate English equivalent of the German Chancellor's phrase, only to find now that the directors of the Wisconsin State Historical Society have served it to me on a platter, as it were: by *Vermassung des Menschen*, Dr. Adenauer obviously means the tendency of our time in the direction of a mass-produced mind.

We are living in an age of mass production and consumption, of this there can be no doubt. The supermarket is gradually making the modest grocery store and butcher shop a thing of the past. The country doctor or the city general practitioner is disappearing and the patient instead has passed into the hands of a whole mass of specialists. The drugstore has become not only a dispensary of pharmaceutical products but also a sales emporium for toys, paperback books, articles of clothing, sweets, alarm clocks, bathing costumes, and space helmets. The registered pharmacist occupies only a small niche in

his establishment. Filling a prescription no longer is accompanied by the soothing sound of a pestle grinding a healing herb to powder in an old-fashioned mortar, or the gentle thud, thud of a gelatine capsule that is being filled by hand of the apothecary. Almost everything a doctor prescribes nowadays has been mass produced.

Motion picture directors seem proudest if they can advertise that literally thousands of humans and animals will be shown in their gigantic, super-duper mass scenes. Our universities and colleges, in which in my day 50 years ago we knew a large percentage of our fellow students, have virtually become intellectual factories. Only a very limited number of collegians today know each other.

Beautiful radio transmissions of symphonies and operas are rudely interrupted by commercials advertising some mass-produced article that will allegedly make housework a pushbutton affair. Need I continue my illustrations of the supplementation of individual by mass production?

From the mass production of things it is but a step to the mass-produced mind. It is an open secret in the theatrical profession that two New York critics whose names I won't mention can make or unmake a show. Apparently the theatergoing mass no longer thinks individually; it accepts the judgment of two men whose syndicated columns reach millions.

My hobby is music. When attending a premiere of a symphony or an opera or pieces for the piano, a string instrument, or voice, I make it a point to ask friends and acquaintances what they think of the composition. Usually I receive the noncommittal reply, "very interesting." I then know that the listener has ceased to do his own evaluation and is waiting for his favorite critic's review. Surely enough, when next I meet this person who dared not go beyond "very interesting" because he feared he might be out of step with the mass-mind-producing critic, I find he has indeed meanwhile arrived at an opinion; namely, that of the critic whose word is law to him.

There was a time, not so long ago, when one of the finest things about a dinner invitation to a cultured home was the joyful anticipation of soul-refreshing conversation which would already begin at the table under the inspiration of its artistic decor, its delicious, individually prepared food, its masterfully selected liquid concomitants, and one's stimulating table companion, but which would reach its full fruition only later in the salon or parlor or living room, when the conversation became general and divergent views, frankly but politely expressed, added to its spiciness.

Today it is by no means uncommon for the hostess anxiously to watch the clock to make sure that everybody will have finished eating and drinking the mass-produced canned foods and libations in time to follow her to a TV set for viewing a program that in her belief is made to order for her company. She thereby merely exemplifies that the mass-produced mind threatens to dominate our social life quite as much as it does every other phase of human living-together.

Now, one main reason for this growing ascendancy of the mass-produced mind (to which we must adjust ourselves, whether we like it or not) is the fact that the communications mediums have been perfected to a degree that the world is now brought pictorially right into our living room, that every event of importance, even if it transpires in a remote corner of the earth, almost immediately becomes known everywhere, that every major speech delivered by a person of prominence resounds throughout the homes of millions. Gigantic radio and TV networks with international exchange arrangements, world-embracing news associations

with facilities for moving story and illustrative newsphoto simultaneously, and feature services which supply the intellectual product of famed columnists to an international clientele—all these have, in one sense, made one world of this planet of ours and have, indeed, produced a mass curiosity as to what other planets may be like.

It is, I believe, no exaggeration to say that the mass-produced mind, whose existence no one can deny, owes its being chiefly to the phenomenal development of communications and communications mediums.

The mass-produced mind is most quickly brought into being and most easily manipulated in the countries in which only such information is imparted, only such ideological discussion is tolerated, and only such facts or alleged facts may be published as will serve to tighten the grip of the tyrant or ruling clique.

Now, it is thinkable that the colossal dictatorships of our time could so quickly have remolded the thinking processes of populous and culturally advanced nations except for the modern mediums of communications? And why is it that in wartime one of the first targets of an invading enemy force is the communications centers—the radio and TV stations, the news association headquarters, the telephone and telegraph and wireless installations? Why is every effort made to seize these communications centers intact, if not because of their importance in influencing—yes, changing—the existing mass-produced mind?

Had Hitler or Stalin or Peron lived a century earlier, could they possibly have taken such a complete hold so quickly of the peoples whom they set out to bring under their sway, and could they in such an astonishingly short time, as human history goes, have so completely remade the thinking processes of millions of their subjects? Were not the modern mediums of communications their most powerful instruments for the quick subjugation of their satellites?

How docile the mass-produced mind can become in a powerful dictatorship was patently illustrated the other day in connection with President Eisenhower's appeal to Bulganin. Four days elapsed without the Russian people's even being told that the American Chief of State had replied to the Soviet Premier's two letters. The masters of the Kremlin evidently knew that nobody in Russia would complain at this withholding of information.

Only after the Politbureau had been goaded by the worldwide discussion of the exchange of letters into making a grudging public acknowledgment of the receipt of the American reply did the Soviet regime deem it necessary to reveal to its captive people in a distorted and eminently unfair manner, a vague intimation of the contents of the Eisenhower missive. Not a word was said about the President's earnest plea to the Soviets to share in concrete labors of peace, not a syllable about his readiness to go the last mile if necessary to avert international carnage.

The Reporter magazine on October 17 last carried an interesting article, Complacency, Conformity, and a Moskvich in Every Garage, by Hans Rogge, who traveled far and wide in the Soviet Union. "There was among most of the people I talked to an acceptance of the basic assumption on which (Soviet) state and society rest," he wrote. Then, as an example of how uncritical the Russian people have become he gave this illustration: The much-decorated army captain who asked me on the train going to Odessa why our newspapers constantly slandered the Soviet Union had, of course, never read one, but he was absolutely convinced that foreign papers could be obtained at any newsstand. In other words, so conditioned is the mass-produced mind of Russia that this army captain did not even have

the curiosity to find out whether he might freely buy a foreign newspaper.

One day early in his campaign for the domination of the German mind Adolf Hitler's wily minister of propaganda, diminutive Dr. Joseph Goebbels, made an interesting experiment in duping his conationals. The official German news bureau, D. N. B., was ordered to release a Goebbels-inspired story to the effect that two foreign unidentified planes, flying over Berlin at an altitude of 5,000 yards, had dropped leaflets which were so insulting to "der Fuehrer" that they were immediately seized by the police. The news release stated that this was an obvious attempt by some foreign power to sow dissension within Germany and thus to rob the Reich, which at last was growing strong under the leadership of Adolf Hitler, of the fruits of unity.

Publication of the dramatic account of this alleged sneaking flight was made mandatory for all German newspapers. Moreover, the press was instructed to publish the story on the first page with smash headlines. The D. N. B. secret directives added, however—and please keep this in mind for the next few minutes—that it would be preferable for each paper to write the introductory paragraph, or lead, in its own style and as though your editor had seen the planes.

The rather amazing situation developed that, listen as I would among people in every walk of life in the German capital, I found nobody who thought of challenging the story. Already the German mind, as mass-produced by Goebbels, had been so conditioned as to accept the story unquestioningly.

There was one vital mistake which the kleine Doktor made and which he was clever enough not to repeat later: he issued his instruction to the German press to describe the incident as though your editor had seen the planes, in the general service distributed to foreign correspondents and services as well as to German. This order should have gone out as a secret instruction to the German communications media.

Even before noticing this directive, which came at the end of the long press release, we had thought it unusual, to say the least, that the flight of the planes should have taken place during the very hour when the entire foreign press had for the first time been invited to a tea party given by Hitler's leader of the foreign-political section of the Nazi Party, Alfred Rosenberg, in the course of which our host—so the invitation read—was to give us a survey of Nazi foreign policy.

After reading the order to our German colleagues, we naturally went after the story in a big way. The first thing we did in our Associated Press office was to consult an aeronautic expert, who took into account the probable speed and altitude of the alleged planes, as well as the direction and velocity of the wind at the stated time of the flight. His verdict was: the leaflets could not possibly have landed in Berlin, but would have descended in Magdeburg, some 90 miles to the south.

Next we inquired at the Propaganda Ministry exactly where the leaflets had been dropped. We were told in the Wilhelmstrasse and on the Alexanderplatz, in other words, in the two places, of all Berlin, where either the propaganda and foreign office personnel or the police, whose central headquarters was on the Alexanderplatz, could hastily seize them before anybody could pick up a copy!

Our aeronautics expert assured us that it was simply impossible to drop leaflets with such precision.

We asked to be shown a copy. "Its wording is so insulting to our 'fuehrer' that we do not propose to show it to anybody," was the reply.

"But how did the leaflets look?" I persisted. "You might at least give us an inkling of their appearance."

"Well, they were pretty poorly printed by hand, with one of those rubber stamp outfits where you put the letters together yourself."

As though a foreign government would send two planes with amateurish hand-made instead of press-printed leaflets.

I stated some minutes ago that the mass-produced mind is most quickly brought into being and most easily manipulated in dictatorships. Also I asserted that this double feat could be accomplished chiefly because of the phenomenal development of communications. That, however, is not the exclusive reason. There is the added and tremendously important one of withholding from a people every means for checking the accuracy of the information imparted by tyrannical governments.

Only those who have lived within a dictatorship and have experienced what it means to be cut off from all information and news except that which the government spoon-feeds to its subjects can grasp how such a condition soon warps one's judgment. Only they will understand fully why tyrannies make listening to foreign radio stations or TV channels punishable, why they forbid the importation of foreign newspapers which are critical of their regime, and why they go to outrageous lengths to prevent any corrective information from penetrating their country. With these counterweights of truth suppressed, a regime can manipulate the mass-produced mind effortlessly.

That brings us to the vital difference between a mass-produced mind in a dictatorship and in a democracy: granted that the impact of our modern media of communications upon the masses of our people is terrific to the point of endangering individualism; granted further that this impact will increase rather than diminish with the expansion of technological development, as is indicated, for instance, by that latest engineering device known as the phantom plug or hidden commercial which a New York Times writer defines as "a sales message pitched so fast by a projector onto a TV or movie screen that it is not consciously seen by the viewers" yet "subconsciously . . . works on lowering the sales resistance of the moviegoers" and the TV viewers.

Granted all this. Even so there remains the corrective of the inherent right of every American to know—a right which, thank God, he keeps on asserting. There remains the possibility of comparing conflicting claims and weighing them judiciously. There remains the availability of proven facts to demolish untruthful asseverations. Those who manipulate a dictatorship cannot afford to be proven in error; we in a democracy proudly claim our right to be wrong as one of our dearest and most priceless privileges.

In the challenging task of making the mass-produced mind an asset to our national life and of preventing it from becoming a danger rather than a blessing, it is imperative that just as much as is humanly possible should be known and studied that will throw light upon the effect of modern mass communications upon society.

The Wisconsin State Historical Society has done an outstanding job of pioneering by launching its Mass Communications History Center. I extend my heartfelt congratulations.

The skeptic may ask: of what value can the papers and documents possibly be which men and women in communications are invited to contribute? What can they reveal that has not already been told in their news stories and newscasts? What can they add toward our understanding of the impact of mass communications upon the human mind? What light can they throw upon

the phenomenon itself which your directors aptly call the mass-produced mind?

When one speaks, say of the Kaltenborn papers, one must remember that my friend "H. V.," like all of us who were or are on the constant lookout for news and to proper clues for its proper evaluation, in reality produced far, far more than ever reaches the public. Even if an Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, or major network correspondent were to present to this center of yours a complete collection of clippings or transcripts of every story that was printed or went out over the air waves or was mailed in one of the feature services, these items would reflect only a fraction of his productivity and impart only a small percentage of the information, often of historical importance, which came to his knowledge.

Speaking as a news association man and foreign correspondent, I can assure you that our Berlin Associated Press staff of 9 men, 7 of whom were Americans, consciously sent much more to our headquarters in New York, especially in the way of mail stories, than we expected to see published. We wanted to offer our editors variety from which to choose whatever seemed most interesting to our fellow Americans. The desk editor was able to gage that interest; not we living abroad.

Let me explain some of the factors that enter into the situation:

1. A story which seemed decidedly newsworthy at the time we cabled it and which on an ordinary day might even have made the first pages of many metropolitan papers, might happen to reach the foreign editor's desk in the home office at the very moment when the first news was flashed of some major catastrophe, such as a sudden volcanic eruption or a tricky tornado, accompanied by wholesale loss of lives, spread of pestilential diseases, and awesome material destruction. The Berlin story obviously could not compete with such major news. Not only our item, but countless others from other localities in such a situation would go into the wastebasket.

2. Again, news association and network reporters as well as correspondents for individual papers often send in advance of a scheduled or likely event, valuable information known as background material. This under-the-dash material, as it is also known because it is usually separated from the news item proper by a dash, usually deals with the locale of the event, gives a description of the personalities involved, presents historical facts leading up to the anticipated occasion. It is regarded as manna from heaven by the busy news editor or the network commentator who would like to embellish the bare news item somewhat.

But what if the event is suddenly called off? What if the locale is unexpectedly changed or the leading figures do not show up? What if other important news competes with the event and only the most salient facts as embodied in the news dispatch can be used? All the careful preparatory work would seem to have been done in vain.

3. Often a good story fails to reach the home desk and, of course, the reading or listening public because people in public life altogether too often won't stand by what they said and as an afterthought demand that this or that statement be stricken from their interview.

Somewhere among the papers which I had the honor to present to this center there is a revealing text of an utterance concerning the Jewish question which Adolf Hitler made in the course of an interview I had with him. It was never published because Hitler had made it a condition for receiving me, that I would submit the text for his clearance.

The burden of his pontification was that the Jew must be eliminated from the German

scene because, as he put it, "wir koennen als Volk ihn nicht verdauen" ("we cannot as a people digest him"). The Italians, for instance, he said, could assimilate or digest the Jew, ditto the British, but not so the Germans.

I could not but chuckle inwardly at this statement, for Hitler had only a few minutes previously extolled the superman qualities of the Nordic race of which, incidentally, he was a most unrepresentative specimen. It seemed like a tremendous confession of weakness on Hitler's part to admit that a nation made up of 99 percent of alleged supermen could not assimilate or, if you please, coexist with the 1 percent of its population that was non-Aryan.

The Nazi dictator must have noted himself what a fatal admission he had made, for with an angry gesture he crossed the whole passage out as he read my script. Incidentally, when I started him on the Jewish question, white saliva exuded from both sides of his mouth.

It is only a tiny episode as history goes, yet the question still intrigues many historians, "why was Hitler so anti-Semitic?" Here is one answer: an obvious inferiority complex.

4. Very often a member of our craft writes confidential memorandums to his boss, revealing facts and incidents which for some reason or other are not intended for publication. Also, he often communicates characterizations about figures in the public eye which, though truthful, are not exactly fit to print. I am sure carbon copies of many such memorandums will find their way into the Mass Communications History Center.

We in Berlin during the Nazi regime frequently requested unsuspected fellow nationals, such as prominent businessmen, on their return to America to take with them confidential letters to our home office. Their discovery by ardent Hitlerites might well have led to our expulsion.

I feel confident that those who are in the domestic communications service also often fill in their superiors on situations that cannot for the present be exploited newswise. Such memorandums might well be helpful to the historian.

5. Another fact about the communications professional is the enormous correspondence that he carries on with men and women in all walks of life. He exchanges letters with statesmen, scientists, literary men, financial experts, economists, labor leaders, and so forth. Thousands of these letters, as they reach this new center, will no doubt have to be eliminated because they really contain nothing of possible historical significance. But I dare equally to prophesy that the historian will here and there dig out from among the papers permanently filed what to his researcher's heart will seem like nuggets of gold.

May I be so bold as again to cite an example from the papers which I was privileged to deliver? I do it because they are the only ones with which I am acquainted; other collections are probably much more valuable and would yield better illustrations, but my ignorance of them is complete.

When I reached Berlin with the very first American occupation troops in July of 1945, one of Germany's best known lawyers came to see me. He was a former president of the German Bar Association and one of the small number of German attorneys free from Nazi taint whom the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg admitted as defense counsel for the accused Nazi leaders. We had known each other for years and had last seen each other at the 60th birthday party of Fritz Kreisler, the world-famed violinist and composer, who had soon thereafter been compelled to leave Germany and the playing of whose inimitable music was forbidden by the Nazi regime.

This noted barrister was in a soul-searching mood. "How could it happen that this nation of a Goethe and a Schiller, of a

Beethoven and a Richard Strauss could succumb to an Adolf Hitler?" he asked me, and the next moment began such a brilliant analysis that I interrupted him with the suggestion that he really ought to put his thoughts down on paper.

The result was a series of at least half a dozen letters which to me seemed most revealing. He was not the only one to write me. All such letters were kept by me and have been or will yet be added to my modest contributions to this center, for I know that the question, "How could Hitler happen?" is still a very live one with people interested in nazism and its implications.

6. A sixth fact to remember about workers in the communications mediums is that many of them build up confidential relationships with persons in high or influential positions and thus are often told facts which they must keep to themselves until a much later period, either to protect their source or for other cogent reasons. Washington and United Nations correspondents probably lead in this category.

A few days ago I chanced to come across a memorandum drafted on February 21, 1947, when I was a member of the 6-man team which, headed by former President Herbert Hoover, was appointed by President Harry Truman to make a survey of conditions in Germany and Austria. On our way back from Germany, Mr. Hoover called upon Prime Minister Clement Attlee in London to brief him on what the mission had done and what recommendation, based upon our findings, the former President was about to make.

While Mr. Hoover was closeted with Premier Attlee, I was introduced to a man, now an important laborite member of Parliament, who had been engaged in psychological warfare work through World War II. He took me aside and made these points which I now feel at liberty to quote from my memorandum:

"The attempt on Hitler's life on July 20, 1944, was believed by the psychological warfare chiefs to be genuine, and they thought it would open a possibility of ending the war by supporting the revolutionists. Brendan Bracken (the British Information Minister), however, ruled that this was 'a Goebbels propaganda trick' and refused to do anything about it. C—believes the war might have been shortened by 7 months had the allies supported the July 20 people."

"The psychological warfare people next tried to persuade Eisenhower to issue a sort of soldier-to-soldier or officer-to-officer appeal to the German generals. According to C—, Roosevelt messaged Eisenhower to 'keep his hands off politics.'"

"When the Allies approached the Saar Valley, the psychological warfare people urged that the Saar miners be assured their jobs and wages were secure and that they should continue to mine. The suggestion was turned down by Washington on the grounds that under unconditional surrender no promises of any kind must be made to any Germans."

"Eisenhower finally agreed to a project of psychological warfare for urging the German population to keep off the streets as the (Allied) armies proceeded, the thought being that then our forces could advance the more quickly. Unfortunately Churchill came to Paris on the day this policy was approved and, learning of it, insisted that the Germans should be given a dose of their own medicine, as applied by them when they overran France, and the population be induced to clutter the roads."

It goes without saying that I shall turn this memorandum over to Dr. Lord. Whether it has any historical value is up to the professionals in the field to decide.

One more closing thought: paradoxical though it seems, it is an indubitable fact that the very men and women who, with the aid of our modern mediums of communica-

tions are bringing into being a mass-produced mind which often tends to endanger individualism—these very men and women are themselves about the most individualistic creatures God ever made. If you don't believe it, try to preside, as I have, over a meeting of the Overseas Press Club, all of whose members have seen foreign lands and have been in journalistic service both within and outside the United States. It is often claimed that our 1,500 members have at least 1,600 opinions. Personally I believe that is an understatement of the year. If anywhere in the world there is a fraternity of individualists, it is to be found in the communications profession.

PROPOSED PLAN FOR 10-NATION CONTROL OF ANTARCTICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post contains an interesting dispatch from the Chicago Daily News Service, but one which gives me considerable concern. The article is entitled "British Seek Polar Rule by Group of 10 Nations."

The substance of the article is that Great Britain is prepared to recommend internationalizing of the South Pole land mass under a 10-nation commission, including both the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, as the author of the Wiley bill for the Byrd Antarctic Commission, I am all for a conference by the interested nations. But I am opposed to any internationalization of Antarctica. I am opposed to it for several reasons.

WE HAVE DONE MOST OF EXPLORATION

(a) In the first place, it is the United States which has made the overwhelming share of sacrifices—commitments of manpower, time, energy, and money for the exploration of the "Unknown Continent."

We, alone, have done more work in Antarctica than all the rest of the world combined.

For us to agree to become simply 1 member of a 10-nation commission, where we could be outvoted 9 to 1, or 7 to 3, or by any other combination, would be to forget the overwhelming amount of American sacrifices in the region.

WHO KNOWS FUTURE VALUE OF ANTARCTICA?

(b) Next, I want to point out that the significance of Antarctica to the United States from a military, economic, political, or weather standpoint can hardly be ascertained at the present time.

No one knows right now how important this vast region of 5 million square miles will be in terms, for example, of man's penetration of outer space, man's future control of the weather, man's hunt for raw materials and minerals.

How can we, therefore, in the present uncertain state of knowledge, take a step which might lead to deeding away territory which might be of infinite importance to us in time to come?

(c) I do not believe that we should waive rights directly, or indirectly, to so much as an inch of Antarctica. That does not mean that we should claim 1 inch of more than is our due.

Many nations have filed their claims in the area. It will take a great amount of international negotiations in order to iron out the conflicting claims.

But I say that I do not want us to act so that future generations rise up and bemoan what might perhaps prove to be our folly in giving up a resource which, one day, may be very precious, indeed.

In 1958, we look back to past decades of American history. We give praise to the men of vision and judgment who bought Louisiana in 1803. We praise those who bought Alaska for the United States and those who acquired other territory. Why should we think of waiving so much as an inch of territory which may, someday, be as valuable to us as are Alaska, Louisiana, California, New Mexico?

To be sure, Antarctica is a long way from us geographically; but it is very close to us in the age of air, in the age of travel in outer space.

TRIBUTE TO OTHER NATIONS' VALOR

I want to make it clear that my comments are not directed against any nation. My comments are not aimed, as such against the British, the Australians, the New Zealanders, the French, the Norwegians, Argentinians, Chileans, or the South Africans; all of whom claim some part of Antarctica.

On the contrary, I am delighted at the cooperation which we have shown to them and which they have shown to us in the International Geophysical Year, and on many other occasions.

Many brave men—Englishmen, Norwegians, and heroes of many other nations—have just about frozen; and, yes, often died in order to unlock the secrets of Antarctica. I pay tribute to all of them. The American people have nothing but admiration for valor; no matter under what flag it is demonstrated.

LET US CONFER BUT NOT LOSE OUR RIGHTS

Of course, we must sit around the conference table and talk over problems like Antarctica with our friends. But talk is one thing, internationalization another.

MY INTEREST IS UNITED STATES FLAG

I am a Senator of the United States, and my interest is the sovereignty and the flag of the United States, and the future of the United States.

I do not want the Soviet Union casting a veto in any 10-nation or 81-nation commission in Antarctica. I do not want the Soviet Union, if it can possibly be avoided, building a submarine base, or a guided-missile base, or anything else of that kind in the unknown continent.

I say that very frankly and openly, because I think the time is long overdue for the United States to wake up to the protection of its own national interests in that region.

I welcome British steps toward talks, as such. My earnest hope is that the conflicting claims may be worked out in a manner agreeable to all.

But past history of the United Nations, and other multilateral organizations, shows that when you are dealing, not with the free world alone, but with the Soviet Union, you are dealing with a very tough bargainer, indeed. And you had better keep your eyes wide open.

I urge that we, of the United States, maintain permanent bases in Antarctica and I urge that we take no step which

might remotely suggest that we are prepared to waive anything which is our lawful due.

Most of all, I urge that the Senate Education and Labor Committee and the House Interior Committee hold hearings at the earliest possible date on the Wiley-Byrd antarctic bill which I have cosponsored.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

BRITISH SEEK POLAR RULE BY GROUP OF 10 NATIONS

LONDON, February 12.—The British are preparing to propose internationalizing the South Pole land mass under a 10-nation commission.

The United States and the Soviet Union would be included on the commission.

Conflicting claims for great chunks of Antarctica would be solved, it is pointed out, and the area would be open for scientific experiment.

The plan would keep the area free of military installations.

The British recognize themselves, the Australians, the New Zealanders, the French and the Norwegians as major claimants to Antarctica.

Argentina, Chile, and South Africa also claim sovereignty over parts of the area. The first two say that much of the recognized British sector belongs to them. South Africa claims part of the Norwegian sector.

The Americans and the Russians recognize nobody's claims and have gone ahead installing permanent bases.

The United States base on the South Pole laps over into the British, Australian, and New Zealand sectors.

The Russian base is in the sector long claimed by Australia.

The commission would have some tieup with the United Nations, but would not depend upon the world peace organization for its authority.

Throughout the Geophysical Year there has been agreement to keep claims and counter-claims in the background, but with its close, friction over who owns what is bound to recur.

DEFENSE OF SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES BY SENATOR BRIDGES

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last week our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] delivered a spirited defense of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles here on the Senate floor. The February 11 issue of the Portland Press-Herald contains a fine editorial on Senator BRIDGES speech.

All of the Members of the Senate may not be aware of the fact that the senior Senator from New Hampshire is a native of the State of Maine and a graduate of the University of Maine. His mother still lives in West Pembroke, Maine, which is "way down east." I am delighted to have an opportunity to join the Portland Press-Herald in saluting a distinguished native son of Maine who now represents our neighboring State of New Hampshire in the United States Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Portland Press-Herald may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of February 11, 1958]

SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES DEFENDS SECRETARY DULLES

Senator STYLES BRIDGES had something to say, last week, to the many who attack, even vilify, Secretary of State Dulles. What he had to say is something to be noted by many critics of the Secretary, many of them really ignorant of what he has done, is doing, and trying to do in one of the most difficult eras that any Secretary of State ever faced. It has been quite the fashion to deride Mr. Dulles, to demand that President Eisenhower fire him.

It is perhaps relatively unimportant when private citizens turn thumbs down on him. Senator BRIDGES thinks it vitally important when Members of the Congress do it; and he cautioned his fellow Senators that Mr. Dulles' attackers are only aiding the Russians; that to disparage our Secretary of State is to aid the Communists. And he said that he, for his part, is unwilling "to surrender the selection of our Secretary of State to Bulganin and Khrushchev."

That sounds like good sense, and so not a few Senators, Democrats among them, thought by signifying their approval of Mr. BRIDGES' position.

SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE "MAINE"

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, Saturday, February 15, will mark the 60th anniversary of a most significant event in American history. On the night of February 15, 1898, an explosion took place in Habana Harbor which reverberated around the world, and which wrote a new chapter in the history of our Nation; an explosion which caused the death of the pride of our Navy, as well as the death of a great overseas empire. On that night the U. S. S. *Maine* was torn apart by a force of flame and fragments the cause of which is yet a mystery.

There is little need to describe the repercussions of this event. The story is known to all Americans. The sinking of this great battleship was the signal which aroused a youthful Republic against an old empire, and the motto it bred, "Remember the *Maine*" served to lead our Nation to victory.

The loss of the U. S. S. *Maine* was a serious one, for when this great 6,632-ton ship sank she carried with her to the bottom of Habana Harbor 266 American lives. Only 88 of the crew survived. It was a great tragedy, and one which in its day was highly comparable to the events of that fateful day, December 7, 1941.

The battleship *Maine*, although corroded by the elements of time, is immortal. She represents not only a significant chapter in the annals of the United States Navy and in the history of our Nation, but she bears the name of a great State whose past is inextricably tied to all the great moments of our Nation's history since the voyage of the Norsemen, and whose future will continue to follow in the path of this great heritage. As the State of Maine has always been proud to have lent its name to our Nation's most historic battleship,

so the U. S. S. *Maine* was honored to bear the name of a great State.

I request unanimous consent that an article describing the sinking of the *Maine* which appeared in the Portland Sunday Telegram of February 9, 1958, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMEMBER THE "MAINE"?—IT HAPPENED IN HABANA HARBOR 60 YEARS AGO

(By John Fuller)

The gas lights glowed on early that winter's evening of 1898.

A cold wind whined across Casco Bay and snow—just as the weatherman had predicted—was commencing to fall. It was a likely night to remain at home, although there were those in Portland with plans that would take them out into the weather.

There was, for example, a firemen's ball at Red Men's Hall, Deering. The Odd Fellows were meeting in South Portland. And the Rentz-Santley burlesque company expected their usual appreciative audience at the Portland Theater.

Doctors were on the alert this bitter, gloomy night since Maine's younger generation was fevered by a measles epidemic. At the Maine School for the Deaf in Portland there were 10 cases.

In Maine, as elsewhere in the United States, anyone who could read a newspaper knew that relations with Spain were deteriorating over the question of Cuba, where insurgents cried, "Independence or Death." Their voice was growing ever louder.

The date was Tuesday, February 15, the day after St. Valentine's Day.

Far down the Atlantic coast, in the harbor of Habana, Cuba, the evening had arrived in marked contrast to that in Portland. It was sultry, oppressive. In the air was a miasma of waterfront odors of a pungency and texture that only a tropical port could produce.

From the infestation of sailor cafes emanated sounds of laughter and guitar music to drift across the narrow inner harbor. In fact, almost every sound ashore could be heard on the ships.

One of these vessels was the United States Navy's pride, the 6,892-ton battleship *Maine*. Bristling with a main battery of 10-inchers and 6-inchers, she was illuminated this evening like a Christmas tree with the intent of making even myopic Cubans—and Spaniards—aware of her bulldog presence.

President McKinley had dispatched the 3-year-old warship just 3 weeks before to this trouble spot in the Western Hemisphere. He reasoned, as did Consul Gen. Fitzhugh Lee in Habana, that the *Maine* would not only generate respect for American citizens and property in Cuba but might even play a passive mailed dove of peace.

The commander of the *Maine*, Capt. Charles Dwight Sigsbee, was the antithesis of the consul general. Slim, quiet, and correct, he could be counted on to do nothing inflammatory while in this Caribbean powder keg.

He and his mighty command had been recent, popular visitors in Portland Harbor. There he had spelled out the name of his battleship in giant letters above the bridge illuminated with electric lights.

About 9:30 o'clock this Tuesday evening the wind shifted to the northwest, and the *Maine* swung slowly at her anchorage. She did not stop until she had changed heading almost 180° and her bow was pointing toward the Spanish naval station, no more than 600 yards distant.

POSITION SHIFTED

It was the first time the easterly trades had shifted since the *Maine* had tied on to the Government mooring. It was as well the first time the battleship had changed position.

Among those who noticed it was Captain Sigsbee himself. To him, it signified a weather alteration. He observed to his executive officer, Lt. Comdr. Richard Wainwright, that rain would probably follow.

Then he went below to his spacious, comfortable cabin.

A tall, 19-year-old signalman, Gustav Dressler, on watch on the bridge, also made mental note of the wind shift. Next, he became aware of the running lights of a large steamer sweeping into the harbor. When he identified it as the Ward liner *City of Washington*, now gliding under the guns of the fort Casa Blanca, he resolved to go aft and report the arrival to Lt. John Blandon, officer of the deck.

Dressler marveled anew at the crowded anchorage. The two-masted Spanish cruiser *Alfonso XII* was so close that he could almost have thrown a ball onto her decks. The Spanish naval transport *Legaspi* rode at anchor nearly as close.

And winding between the vessels was the ferry from Regla, her passengers noisy, drunk, as usual. Dressler continued aft, vaguely disquieted by the profusion of ships, virtually on top of his own.

Captain Sigsbee had fed his pup dog, Peggie, which was now curled up on her master's settee. Sigsbee himself was commencing a letter to his wife. It was a note of apology for forgetting to mail a letter she had handed him nearly a year ago. He had just discovered it in the pocket of his lounging robe.

TAPS SOUNDED

Then he paused in his writing as he heard the notes of a bugle, singularly beautiful in the oppressive stillness of the night. Taps were being sounded forward.

Dressler had paused on his way to the stern to have a cigarette with his buddies.

In Sigsbee's cabin, the overhead fan whirled and Peggie slept. He soon finished his note and placed it in an envelope.

Then, the lights, without warning, flicked off. The floor quaked beneath his feet and he was deafened by a roaring explosion.

He was hurled from his chair onto the deck. In seconds, seawater was over his hands and legs.

To Dressler, the signalman, it happened as if in a dream. In one moment he had been smoking and talking. In the next, he was sprawled in netting around a 6-pounder, on the gun platform above where he had been standing.

Water was swishing around his ankles. The strange thing: He had seen or heard nothing.

Lieutenant Blandon, the officer of the deck whom Dressler had never reached, heard a dull, sullen roar * * * followed by a sharper explosion.

Somehow he kept his footing on the deck even though shipmates around him had jumped into the harbor in fright or had been blown off the stern like paper dolls.

AWESOME SIGHT

The explosion was an awesome sight as seen from the decks of the *City of Washington*—a fountain of red flame, followed by billowing, black clouds of smoke, then a rain of falling debris that sent the vessel's passengers scurrying below decks.

One large concrete-like block crashed through the promenade deck of the Ward liner and plummeted on down to the saloon below.

As Sigsbee, still shocked, groped his way along a semidarkened, smoke-filled passageway toward the deck he met Pvt. William Anthony, of the Marine Guard. The latter, saluting, advised:

"Sir, the *Maine* has been blown up."

Reading in his library in Habana, Consul Lee saw a great column of fire go up in the air. Even before he leaped to the window he seemed to know it was the death eruptions of his Nation's battleship.

He ran outside and off toward the offices of Spain's Governor General, Ramon Blanco. For a man of his age and corpulence, he went fast.

"I moved forward of the superstructure a few feet," Sigsbee was to report later, "and saw in front of me and high overhead a great black mass, dimly outlined against the western sky. On my left was a long, heavy object lying flat and on my right was another."

"These were the smokestacks of the ship, blown far aft, although I could not identify them at the moment * * * the silence on board was ominous, but the great loss of life was not yet realized."

A few moments later, "fire broke out in the great mass of debris amidships, and illuminated the ship."

Not many officers survived. Wainwright, the executive officer, however, was among the fortunate.

"Flood the forward magazines," Sigsbee ordered his executive officer. He was somewhat stunned at the latter's quick reply that nothing forward remained to be flooded.

It became obvious that the forward magazines, containing some 16 tons of black, as well as the less stable brown powder, had exploded.

Sigsbee's command was fast disintegrating in an inferno of smoke and flame. He ordered those remaining with him on the stern to abandon ship.

Only the captain's gig and one whaleboat were left in the battleship's lifesaving equipment. The lifeboats had been blown to bits in the original blast, or blasts.

RESCUE MADE

However, Wainwright decided personally to take one last look around the doomed *Maine* before he obeyed his captain. In doing so he discovered Dressler, who had been joined by two other sailors in their precarious netting perch, sprayed by flames and hot shrapnel.

By now, however, a launch from the *Alfonso XII* was beside the *Maine*, having braved the pyrotechnics about it. Wainwright helped the three sailors into the Spanish craft.

Lifeboats from the *City of Washington* and a motley assortment of harbor craft—from ferries to fishing smacks—were nosing toward the stricken *Maine* as Sigsbee pushed off from the poop deck. There wasn't much left above water of his battleship.

The captain himself was taken aboard the *City of Washington* where he commenced an historic telegram to Secretary of the Navy John D. Long, in Washington:

"*Maine* blown up in Habana Harbor at 9:40 tonight, and destroyed. Many wounded and doubtless more killed or drowned * * *."

Wednesday, February 16, had arrived. In Portland, people paused in shoveling snow to listen to the newsboys' cry of extra. The headlines of the papers they hawked proclaimed: "Disaster Most Dreadful."

The subhead of the Express explained further, "Mysterious Explosion Destroys Battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor."

It was indeed a "disaster most dreadful" and every protestation of innocence and offer of amends (including deeding to the United States in perpetuity an Habana cemetery plot) seemed too late for calling off the dogs of war. Through the length and breadth of America they were already baying.

On April 25 Congress formally declared war on Spain.

The *Maine*, like Concord Bridge, like the Alamo, like Bull Run or John Brown's Body, was to be remembered—and immortalized.

ONLY 88 LIVED

Of the *Maine's* complement of 354 officers and men, but 88 survived. In the 3½-month war which ensued only 290 soldiers died in battle. It was, the more cynical declared, a

cheap price to pay for the Pacific and Caribbean empires America won from Spain.

Yet the question persisted: What did blow up the beautiful *Maine*? Congress had declared war because, among other sources of friction, it believed the Spaniards had destroyed the battleship.

In 1911 United States Army engineers finally raised the wreckage from the mud of Habana Harbor. The remains of the shattered warship were so twisted, barnacled and rusted that she still clung to her secret with the tenacity of a widow and her memories.

In ensuing years, however, ordnance experts have come to the conclusion that the *Maine* probably blew herself up. Her brown powder was highly unstable, had destroyed or damaged war vessels of other nations. There was also the likelihood of spontaneous combustion in her paint locker or her coal bunkers, or of a dynamo explosion.

One glaring bit of evidence could not be overlooked—how could the *Maine* in busy, traffic-filled Habana Harbor be mined in the first place without someone aboard some ship noticing?

In 60 years no one—in a deathbed confession for example—has come forward with one shred of proof that the *Maine* was destroyed deliberately.

She was, however, a ship that started a war—and wrote a new chapter in American history.

A new *Maine* was launched in 1902. Her career was uneventful. She was hardly more suited to the scientific demands of the 20th century than her forebear, finally was scrapped well before World War II.

But the memories which persisted from the tragedy of Habana Harbor inspired Congress in 1940 to authorize yet another battleship *Maine*. Officially listed as the BB-69, she was contracted for with the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn—singularly enough, the birthplace of her predecessor.

Preliminary blueprints were drawn and plans accelerated for her construction as World War II embroiled the United States.

By mid-1943, however, as the battleship was being unmistakably supplanted by the aircraft carrier, the Navy revamped its building program. The contract was canceled for the ship whose keel was yet to be laid.

But somewhere in the vaults of the Brooklyn Navy Yard the blueprinted ghost of a U. S. S. *Maine* that was stillborn remains to haunt a file marked "Dead."

AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN THE BRUSSELS WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Members of this body have consistently supported in full American participation in the Brussels World's Fair. All funds for this event requested by the administration during the past year have been promptly approved, and many Senators, including most recently the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], have called attention to the urgent need for putting our best foot forward at this tremendous international exhibition.

For 6 months, before more than 50 million people from all over the world, the United States will in effect be "on trial" at the Brussels Fair. Our achievements, our ideals and our way of life will be judged at least in part by our representation at the fair, and, whether we wish it or not, we will be compared either favorably or unfavorably with the Soviet exhibition now going up immediately adjacent to our own.

It is already apparent that the United States is going to suffer by comparison with the Soviets, that we will be outspent, outmanned and outshone in this

competition for international prestige and good will. There is no point now in detailing once again the contrast between Russia's \$60 million effort and the performance we will present for less than \$15 million; nor in attempting to fix the blame for the delay and inadequacies of our own World's Fair budget. The final budget item of \$2,054,000 still awaits action by the other House before this body can act on it. An amendment to this appropriation which simply requested additional funds—for which no plans have been made or budgets devised—would at this late date be of little value; and to insist that the small budget and space already allocated be revamped in order to include some new project would not be helpful in the long run.

In short, the only way in which the Congress can improve our Brussels Fair showing, beyond approving the budget already requested and allocated, is to provide additional funds for our fair participation specifically earmarked for an additional project that can be completed before the fair is half over and that can add real impact to our presentation.

A NEW PROPOSAL

It is my intention to offer such an amendment when the measure containing this latest supplemental fair appropriation comes to the Senate floor. The subject of the additional exhibit I propose is one so basic to our way of life and so high among our greatest feats that I do not see how we can think of omitting it. I refer to the subject of public health.

It is my understanding that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is capable of fitting an outstanding public health exhibit into our present plans, within the time remaining, for as little as \$600,000. Here is an opportunity to demonstrate to the world what American science and research have accomplished, not in missiles and weapons, but in vaccines and sanitation. Let us demonstrate what we have done in our Nation, and stand ready to do cooperatively all over the world, as the President indicated in his state of the Union message, not in the way of snuffing out lives, but saving them, not maiming the bodies of men, but reclaiming them.

Particularly impressive, in my opinion, would be a visual presentation of our efforts and accomplishments in rehabilitating disabled workers—showing to the rest of the world that their crippled and handicapped, too, can become useful assets, not burdens. Perhaps, as Ed Sullivan has suggested on television and in a letter to me, our top medical men like Jonas Salk and Howard Rusk could actually go to Brussels, to demonstrate what we can do, and what Americans are really like.

No such exhibit—no health exhibit of any kind—is planned today for our underfinanced, overcrowded American pavilion. But the U. S. S. R., according to a recent article in the Soviet journal, *Medical Worker*, will have a tremendous public health exhibit displaying Communist knowledge and activity in this field.

If we act quickly and effectively, we can still show to the world that America

seeks nothing more outside her shores than the eradication in all countries of disease, poverty, and degrading standards of living. I hope that the final fair appropriation measure will come before the Senate before it is too late to act, and that at that time other Members will join with me in this effort to demonstrate to a wondering world that our chief concern is not with wars or material things but the helping of all mankind.

REUTHERIAN ECONOMICS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, Walter Reuther's strange brand of "Reutherian Economics" has been discussed at length before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Mr. Reuther on January 28 presented a prepared statement of 110 pages accompanied by 29 technical tables. Regardless of the number of words, the economics behind them is still faulty. His theories are designed to lead us only in one direction, namely, toward state socialism.

The distinguished columnist, Raymond Moley, in the *Waterbury Republican* of January 22, 1958, analyzes Mr. Reuther's economics. His comments should be of interest to all Members of the Congress. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the body of the *Record* at this point.

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

REUTHERIAN ECONOMICS

(By Raymond Moley)

Among Walter Reuther's assorted talents is the capacity to propose absurd economic theories to which he attributes solutions to complicated problems of our society. A few days ago the United Auto Workers' political economist—accent on political—came out with one of his more fantastic schemes. Boldly he proposed a two-level collective bargaining program calling for a profit-sharing plan which would take in consumers and employees as well as the auto companies and a wage hike in the industry amounting to at least 10 cents an hour.

This package, he claims, would not be inflationary and would pump purchasing power into the economy. Here, he would have it appear, is an answer to our "ailing economy," here is something for everybody.

The fact that Mr. Reuther's demands smack of genuine socialism is too clear to require elaboration. Facts which should be set straight involve the trickiness of Reuther's economic thinking and his apparent desire to take over the functions of running the entire automobile industry through control of profits, compensation and prices, as well as to control the Government through determination of just what profits in the industry may be taxed by Congress.

Mr. Reuther proposes that profits before taxes up to 10 percent on investment be handled as they are now. He is saying 10 percent before taxes is a fair return. Yet Federal corporate income tax is 52 percent, which leaves for the industry and its stockholders a 4.8 percent profit, certainly not enough either to provide incentive to assume the risks in such a competitive field or to assure necessary reserves for emergencies the future may hold. Profits over 10 percent would be divided—half to the industry and its stockholders, one-fourth to workers and one-fourth to purchasers of automobiles in the form of a rebate at the end of the year.

Since the 1,300,000 members of Mr. Reuther's union pay far lower taxes compared to the high corporate income tax, revenue loss to the Federal Government would be substantial. The rebates would represent a total loss. Together, these items would cost the Government close to \$300 million in taxes from General Motors alone, taking 1956 figures as a yardstick.

Should Reuther's scheme be applied to all industry, tax loss would mount into the billions. In his letter to local unions Mr. Reuther mentioned the demands on our economy imposed by our position in the world. But how would this tax loss be made up? Here Mr. Reuther's economic day-dream disintegrates. His increased purchasing power would be nullified by higher taxes on personal incomes. And perhaps corporate taxes would go up, undercutting even further the possibility for reserves for plant expansion and future exigencies.

Again, Mr. Reuther has revealed himself as a remarkably ambitious man, for he would take it upon himself to control a mighty industry and through manipulations remove from the field of corporate taxation an enormous amount of money.

This plan is further proof of what John L. Lewis recently said, "Well, Reuther is an earnest Marxist."

THE POST OFFICE MODERNIZATION PROGRAM, UNEMPLOYMENT, AND TVA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am interested to learn that Postmaster General Summerfield has proposed a gigantic post-office-modernization program—on a lease-purchase basis, of course—as his partial answer to growing unemployment.

The President says that if things are not better next month he will have a program, too.

The reason for these statements, of course, is the latest unemployment figures—1.1 million rise in January, to a present figure of 4.5 million.

I have a suggestion for the President and the administration, as they look around for things to do. My proposal concerns the Tennessee Valley. Over in the House of Representatives is a bill, passed by the Senate last year, which would provide a method for the TVA to finance its own needed expansions.

The President ought to get behind that bill, and help line up some Republican support for it. If it passes, new steam plants will be built in the valley. They will provide jobs now—and they will be a continuing stimulus to the economy of an entire region of the country. The things that go into these plants will be bought all over the country.

And it will not cost the Federal Government 1 cent—nothing will be added to the national debt—for all we ask for is the opportunity to finance this needed construction ourselves.

The President says he is for this program. He mentions it year after year in his budget messages to Congress. His Budget Bureau, however, has yet to be convinced that he is really for a workable program; they consistently gum it up with unworkable financial provisions.

We managed to provide for the program in the Senate in a workable way over the opposition of the Budget Bureau. That was last year. This is a new year—with new unemployment harass-

ing the Nation—and a new opportunity for President Eisenhower to deliver a few votes to go along with his good wishes to the Tennessee Valley region.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, moral indignation has apparently become too expensive a virtue for the Republican Party.

Day before yesterday we read in the papers that Chairman Alcorn, of the Republican National Committee, would not permit the lily-white hands of his committee to be soiled by touching the \$100,000 raised at the Houston oil and gas dinner for JOE MARTIN. At the same time we learned that Chairman Alcorn's scruples in the matter were fully endorsed by President Eisenhower.

Those Republican moral scruples lasted about 48 hours. This morning we learn that the chairman of the Republican House campaign committee will be glad to have the money. This morning we learn that the chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee says that he will be glad to have the money.

We have not heard today from Jack Porter, the Republican national committeeman from Texas, who now has the money. Doubtless he will be happy now. The money will be going precisely where he intended it to go in the first place.

That money, the Republican national committeeman suggested, in his letter, was needed as a stimulus to help the Republican leader in the House to help persuade votes from Congressmen whose constituents think the gas bill will hurt their interests.

All the bill does is to remove natural gas from price regulation by the Federal Power Commission. All the burden it places on the consumer is a billion-dollar addition to his gas bill every year.

One can understand the anxiety of the natural-gas interests to get this bill passed. If it passes the Congress and is signed by the President, the stroke of his pen will add \$12 billion to the value of gas reserves in the United States. In that one stroke of the pen a fairly small segment of Americans will be made \$12 billion richer. No wonder there is so much effort to get the gas bill passed.

The \$100,000 kitty is now marked money. Voters are going to be mighty curious as to where the money came from and what was done to get it. I am afraid that the sheep will be counted along with the goats.

PHONY PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the announcement by the White House and the Postmaster General of a \$2 billion public-works program is a product of the political mind at work.

I doubt if there is a more expert political mind around than that of the present Postmaster General. This so-called public-works program is one of his finer efforts. It has the outward appearance of a forthright administration step to combat the recession; but internally,

it is loaded with booby traps. In short, it is about as useless as an antirecession weapon as one of Mr. Summerfield's canceled postage stamps.

This mirage of a public-works program is divided into two parts. Part 1 commits the Government to spend the princely sum of \$175 million a year to modernize the Post Office Department.

Even \$175 million pumped into the economy now might be somewhat beneficial. But Mr. Summerfield and the White House intend to finance this \$175 million by taking it out of the pockets of the American public in higher first-class postage.

Giving this modernization program an antirecession coloration is simply a crude effort to blackmail Congress into raising postal rates on first-class mail.

The second part of Mr. Summerfield's dead letter mentions \$1½ billion for new or remodeled post office buildings. This, in terms of money, appears to be more like a genuine effort to come to grips with the recession. But it, too, will blow up in our hands if we look under the surface.

In the first place, it sounds like a new program. But Mr. Summerfield admits it has been going on for the past 4 years.

Secondly, it would obtain new buildings through the least advantageous and most expensive method for the Government—by leasing.

The program is supposed to cover a period of 3 to 5 years, and would cost from \$400 million to \$667 million a year. This is grossly inadequate to fight the recession. Considering the lead time necessary in such a program, it would be many months before the expenditure of even these piddling sums would be felt.

As I suggested on the Senate floor last week, there are many realistic ways to bring back prosperity, including income tax cuts and a genuine public-works program. But the Summerfield-White House method is simply political trickery.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

REINVESTMENT BY AIR CARRIERS OF PROCEEDS FROM SALE OF CERTAIN OPERATING EQUIPMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce that on Monday, February 17, the leadership expects to move the consideration of Calendar No. 1178, H. R. 5822, to amend section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, with respect to the investment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment.

It is requested that the attachés notify Senators on both sides of the aisle of this proposal.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR MODERNIZATION OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an announcement by the President requesting Congress to approve a modernization program for the entire postal service of the United States.

I am informed the program will involve rehabilitating, enlarging, or replacing 2,500 Government-owned post offices, and replacing or remodeling 12,000 leased postal buildings and providing modern mail handling equipment for all postal facilities in the United States.

In my judgment, this affords Congress an opportunity to provide a program which many Members have long desired. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] will propose an amendment to the postal rate bill establishing a fund for this modernization program. Each Member of this body will have an opportunity to vote favorably for a program which will, in my judgment, have advantages for every community in our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed, following my statement, the text of the President's statement, which was published in full in the New York Times of Wednesday, February 12, as well as the statement of the Postmaster General, Arthur E. Summerfield, outlining the administration's program for modernization of the postal service which he made yesterday, February 12, before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

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

[From the New York Times of February 12, 1958]

STATEMENT ON POST OFFICE

WASHINGTON, February 11.—Following is the text of a White House statement today on post office modernization:

"The President today directed Postmaster General Summerfield to present promptly to the Congress a \$2 billion program to modernize the obsolete physical plant of the Post Office Department over the next 3 to 5 years. The program will involve rehabilitating, enlarging, or replacing 2,500 Government-owned post-office buildings, replacing or remodeling 12,000 leased buildings, and providing modern mail-handling equipment for all postal facilities.

"Under the new program, developed by the Postmaster General, the funds from private investors for construction of new post offices to be occupied under lease would approximate \$1,500 million.

"The capital investment to be made by the Government is estimated at \$175 million a year for the period of the program, and would be for mail-handling devices and other equipment for these new leased buildings, and for the costs of rehabilitating and expanding some of the federally owned post offices. The total postal modernization program would therefore involve more than \$2 billion, and would affect every section of the country.

"The Government's portion of these expenditures would be financed by revenues from increased postage rates proposed by the administration and now before the Congress. The budget message has proposed a 5-cent letter rate on out-of-town letters, a 4-cent rate on local letters, and increases in other classes of mail."

POSTAGE TO PAY FOR PLAN

"The plan contemplates that the postage above 4 cents on first-class mail—namely, the 1 cent on out-of-town letters, which will amount to \$175 million a year—will be used to pay the modernization costs. The remaining increases would provide about \$500 million a year to reduce the postal deficit, estimated at \$850 million annually, including pending wage increases for postal employees proposed in the budget. When the program is completed, the added revenues, the improved and more efficient operations which can then be expected, should permit further reduction in the remaining deficit.

"During the past 4 years the Post Office Department has gained valuable experience from its leasing program whereby about 2,000 new postal buildings have been built to its specifications by private investors and leased to the Department. These postal buildings pay local taxes, are sound investments for their owners, eliminate the need for Government capital, and are economical in that they are more efficient for modern mail-handling methods. The new buildings to date have been leased at less cost per foot than older, unsatisfactory space."

RESEARCH ON HANDLING

"During this same period of time the Post Office Department has had a research and engineering program underway whereby modern, mechanical, and electronic mail-handling equipment has been developed to the stage it can now be introduced in new postal facilities. This equipment will speed mail deliveries and help to reduce postal costs.

"Necessary appropriations will be requested for the fiscal years 1958 and 1959 to start immediately the postal facilities modernization program as soon as postal-rate increases have been enacted.

"Unless prompt steps are taken to build and equip the thousands of new post offices needed throughout the country and remodel and refurbish many others, postal service will deteriorate.

"This must not happen.

"The President urges the Congress to approve the plans to modernize the postal establishment as they will be presented by the Postmaster General."

STATEMENT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD OUTLINING THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM FOR MODERNIZATION OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. Chairman and the members of this committee, at your invitation I have returned to your committee today for further discussion of the amendment to H. R. 5836, which would establish a 5-cent rate on each ounce of nonlocal letter mail, as proposed by the administration in the 1959 Federal budget.

The time of my appearance is especially timely. Yesterday the President announced that he had directed me to present to the Congress a program for modernization of the postal plant, including the replacement, or rehabilitation and expansion, of many of its buildings, and the procurement of newly developed modern mail-handling equipment.

In many respects, the proposal that I am here to present corresponds with the one outlined by a member of this committee, Senator CARLSON, on the floor of the Senate a few days ago. It contemplates the expenditure of approximately \$2 billion over a period of 3 to 5 years to provide improvements in the postal facilities in every section of the country.

This plan has the dual benefit at this time of not only providing for the needs of the postal service, but of giving the economy a timely stimulus. Fortunately, the progress of our research and development programs of the last 4 years has brought us

to the point of technological knowledge where we can promptly and effectively proceed with the modernization of our mail-handling methods. We are prepared to begin to introduce entirely new mechanical and electronic devices to handle mail.

A large part of the cost of this program will be financed by private investors. Our leasing activities of the last 4 years have provided 2,000 new post offices planned and built under our specifications. We now propose to rehabilitate, enlarge, or replace 2,500 Government-owned post-office buildings, replace or remodel 12,000 leased buildings, and provide modern mail-handling equipment for all postal facilities.

The Government's expenditures will be those necessary to equip these buildings with modern machines and devices, and to rehabilitate and enlarge, as well as equip, some of the federally owned post offices.

The Government's share of this cost will be planned for expenditures at the rate of \$175 million a year. It is proposed that this will be financed by the extra cent above the 4 cents that we are asking the Congress to add to each ounce of nonlocal mail, which will likewise amount to approximately \$175 million a year.

I would like to urge upon this committee the fact that these new facilities and the improved service that will result are necessary to make meaningful to the public the increases in postage that we need to reduce the fantastically large postal deficits.

I would like to review again our financial predicament.

As you will recall, in my last appearance before your committee on January 24, 1958, I outlined our current fiscal situation and pointed out that the aggregate of our postal deficit since 1945 to the end of this fiscal year will amount to \$6 billion.

For fiscal year 1959, we anticipate a minimum operating deficit of \$700 million, exclusive of other possible increases such as contemplated in the various pay bills now before the Congress.

The facts were presented by me which show beyond the question of a doubt that the 5-cent letter rate is equitable, necessary, and in the public interest. These facts included:

(1) Letter mail-cost coverage is now far below the historic average.

(2) Letter mail no longer pays a fair share of total costs of operating the Post Office Department.

(3) Letter mail is the only service that has made no contribution whatsoever, in terms of rate adjustments in the last 25 years to help defray operating cost increases.

(4) Considering the decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar, a letter taking a 3-cent stamp in 1932 would cost 6 cents today.

(5) The Senate action in 1951 in voting a 4-cent rate underscored the reasonableness of the 5-cent letter rate today.

(6) Thirty-four postal systems in foreign countries charge approximately 5 cents for letter mail, even though their labor costs average one-third to one-half of our own postal employees.

(7) Out-of-town letters cost more to handle.

(8) A 5-cent letter rate conforms with policy provisions of H. R. 5836.

(9) The proposed increases in letter rates are still less than recent increases in the telegraph and telephone industries.

Senator FRANK CARLSON's speech on the floor of the Senate on Friday, January 21, 1958, served to point up the serious dilemma that your postal service is now facing. On the one hand, we have huge mounting deficits with an urgent need for rate adjustments to help defray operating cost increases and remove the burden from the general taxpayer of financing these huge growing deficits. On the other hand, we have the serious problem of obsolescence of our out-

dated postal facilities all over the United States.

Federal public works funds have not been appropriated for new United States post office buildings since 1938. During this period of 20 years our national population has increased from 130 million to 170 million—a gain of 31 percent—and the mail volume handled in our post offices has increased from 26 billion to 61 billion pieces—a gain of 135 percent.

Marked changes have taken place in the transportation pattern of common carriers during this 20-year period. For instance, in 1938 there were approximately 6,600 trains carrying mails and today there are about 2,400 mail-carrying passenger trains—a reduction of 63 percent. This means that we must relocate many post offices once built for railroad service but now served by other transportation means. It means that we need a different type of structure—one with land areas required for driveways, and with platform space and docks for truck dispatches and deliveries.

Every city in the Nation has experienced a large-scale movement to the suburbs. There have been over 16 million new non-farm residential units built, each a new stop for the mailman.

The physical plant of the Department has not kept pace with the Nation's growth. More than half of the post office space is concentrated in 3,300 Federal buildings, all located in key gateway cities. These buildings, built in the late thirties or earlier, some over 50 years old, are mostly monumental in character and completely unsuited for today's mail-handling problems. They are multistory with narrow bays, poor lighting, inadequate trucking facilities, and cannot be easily remodeled for mechanization.

During this period of rising costs basic postal rates have remained at the 1932 level and the Post Office Department has operated at ever-increasing huge deficits. The Department has had to depend upon small amounts in its annual appropriations to attack the huge problem of an obsolete plant, instead of through a long-range building program.

The Department has been making progress in improved service by encouraging private enterprise to build some buildings for lease to the Department. This program, as far as it has gone, has proved successful, economical, and highly desirable. To date, however, we have been unable to replace our obsolete large Federal buildings, or provide modern equipment, because of inadequate funds.

Our research and development program has now produced a breakthrough in new concepts of mechanized mail handling. With the first results of this program now available, the Department is now in a position to enter into a planned capital improvement program which will combine modern, one-story, functional post offices, and the newest and most efficient mail-handling equipment with better working conditions. This program, when completed, will substantially reduce our costs to counteract the ever-increasing volume of mail.

While the Congress at this time is considering giving the Department the help it needs to overcome its fiscal plight, it is important for it also to provide the Post Office Department with the means to modernize its obsolete post offices. The increase in the first-class rate on out-of-town mail to 5 cents per ounce will go far to accomplish this objective.

A substantial part of the Federal buildings and also the privately owned buildings which are leased to the Post Office Department are badly in need of modernization or replacement. To modernize or replace these several thousand buildings will cost about \$1.5 billion and this entire invest-

ment would be financed by private capital. The only Government funds necessary would be for the purchase of equipment to be installed in these new or modernized facilities and for rehabilitation and enlargement of some Government-owned buildings. This program, already underway on a very small scale, should be rapidly accelerated with the objective of completion within 3 to 5 years.

To summarize, this program would offer the following advantages:

(1) It would give us a modernized postal service that will take care of the present volume, as well as the anticipated 75 billion pieces of mail by 1970.

(2) It will make possible an important reduction in the costs of handling the increased volume of mail through modernization and the elimination of obsolete equipment.

(3) The poor working conditions existing in most offices will be immeasurably improved for our more than 500,000 dedicated employees.

(4) The morale improvement will be reflected in greatly improved service.

(5) The major portion of the capital expenditure necessary for the program will be provided by private capital rather than a direct appropriation by the Congress and a further demand upon the Treasury of the United States.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, our postal service affects every family in the United States and it is absolutely necessary that this greatest system of communication on earth be maintained in keeping pace with the growth of our country.

Today the postal service of our country is truly at the crossroads.

One road leads to fiscal responsibility and better mail service.

The other leads to still heavier tax burdens on the general public, increased postal subsidies to the large mail users, and unavoidable deterioration of mail service.

The Post Office cannot stand still.

The choice, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, is yours.

PROPOSED CURTAILMENT OF THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, by now I am sure that all of our colleagues in this Chamber have been alerted by the patriots of their respective States to the latest Pentagon plan to curtail our Nation's militia.

Our National Guard, historically the first and last line of America's defense, faces another cut to keep the Regular Army within its 1959 budget.

Last spring, 35,000 volunteers were lopped from the guard rolls to pare them to a mere 400,000 citizen soldiers. Now come reports of another 40,000 slash.

This comes as grave news to a Nation already disturbed about other phases of its survival—at a time when our original satellite failure has betrayed a vacillating loyalty on the part of some of our allies abroad, and at a time when many of us are not too sure that we will win a future war by pushbuttons alone.

In my own State of Maryland, the Army's proposal would strip our historic militia by 2,000 men. Indeed, it threatens the very existence of our beloved 29th Infantry Division of World War II fame.

I am sure that this kind of news shocks not only the Members of this Chamber, but all good Americans every-

where, for our history books have bred in all of us a deep respect for the heroic patriots who have always been there—ready, willing and able—to shoulder arms in our Nation's defense.

Our militia tradition predates the republican democracy it made possible. Our citizen soldiers stood at Bunker Hill before there was an American Army; our Dandy Fifth Regiment routed the tyrant at Cowpens before there was a United States.

The 175th Infantry, once the Dandy Fifth and now part of our 29th Division, has fought with glory and distinction in every war our Nation has waged.

Our 115th Infantry Regiment—in fact, all of our Maryland units, which I mention specifically because I am so well acquainted with them—are responsible for some of the most inspiring chapters of our Nation's history—chapters written in sweat and blood.

Similar contributions have been made by the guard units of other States, too, of course, and the annals of heroism are filled with their proud achievements.

From generation to generation, our militia has handed down the great traditions of a people willing to face any sacrifice to keep our Nation free—free not only from an alien foe, but free also from internal disorder or dictatorship.

Currently, of course, we fear no possibility of a dictator. There are no Hitlers or Perons rising at this time who might convert our Pentagon into a citadel of oppression.

But when we look to certain other lands and see military rulers corrupting governments fashioned in our image, when we see the wretched plight of whole peoples ruled by bayonet in alleged democracies, then we must all realize that but for certain safeguards, it could happen here.

That is not a new thought. Those wise and able men who established our Government feared the military tyrant. And they charged us—the Members of the Congress—to see that no man on horseback ever subjugates our free land.

Mr. President, I cite only as a reminder article 15, section 8, of our sacred Constitution. Here our forebears charged the Congress specifically with the duty "to provide for calling forth the militia." And in article 16, the duty is imposed on us "to provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia."

I fail, Mr. President, to see how we can relegate these solemn duties to the Pentagon.

It has always been a matter of wondrous amazement to me to watch history unfold and realize how our Founding Fathers foresaw and provided safeguards for almost every emergency our Nation has faced in almost 200 years.

In this matter, too, they showed the same rare wisdom. They considered the militia of such importance to a free people they took even further steps to keep our citizens armed.

Mr. President, I now quote from article 11 of history's most magnificent afterthought—our hallowed Bill of Rights. It says:

A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of

a people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Those are not my words, Mr. President, I wish they were. They were the words of our forebears, protecting us from shortsighted expediences.

They considered this provision so vital, so inherent to our liberty, that they told why they did it—to defend the security of a free state. It is the only measure in the entire Constitution, Mr. President, which bears an explanation of why it is there.

So I take the floor, today, to remind the Congress, and the Pentagon, that our Constitution says the right of the people to bear arms shall not be infringed.

It shall not be infringed by manpower cuts that reduce it to an impotent corporal's guard.

Nor shall it be infringed by appropriation cuts that reduce the proportions of our Minutemen too far below those of our professional soldiery.

Mr. President, I remind the Congress that with a "well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state," we must justify the trust reposed in us by the Founders and see that it is just that—well regulated—with enough officers and men and material to insure that security.

To do otherwise is to betray our free heritage—to pave the way for a future and more successful Aaron Burr.

I am sure you will recall, Mr. President, that our initial military draft of 1941 fed most of its manpower levies directly into our mobilized guard units. The Regular Army was not prepared to handle them any other way.

True, the guard was undertrained, undermanned, understaffed. But the guard—along with the Army—was our salvation.

As a peaceful nation without aims of conquest, this Nation has until our current crisis always depended on a small standing army, backed up by its militia.

Mr. President, I close with a thought from the Baltimore Sun on this grave situation. In an editorial which deplores, as many of us do, this hamstringing of our citizen soldiers, the Sun remarks:

It is questionable whether, in a country where many men try to get out of military duty, those who want to serve should be discouraged or denied this opportunity.

I am sure the American answer is "No."

WITHDRAWALS OF LANDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5538) to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORRISON in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5538) to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

At page 2, strike out all after line 19 down to and including line 4 on page 3, and insert the following:

"(4) nothing in sections 1, 2, or 3 of this act shall be deemed to be applicable either to those reservations or withdrawals which expired due to the ending of the unlimited national emergency of May 27, 1941, and which subsequent to such expiration have been and are now used by the military departments with the concurrence of the Department of the Interior, or to the withdrawal of public domain lands of the Marine Corps Training Center, Twentynine Palms, California, and the naval gunnery ranges in the State of Nevada designated as Basic Black Rock and Basic Sawwave Mountain."

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
FRANK CHURCH,
GEORGE W. MALONE,
GORDON ALLOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER S. BARING,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

ACCELERATION OF THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in 1956, the Congress enacted a far-reaching highway-construction program. Of particular significance in the Act of 1956 was the specific recognition of the importance of, and Federal responsibility for, the early completion of a national system of interstate and defense highways. The Act of 1956 contained this specific declaration:

It is hereby declared to be essential to the national interest to provide for the early completion of the "National System of Interstate Highways," as authorized and designated in accordance with section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838). It is the intent of the Congress that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over a 13-year period and that the entire System in all the States be brought to simultaneous completion.

Under this act, the Federal Government undertook to pay 90 percent of the cost of this segment of our highway system. The act contained authoriza-

tions for Federal expenditures for the years 1957 through 1969, inclusive, totaling \$25 billion. This amount, added to contributions to be made by the States, was estimated to be sufficient to provide for completing the then designated Interstate Highway System within the 13-year period, with construction standards adequate to accommodate types and volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975.

In making authorizations for a 13-year period, the Congress departed from its prior practice of authorizing highway expenditures for only two years at a time. This action was taken in order to assure the States of the Federal Government's determination to provide adequate funds to complete the system within a definite period of time. This multiple-year authorization also provided needed assurance to the construction equipment, cement, asphalt and aggregate industries, highway contractors, and others associated with highway building, so that they might safely make their plans and might program their activities in such ways as to permit timely completion of this gigantic construction program. It provided assurance, too, to the 48 States.

Under the act of 1956, funds authorized for the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, totaling \$4,875,000,000, as the Federal contribution for the Interstate System for those years, have been apportioned to the States, and are available for obligation by the States, for engineering, the purchase of rights-of-way, and the award of construction contracts. The several States are now proceeding with their plans involving the expenditure of these sums.

Quite frankly, the progress made in getting actual construction under way is not as rapid as I should like to see it. We must recognize that the problems involved in reaching the construction stage are formidable. Though somewhat tardy, several States are only now in a position to proceed with the actual award of construction contracts involving substantial sums of money.

I call to the attention of the Senate that this very necessary program, now in its early stages, stands in danger. Unless appropriate action is taken by the administration and the Congress, the program will have to be so curtailed as to make it impossible to meet the objectives set forth in the act and to make meaningless the declaration of policy which I have quoted.

If the rate of actual apportionment, as now estimated and recommended by the administration's budget, remains unchanged, construction of the 41,000-mile Interstate System will be stretched out to approximately 24 years.

New estimates submitted by the Secretary of Commerce indicate that the cost of the originally designated 40,000-mile Interstate System will be \$37.5 billion, an increase of about 37 percent, or \$10 billion, over the estimates submitted in 1955. Assuming that the most recent estimates submitted by the Secretary of Commerce are accurate, unless positive action is taken, actual construction of the highway system which the Congress declared should be built by 1969, will

not be finished until 1980, or later. In such event, this grand system of highways will be obsolete even before it is finished.

The President of the United States, in his message to Congress on February 2, 1955, proposed that the Interstate System be built in 10 years, at an estimated average annual outlay of Federal funds in the amount of \$2.5 billion. Specifically, the recommended construction schedule accompanying the President's message provided for the expenditure of \$2.9 billion in the fiscal year 1960. This compares with \$1.6 billion available for obligation under present recommendations.

In his message of 1955, the President pointed out that while one in every seven Americans makes his livelihood and support for his family out of our highway system, the existing network is, in large part, inadequate for the Nation's growing needs.

The economic benefits flowing from an adequate highway network are in themselves ample justification for maintaining the construction schedules set forth in the Highway Act. The need for doing so is even more urgent in view of the current state of our economy. The Labor Department announced this week that in January, 4.5 million persons were actively seeking jobs which were not available. This represented an increase of more than 1 million over the unemployment figure for December, and is 41 percent larger than the figure for January of last year. Everyone predicts that unemployment will be even higher this month.

Some segments of our economy, notably the farmers, have been in a depressed state for several years. Until comparatively recently, other segments of the economy have experienced reasonable levels of activity which, from the standpoint of overall statistics, have tended to obscure the soft spots. One of the more serious aspects of the current recession, however, is that most major segments of the economy are on the downturn simultaneously. Plant expansion has been sharply curtailed; business inventories are being reduced; consumer purchasing shows increased signs of weakness; the home-building industry still suffers from nonavailability of mortgage funds; and the farm economy shows no signs whatsoever of improvement.

I should like to make it clear that I do not consider that we are in a depression, although I admit it might be hard to convince the 4½ million unemployed and other millions who are only partially employed that such is not the case. It is my view that governmental action is necessary to avoid a much more serious situation than that we now face.

It is encouraging that President Eisenhower has recognized the Nation's present economic plight. That is a prerequisite to adequate action. The President did not propose adequate action, however.

One of the most effective means of stimulating our economy is by accelerating a sound public-works program. There is no better place to start than

with the highway program. As a result of the policy declarations in the 1956 act, the highway-construction industry is prepared for a construction program at a higher level than that now in effect. Preliminary planning has been accomplished, and detailed planning for additional projects could be completed in a very short time if availability of funds is assured. The administrative machinery for the program is already in existence and is functioning.

Section 209 of the act contains a policy declaration that it is the intent of the Congress that if total receipts in the Highway Trust Fund are insufficient to meet necessary expenditures, the Congress shall enact such legislation as may be necessary. It is obvious that the time for such action has now arrived. We simply cannot permit the program for construction of an interstate system of highways to be slowed down and stretched out, as it inevitably will be unless action is taken.

Thus far, the only administration proposal affecting the highway trust fund is a recommendation that approximately \$68 million be diverted annually from the fund and be used for purposes other than those of the Federal-aid highway program. I vigorously oppose these proposals to raid the fund. It is abundantly clear that, instead of talking about diverting funds now earmarked for the highway program, we must take necessary action to increase available funds. As a very minimum, we must take action to place in the highway trust fund sufficient funds to permit the apportionment of the full amounts authorized for the interstate system.

Our highway program is aptly described as one for which the users of the highways pay. I have always had serious reservations about earmarking funds in the General Treasury. Such action generally tends toward inflexibility in Government fiscal operations.

Furthermore, it is obvious that good highways benefit everyone, not just those who travel on them. Every business activity in an area served by a new highway benefits from it. I have no hesitation whatsoever in recommending that general revenues be appropriated to the trust fund as required. However that may be, if the Congress decides that only highway-user taxes should be spent for highway construction, I believe the receipts from such taxes will be fully adequate to meet the needs.

In its report on the highway bill in 1956, the Senate Finance Committee estimated that the receipts from the highway-user taxes which, in the aggregate, through 1972 would total \$55,460,000,000. In setting up the highway trust fund, however, not all of these taxes were appropriated to the fund. Only the highway-user taxes which, in the aggregate, were estimated to yield about \$38 billion during this period were earmarked for the fund. If the remainder of these excise taxes paid by highway users were likewise earmarked for the trust fund, the receipts would be adequate to permit apportionment of the full amounts authorized in the act and, in addition, would be sufficient to permit increasing

those authorizations sufficiently to enable them to take care of the increased cost of the interstate system, as well as the needed increases in authorizations for our primary, secondary, and urban Federal-aid systems.

In 1955, President Eisenhower recommended construction of the Interstate Highway System over a 10-year period. He recommended the program as being necessary from the standpoint of national defense, highway safety, and economic progress.

After lengthy and careful consideration, the Congress concurred in the view regarding the necessity for a vigorous highway improvement program, not only with respect to the Interstate and Defense Highways, but also with respect to the primary, secondary, and urban highway systems. The conditions and facts upon which the President and the Congress reached these conclusions in 1956 are still present, and today they are even more pressing.

For instance, more than 37,000 people were killed in highway accidents last year. More than 1 million others were maimed and crippled. The measurable economic losses from highway wrecks exceeded \$4 billion.

Moreover, it is estimated that the additional cost to highway traffic from inadequate highways amounts to approximately 1 cent a mile, which, when measured against the current volume of traffic, amounts to an economic drain of approximately \$5 billion a year on our economy.

These facts are arresting. They dramatically illustrate the severe economic losses which we suffer from inadequate highways. The situation promises to grow progressively worse unless we pursue a vigorous highway-improvement program.

In addition to these facts, which led a Democratic Congress and a Republican President to agree upon a vigorous highway program in 1956, and which today are present and even more pressing, we have the urgent need to stimulate our national economy.

In the face of these impelling conditions and facts, we have a proposed 24-year stretchout of a 13-year program upon which agreement was reached only 2 years ago. This we must not permit. The national interest requires acceleration of its highway program rather a stretchout.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL FOR IMPROVEMENT OF POST OFFICE FACILITIES—A SHAM PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the President of the United States made a statement yesterday that purported to be offering the American people a public-works program of some \$2 billion. It is the characteristic type of sham the President of the United States has been presenting to the people of the United States. In my judgment, it is not a true public-works program at all. It represents another shakedown by the bankers. It represents another example of favoritism for big business in this country. It represents another fraud upon the taxpayers of the country.

We ought to have the type of program in support of which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has just raised his voice in the Senate, a public-roads program that would do something toward bringing to an end highway murder of some 36,000 or 37,000 Americans a year. Experts point out that there is little we can do about the large number of fatalities on the highways until the roads engineering can accommodate the number of automobiles on the highways. Our present roads cannot take such a large amount of traffic.

What does the President propose to do about that? He says not a word with regard to getting the road schedule back on time. He proposes once again, as he did earlier in this administration, another handout to the bankers of this country.

This matter of lease-purchase has been before the Senate of the United States before. I shall insert in the RECORD a part of the debate we had when the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate, pointed out to this country how much more the President's giveaway program to the bankers would cost the taxpayers, and how much less they would be getting than what they would be paying.

It is no understatement to say it amounts to taking away from the taxpayers at least one-third of the cost of construction, in addition to what the Government could build the post offices for, if it built them itself. I am in favor of building post offices, but I am for the Government building them, without a third handout to the bankers and the construction people of this country over and above what the Government itself could build the post offices for.

There is no saving under the President's plan. Whether the money is raised by conventional Federal financing or by lease-purchase, a form of installment plan, the taxpayers will foot the whole bill over a period of time. But, lease-purchase makes the buildings far more expensive than conventional Government financing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD certain paragraphs from the debate we had on this matter from April 20, 1954. What a group of us said on that date is as true and applicable today to this latest representation on the part of the President of the United States—that he is not really proposing a public-works program, when all it is is a shakedown of the taxpayers of the country.

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

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF April 20, 1954]

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should first like to conclude my statement; then I shall be happy to yield.

If the Federal Government needs a building, it should come to Congress and ask it to appropriate the money for it. That is the cheapest way to do it. If we cannot afford to do it that way, why enact a bill like this and pile up the costs to which I am about to refer under this method, which the

committee itself says is more costly than the old method?

The committee has provided no estimate as to what the program will cost. I was curious on that point. I thought the Senate should have some information to guide it in its deliberations on this measure. Therefore I asked the Library of Congress to provide me with some figures. To me they are most interesting. Let me demonstrate what I mean.

We are talking about saving money. Yet we are presented with a program which will be much more costly than any other program.

Estimates as to the amount of construction which would take place under this bill vary. Some have quoted a figure as high as \$3 billion. For purposes of illustration, I have assumed that \$900 million worth of construction would take place under this program.

All of us know that a builder will not construct a Federal building without making a profit. I am assuming that he would make a profit of approximately 10 percent, which is the average profit on construction. Under the proposed lease-purchase program the builders—and I ask Senators to mark this point—would go to their bankers to borrow the money. Naturally, they would borrow enough to cover their estimated costs, or \$900 million, plus a legitimate profit. For easy figuring, let us assume the builders borrow \$1 billion. This amount would cover the cost of construction, plus the profit. Collectively, the mortgage total would be \$1 billion.

I doubt that the interest rate on these mortgages would be less than 4½ percent. That is the normal, average rate of interest on money lent for construction purposes. Let us assume that the rate is 4½ percent, and that the lease-purchase contract runs for 25 years. The total cost of these buildings to Uncle Sam would be \$1,686,000,000, in round figures, as compared to \$900 million under the straight appropriation method. The amount of \$686 million is the amount of interest the taxpayers will pay on a program of the magnitude I am discussing.

The annual payment to amortize the cost of the buildings, plus interest over a 25-year period, would be \$67,439,000.

Let us assume that the Federal Government were to finance the same building program by appropriations, which is the honest way to do it. The cost of the money to the Government would be not more than 2½ percent. It would be in the ratio of whatever the deficit of the Federal Government was for the fiscal year. It would be less than that, but let us assume it would be 2½ percent. Over a 25-year period the interest charge would be \$357 million in round figures.

In other words, it would cost Uncle Sam, at the highest figure we could assume, \$329 million more in interest alone to finance a \$1 billion construction program under this proposed legislation than it would cost if Congress made the appropriations directly.

That is quite a tribute to pay to the moneylenders, particularly at a time when we hear so much talk about economizing. In addition, it is an extremely high price to pay in the name of a balanced budget for the sake of a balanced budget.

Let us assume that the money costs the builder 5 percent. In that case the total interest the Federal Government would ultimately pay on a \$1 billion construction program would amount to \$774,855,000. In that case the buildings would cost the taxpayers \$418 million more in interest than they would cost if Congress appropriated the funds.

If builders had to pay 5½ percent for their money, the difference in cost would be \$507 million. The total interest would be \$864 million, in round figures.

This, however, is not the full story. We still have to consider taxes. Under this bill the title would not pass to the Federal Government until final payment is made.

In consequence, the builder would pay local taxes on the property. The property with improvements would remain on the tax rolls.

This may be a desirable provision. Many of us in the Senate have thought the Federal Government should make some payments in lieu of taxes to States and municipalities. Under the Constitution, however, States and political subdivisions may not impose a tax on the Federal Government. This bill provides a backdoor method for permitting the Federal Government—through annual installments on lease-purchase buildings—to pay the taxes.

I am not arguing the merits or demerits of the proposition. I now merely want to demonstrate the additional cost to the Federal Government of acquiring buildings under this legislation attributable to local taxes.

For illustrative purposes, I have taken two cities—Seattle and Baltimore—on opposite sides of the country. I realize, of course, that the Federal Government is not going to acquire a billion dollars worth of construction in Baltimore or in Seattle. The property tax rates in those two cities, however, will demonstrate the point I am making.

In the State of Washington we have a constitutional limitation on real estate taxes of 40 mills. Assessment valuations are made at 50 percent of true value. On a billion dollars worth of construction, therefore, the annual real estate tax will amount to \$20 million. Over a 25-year period these taxes would add \$500 million to the cost of these buildings.

In addition, there are local levies. In Seattle they amounted to \$6.60 per thousand in 1953. Assuming this rate will continue, this would add another \$165 million, or a total of \$665 million in taxes over 25 years.

Mr. President, that is probably more than the cost of the buildings themselves.

In Baltimore, the rate is \$20.80 per thousand. Assessments are supposed to be made at 75 percent of value. The annual taxes on a billion dollars' worth of construction would be \$21,600,000. Over a 25-year period taxes would increase the cost to the Federal Government by \$540 million.

Let us go back and figure out what the total additional cost of a billion dollars' worth of construction would be, taking into consideration the additional interest charge and the additional tax bill.

Assuming that builders acquired their money at 4½ percent, it will be remembered that the additional cost was \$329 million in round numbers.

If the construction took place in Seattle, or in a comparable city, the increase in cost under this proposed legislation would be—in taxes plus interest—\$329 million plus \$665 million, or \$994 million.

If the construction took place in Baltimore, or in a city of comparable circumstances, the total additional cost would be \$329 million, plus \$540 million, or \$869 million.

If the money cost the builders 5 percent, an additional \$89 million, in round figures, would have to be added. If money cost 5½ percent, \$168 million would be added.

It is apparent from the figures I have cited that construction under this program is going to cost the taxpayers almost double what it would cost them if Congress appropriated the funds—figuring interest and taxes alone. The committee was certainly correct when it said in its report that the appropriation method of constructing Federal buildings is the cheaper.

Over and above the costs I have mentioned, there are other hidden costs which

I think will increase Uncle Sam's outlay under this program.

Personally, I think there will be a strong inclination on the part of the Postmaster General and the General Services Administrator, to acquire by lease-purchase buildings which will incorporate more frills and fur-below than will be necessary to meet an agency's needs. There would be strong incentive to add features that really are not necessary.

It is like buying an automobile or a refrigerator or a gas or electric stove on time. The customer tends to purchase something more expensive than he can actually afford. All of us do that when we purchase on the installment plan. It is simply human nature. There is no way of estimating the cost that would be added from this source. In my judgment, however, it would be substantial.

Furthermore, I find nothing in this bill which requires General Services Administration or the Post Office Department to prepare its own designs. The bill and report speak of competitive bidding, but actually the only way we can have competitive bidding is if all the parties are preparing their estimates on the same set of plans.

Under this program a 25-year contract can be entered into by negotiation. Since the individual builder will be submitting his own set of plans, there is in reality no competitive bidding in the true sense of the word. The Federal agencies will be merely checking on the estimates the builder and his architect have prepared.

Let us assume that three contractors bid on a post office in Seattle. As this bill is drawn, the Postmaster General or Administrator of General Services could decide that the contractor with the fanciest set of plans should get the award. As I said before, there would be an actual incentive to do that because the day of reckoning would be postponed and because Congress would not have the check on the executive branch that it would have if the appropriations were made directly.

I raise these questions:

Does the Senate of the United States want to authorize payment of taxes to States and their political subdivisions by way of this lease-purchase bill?

Second. Do we need these buildings so badly that we are willing to pay tribute in the magnitude I have already mentioned—namely, \$329 million in additional interest over a 25-year period on a billion-dollar construction program?

There is still one other thing I want to mention. The committee reports say that "the General Services Administrator would make use of this legislation when (1) there is no suitable Government-owned space available, (2) there is no prospect of direct Federal construction within a reasonable period of time."

Mr. President, the General Services Administrator has to be a crystal ball gazer to figure that one out. Supposedly he will look into his crystal ball and decide that "there is no prospect of direct Federal appropriation." He will go into a seance with himself and decide that Congress is in no mood to appropriate money or that the President and his Bureau of Budget are pennypinchers, and, hence, that he should construct buildings under this proposed legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me finish one paragraph, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, the executive branch is deciding what the Congress will or will not do. The only way to ascertain what the Congress will do is to come before Congress with a sensible program and talk to us about it. If the need is great, Congress will appropriate—provided, of course, the executive branch is not more interested in claiming a

balanced budget than in achieving real economy.

Mr. President, I wish to digress at this point. The only purpose of a bill in which the Government will get \$900 million worth of buildings in 25 years, while the taxpayers will have paid more than \$2 billion for the buildings, is merely to show that it is not necessary for the executive departments to come before Congress and to ask to have the money appropriated. That is the only purpose of the bill. I could say some other things about the bill, just as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has done on several occasions.

There is now in progress an investigation with respect to Federal housing. Unless I am wrong, if the building program is started under the provisions of the bill, future investigations of abuses and costs to the taxpayers will make the Federal Housing Administration investigation look like a Sunday-school picnic.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I share the viewpoint expressed by the Senator from Washington. In my judgment, not only is this a form of unnecessary subsidy, but really, in the long run, it will prove to be a form of extortion, so far as the taxpayers are concerned.

SPUTNIK AND AMERICAN EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published as a part of my remarks a very penetrating and able article by Dr. Earl McGrath, former United States Commissioner of Education, entitled "Sputnik and American Education." I read only the first paragraph, and then call attention to one other item, as I am speaking within a time limit.

The first paragraph of the article reads:

Every thoughtful American is properly concerned about the meaning of the Russian dramatic success in putting a satellite in orbit 560 miles from the surface of the earth. Many are worried about the military significance of this epoch-making feat. They foresee hydrogen bombs being dropped from a similar instrument into the midst of our cities and the devastation and death of Hiroshima multiplied a thousand times. They also share a common humiliation when they realize that our Nation, which has boasted the greatest wealth, the most education, and the largest force of skilled workmen, has been forced into second place in at least one very important area of scientific and technological development.

Later in the article he points out:

Scientists must be free to investigate. The Federal Government can also increase scientific production by adopting policies consistent with the nature of science and congenial to the scientists' methods of working.

In this article he bears out what a great physicist from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology said at a luncheon a few days ago as he briefed a group of us. He pointed out that security relations we have imposed on scientists have already cost us one generation of scientists, on the basis of education of nuclear physicists.

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

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

SPUTNIK AND AMERICAN EDUCATION

(By Dr. Earl McGrath)

Every thoughtful American is properly concerned about the meaning of the Russian dramatic success in putting a satellite in orbit 560 miles from the surface of the earth. Many are worried about the military significance of this epoch-making feat. They foresee hydrogen bombs being dropped from a similar instrument into the midst of our cities and the devastation and death of Hiroshima multiplied a thousand times. They also share a common humiliation when they realize that our Nation, which has boasted the greatest wealth, the most education, and the largest force of skilled workmen, has been forced into second place in at least one very important area of scientific and technological development.

There is no question that being outstripped by the Russians in these scientific developments has placed us in a weakened military position. The Gaither Committee says that the Nation is in the gravest danger in its history exposed as it is to an almost immediate threat from the missile-bristling Soviet Union.

Perhaps an even more serious loss is the almost irreparable damage to our prestige in the family of nations. In terms of status and the ability to gain the support of other nations through admiration or intimidation, the Russians have made a grand slam.

But viewed from another position, Russia's launching of sputnik may be a real boon to the United States. The only constructive attitude to take is to view it as a challenge rather than a disaster. It should make us realize that in one realm of creative intellectual endeavor at least one nation has surpassed us. It should warn us that the present dramatic success of the Russians in the science of space is probably only the forerunner of many others equally impressive. The Russian intention to surpass us in other scientific fields is made abundantly clear in the recent statement of Alexander N. Nesmeyanov, chairman of the Soviet Academy of Science, when he said that "great efforts are still needed to beat the United States on all scientific fronts." It should make us realize, therefore, that no crash program in the intellectual realm will quickly reestablish our scientific supremacy, for the Russians are doubtless already husbanding a large stockpile of new ideas and plans to be used in accelerating their scientific advance.

As is our custom as a people, we think immediately of a crash program, an intensive and arresting effort to deal swiftly with a serious problem. Our Government must, of course, give prompt attention to plans for reestablishing our competitive advantage in the military arena. We must exploit quickly all the scientific knowledge and skills available in the production of weapons of offense and defense.

Fortunately, however, our people are exhibiting an immense amount of understanding in recognizing that the solution of our present difficulties related to sputnik calls for something more than larger funds for the military to build bigger and better satellites. Even though not in possession of all the facts, our citizens intuitively realize that the causes of our inadequacy must be fathomed in more complex social forces. While making every effort to defend ourselves militarily, it is with matters of social values, political institutions, and educational practices that we must be primarily concerned if the gap between our own scientific developments and those of Russia is to be closed. Only thus can we be certain that the next generation now in our schools and colleges will not find itself more embarrassed on the international scene and more insecure at home than our own.

WE CANNOT USE RUSSIAN METHODS TO OVERTAKE THEM

In dealing with the present situation the first major fact to be considered is that we cannot match the Russians in science and technology, or in any other endeavor, by adopting their own practices. To the extent that we ape them we will be losing the cold war by turning our own democratic state into a totalitarian society as we began to do under McCarthyism. The spectacular speed with which the Russians have been able to outstrip us in some areas of science can be explained in large part by the power Soviet leaders have over the private lives of the Russian people. Unlimited money can be poured into salaries, buildings, libraries, and equipment. Individuals can be tested, classified, and ordered into any program of studies deemed by the leaders to be of use to the state.

We can do none of these things. To the extent that we adopt such measures we do become a totalitarian society. In the present situation, therefore, we cannot through the powers of the state drag scientists into Government research and the production of satellites. We cannot arbitrarily restrict the production of consumer goods in the interest of a military buildup. We cannot commandeer students into classes in science or engineering, without regard to their personal occupational choice. To do these things even in the emergency we now face would be to abandon our most cherished personal freedoms while embracing the most repugnant controls of the totalitarian state. Reason and persuasion, not coercion and control, must be our methods. Hence, the success of our efforts will depend upon the promptness and effectiveness with which our officers of Government make known to the public generally the exact situation in which we now find ourselves, and the sacrifices of luxuries, comforts, and treasure required to meet this emergency. To this kind of candid appeal our people will, as they have in the past, respond with unselfish dedication to the problem at hand.

Within the context of our pattern of living what can be done to meet the present challenge? More importantly, what can we do to guarantee an adequate future supply of intellectually elite in all the phases of our national life? There are many answers to these two questions. Since education is basic to most, I will concentrate on changes in our educational enterprise best calculated to regain for us a position of intellectual leadership in the world.

THERE CAN BE NO CRASH PROGRAM IN EDUCATION

First, with regard to the immediate future. It must be recognized at the outset that there can be no such thing as a crash program in education. Education is a slow process at best, and regrettably we have not been operating our educational system at its potential best. Within limits, learning can be speeded up by exceptional teaching, increased motivation, and wise guidance, and students can be saturated with facts in a relatively brief time. But this process does not cultivate the powers of reflection, imagination, and reasoning without which one can hardly be called educated. Moreover, the latter attributes of mind are the very qualities needed in the kind of scientific research which has given the Russians their present lead.

The best one can hope for in the form of a crash program then is limited to the shifting of persons with the necessary abilities from activities of relatively low value in the present emergency to those of top priority. These efforts can be accompanied by the acceleration of the education of those who are near the end of their advanced formal education. The great benefits which would automatically flow from an improvement of education at the lower levels must

be scheduled in terms of 10 to 20 years. The recent drastic proposals for changes in the content and the methods of education in our elementary and secondary schools, even if they had merit, and many have none, would not help in the near future. Some, for example, are proposing more science and mathematics from the early grades through high school, heavier assignments in school and out, more rigorous discipline throughout the system, required instruction for all in science and mathematics through the college years, an elimination of vocational studies, and a host of other panaceas. None of these suggestions will help at all in the present emergency.

The men and women who contributed most to the recent startling scientific accomplishments in Russia were not school boys or even recent graduates of the universities. They were scientists ripe in learning, mature scholars capable of doing and understanding the most advanced research. Though a few may have been relatively young, the educational programs they had completed beyond the elementary school would cover not less and usually much more than 12 years, to which years of further education in research were doubtless added. It is obvious, therefore, that proposals, however meritorious, relating to the early years of schooling can be of little help in offsetting the initial advantage which Russian scientists now apparently hold.

WE MUST SHIFT SCIENTISTS FROM NONESSENTIAL ACTIVITIES

The only way to increase the quantity and quality of basic research in the immediate future is to make better use of the scientists already capable of adding to the store of theoretical knowledge. This plan would involve identifying the persons who have already had the essential formal education and moving them into research work related more closely to the national welfare than their present activities.

There has been much talk since World War II of the shortage of engineers and scientists. No doubt there are such shortages in some branches of business, industry, government, and the universities. Yet there is considerable evidence to show that if engineers and scientists were more effectively used these shortages would markedly shrink. Even though shortages do exist, the figures provided by the National Research Council for the years 1945 to 1955 inclusive show that 1,762 persons received the doctor of philosophy degree in mathematics, 4,175 in physics, and 9,027 in chemistry in the universities of the United States. In the same period, several hundred thousand degrees were awarded in engineering. There is no way to determine the intellectual quality of these persons, nor to compare it with the quality of Russian scientists. How many of our scientists are capable of genuinely original research no one can say. It is certain, however, that a large percentage of very high-grade scientists have trained for research and are now employed in some branch of our economy.

The significant fact, however, is that too few qualified scientists have been engaged in research even remotely related to the chemical, physical, or mathematical problems involved in satellite development, or in any other efforts to advance theoretical knowledge. Indeed, most of them are not engaged in any investigations which could conceivably result in a major breakthrough in theory. Many are devoting their intellectual energies to perfecting new computing machines, discovering more effective detergents, or developing a more resilient automobile spring. Russian scientists, on the other hand, have been driven into pure research by the authority of the state or lured into it by large financial rewards and high social status. In this country the salaries paid to scholars and the relatively low prestige of the intel-

lectual have forced many of our best minds in science into industry. There the financial reward is from two to five times that of university teachers and research workers, and there they can disguise their intellectualism. The first critical factor in our present inferior position is clearly a matter of values, the things we prize enough to pay for and to honor. When we consider sputniks and all the other potential products of theoretical science as valuable as new automobiles and improved nylon stockings, when we respect intellectual accomplishment, then we will be able, with our enormous wealth and educated manpower, again to gain the lead in the world of science, and other cultural enterprises.

Until a well-planned, long-range educational program has redressed our present weaknesses, drastic decisions will have to be made by our Government and by our people regarding the place and the use of scientists in our society. For years there has been a roster of scientific personnel in this country. The amount and kind of their education, their present place of employment, the type of work they are engaged in, and a host of other relevant facts are available. If, as Dr. Teller says, we are 10 years behind the Russians, the Government ought at once to canvass our needs for scientists and establish procedures for shifting them from activities with relatively low social value to those which could restore our scientific supremacy.

Unlike the Russians, we cannot order scientists to leave industrial, teaching, or governmental research of certain types and to enter upon others closely related to the national welfare. We can, however, publicize the need, exhort industries to release such persons as are qualified and required, and provide salaries and working conditions which will attract the most imaginative minds and the most dedicated scholars. A mustering of the large corps of talented scientists already available will carry us through this trying period until a larger group of promising young scholars can be recruited and trained. The strongest argument with industries should be that the practical problems with which they deal can only be solved and new processes and products developed on the basis of pure research which at the outset may appear to have no immediate value or purpose. In a nation as wealthy as the United States there is, of course, no reason why the supply of scientists and all other highly educated personnel cannot be adequate to all the needs of industry, government, and the universities. But even with clarity of purpose and energetic efforts, this goal cannot be reached for 10 or 15 years because of the time required in the process of education.

THE GRADUATE STUDENT MUST BE BETTER PAID

A second effort to produce an early increase in scientific personnel relates to the salaries of graduate students and professors. Through the National Science Foundation and some corporations a considerable number of well-paying fellowships have been provided for graduate students of small means. Those granted by the many corporations, however, are frequently restricted to use in research projects connected with the production processes in specific industries. Hence, the type of investigation needed for the expansion of theoretical knowledge in mathematics and science, the new body of knowledge from which satellites are born, has not been sufficiently supported. For the same reason, it would be unwise to focus too sharply on our scientific needs related to satellites. It is important to remember that the Russians are, as Dr. Nesmeyanov says, working as diligently in other scientific fields, such as biology and nuclear physics, as in astronautics. Since we do not know the areas in which new scientific developments may occur in Russia, both industry and government must contemplate large-

scale support of a well-rounded research program.

Fortunately the fellowship program of the National Science Foundation and some of the military research programs have had this broad objective in view. The stipends awarded to graduate students, most of whom are married and have families, must be the equivalent of full-time salaries so that the student will neither be delayed in his education by outside work nor harassed by privation and insecurity. The salaries of fellows of demonstrated promise should be from five to ten thousand dollars a year for a period of 3 or even 5 years if a particular research project requires a longer period to be brought to completion.

PROFESSORS' SALARIES MUST BE DOUBLED

The low financial reward for those who teach and do research is another real bottleneck in scientific developments in the United States. Indeed, this factor is the basic cause of the crippled condition of our educational system from the first grade through the graduate and professional schools. But in the fields of mathematics and science the situation is particularly acute because the competition for the ablest scholars is intensified by opportunities in government, business, and industry. Most college or university presidents have had the experience of having a science teacher come into his office to say that he had had an offer in industry. Since the salary is twice or three times as large as his academic compensation, he feels he cannot turn the opportunity down. He generally adds that he likes academic life, but that he has to consider the welfare of his family. On an academic salary he finds it impossible to buy a suitable house, carry adequate insurance to protect his loved ones, take a vacation, or send his sons and daughters to college.

Seductive financial appeals from industry where the higher salaries can merely be added to the cost of production and passed on to the consumer, or deducted from taxes, have resulted in the educational world's continuous loss of many of the most able, imaginative, and dynamic scholars. That so many able persons remain in academic work in spite of low salaries is testimony to their high-mindedness and their dedication to youth and to the Nation. Until the professors who must produce the scientists the country so desperately needs receive salaries of from \$25,000 to \$30,000, roughly comparable to the compensation of their peers in the business world, the supply of topflight scientists able to teach their successor and able to do research will simply not be available. The proposal that academic people ought to have larger salaries is neither new nor radical. Now, however, since the scientific achievements of the Russians have shocked our people into an awareness of the present danger, it may be hoped that concern for the national welfare will galvanize public leaders inside and outside the Government into action to correct the present inequities.

FEDERAL GRANTS FOR SALARIES AND FOR PHYSICAL FACILITIES

In this connection it might be instructive to study the salaries and the social status of scholars in Russia to determine the possible influence of these rewards on the size and the quality of the academic guild. It is reported that Russian professors receive from 5 to 10 times as much salary as ordinary workmen. In our country there is little difference between the two groups except in the cases of the most accomplished men and women in the world of learning. Since many universities are incapable of meeting their current financial obligations without large deficit spending no spectacular increases in salaries can be expected without large additional resources. The Federal Government will have to provide a large part of these

funds if the Russian lead in science is to be nullified.

Other policies of the Government can be equally effective in holding fledgling or mature scientists in basic research. In addition to supplying funds for satisfactory salaries for research workers, the Government ought to develop long-range programs for the support of higher education involving substantial grants to universities for science buildings and equipment. Universities cannot be expected to bring into their faculties highly paid professors and to supply the needed expensive facilities on the basis of uncertain commitments renewable from year to year. The Congress has the power and the responsibility to make large sums available to institutions of higher education over a 5- to 10-year period. If this were done the income from Government sources could be foreseen with reasonable accuracy and the financial obligations of these institutions stabilized.

SCIENTISTS MUST BE FREE TO INVESTIGATE

The Federal Government can also increase scientific production by adopting policies consistent with the nature of science and congenial to the scientists' methods of working. Science flowers under conditions of unrestricted investigation and freedom of communication. Actions of government or of citizens generally which restrain the individual scientist's freedom of inquiry or the interchange of his ideas with other scientists impairs the total scientific enterprise. In the present situation, such practices actually undermine the national welfare.

Some practices of Congressional committees and of the executive branch of the Government have, in recent years, violated the basic principles of scientific inquiry. The motives and the patriotism of scholars have been impugned, their characters maligned, and their livelihood endangered by governmental bodies. Personal injury and the abridgment of constitutional freedoms have been accompanied by damage to our scientific efforts. These activities have driven out of essential scientific investigation many capable scholars. Nobody can possibly measure the damage to our national defense effort and to the well-being of our scientific enterprise caused by Senator McCarthy and his supporters. That it was considerable, however, no objective analyst of our present weakened position can doubt. Scholars must be freed from interference in their work and we need to reappraise the place of the intellectual in our society. The so-called egghead ought to be honored rather than lampooned. It is now literally true that only he can lead us out of our present dangerous situation.

WHERE HAVE 20TH-CENTURY LEADERS IN SCIENCE COME FROM?

These proposals for immediate action related to the parts industry, government, and citizens generally can play in strengthening the scientific enterprise should be paralleled by changes within the educational system itself. One such action is concerned with the graduate schools of universities, the institutions which produce scholars in all fields of learning, including the sciences and mathematics.

Since the beginning of this century our universities have produced many renowned scientists. The names of Michelson, Millikan, Compton, Lawrence, and others amply prove the point. But in terms of the percentage of our people who have had the advantages of higher education, the record compared to that of other countries is disappointing. When one reviews the major scientific advances since 1901, the names of Lorentz, Becquerel, Curie, Planck, Einstein, Bohr, Heisenberg, Schrodinger, and Fermi make it obvious that the products of foreign education have occupied the center of the stage. Even some of our most distinguished scientists like Millikan received their advanced

education in foreign universities. Our failure to produce enough highly imaginative, inventive research scholars must in considerable part be the result of defects in our educational system.

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY EDUCATION NEEDS TO BE OVERHAULED

Weaknesses in the lower schools deserve serious attention. But the element of time demands that the shortcomings of graduate education be given first consideration. The plain fact is that graduate education in the United States has not sufficiently encouraged creative intellectual achievement. A significant percentage of those who obtain the Ph. D. degree are neither seriously interested in adding to human knowledge nor capable of doing so. The practices and policies of graduate education encourage routine intellectual processes. As they enter upon their first test of creative intellectual ability many are given a problem closely related to a professor's own research. The techniques, apparatus, and library resources required to explore the problem are suggested by a senior research worker. Often the dissertation is to a large extent written by the sponsor.

A few years ago the longtime head of a physics department in a prominent State university was asked what percentage of those who had received the doctor of philosophy degree in his time had had the imagination to find a problem worthy of study and had then carried their research project through to completion with a minimum of direction from a senior colleague. His estimate was 1 in 10. That this may have been a general situation is suggested by studies of the scholarly production of mathematicians and historians which showed that only 15 to 20 percent of those who receive doctor of philosophy degrees in these fields thereafter ever do any significant research. For too many, their professional education as scholars is not an exciting, intellectual experience. It is not one in which the individual loses himself in a work of consuming interest. It is not viewed as it may well now be, as an effort which could determine the future destiny of the Nation and of the world.

The processes of graduate education are burdened with traditional and meaningless requirements. They include a given number of years of study in residence, the superficial study of foreign languages which almost none can then use, and a system of academic book-keeping in which the number of hours of work completed in the classroom or laboratory rather than measures of genuine intellectual growth and power determine the outcome. These requirements, extraneous to true scholarship, dampen intellectual enthusiasm and stifle scholarly accomplishment. Additional handicaps are imposed by the student's needs to make a living through outside work.

As Dean Barzun, of Columbia University, has pointed out, these encumbrances and interruptions often extend the graduate experience to 5 or even 10 years. And more importantly, the total impact of this experience which should excite the intellect, quicken perception, and embolden the spirit of inquiry, actually often leaves the finished product weary in mind, body, and spirit.

The entire program of graduate education needs immediate reappraisal. Those of superior intellectual gifts should be admitted earlier, unburdened of meaningless rules and regulations, freed from monetary worries, and charged with a passionate devotion to the search for truth. Though the immediate purpose in these changes may necessarily be the preservation of the Nation, as I believe, the long-range objective should be to create a more vital system of higher education. To gain this end will require, however, an overhauling of the entire structure and practice of graduate education in the United States, with the national interest taking precedence over vested academic interests. Tinkering

will not do. To change the residence requirements from 60 to 55 credits, to permit graduate students to satisfy the language requirement by studying Russian instead of German, to raise graduate stipends from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and to make other trivial alterations will be to proceed in the laborious manner customary in academic life. The times urgently require a more critical assessment of present practice and a more dynamic program for its improvement.

The actions thus far proposed can be taken immediately to meet the Soviet challenge. In a period of from 5 to 10 years they could result in a rapid acceleration of basic scientific discovery. Whether these changes can be speeded up in time to avoid a disastrous attack on the United States is a question which only history can answer.

Only a long-range program, however, extending over a period of several generations, can vouchsafe a world in which our children and their children can enjoy the freedoms which we have known. The crucial element in any such program to strengthen the position of the Nation in science, and in many other aspects of our common life, is the quality of our entire educational system. The people of the United States from the very beginning have had an abiding faith in the value of education. The constant extension of the opportunity for education to larger and larger numbers of youth is tangible evidence of this deep-seated conviction.

But our present embarrassment stems partly from the fact that this idealistic conception has not been matched by a willingness to pay for its realization. The actual dollars spent for education of all kinds have increased from 6 billion in 1940 to 16 billion in 1955. In the same period, however, the number of children to be served and the cost of operation have skyrocketed. The supply of teachers and buildings has not kept pace. A gradual deterioration of education for millions of children has been the result. In many communities half-day sessions, classes of 40 or more pupils, unqualified teachers on emergency certificates, classes in stores, factories, and church basements have been the order of the day. This educational privation is found primarily in the poorer States and communities. But in the past 10 years, the press has carried many stories of wealthy communities in which school taxes and bond issues have been voted down, communities in which the 2-car family, the well-filled wine cellar, and the summer home at the shore are typical rather than exceptional. The financial plight of many colleges and universities both public and private presents a similarly disheartening picture.

In attempting to place our scientific enterprise on a level with the Russians, to say nothing of improving the other essential social services which require advanced education, our first decision will have to be our willingness to pay the bill. The Russians some years ago recognized that world supremacy in science could only be achieved by sacrificing other satisfactions in favor of more and better education. Comparable figures are not easy to obtain, but informed persons believe that the Russians are putting a much larger percentage of their available national resources into education than we are. In any event, our unwillingness to spend more than 3 or 4 percent of the gross national product of over \$400 billion dollars for all forms of education is the seat of many of our present difficulties.

We will not come abreast of the Russians—indeed, we will continuously fall further behind them—until the educational budget is materially raised. When teachers' salaries attract the most capable of our young people into the profession, when the school plant is modernized and equipped with tested teaching materials, when American children attend school for a full day under

skilled teachers, when the majority of our colleges and universities are no longer limping along on large deficits, when all young people of college age are able to get a higher education suited to their abilities, then we can expect the educational system adequately to serve our needs in the domestic and international spheres.

In recent years there have been loud voices criticizing American education. Sputnik has joined these voices in a chorus of lamentation. The main theme is that, because of modern educational theory, pupils in our schools have been encouraged not to study such difficult studies as mathematics and the sciences. Statistics have been cited to show the falling enrollments in these subjects in our high schools. The most impressive and also the most misleading of these presentations appeared in U. S. News & World Report in an interview with Prof. Arthur E. Bestor of the University of Illinois. The statistics cited purport to show a shocking drop since the turn of the century in the percentage of high-school students studying science and mathematics. Prof. Harold C. Hand of the same university has shown, however, that, contrary to the figures of Dr. Bestor, the percentage of students taking science in high school has not dropped from 84 in 1900 to 54 in 1950, and in mathematics from 86 to 55. On the contrary, the percentages have risen from 84 to 98 in science, and from 86 to 90 in mathematics. Moreover, the high-school population has increased from 519,251 in 1900 to 5,399,452 in 1950. A percentage of over 90 in each subject in 1950, therefore, means a tremendous increase in the number of students studying these subjects. Even after eliminating those who have no special aptitude for, or interest in, a scientific career, this is a large reservoir from which to draw 10,000 potential doctors of philosophy in physics, chemistry, and mathematics; more than the total of doctor of philosophy degrees granted in these fields from 1945 to 1955.

The number could and should be larger. There are several obstacles to the attainment of this goal. The first is the size of our high schools. In 1952, 824 high schools had fewer than 25 students. Thirty percent had enrollments under 100. When these students are distributed over a 4-year period, and the dropouts from the freshman to the senior year are taken into consideration, it is apparent that a large percentage of American high schools simply do not have enough students to offer instruction in the sciences, especially those requiring a laboratory. Even in advanced mathematics, the demand does not warrant such instruction in many of the small school districts.

Furthermore, in small high schools it is not possible to have specialized teachers in all subjects such as chemistry, mathematics, physics, English, history, foreign languages, vocational courses, and the other subjects usually provided in a large, comprehensive high school in an urban center. Consequently, teachers whose main interest and training is in literature or social studies may be required to teach science. This instruction is sometimes inferior. The National Science Foundation has launched a number of programs to upgrade these teachers, as well as those originally qualified in science but whose training needs to be brought up to date on the latest recent scientific developments.

For many years educators have earnestly urged the establishment of larger school units. They have tried to persuade school boards to consolidate ineffective small school districts to make possible larger class groups with special teachers in the various high-school subjects. Many States have offered leadership and financial assistance to districts wishing to consolidate. The foregoing figures show that, because such consolida-

tions have not been effected, many American youth have inferior or no instruction. If a full complement of subject matter is desired, the establishment of larger high-school units should be pressed with all vigor.

A major difficulty in providing good instruction in science, especially in small schools, is the cost of equipment. Many colleges and high schools are deprived of such equipment by its high cost. Here the Federal Government could do something concrete to help in the present emergency. Much teaching equipment in the sciences can be purchased in European countries for a fraction of its cost in the United States. Because of high tariff rates, however, these materials cannot be acquired at the lower price. Import tariff rates are set as high as 50 percent. Educators have stated that one of the major obstacles to effective and interesting teaching in science in high schools and colleges is the lack of suitable technical equipment.

Efforts by a committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science to get Government action to reduce import duties on these articles indispensable in good teaching have been abortive. In spite of the fact that the total value of such materials constitutes only a negligible percentage of the annual volume of business of the American firms concerned, they have vigorously fought and lobbied against any change in the tariff on these articles. Here again, it may be hoped that the urgent needs of the Nation, dramatized by sputnik, may effectuate what reason and importunity could not. If the United States Government is serious about its desire to advance the cause of science quickly and materially a reduction in the tariff on scientific apparatus is an easy and inexpensive way to do so.

Even in the high schools where mathematics and science are now being taught, the number of students taking such courses can be significantly increased, and the quality of learning improved. Certain policies and practices have militated against a full enlistment of the interests of students who are capable of higher education, especially in the subjects with which we are now concerned. The preparatory basic instruction in some elementary schools has not been as effective as it could be. Hence, some students come unprepared for and afraid of courses in the sciences and mathematics. Moreover, the reputation which these courses have in many high schools and colleges, because of uninspired and uninspiring teaching, causes many students to avoid them. The guidance programs in some schools fail to identify and guide promising students into the proper courses. The schools can do much to improve science teaching.

One of the most significant factors in this—the failure of students to elect science courses—is totally beyond the control of the schools. That is the attitudes of parents. The fact is that many students, when possible, avoid subjects which require hard work and long hours of study. Many members of the teaching profession have been more tolerant of this attitude than is good for the student or for the country. Often, however, the basic factor in the student's desire to take an easy course is the attitude of the parents who do not want their children to do more than the minimum of study to get through. Many are more interested in having their children get a diploma or a degree than an education. This point of view has been more influential in undermining standards of accomplishment and discipline in the schools than the philosophy of John Dewey. Dewey was an ardent advocate of self-discipline and the exertion of effort toward well-defined goals, as his own life so abundantly illustrated. He was opposed to dull routine, memorization of facts, and the authoritarian discipline imposed

without reason. He rightly believed that learning was most effective when self-motivated.

Parents can inspire an interest in learning by valuing it as an indispensable element in a good life and a necessary factor in a healthy society. When parents are as proud of their son's grades in academic subjects as they are of his throwing the pass that won the game on Saturday or of his playing the trombone in the high-school band, more students will study science with more interest and more success. With full cooperation between teachers and parents many more students of appropriate abilities and interests will find their way into courses in science and mathematics and all the other fields of study of equal value in a vital and growing democratic society.

One proposal of increasing popularity to meet the shortages in the sciences involves requirements for all students in certain subject-matter fields. In its most extreme form, the several States are asked to pass laws requiring all students to study science and mathematics. This suggestion is ill-advised. In the first place, it is a modified form of the Russian system of regimentation and of coercion which is repugnant to Americans. Second, many students by disposition and vocational interest are unable to profit as much from such instruction as they could from others. Third, there is great danger that in the hysteria of the moment we will impose policies and practices which will make intellectual and emotional misfits of a considerable number of our people. We can also create a lopsided society in which science overbalances all the humane and social disciplines of equal if not greater value in the resolution of our domestic and international problems.

The alternative to a universal requirement is a sensitive testing of all pupils in the early years of schooling to discover the student's abilities and interests. This program needs to be coupled with an efficient guidance and counseling service to get students into a type of advanced education congenial to their abilities and conducive to satisfying achievement. Such a program will produce more and better scientists than compulsory study in fields for which the student has little aptitude or interest. It will also produce a balanced supply of satisfied workers in all other fields which are equally essential in a dynamic and well-rounded society.

To provide the maximum number of superior high school students for higher education in the minimum time consistent with their abilities and their health, these students should be identified earlier than is now uniformly the practice. They should be guided into the courses needed for college admission, and speeded on their way to an even tentatively established educational goal. A mistaken notion concerning the nature of a democratic school system has operated to prevent the application of these conceptions in the everyday program of the schools. Whether we like it or not there are wide differences among students in ability, interests, and the desire to excel in intellectual achievement. No eutenic or eugenic program is likely to erase these human variations in the visible future. Some teachers and school administrators have adopted or condoned practices which seem to recognize these individual differences only at the lower end of the ability scale. They favor individual attention and special treatment for those of below average ability and many programs have been established for this purpose. They have been less aggressive in recognizing students of unusual talents and providing special treatment for those who have potentially the greatest contribution to make to American society. I believe that our people are ready for such developments. The quicker we identify the most capable students in all intellectual

spheres and provide for them an accelerated and enriched program, the sooner the urgent national need for talented scientists will be met. Higher standards of accomplishment for the most capable will change education from a dull series of intellectual routines into an exciting adventure. I believe that many parents will accept this type of educational program at this time, if its plan and purpose are made clear.

Applied to educational policies, this concept of requiring the best efforts of students in terms of their capacity means that those of ability should be moved forward intellectually toward an educational goal as rapidly as possible. They should be guided into as difficult studies as they are capable of mastering, and they should avoid subject matter which needlessly dissipates their time and energy. Specifically in the case of a boy or girl who expects to enter a scientific field, the high school program should include 4 years of English, mathematics through trigonometry, 3 years of one foreign language, at least 2 years of science, and 2 years of social studies. This program would still leave two or three units for other electives. Most youth of college ability can complete such a program without harm to mind or body. Indeed, many would be better adjusted emotionally if they had a more demanding program of studies. A false notion has prevailed in the past two decades that exacting intellectual work leads to social and emotional maladjustment. There is no scientific basis for this belief. The difficulty of studies must be adjusted to the ability of students. Too easy a program is just as likely to cause maladjustment and unhappiness for superior students as too hard a program for those of limited intellectual abilities.

All the foregoing proposals, though they would provide a larger pool of qualified scientists, really leave the major long-range problem untouched. The crucial factor in the shortage of trained manpower of all types which stems from deficiencies in our educational system is our failure to support education adequately. Considered as a group, the education of our children has been deteriorating since the beginning of World War II. There are, to be sure, many school systems in the United States in which fully certified, highly competent, enthusiastic teachers conduct their classes in up-to-date, light, and fireproof schools with the best teaching materials available. As a result of the dedicated and patriotic efforts of Mr. Roy Larsen and his associates in the National Citizens' Commission for the Public Schools, many children have had better teachers in more modern schools than they would otherwise have had.

But in terms of the growing need for new classrooms and teachers, the national picture of inadequate support remains about as depressing as it was 10 years ago. The story has been told so often in the press and on the air that it need not be repeated. It is enough to say that in September 1957 the United States Commissioner of Education reported the shortage of elementary and secondary-school teachers to be 135,000. According to the figures supplied by educational authorities in the States, in the fall of 1956 there was a national shortage of 159,000 classrooms. If the fact that some classrooms now in use were built before 1900 is taken into consideration, this figure ought to be raised to 250,000, and the process of obsolescence continues apace. Since hundreds of school districts have reached their legal debt limit, the school plant cannot be improved without outside financial aid in the visible future. As a consequence of these shortages, 800,000 students attended school only a half day and 17.9 percent of the elementary-school classes in 1956 (the most recent figure available) had more than 35 children. In the cities of 500,000, over 8 percent of the classes had 40 or more children. Moreover, thousands of teachers were

on temporary emergency certificates, which means that they were unqualified in terms of accepted professional standards.

The consequences of our failure to provide the funds needed merely to bring the schools of the Nation up to normal operating efficiency, with every child receiving instruction in an acceptably modern school plant under a properly certified and adequately paid teacher, are now becoming blatantly apparent. It is in these shocking facts and figures that we should look for the causes of our weakening scientific position on the international stage. How can we expect pupils to learn as much basic arithmetic and science in half-day classes as in a full school day? How can high-school students learn the fundamentals of science when it is taught in classes of 40 or 50 by teachers whose primary intellectual interests are in other fields, in rooms not designed as laboratories and not equipped with the necessary teaching materials? How can teachers devote their undivided time, energy, and enthusiasm to their students when they must bring their income up to a living wage by driving taxicabs, selling insurance, or testing prisoners at odd hours in the local jail? It is just as foolish to expect children attending school half a day in classes of 35 or 40 under unqualified teachers to be educated for life in today's world as it would be to expect the Ford Co. to produce the Edsel in the plant of 1920 with engineers educated in 1900 with the materials of construction used in the Model T. Yet, this is the miracle some of our citizens expect school officials to perform.

Many informed and patriotic educators and laymen have been aware of the deterioration that has been occurring in the school enterprise. They pointed out a decade ago that a child's education could not be put in a deep freeze for a period of years. Their exhortations have fallen on too many deaf ears among their fellow citizens. The saddest aspect of our educational inadequacy is not yet apparent to most citizens. The children whose early education was neglected in years passed are only now beginning to show that they do not have the essential basic education for their further intellectual development. It is a national tragedy and a national scandal that little can now be done to repair these deficiencies. A considerable amount of the precious talent we need so badly in this hour has been lost forever by a callous disregard of the condition of our educational system. This situation is in strange contrast with the efforts the Russians have made to strengthen education by depriving themselves of many of the comforts not to mention the luxuries we take for granted. The disparity between our own efforts to provide basic education for all and the Russians will doubtless increase until a new generation of children passes through a strengthened and enriched educational program.

This objective can only be reached with the leadership and the resources of the Federal Government. Some local school districts and some States have adequate resources to raise teachers' salaries by 50 percent and to erect the additional classrooms to accommodate the increased school population and to replace obsolete school plants. It is their patriotic duty to do so without delay. Their best efforts, however, will leave an enormous gap between the national need for improved education and our ability to provide it on a national scale. There is no necessity to recapitulate all the irrefutable arguments for Federal aid for education. We have the necessary funds as an impartial review of the economy conclusively shows. We lack only the will of the people at large to take this step through their representatives in Washington. Both Democratic and Republican administrations have advocated various forms of Federal aid for a number

of years. These efforts have been frustrated largely by skillful and powerful lobbyists, and by the dissemination of false information among the people. As events now prove, these organizations and their richly supported lobbyists have been toying cavalierly with the welfare of the Nation. It is to be hoped that if they are not shamed by the melancholy international events of recent months into a withdrawal of their opposition to Federal aid, the people generally whose lives and welfare are in jeopardy will undoubtedly express their disapproval at the polls in November 1958.

There is no way to calculate the exact amount of Federal aid required to bring the school system of the Nation to a level of effective operation. There is also no way to determine exactly how many missiles or other forms of weapons are needed to defend the Nation against attack. This does not mean that we will delay missile programs until the last facts are available, because in a fluid situation they will never be available. Likewise, the national need for highly trained manpower can never be precisely determined. A beginning must nevertheless be made at once on the Federal level to meet the need that exists.

A modest program in terms of our national resources would be a billion dollars a year for 5 years. Testimony over the past 10 years in committees of the Congress shows conclusively that a half billion dollars a year of Federal subsidy of education within the States for current operating expenses would go far to bring teachers' salaries up to a level that would attract and hold competent and dedicated teachers. Testimony before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor under Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY's chairmanship in 1957 revealed that \$500 million a year of Federal funds, matched by varying contributions of States according to their financial ability would in a few years erase a large part of the deficit in school-house construction. If legislation could be passed in the next session of Congress, as it should be, embodying an aid program of this magnitude, the continuing process of erosion of our educational standards would be retarded and eventually brought to a stop. With this assistance, local schools can restore their programs to a level of effectiveness consistent with our national status and honor, and with our declared purpose of providing full educational opportunity to all children regardless of their social status or their geographical location.

Another effort to increase the pool of educated manpower can be made by the Federal Government through a substantial program of undergraduate scholarships. Numerous studies in the various States have shown that many of the upper 25 percent of high school graduates do not continue their formal education. The majority discontinue because of lack of funds. Colleges and universities in a recent year used over \$50 million of their own much-needed resources for scholarships. Some corporations and private individuals also provide large resources to assist worthy students. But there are still at least 100,000 high school graduates of high quality each year who would attend an institution of higher education if they had the funds.

In view of the national emergency the Federal Government should establish a program offering between 30,000 to 50,000 scholarships each year to students of ability. Grants under the scholarship should be at least \$1,000 a year. These funds should be distributed through State education authorities on the basis of the respective State's economic condition and the number of high school graduates. The total number of scholarships involved over a 4-year period would thus be between 120,000 and 200,000, with an eventual annual cost of between

\$120 million to \$200 million, about half the cost of one aircraft carrier.

These scholarships should be awarded to any qualifying student regardless of his intellectual interests. If, however, it is necessary to use a large proportion of the funds available for science education for a period of years a provision could be written into the law empowering the President to reserve a certain number of scholarships for students in scientific fields, including engineering. Since student fees do not cover the cost of education, and since colleges and universities are already in serious financial trouble, the institutions accepting these Federal scholarship students should receive a substantial grant as well. The total funds involved should be about 50 percent of the scholarship fund, or when it is in full operation, \$50 million annually.

In all the efforts to strengthen our position in science vis-a-vis the Russians, one concept should dominate our planning. There is a great danger that in our eagerness to move forward rapidly in science and technology we will neglect the other branches of learning that are no less important in a democratic society. There is reason to believe that the Russians are using a disproportionate share of their national resources for education in science with a consequent impoverishment of the humane disciplines which constitute the enduring basis of our culture. Such policies involve less danger in a totalitarian society in which large social policies are laid down by a small directive class. In a nation like our own, however, which from the beginning has depended upon the general enlightenment of the people for wise decisions on social and political matters, a broad education in all the major branches of knowledge is indispensable to the health of the Nation. Moreover, the enrichment of life for the individual depends no less upon his acquaintance with the literary, artistic, and philosophic heritage of western and other civilizations. Though it may be necessary in the present emergency to attract more students into scientific fields and to spend an excessive proportion of our resources for scholarships, teachers, buildings, and equipment related to science, the ongoing educational program must maintain a proper balance of learning for all enlightened citizens.

DISARMAMENT TALKS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial which appeared in the *Michigan Daily of the University of Michigan* Sunday, February 9, 1958, entitled "Tit-for-Tat in Disarmament Talks."

This editorial was written by Mr. Peter Eckstein, editor of the *Michigan Daily*. It is a thoughtful, constructive discussion of the difficult and perplexing problems surrounding disarmament negotiations. I congratulate Editor Eckstein and welcome his thoughtful study and analysis.

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

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

TIT-FOR-TAT IN DISARMAMENT TALKS

What with the maze of conflicting views on disarmament being offered by Dulles, Stassen, and the Soviets, and with Adlai Stevenson proposing a world conference of respected men to formulate other views, any further suggestions may seem superfluous. But the American and Russian proposals are taking

some sort of form and may contain within them the seeds of a limited agreement.

Stassen unofficially and the Soviets officially both appear to favor separating the issue of hydrogen testing from the question of general disarmament, Stassen because he is anxious for any sort of agreement, the Russians because they realize the propaganda value of test suspension among the uncommitted peoples. The United States seems to fear test suspension will allow the Soviets to overcome our slim lead in hydrogen weapons.

Secretary Dulles in his press club speech, while sticking to an insistence on a link between the issue of nuclear weapons and general disarmament, advocated a separate agreement on control of outer space, in which the Russians have a lead. But the Russian reply has been to link space control with the issue of general disarmament.

After so many years of futile negotiations and exchanges of letters, there is no question but what there is no better way for either side to kill any idea than to insist that it only come as a part of a general agreement. Modern technology has provided small enough weapons of complete destruction and effective enough means of underground production and storage to make any system of inspection—the key to a foolproof agreement—unthinkable.

Thus while each side wants an agreement to check weapons development in the area in which the other is ahead, each side attempts to prevent an agreement which would check its progress in the area in which it is behind. This may or may not be rational: It seems to be predicated on the assumption that one can overcome the other's lead, be it in satellites or hydrogen bombs, or nullify it if only both sides stop testing. It assumes there is no advantage in freezing one's own lead in the area in which one has gained preeminence.

And both positions assume some ability to inspect, undoubtedly from some distance, the experiments of the other, which is possibly not justified for the testing of small nuclear weapons and undoubtedly not justified for the construction of space platforms or other militarily valuable outer-space devices.

But there still might be advantages—for propaganda, for economy, and even for peace—in agreements to check space and nuclear testing, especially if both sides approached such agreements with equal amounts of skepticism and credulity. And the current impasse may be the only optimistic note on the whole disarmament front, since the ideal time—if not the only time—for an effective agreement on anything is when both sides have approximately equal amounts to gain and to lose, or, more accurately, when they think they do. The Russian de facto rejection of control of outer space and the American de facto rejection of a ban on nuclear tests may eventually become the basis of a tit-for-tat bargain linking bans on nuclear tests and space weapons with each other, and not with the whole hopeless question of total disarmament.

THE ISSUES OF PEACE AND SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are two great issues before the American people today. One is the issue of peace and security. The other is the growing economic decline, the recession which has begun to make itself felt in long lines of unemployed, in reduced paychecks, and in genuine hardship throughout our country.

Yesterday I released to the press a statement commenting on the President's proposal to build postoffices as an

antirecession measure. I must say, Mr. President, that is at best but a token of recognition of the troubles facing the Nation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD this statement, entitled "Senator HUMPHREY Urges Tax Cut, School and Home Construction as Key Anti-Depression Measures."

I should add, an effective agricultural program which will at least stabilize and I trust stimulate and expand agricultural consuming power.

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

SENATOR HUMPHREY URGES TAX CUT, SCHOOL AND HOME CONSTRUCTION AS KEY ANTI-DEPRESSION MEASURES

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, today urged the administration to "put first things first" and to set an urgent priority on a "tax cut for 1 year to stimulate purchasing power, massive school construction and slum clearance program, and income-producing public works rather than pinning all its hopes on a post-office construction program as the answer to the growing recession."

"A tax cut may temporarily reduce government revenues," Senator HUMPHREY said, "but the drop in production and jobs in the current recession will be even more costly to the Government and indeed to the people. It is better to have an unbalanced budget than an unbalanced economy; by firming up jobs, production, and construction, the budget will eventually be balanced."

The Minnesota Democrat, who introduced a school construction bill at the beginning of the 85th Congress last year, pointed out that a school construction program would provide a "very large number of individual construction projects with a minimum time delay in getting actual construction started." He urged that President Eisenhower lend his early support to the school construction legislation now pending before the Congress.

Commenting that at least the post-office construction proposal is recognition by the administration of the principle that essential public works can and should be used to stimulate the economy, Senator HUMPHREY said that the President nevertheless has ignored the two most urgent public works needs: school construction and slum clearance.

"Our people need jobs and they need tax relief to restore purchasing power," Senator HUMPHREY declared. "And at the same time we badly need more classrooms, more public housing and a strong and resolute attack on our city slums and blighted areas."

"Post offices are needed," he said, "but the administration should recognize what every parent and school child knows—that we are slipping further and further back in classroom facilities and low-income housing. It is a little hard to swallow the implication that new post offices are more important than new schools and slum clearance."

"Priority should not only be given to schools and public housing and at least a \$20 per capita cut in the personal income tax," Senator HUMPHREY declared, "but there is a broad field of income-producing public works which are also needed."

"For instance," he said, "the administration should take the brakes off rivers and harbors development for navigation improvement and public power facilities. And it should move to accelerate the highway program, which has been proceeding at a snail's pace."

"These income-producing public works will have a double effect on the economy, providing not only a 'shot in the arm' to the construction industry, and transportation

and commerce, but also to the long-range revenue base of the Government," Senator HUMPHREY pointed out.

"Post office construction should be fitted into a priority of public-works projects," Senator HUMPHREY urged. "It is one of several ways that the Federal Government can move to check the growing recession."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in addition to a tax cut, and a sound program of public works, there are many other activities of the Federal Government whose direction should be changed. I am referring to the high-interest, tight-money policies of the Federal Reserve System, and of all the Federal agencies with loan programs. We need expanded direct credit programs—for farmers, for homebuyers, and for businessmen. And we need lower interest rates. These are critically needed, and it will not take special legislation to achieve them. The administration can, within the framework of existing law, loosen up the money situation and permit the wheels of the economy to roll smoother.

Mr. President, I have noted a number of very pertinent comments in the public press during the last few days dealing with the growing recession. They discuss not only public works and the tight-money situation, but they also discuss the role of an expanded trade program in restoring our economy to equilibrium.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 12 written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Facing the Recession."

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

FACING THE RECESSION—IT SHOULD NOT BE TREATED AS AN INDELICATE SUBJECT
(By Roscoe Drummond)

The present recession is not something which will go away by pretending it doesn't exist. We ought not to treat it as an indelicate subject.

Conceivably the upturn is already in the making and will shortly be visible. But there is no guaranty that this is the case.

It confronts the Eisenhower administration with a hard and uncomfortable dilemma. The dilemma is: Whether to undertake a large public works program, initiate a tax cut and accept a sharply unbalanced budget, or to delay vigorous action in the hope that the recession will right itself without going into a long downward spiral of deflation.

My information is that the President is disposed to act vigorously the moment he believes it is needed. The issue is one of timing. With a man like Robert Anderson at the Treasury, backed by Presidential advisers Gabriel Hague and Raymond Saulnier, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, timidity is less likely to prevail than under Anderson's predecessor.

The stakes are high. There is, first of all, the human misery of large-scale unemployment. Secondly, for the United States to accept—and to accept unnecessarily—a serious depression in the present state of the world would have devastating repercussions. We would simply be giving the game to the Kremlin.

There is also a political stake. There is no doubt in my mind that if the administration falters or fumbles in dealing with the recession, it will be a long time before another Republican President is given the opportunity.

There are adverse elements in the current downturn which were not present in the mild recessions of 1949 and 1953-54. At this point unemployment is running about the same as before, but unlike the earlier recessions, the major sectors of the economy are nearly all ailing at the same time—consumer buying is down, inventories are still being reduced, capital expansion is sharply declining.

There is another adverse factor. In 1949 and 1954 Western Europe's economy was moving up when ours began to move down. This helped to arrest our own recession. Not so today. Economic difficulties in Western Europe are forcing a cut in the purchase of American exports.

On the encouraging side is the fact that housing activity is showing signs of rising, State and local governments are sustaining employment by major school and road construction and larger defense buying is beginning to flow.

I am not bespeaking a mood of gloom and doom. I am only saying that it is not sensible and it is not safe to take this recession lightly, for, as Elliott V. Bell, editor and publisher of Business Week magazine, pointed out in a recent talk to the Detroit Economic Club, once a spiral of deflation gets momentum, it is well nigh impossible to halt it.

It does seem to me that Mr. Bell makes sense when he says that since there are alternative risks, let's take the risk of doing more than is needed than the chance of being too little and too late.

There is no doubt that this is the most closely watched recession in American history. Mr. Eisenhower has lately created something near to a national economic council. Under his chairmanship its participants are Treasury Secretary Anderson, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin and Hauge and Saulnier.

There are good reasons to believe that Mr. Eisenhower will act boldly and energetically if the economy does not soon show signs of starting another period of growth. It would help, I believe, if the President made his intentions much more explicit than he has thus far.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the lead editorial of the Washington Post for February 12, 1958, entitled "To End Stagnation."

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

TO END STAGNATION

The new figures on unemployment strongly suggest that the time has come for more drastic measures to reshape and reinvigorate the national productive effort. Conferences among top administration officials at the White House indicate that some such measures are being formulated. But if there is to be a genuine rebirth of confidence, without which the slump cannot be arrested, whatever program is being formulated must have some real substance. Mere restatements of the Presidential optimism, it is now plain, will not suffice.

At the same time, it needs to be kept constantly in mind that powerful forces of expansion are still present which, unrestrained, could again lead quickly to unacceptable inflation. The capacity to build homes, for example, and the need for more housing are as strong as ever and will grow stronger in the decade ahead. The same is true in many other fields. What is required is just enough new incentive to get the ball rolling; what is to be avoided is a slam-bang, crash program that would in a short time require severe new restraints to prevent a price run-away.

If a tax cut should become necessary to trigger a resumption of growth, most assuredly it should contain an automatic repeal provision. Federal spending needs to be increased by several billions annually if urgent defense and domestic needs are to be met. An increase in the 1959 budget goals would also have a considerable tonic effect on the economy. If, later on, it appeared that higher spending was having an inflationary effect, the budget could be restored to balance by a tax increase. For this year and perhaps for the next, however, a deficit would certainly be no cause for alarm.

As for monetary controls, the Federal Reserve Board ought to encourage further cuts in the rediscount rate at once. Very soon it should ease bank reserve requirements if the situation does not improve. These actions are easily reversible. The very fact that the financial community knows this—and knows that reversal would come swiftly if required—means that fairly vigorous actions to ease credit restraint are required to induce an actual credit expansion. The two cuts in the "Fed" rediscount rate made since the current recession began last fall have not been strong enough medicine.

An immediate and determined administration drive for long-term renewal of the Trade Agreements Act and for a real expansion of foreign economic development aid also would have a useful effect in restoring confidence. The slump in exports is serious and cannot be altogether offset by any foreseeable expansion of Government or private spending in this country. If the Nation does not act to insure a steadily growing market for its goods overseas, it will inevitably and critically stunt its economic growth. Significantly, those countries which in recent years have outstripped the rate of American economic growth have been nations which, like Germany, the Netherlands, and Japan, have been pushing foreign trade to the hilt.

Finally, a redefinition of American economic objectives probably would do more to promote expansion than any other single step. There is a growing feeling of unease that preoccupation with consumer spending leads to growth that requires some artificial—and therefore undependable—stimulants and props. There is a yearning for validity in the national economic effort, a yearning that we suspect will not be satisfied until there has been a substantial diversion of that effort to neglected fundamentals like research, education, and improved patterns of urban living.

Most of what needs to be done is not compatible with an 1890 view of free enterprise. But the same spirit which threw railroads across a continent and created the mightiest industrial plant on earth can serve today's needs too. It needs only a leadership and a direction that comprehend the radically changed nature of the challenges we now face. At bottom, the provision of that leadership is the real key which alone can unlock an economic future bright with promise.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the New York Times of February 11, 1958, entitled "A Little Recession," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A LITTLE RECESSION

Former President Truman, in a statement to the North American Newspaper Alliance published in this newspaper yesterday, expresses the opinion that the present slow-down of the American economy reflects a "lapse of confidence by our people in what we have been doing and where we are going." And he adds: "There are those who have been saying that a little recession is a good thing for the health of our economy. * * *

This kind of thinking is like believing a little bit of war might be beneficial."

Mr. Truman is particularly critical of our monetary policies, which he sees as "the most dangerous form of Government manipulation." There is nothing more damaging, he observes, "than the clamping down of sudden brakes on an expanding economy, which, without adequate preparation, is jolted again by a reversal of momentum."

We do not know anyone in the administration who has gone on record to the effect that a little recession is a good thing. We know many persons, in and out of the administration, who believe that a little recession is infinitely preferable to a major recession. And a temporary slow-down of the economy is one of the calculated risks that is always present when the authorities set out to head off runaway inflation—which is to say a serious and prolonged deterioration in the value of the Nation's currency.

It might be possible to make a case to show that the Federal Reserve authorities were slow in abandoning their easy money policy when they did, and that when they did adopt a restrictionist policy they pursued it too cautiously. But when the raising of the rediscount rate from 1½ to 3½ percent is carried out gradually over a period of more than 2½ years—or from early 1955 until late in 1957, it is a little difficult to conceive of it as clamping down of sudden brakes on an expanding economy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the February 11 edition of the New York Times written by Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., entitled "Economists Doubt Fall Prosperity," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ECONOMISTS DOUBT FALL PROSPERITY—BUT PANEL OF FIVE TELLS CONGRESS THE NATION MAY THEN BE IN A RECOVERY PHASE

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—A panel of five economists was unanimous today in the opinion that the Nation would not return to a state of prosperity by November unless the Government took further antirecession action.

The economists testified before the Joint Congressional Economic Committee. Several said they felt the downward movement would be over by late fall or before that time, even without Government action. But they did not foresee a pickup that would return the Nation to prosperity.

DOUGLAS ASKS TAX CUT

The economists had been asked whether they agreed that by election we'll have prosperity. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, attributed that view to the Secretary of Commerce, Sinclair Weeks, on the basis of remarks by Mr. Weeks on a television program yesterday.

The group generally agreed that the Government must be ready to move in case the situation grew worse, though they disagreed on what should be done.

One indicated a preference for more defense spending, 1 for more domestic spending, and 2 for a tax cut. The fifth did not propose any remedies but stressed the importance of lower trade barriers.

Meanwhile, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS became the first member of the Joint Committee to advocate an antirecession tax cut. In a Senate speech the Illinois Democrat, an economist in private life, said "the time to act has arrived." He based his view mainly on the rise in unemployment.

He urged that the rate on the first \$1,000 of taxable income be reduced from the present 20 percent to 15 percent, with a resulting

tax cut of a maximum of \$50 a person. He also asked for reduction or elimination in a wide variety of consumer taxes. The total cost of his proposal would be \$4,400,000,000 in revenues, of which \$3 billion would result from the income-tax cut.

In another development President Eisenhower conferred again with his special economic advisory group. Its members are Robert B. Anderson, the Secretary of the Treasury; William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board; Raymond J. Saulnier, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, and Gabriel Hauge, White House economic assistant. As usual, no announcement was made after the meeting.

DATA ON PROJECTS ASKED

Also today Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas and chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, announced he had requested a special report on Federal public works projects that might be started quickly if needed. The request was sent to Maj. Gen. John S. Bragdon, the President's special public works assistant.

Today's comments by the five economists came at hearings on the President's economic message.

John Kenneth Galbraith of Harvard University urged a further substantial easing of monetary policy, an increase in unemployment compensation and an increase in spending for domestic programs.

He opposed a tax cut as hard to reverse and said it might not produce so quick an effect as higher spending. He said "we now have many things that need doing," in the fields of education, research, health, rental housing, urban redevelopment, and resource development.

ASKS DEFENSE INCREASE

Lester V. Chandler of Princeton University said that without Government action "the decline may well continue through the end of the year." He recommended "an immediate and rapid increase" in defense spending. He also opposed a tax cut.

Ralph J. Watkins of the Brookings Institution saw "a good prospect that recovery will be underway before another 6 to 7 months have gone by."

However, he urged that plans be made for a tax cut if needed and for "a prompt request to the Congress for repeal of the debt ceiling."

Yale Brozen of the University of Chicago argued that a lowering of United States trade barriers would help stimulate exports and therefore help industries that have suffered most.

Roy Blough of Columbia University said the "present recession should be taken more seriously" than those of 1949 and 1953. He said the "outlook for major expansion to be initiated in the near future in the private sector seems rather dim."

He called for a "temporary reduction of individual income taxes" if the economy "declines much further or if there has been no considerable upturn by the time Congress approaches adjournment."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, each of these thoughtful and incisive editorials and reports deserves the study of my colleagues. They express the growing concern among informed and intelligent Americans not only that we are moving headlong into economic difficulties, but that the Administration is not grasping the many opportunities available for checking this slip into the economic pit.

RIISING BANK PROFITS

Mr. President, we are now witnessing the results of the administration's fiscal and monetary policies. Unemployment

is mounting, industrial production is dropping, retail sales are declining and business failures are at an 18-year high. For many, many months, Mr. President, I have spoken out on the inherent danger to our economy in the economic policies and programs of the administration. I have in particular called attention to the fallacies of the tight-money program which has sent interest rates to 25-year highs and hampered economic growth.

I wish to call attention to the fact, however, that the administration's tight-money policies have proved beneficial to at least one group, namely the investment and commercial banks. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System recently announced that the earnings of member banks for 1957 were the highest in history. Bank profits after taxes last year amounted to \$1,169 million—an increase of 14 percent over 1956. While bank profits last year rose by 14 percent, per capita personal income after taxes rose only 2.5 percent. In the past 5 years while bank profits after taxes climbed 41 percent, per capita personal income increased 16 percent.

As I have said many times, the Republican Party takes care of its friends. Tight money might not help consumers, farmers, small-business men, and wage earners, but it has proven a bonanza for the bankers.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a table showing net profits of member banks from 1952 through 1957.

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

Profits after taxes of Federal Reserve member banks

[In millions]

1952.....	\$829
1953.....	865
1954.....	1,096
1955.....	985
1956.....	1,027
1957.....	1,169

Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

SUBSIDIZING CONSUMERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if as much space were given in the city press and national periodicals about how American farmers are subsidizing consumers as is devoted to attacks on supposed subsidies to farmers, there would be far less misunderstanding about the need for a strong agriculture.

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. Food and clothing during the 1951-57 period would have cost consumers many billions more than consumers actually paid. For consumers and taxpayers, other than farmers, this has been a fabulous bargain.

Farmers, in effect, have been, and still are, subsidizing consumers of America. They are taking the losses, so consumers can have a bargain. Food absorbs a smaller proportion of the consumer's

spendable dollar than anywhere else in the world.

In view of these facts, it appears rather ungrateful for city residents and consumers to object to efforts toward seeking some economic justice for the producers making such food bargains possible. Of course, it is not the consumers who are to blame. They are not getting the real story; they are continually being given a distorted version.

We need to see that consumers get the real facts. Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, very effectively pointed this out in an editorial entitled "No Time To Lose" published in the February issue of the National Grange Monthly. Every city Senator and Representative should read this editorial.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have portions of the editorial referred to printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NO TIME TO LOSE

We in agriculture need to give more thought and attention to our reputation. What other people think of us is mighty important, and what many city people are thinking about us is downright alarming.

Today 150 million people live in small towns and big cities, but only 21 million live on farms. Farmers are a steadily diminishing minority, both in actual numbers and percentage of the total population.

In a democracy what the majority thinks is, sometimes, even more important than the facts. City people form their opinion about farming and farmers on what they hear and read. Few of them have little direct contact with farmers.

Industry and labor spend billions of dollars a year to influence public opinion. Their annual budget for public relations, advertising, and promotion exceeds the net income of all farmers combined. I doubt that agriculture spends as much as \$100,000 a year for that purpose.

BIGGEST BARGAIN

We've got a selling job to do, and that includes a great deal more than persuading consumers to buy more of our good products. We need to convince them that food and clothing are their biggest bargains today.

City consumers hear a lot about high food prices, and many of them, if not most, think what they hear is true. They are told that Government programs which restrict production and support prices are responsible. They read and hear that they must pay 2 prices for their food—1 at the grocery store and "another through taxes to support a \$5 billion a year subsidy to farmers."

I don't blame them for believing as they do. We have done too little to provide them with the facts. We can never earn their friendship and understanding just with a hard-luck story. That would be the wrong way to go about it. We do have more than our share of troubles, income-wise, but we have no monopoly on troubles.

Possibly most food consumers are not greatly interested in our troubles, but the vast majority of them are fair-minded individuals when they know the facts. What they have been getting are half-truths and distortions. Some of the facts are:

Food is the biggest bargain in America today.

Retail food prices average only 1 percent above 1951.

Prices received by farmers have gone down 20 percent since 1951.

Farmers' operating costs have gone up 15 percent since 1951.

Weekly factory wage rates have gone up 23 percent since 1951.

Per capita farm income is about half the urban rate—even with reasonable allowances for farm produced and consumed items to make the figures really meaningful.

The plain facts of the matter are that food absorbs—in this country—a smaller proportion of the consumer's spendable dollar than anywhere else in the world. Eight minutes of labor will buy a quart of milk. In France it requires 16 minutes, and in Russia 42 minutes.

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. Food and clothing during the 1951-57 period would have cost consumers many billions more than they actually paid. For consumers and taxpayers—other than farmers—this has been a fabulous bargain.

Farmers, in short, have been—and are—subsidizing the consumers of America.

The story of today's food bargain is one that we need to tell over and over. Much of the current resentment against farmers is based on the false assumption that food prices are high and that farmers are reaping the benefits. This is the challenge agriculture, and in fact the entire food industry, faces today.

It would seem, then, that if we are to make income progress for agriculture, it is time to acquaint consumers with the fact that today's food bargain is a result of inadequate income for the producers of food.

NEED FOR PRODUCTION RESEARCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a convincing case for continued support of agricultural production research, at a time when many will be clamoring to cut back such activities, is contained in an editorial appearing in the January issue of the Farmer, published in St. Paul, Minn., and serving 260,000 subscribers in the Midwest.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am impressed by this effective presentation. I urge that it be carefully read by my colleagues on the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Let's Not Skimp on Production Research," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

LET'S NOT SKIMP ON PRODUCTION RESEARCH

Something you ate today was on your table because a scientist in a laboratory or in a field somewhere 10, 15, or 20 years ago made a discovery. Something you grew last season * * * Hard Red Spring wheat, for example * * * came through the summer and produced a reasonable yield because of efforts of a plant breeder in St. Paul or Fargo or Brookings or somewhere else a dozen or more years ago.

Reflect on this basic fact as this session of the Congress gets underway. During the coming months you will be reading excerpts from persuasive speeches on the floor of the House and Senate. These will come from the lips of men and women representing agricultural States as well as States with very large urban populations. They will argue that since so much money is needed for missile development, and development of other defense tools, there must be a cut

in Government costs, and what more logical area, they will argue, than in research aimed at increasing agricultural production.

"Why keep these scientists at work producing better wheat varieties when we've got wheat enough for the next 2 years?" The same argument will be applied to corn and cotton, to increasing production from our milk cows, to the production of more pork and beef, to development of better grasses and legumes, and to research aimed at protecting our crops and our herds and flocks against diseases and parasites. And there will be a vast majority of America's urban population who will agree. And some farmers, too.

Forseeing these efforts to withdraw funds from production research has been a matter of deep concern lately to many thoughtful persons. One of them, S. L. Nevins, vice president of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., and a member of the national committee on boys and girls club work, speaking in Chicago recently, declared: "I am certain that agriculture is the next area in which we will be challenged by the Russians. And if Russia ever beats us in the cornfield, we'll be poor indeed. We will have lost our most significant race."

There is reason for Mr. Nevins' prediction. Russia is graduating two and a half times more agricultural students than are now being graduated from American universities, despite the fact it has only half as many enrolled in colleges and universities. This stepped-up emphasis on agricultural science is comparatively new to Russia. The number of agricultural students being graduated from Russian universities was stepped up 80 percent in the years between 1948, when that country started its all-out strength-building program, through 1954. During the same period there was a decline of 30 percent in the number of agricultural students being graduated from United States colleges.

Looking from another angle at this picture of deemphasizing production research on the one hand, and on the other emphasizing the so-called pure sciences, such as chemistry and physics, Dr. Theodore C. Byerly, Deputy Administrator of Research in USDA, told us while we were in his office a while back: "Government budgetmakers don't even regard the natural scientist as a scientist anymore. If he is thought about at all, it is with contempt or accusation * * * contempt for the work he has done, accusation that he has already done too much."

The legislator who argues that we have so far outdistanced potential enemies in food production that they will be a long time catching up, so we can afford to drop a large part of production research program for awhile, overlooks the constant danger to our crops. Certainly he overlooked a most dramatic example in the past year. That was the invasion of white leaf (Hoja Blanca disease) of rice found in a field near Belle Glade, Fla., last August. It threatens our \$200 million rice crop. But because plant breeders have pulled out of our world collection of 4,000 strains and varieties of rice, 289 that are resistant to the disease, there isn't much worry. There'll be one or a dozen that can be combined with our good varieties to make new kinds of the quality and with the capacity for yield which rice growers need.

We don't need to think of a crop as unimportant as rice is to us in the upper Midwest to find an example of the importance of production research. The wheat we mentioned at the outset of this editorial is as good an example. We would point out to the legislator arguing against funds for production research that had it not been for Thatcher Hard Red Spring wheat that replaced Ceres in 1935, and Mida, Rival, and Pilot that replaced Thatcher in about 1940, and Selkirk that replaced wheats susceptible to rust race 15B in the early 1950's, there would

not be a sufficient supply of good bread wheat at the moment. And certainly we'd not be making friends at home and abroad with our fine durum had it not been for having had varieties ready to replace those susceptible to rust. We believe it is better to have a surplus of these wheats than to be worried about a shortage.

Just consider what a terrible blow it would be to our livestock industry, and therefore to all of our citizenry, if it became impossible to grow alfalfa. Alfalfa was threatened by the alfalfa aphid. First discovered in California in 1954, it spread across 31 States and caused \$80 million damage in the following 3 years. And the stem nematode of alfalfa, now a plague of the Southwest may one day reach us. But there is a strong line of defense against these threats to alfalfa. It just happened that some money appropriated for alfalfa research was earmarked for use by Dr. Oliver Smith, a USDA plant breeder working at the University of Nevada experiment station. He observed plants from crosses he had made are resistant to both the aphid and the nematode. Unfortunately, the varieties are not winter-hardy enough to grow here, but the resistant characteristic is being combined with the winter-hardy and other characteristics of our better varieties to tailor-make one for our climate.

When and if your city friends complain about the use of tax money for agricultural production research, you might counter their argument with examples already given in this editorial, and with others, that they are getting more for their dollar in production research than anywhere else that government spends and/or invests tax dollars. One most excellent example is how well investment in research on poultry nutrition has paid off. (Much better for the urban dweller just now than for the farmer.) But suggest that your friend consider this: A few years ago a broiler consumed about 4½ pounds of feed to make a pound of gain. Now broilers are being produced at a feed conversion rate of 2.4 pounds and down to 2 pounds of feed per pound of gain, and so ready-to-cook broilers can be bought for 40 cents or less a pound in the retail meat market now while a few years ago, when the food dollar was much more valuable, they cost 65 cents a pound or more. Discussing this, Dr. Ervin L. Peterson, Under Secretary of Agriculture, recently reminisced: "In 1925 I worked in a Los Angeles poultry market. I remember selling live, tough old tom turkeys for 65 cents a pound, live old hens for 65 cents a pound as a Saturday special, and live broilers that a woman had to take home and pick, gut, and dress for 45 cents a pound."

And Dr. Byerly, to whom we previously referred, doesn't think that scientists have made the feed conversion rate down as far as is possible. "Just think," he says. "When you are putting feed containing 90 percent dry matter into a broiler containing 25 percent dry matter, the feed conversion rate isn't 2 pounds per pound of gain. In terms of dry matter it figures out to be 7.2 pounds of feed per pound of gain, and that leaves the scientists with quite a challenge on their hands."

It is altogether likely that some scientist working somewhere at the moment you read this is on the threshold of a discovery that in peace or war will be of immense value. We cannot afford to take chances by cutting down on the appropriations he and his colleagues need to carry on their work.

FACILITATION OF TRAVEL AND COMMUNICATION BETWEEN MINNESOTA AND CANADIAN PROVINCES OF ONTARIO AND MANITOBA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most engaging and interesting in-

ternational relationships exists along the northern border of our country with our good friend and neighbor to the north, Canada. My own State of Minnesota borders on the Canadian Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba, and quietly, year in and year out, efforts are made by both Americans and Canadians to facilitate travel and communication back and forth between our two countries. Currently our Minnesotans are engaged in a friendly discussion and effort with the Manitobians to develop a port of entry at Caribou, Minn.

The reasons for this effort are set forth very clearly in a letter which I recently received from the president of the Greenbush Association of Commerce, Mr. Don Wicklund.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed at this point in the Record the letter from Mr. Wicklund, dated January 27, 1958.

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

ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Greenbush, Minn., January 27, 1958.
Re port of entry, Caribou, Kittson County,
Minn.
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We, the Association of Commerce, Greenbush, Minn., at the request of and in behalf of the other civic organizations of our community, and the people located here, respectfully urge that a port of entry be established at Caribou, Minn. We feel that this port of entry should first be started on a trial or test basis and that this test should commence about May 1, 1958. We hereby submit our reasons for thinking that a port of entry should be established as above explained.

There is a continual and definite demand for the establishment of this port of entry by the peoples in our area. A copy of a petition as held in our files, and herewith attached, at least shows the interest taken by some 200 individuals of our community as it pertains to this Caribou port. The towns and communities to the south of us, including Strathcona, Middle River, Holt, and Thief River Falls, are likewise vitally concerned and are urging the establishment of this port of entry. Our Canadian neighbors to the north of us have for many years worked for the establishment of this port. This was especially demonstrated to us on August 17, 1957, when the Honorable Premier Douglas Campbell, of Manitoba, made a special trip to Greenbush, Minn., for the purpose of eliminating obstacles so that a port of entry could be established at an early date at Caribou.

A borderline survey indicates that there is a greater distance between ports in our area than in any other area in this district.

The obstacle of an inadequate road on the Canadian side from the border toward Vita has now been eliminated by the recent construction of a gravel-surfaced highway; further road improvement is anticipated on both sides of the border if a port is established. Roseau County officials have informed us that the construction of a black top highway from Greenbush, north, toward Caribou for a distance of, at least, 8 miles is in the calendar for 1958. The long-term goal is that Minnesota State Highway No. 32, which now ends at Greenbush, will be extended up to Caribou, Minn., where it would link with the Canadian Highway No. 32 from the border to Vita, Manitoba, and thence to Canadian Highway No. 12, 12 miles north of Vita and thence to Winnipeg.

The tourist business is fast becoming an important part of our economy and shows promise of being more so. The natural tourist attractions on both sides of the border, such as lakes, Roseau River Refuge, etc. will be greatly improved by the establishment of this port.

We also believe that a port of entry at Caribou, Minn.-Arbakka, Man., would greatly help to perpetuate the friendly relations which now exist between the United States and Canada. It is a matter of record from past history, that Canada has at times, in co-operation with the United States, established customs and immigration facilities where the stronger desire for the port of entry was from the United States side of the boundary.

Now the Canadians, themselves, have initiated the drive to establish a port of entry in the Caribou-Arbakka area; they have proved their good intentions by the construction of the new highway to the border; they have labored long and hard to impress their own government with their needs; they have made numerous visits to this area to encourage our cooperation and to prod us into action when we have lagged. The establish of the port should be regarded as a move of cooperation with these friendly neighbors and would in effect be a maintenance of good foreign relations which is of such great importance today.

We know that you are well acquainted with existing conditions in our area, which has been somewhat retarded the latter years by adverse weather and crop conditions, but which has, in the past and will again in the future, be regarded as a prosperous agricultural area supporting active towns such as Vita, Stuartberg, Steinbeck, etc.

We again respectfully urge that our application for a port of entry at Caribou, Minn., be presented to the Bureau of Customs and that full support and all possible effort and consideration be given the matter.

Very truly yours,

GREENBUSH ASSOCIATION OF

COMMERCE.

DON WICKLUND, *President.*

C. G. CARTWRIGHT, *Secretary.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have asked the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Customs Service to study this proposal and to give me a report as to its feasibility. In the meantime, I wish my colleagues to know that an exchange of ideas and co-operation is proceeding very fruitfully indeed along our northern borders.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

INVESTIGATION OF ACTIVITIES OF REGULATORY BODIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to say most respectfully to my friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], that I wish to commend him for his courageous efforts in seeking to have the regulatory bodies of Government, which are the creatures of the Congress of the United States, periodically examined and placed under the watchful eye of Congressional scrutiny.

These executive agencies, Mr. President, are independent agencies. They depend for their continuity upon Congressional enactment. They therefore have a particular responsibility to the Congress, as the Congress has to them.

I am happy to notify the Senate and the other body, Mr. President, that on November 28, 1955, I directed a letter to

the Senate Committee on Government Operations, addressed to the staff director, Mr. Walter Reynolds, and asked that a study be made of the activities and procedures of five regulatory agencies; the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I am happy to report, Mr. President, that in response to such request of the staff, the Comptroller General assigned a member of the Comptroller General's staff, one Mr. Arch Brown, to assist in the development of information relating to the delays and irregularities that were allegedly existing at that time in the agencies which I mentioned.

Mr. President, those reports were turned over to the so-called Moulder subcommittee. They are in the possession both of the Senate Committee on Government Operations and the Office of the Comptroller General, as well as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the other body.

I wish to say to whatever committee may be established in the Senate, or whatever work may be done by the Committee on Government Operations, that a substantial body of evidence is in our possession already. In fact, much of the work which was done in the House subcommittee was the result of the preparatory investigations or the preliminary investigations made by the staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

I wish to add, Mr. President, that the only reason why this inquiry was not carried further was that the field had been preempted, so to speak, by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The former counsel of that committee, one Mr. Bernard Schwartz, whose name has been most prominently mentioned in recent days, received these reports as preliminary guidelines for his investigative activities.

I invite the attention of Senators, Mr. President, in this regard, to pages 65 to 67 of Senate Report No. 1 of the 85th Congress, which sets forth the details concerning the staff study and points out that the committee discontinued its studies at the request of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I hope that the Senate will make it its business to go into whatever inquiry the situation may require, methodically, carefully, and with painstaking effort. I associate myself with that endeavor.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). At the request of the Vice President, the Chair announces the appointment by the Vice President of the following members on the part of the Senate to the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy: The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT AND ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "A REVIEW OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND OPERATIONS," SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ELLENDER TO APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, JANUARY 24, 1958

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a resolution which I submit at this time, in behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 260) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document the report entitled "A Review of United States Foreign Policy and Operations," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on January 24, 1958; and that 3,000 additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. The senior Senator from Louisiana made a very extensive tour throughout the world, and his report was printed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, of which I am chairman.

There has been a great demand for the report. The Senator submitted a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I am also a member, providing for the printing of 7,500 additional copies. However, upon examination of the cost of printing, it was discovered that the printing could not be taken care of through a Senate resolution. It would require a concurrent resolution.

I have, therefore, reduced the number to 3,000 copies, which could be printed under the limitation of \$1,200 as provided by law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 266) requesting the return of the enrollment of H. R. 8038 by the President to the House of Representatives for the purposes of reenrollment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 1040. An act to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940; and

S. 2920. An act to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall.

PUBLIC WORKS AND THE RECESSION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, when I read the newspapers yesterday morning and saw the headlines to the effect that a \$2 billion program had been announced by the President for the purpose of stemming the recession, I had the feeling that the executive branch of the Government was about to take positive steps immediately to turn back the recession from which the country has been suffering.

THERE IS NO \$2 BILLION PROGRAM PLANNED

I was amazed, however, upon learning the details of the statement made at the White House, and the description made therein, to find that there was really no basis whatsoever for the implication which was made by the announcement of the \$2 billion program. It is not a \$2 billion program at all. It is a \$175 million program, and is based wholly upon the willingness of Congress to pass new legislation, amending the suggestion which has already come from the Post Office Department, with the blessing of the President, to increase the postage rate on first class mail to 5 cents outside local communities, and to increase the rate to 4 cents for local mail.

Of the \$2 billion mentioned in the press yesterday morning, \$1½ billion is wholly dependent upon the so-called pay and purchase program, and it would take probably 5 years to carry out that program.

SUGGESTED PROGRAM IS BASED ON PRIVATE INVESTMENT

In order to make clear precisely what is meant by the so-called \$2 billion program, I think I should read into the RECORD portions of the release from the White House dated February 11, for which credit is claimed by Mr. James C. Hagerty, press secretary to the President:

The President today directed Postmaster Summerfield to present promptly to Congress a \$2 billion program to modernize the obsolete physical plant of the Post Office Department over the next 3 to 5 years.

This is not a proposal for immediate action, Mr. President. That should be made clear. I continue:

The program will involve rehabilitating, enlarging, or replacing 2,500 Government-owned post office buildings, replacing or remodeling 12,000 leased buildings, and providing modern mail-handling equipment for all postal facilities.

Under the new program developed by the Postmaster General, the funds from private investors for construction of new post offices to be occupied under lease would approximate \$1,500,000.

RECESSION STEMS FROM HOLD-BACKS IN PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Mr. President, one of the causes of the recession from which we are suffering is the failure of the owners of capital to invest. They have been holding back from investment. I know of no testimony which has been presented as yet which indicates that there is any real

possibility that investment in the degree of \$1,500 million may be expected to carry out the proposal to fight the current recession.

THE RECESSION IS HERE NOW

This is a current recession. The budget was prepared last November and December. It is very difficult for the Bureau of the Budget to prepare the document because it must look forward for some 18 months, at least, to determine what the receipts of the Government will be and what the expenditures are likely to be.

ADVANCE WARNINGS OF RECESSION WERE IGNORED

The sad fact is that when the budget was being prepared, any person, either in public life or out of public life, who even hinted that the reductions in the expenditures of the Government for national defense were themselves helping to produce unemployment was called a prophet of doom and of gloom. Those who wished to issue a warning that economic things were not going along all right were urged not to open their mouths; they were told that to make such statements would be to undermine public confidence.

Mr. President, I think all of us must agree that if the signs of an economic downturn are apparent, they ought to be made clear, both to the public and, particularly, to those who are in charge of the activities of the Government. Certainly they should be made known to the Members of Congress, who are called upon to pass the legislation which may be necessary.

JANUARY PREDICTIONS OF INCOME INCREASE WERE UNWARRANTED

The budget which was submitted to the Congress in January actually predicted that in 1959, personal incomes would be \$9 billion larger than they were in the previous year. In the President's budget message it was stated that instead of the \$343 billion total of personal incomes in 1958, the personal incomes of the people of the United States in 1959 would be \$352 billion. I hope I have stated the figures correctly. If not, I shall see that they are corrected from the documents in the record.

That was a prediction that there would be a \$9 billion increase in personal income. But at the same time, and in the same document, it was predicted that corporate incomes would remain stationary, at approximately \$40 billion. When Mr. Anderson, the Secretary of the Treasury, appeared before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I directed his attention to that statement in the budget message; and I asked him for an explanation of how it was possible to expect personal incomes to increase by \$9 billion when there would be no increase at all in corporate incomes.

CABINET CHANGED TUNE ABOUT A MARCH UPTURN

All of us know that a very large segment of employment is by the great corporations. We know that unemployment is increasing. At the time when the budget was being prepared for presentation to the Congress, members of the President's Cabinet were saying there

would be an upturn in March. But when we held the hearings before the Joint Economic Committee and when we asked those members of the Cabinet—the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, and other branches of the Government—to state their views about unemployment, they no longer held to the prediction that the upturn would come in March. Instead, they predicted that it would not come until much later.

LEADING ECONOMISTS DO NOT BELIEVE UPTURN WILL COME SO SOON

The last hearing of the Joint Economic Committee was held on last Monday. At that time five economists testified. They were not chosen by hand, to represent a particular doctrine; instead, they were chosen because throughout the country they are recognized as being men of ability, patriotism, and keen understanding of the economics of the Nation. Not one of those men looked for any improvement by March. All of them agreed that the upturn could not come speedily.

When I selected from Barron's Weekly of February 10, last Monday, a brief quotation, which I read into the RECORD, quoting the views of the Chase Manhattan Bank—certainly not a prophet of doom and of gloom, but one of the largest banks in the world, and one which should know something about the economic situation—and when in that way I showed to them the position taken by the Chase Manhattan Bank, namely, that the crux of this recession would not come until 1959, not one of those gentlemen challenged that statement.

OTHERS DO NOT SHARE THE PRESIDENT'S OPTIMISM

Mr. President, imagine my surprise when I found the President quoted as saying that he expects the upturn to come next month, in March.

Unemployment has been increasing; and men of unassailable ability have testified that the unemployment will reach 5 million.

The committee could call before it any witnesses, without regard to partisanship. None of the witnesses who appeared before the committee wore the rosy glasses which have been presented to the President, for him to use in looking at the situation which now exists in the Nation's economy.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was present at the hearings. I remember his presence in the joint committee, when it heard the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson—a very able and capable man, who has reversed the policy of the preceding Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey. Even Mr. Anderson said—in response to my question—that he expected that things would grow worse before they grew better.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What the Senator from Wyoming has just said reminds me

of the fact that, according to the press and radio reports, the Secretary of Commerce last night made a speech in the course of which he condemned the brigade of gloom and doom forecasters among the Democrats. However, is it not true that the Secretary of Commerce himself, in announcing the unemployment figures last month, predicted that the unemployment figures for next month would be even larger?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course he did.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yet when any of us dare say something about that, we are said to be prophets of gloom and doom, according to the terminology used by those to whom I have just referred. Is not that true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely; that is exactly what the situation is.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a further question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming read carefully the President's presentation, on yesterday, of economic facts of life, and his predictions, and so forth. Did the Senator from Wyoming find in the President's pronouncement a new thought or a new program? Was not it simply a recapitulation of his budget message and his economic message, with the sole exception of the reference he made to a proposed post-office building program?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; the only new proposal was the suggestion of a change in the use of the funds proposed to be derived by increasing the price of postage stamps.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, by increasing the price of the postage stamps which must be placed on the mail which the mass of the people send or receive.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Just before the Senator came to the floor, I was reading a press statement that came from the White House, under date of February 11, and credited to Mr. James C. Hagerty, to show the facts as he presents them belie the impression that was carried in the headlines, of a \$2 billion program to fight the recession. So I attempted to prove, by what Mr. Hagerty says, that this is a program without substance, and not calculated to have any beneficial effect upon the recession from which the country is suffering.

Let me read this from Mr. Hagerty's statement. He said first, so that the context may be clear, that of the \$2 billion, \$1½ billion would come from private investment. We all know that private investment is one of the categories that has been going down, and one of the reasons why we have a recession.

Mr. Hagerty states:

The capital investment to be made by the Government is estimated at \$175 million a year for the period of the program.

And the program, of course, is for the next 3 to 5 years. The trouble is now, not 3 to 5 years from now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator know or does he have a good idea as to

whether or not plans are ready on a single one of those buildings?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no idea. I know the President speaks of taking them off the shelf. Before I get through, I shall point out how the Bureau of the Budget has required the Department of the Interior to put on the shelf public works projects for which Congress has appropriated and authorized all the money needed for the present.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Are they not still on the shelf?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are still on the shelf, and I am hoping they will be taken off the shelf.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Those projects are ready to go now, are they not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. One of them was actually going.

I say to the Senator that, for example, the appropriation bill which Congress passed last year for public works provided \$1½ million for the building of the Navaho Dam in the State of New Mexico for the benefit of the Indians.

That money was to have been expended during the fiscal year 1958, of which 7½ months are now behind us. Not a penny of that \$1½ million has been expended for Navaho. Because some of us representing Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah complained about the action of the Bureau of the Budget compelling the Department of the Interior to cut back, that \$1½ million has been switched from the Navaho project in New Mexico to the Flaming Gorge project in Utah and Wyoming.

As one of the Senators representing the State of Wyoming, I say the public officials of my State do not want to take that money away from Navaho. The Navaho project ought to be worked on immediately.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming could multiply instances of that kind many times over, examples of projects that have been placed on the shelf, and that could easily be taken off the shelf and used to put people to work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The program announced by the administration is that there shall be no new starts in the construction of reservoirs to store water. Next Monday, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I shall open a hearing in the Senate Office Building to review the work which has been done behind the Iron Curtain to conserve the waters of Soviet Russia, both in Europe and in Siberia. I shall point out the expenditures that were made behind the Iron Curtain, under the instruction and guidance of American engineers, sometimes by big American corporations like the General Electric Co., which sent its men to those countries to do the work on building some Russian reservoirs. We shall show how the waters of Russia and Siberia are being conserved, while the policy of this administration is no new starts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, he may recall that about 2 weeks ago, or perhaps a little less, I delivered a talk here on the

Senate floor in which I discussed the housing program in the light of the President's economic report and budget message, and also some of the potentials of home building to help pull up the sagging economy.

If the Senator noticed, in the President's statement of yesterday he referred to housing as his first program. May I say to the Senator I read the statement carefully, and there is not one single new proposal in the statement. There is nothing in it to challenge the sagging economy of this country or to give even a psychological lift in the fight against the present recession.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator how that housing program began?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator mean how it began years ago?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. I referred to the liberalization provisions of August 1957.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The White House told of the few things that had been done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How did that program begin? Who took the initiative?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We in the Congress have been prodding for action. Last year we passed a better housing program than the administration would endorse. We passed it over the administration's opposition.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me make my question specific. Who passed the provision for a sharply liberalized schedule of minimum required downpayments?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Congress passed it last year, over the opposition of the administration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read the paragraph I have before me, because someone is fooling the President, and I resent it. I do not believe the President of the United States should be put in the position of claiming for himself acts that were taken by Congress. Let me read. This is very, very cleverly written. The hand of Madison Avenue guides the pen in the White House.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, we all know this administration has the cleverest writers of any administration in history.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is why I say the mind of Madison Avenue guides the hand holding the pen in the White House.

I shall now quote from the Fact Paper on Certain Programs and Proposals Bearing on the Current Economic Situation, issued from the White House at the same time the President made his statement on the economic situation:

The Federal Government has taken a number of steps, going back over a period of months, to help promote an increase in home construction.

In August 1957, a sharply liberalized schedule of minimum required downpayments was put into effect for FHA-insured home loans. On a \$12,000 house, for example, the minimum required downpayment was reduced from \$1,200 to \$600.

Not a word was said about the action of Congress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is right. A little further on in the statement he laments the fact that Congress

did not do all he asked it to do, the principal point being to raise interest rates. Is it not a little contradictory that right at this time he should make such a statement, when interest rates are coming down? As a matter of fact, if he did not make reference to it in this message, at other times he has talked about the credit charge. That is another way of saying interest rates.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let us get this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the same spot, so that everybody who reads the RECORD may understand what is going on by way of publicity. It is important that the people should know how they are being deceived by publicity statements.

In the first set of indented paragraphs of things that have been done "to help promote an increase in home construction" there is not a word about any participation by Congress, which leaves the impression in the mind of any reader who does not know better that these things were all done by the Executive—whereas they were not. They could not have been done by the Executive if Congress had not acted.

Then we come to the new set of steps to be taken, and it opens this way:

Prompt action by the Congress on several matters already before it would help to promote a higher level of home construction.

There is the assumption now that if it were not for the Congress something would be done.

The Congress should act promptly on the request of the Federal Housing Administration for a supplemental authorization which would permit FHA to accelerate the processing of home loan insurance applications.

The interest rate limitation on GI home loans should be eliminated, to permit veterans of World War II to enjoy their benefits under this program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I interpolate? That means the interest rates should be raised.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would have been very accurate and very illustrative of the fact if the author of this press release had added there, "The policy of Secretary Humphrey has been abandoned."

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I say that it could have been greatly shortened if they had simply stated, "Congress ought to raise interest rates on loans to GIs"? That is what it means, but they used the language the Senator has quoted.

Will the Senator look at that language again, to see how far around they went without mentioning interest rates? That is what the statement means. It means interest rates should have been raised on loans to GIs.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I assume the Senator knows that an increase of 1 percent in the interest rate that the veteran has to pay for one of these long-term mortgages represents an increase of 10 percent in his monthly payment and an increase of 10 percent in the final cost of the house to the veteran. If the Presi-

dent really wants to help those veterans, might I suggest that he should use his influence to bring interest rates down, because I am convinced that the administration has used its influence to get them up where they are.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that the paper from which I am reading was not written for the purpose of persuading Congress to do anything. This paper was written for the sole purpose of convincing the writers of headlines in the newspapers that the administration has made a complete turnabout in its policy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator is absolutely right. Did the Senator notice what the Wall Street reaction was after this message went out?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I heard about it on a television program last night.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Those who are on Wall Street apparently saw through it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, somebody ought to see through it. Somebody certainly ought to see through it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I interpolate one other thought in connection with what the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said?

I am speaking now from memory, but I think my memory is correct when I state that increasing the interest rate 1 percent over the time for the payment of the mortgage has the effect of increasing the amount which the person has to pay by \$6.50 per thousand per year. In other words, on a 10-year mortgage that would represent approximately \$6 a month of additional payment that the veteran would have to make. For some of these fellows who buy houses with \$10,000 mortgages—which is about the cheapest house one can buy today—the \$6 per month additional payment is quite an item. In effect, that is about what is being stated in the circumlocution which the Senator from Wyoming read to us.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield further, an increase of an interest rate on a housing mortgage works out to a higher percentage of increase on the payment, depending upon the period of the mortgage.

For example, on a 25-year mortgage, an increase of 1 percent in the interest rate will work out to an increase of somewhat more than 10 percent on the monthly payment and the total cost. If we talk about a 30-year mortgage, the increase of 1 percent in the interest rate works out to more than a 10-percent increase in the payments and total cost.

I believe most veterans' mortgages, Mr. President, are about 25-year mortgages. If the veterans want to know what Mr. Eisenhower is asking Congress to help the veteran do, it is to add 10 percent to whatever monthly payment is involved. If it is a \$60 monthly payment, the President is urging us to help the veteran pay \$66. If it is a \$70 monthly payment, the President is urging us to help the veteran pay \$77. If it is a \$100

monthly payment, he is urging us to help the veteran increase it to about \$110.

Those of us on this side of the aisle would like to see this administration use its efforts to bring these interest rates down, so that there would be plenty of money available to finance these veterans' houses at a lower cost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator has made his comment, but I want to avoid turning these few remarks of mine into a discussion of housing. I am trying to discuss public works.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator yield one more time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator knows, of course, my close identification with housing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do, indeed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It happens that housing was the No. 1 measure discussed on the fact sheet.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. On the Madison Avenue fact sheet.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I think the Senator will agree that home construction could easily be one of the most effective and one of the quickest methods to use to get into action on any program which could be devised to help pull up the sagging economy.

May I say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that there is not one thing in the proposal of the President related to housing—and I believe this probably applies to all the other subjects—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is not a thing in this proposal that can be effective, even if carried out before the 1st of July, to fight a present recession.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Furthermore, let me say that when the President refers to a housing program which he has submitted to Congress, he is talking about some of the programs he submitted last year. The committee is waiting right now about holding hearings on a new housing program for this year until the administration presents its proposals to us for consideration. We have served notice that we are going to hold those hearings in March, whether the administration has its proposals ready or not.

I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and to the other Members of the Senate that we are going to propose a housing program which will be challenging. We are going to propose a housing program which will help pull us out of this sagging economy or this recession that we are presently in. I hope that the administration, without any of its Madison Avenue phrases and phraseology and techniques, will simply put its shoulder to the wheel and help us put that program across. I believe that if the administration will do that, and will do it with these other potential programs, we can stop this recession and we can start things up again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

I was trying to support my statements by quotations from the Hagerty docu-

ment. Let me proceed along that line for just a minute.

The Government's portions of these expenditures—

I know now that would be \$175 million for a year for the program, and could not possibly exceed \$500,000 in addition. Mr. Hagerty proceeds:

The Government's portion of these expenditures would be financed by revenues from increased postage rates proposed by the administration and now before the Congress. The budget message has proposed a 5-cent letter rate on out-of-town letters, a 4-cent rate on local letters, and increases in other classes of mail.

The plan contemplates that the postage above 4 cents on first-class mail—namely, the fifth cent on out-of-town letters, which will amount to \$175 million a year—will be used to pay the modernization costs.

The remaining increases would provide about \$500 million a year to reduce the postal deficit, estimated at \$850 million annually, including pending wage increases for postal employees proposed in the budget.

It is clear from that statement that if the proposed increase is granted, the fifth cent of the postage rate on first-class mail will be taken away from financing the Post Office budget or contributing to the payment of the salaries of the postal workers, whose wages are not sufficient to keep pace with the rising cost of living; it will be devoted to the rehabilitation and repair of post office buildings in various parts of the country.

BUILDING POST OFFICES WILL NOT ADD TO REVENUE; RECLAMATION PROJECTS WILL

What I wish to point out is that such expenditures on post offices will not be productive expenditures. They will not add to the revenue of the United States. On the other hand, I invite the attention of Senators to the appropriation bill which was reported by the Appropriations Committee, for public works, on July 12, 1957. This appropriation bill was accompanied by a report. On page 36 of the report, I find this reference to the Colorado River storage project:

Appropriations, fiscal year 1957, \$13 million.

That means that for the fiscal year 1957, \$13 million had been appropriated for this project. The budget estimate for the fiscal year 1958 was \$25,142,000. The House allowance was \$25,142,000. The committee recommendation was \$25,142,000.

BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COLORADO RIVER PROJECT ENDORSED

So it will be seen from the record that at the last session the Appropriations Committee endorsed the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

Then there was this statement:

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of the budget estimate of \$25,142,000 for the Colorado River storage project. The funds recommended are for the following units of the project:

Flaming Gorge unit, Utah, \$4,800,000.

Glen Canyon unit, Arizona-Utah, \$17,300,000.

Navaho unit, New Mexico, \$1,800,000.

Transmission division, \$100,000.

Advance planning, \$1,142,000.

The total of those items was the fund appropriated, namely, \$25,142,000.

Then comes this paragraph—and I call particular attention to it:

SIMULTANEOUS CONSTRUCTION OF THREE UNITS PROMISED

The committee recommends the allowances of these funds with the understanding that construction will proceed simultaneously on the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, and Navaho units of this project.

There, Mr. President, was the understanding of the Congress and the agreement of the Reclamation Bureau. The Department of the Interior made no criticism of that understanding. No change was made until after sputnik appeared in the sky, and then immediately the Bureau of the Budget sent out word that the time had come to cut back on the conservation of water in the arid land States of the West.

HOOVER DAM ALLOWED COLORADO'S WATER TO BE CONSERVED FOR LOWER BASIN

There are three great rivers in this country, namely, the Missouri-Mississippi, the Columbia, and the Colorado Rivers. All three of those streams have been pouring water down since long before the white man inhabited the western part of the United States. In the Colorado River those waters tumbling down to the sea have worn away a great canyon. The waters have gone to waste in the sea, and have not been utilized on the way down, until, under the Presidency of President Hoover, the Hoover Dam was constructed on the lower portion of the Colorado River Basin. The construction of that dam has worked wonders for California and the lower basin. The population of the city of Los Angeles has been multiplied over and over because this great engineering concept of conserving the water instead of letting it go to waste was followed.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT APPROVED BY CONGRESS

States of the upper basin did not reach an agreement as to the division of the waters until several years ago, long after the Hoover Dam had been constructed. Then began efforts to provide for the planning to build the project. I well remember it, because I was a member of the Appropriations Committee at that time, and I was fortunate enough to be able to persuade my colleagues on the committee to appropriate the funds to enable the Bureau of Reclamation to make the studies and draw the plans by which the upper Colorado River storage project could be started.

ADMINISTRATION SHELVED 2 OF 3 PROJECTS

Here was the appropriation for the fiscal year 1958, following one which had been made for 1957, of \$4,800,000, under an understanding that the construction would proceed with Glen Canyon, Navaho, and Flaming Gorge. But Navaho and Flaming Gorge had been effectively placed upon the shelf by the Department.

I am calling attention to the fact that no legislation by Congress is needed. The legislation has already been passed. The authorization bill was passed by the previous Congress. Nothing is needed but Executive action.

The Governors of all four of the upper basin States are supporting this project.

Some of the \$4,800,000 which was appropriated for Flaming Gorge has been expended in the construction of preliminary work, such as access roads and the like; and the promise was made that out of the fund appropriated and still available, the Bureau of Reclamation would be permitted, in December 1957 or January 1958, to call for bids for beginning the construction of the dam.

PROMISE TO CONGRESS NOT KEPT

That promise has been violated. Bids were not called for. No word came in December. I called upon the Bureau of the Budget for some explanation, and received in reply only the old-fashioned notice that my suggestions would "receive careful consideration."

I knew what was going on. I knew that the public works which had been authorized by the Congress, with the agreement of the Bureau of the Budget and the administration, and for which appropriations had already been made, some of which had been expended, were being carefully put back on the shelf.

WHITE HOUSE ACTUALLY HAS STOPPED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

I cannot sit here silent and hear the claim go out from the White House that the White House is launching a public-works program, when the plain facts are that the White House has stopped the public works program.

Mr. President, we have a recession. The best information the Joint Economic Committee could get is to the effect that unemployment will not begin to turn up in March, and that it will be long after the middle of the year before an upturn may be anticipated.

The Bureau of the Budget has very graciously allowed the Bureau of Reclamation to take the unobligated balance of fiscal year 1958 on the Navaho unit, and \$2½ million of the unexpended funds from the Flaming Gorge appropriations, making a total of \$4 million. However, the only action that has been taken was reported to me on January 8, in a release by the Secretary of the Interior. It was to the effect that the Bureau of Reclamation had renegotiated a contract with the Witt Construction Co., whereby 30 units of 80 units of construction on a housing job had been canceled. That is public works in reverse. That is not public works to develop natural resources or an effort to fight unemployment.

I have no hesitation in saying that if this program does not go forward as originally planned and agreed to by the Department of the Interior and Congress, this administration cannot claim that it is a supporter of a public-works program which means anything. The storage of the waters in the Upper Colorado River Basin will mean new wealth for the country. The storage will make it possible to develop the natural resources of that area. I wish to tell Senators, as I told Dr. Saulnier, when he testified on the opening day of the hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, that in two States of the Upper Colorado River Basin, New Mexico and Wyoming, from which public works appropriations are

being withdrawn, there exist the two largest known deposits of uranium anywhere in the United States.

New Mexico, on the basis of presently discovered reserves, stands first. Wyoming stands second. The miners and the engineers who work in Wyoming tell me that the additional operations there will make Wyoming rival New Mexico as a source of uranium.

COLORADO RIVER PROJECT WILL DEVELOP
NATURAL RESOURCES

I say the storage of water in this area in New Mexico and in Utah and in Wyoming and in Colorado will all help to develop the natural resources. We need the development. The Nation needs the development. All of us need the development of those natural resources because we are in the depths of a cold economic war with Soviet Russia.

We know that the interest upon the national debt is increasing by every month during the present administration. The interest on the national debt will be over \$7½ billion this year. That is a greater expenditure than for any other item on the President's budget, save only defense and mutual security. It is \$7½ billion. We are cutting back the appropriation for agriculture. We are cutting back the appropriation for the veterans. They were registered last year for \$5 billion.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator does not wish to be inaccurate in his statement. The interest charge on the national debt is the second largest item in the budget. It is larger than mutual security or defense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Louisiana misunderstood me, I believe. I joined together national defense and mutual security as the only item which is greater than the interest on the national debt.

Mr. LONG. I am sorry that I misunderstood the Senator. I thought he meant to say that the interest charge on the national debt was not as large as the mutual security appropriations. Of course the Senator knows it is larger.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes. The appropriations to the President, to be expended at his discretion for foreign military aid and foreign economic aid, and other appropriations of that kind, amount to more than \$4 billion. That is the request which is made in the budget before us.

I was making the comparison between the interest on the national debt and all the other activities of Government, save only national defense and mutual security. The interest on the national debt is more than \$7.5 billion, and that amount is next in line to those two items I mentioned, added together.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have published in the RECORD at this point the release which I received from the Bureau of Reclamation, showing the facts which I have recited. I ask that the release be printed in the RECORD at this point so that there may be no challenge of what I have said.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, FISCAL YEAR 1959
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, COLORADO RIVER
STORAGE PROJECT, FLAMING GORGE UNIT,
UTAH

Fiscal year 1958 program-----	\$4,831,899
Funds provided in fiscal year 1959 budget-----	2,500,000
Unobligated balance, fiscal year 1958, Navaho unit transferred to Flaming Gorge-----	1,500,000
Total, fiscal year 1959 program-----	4,000,000

The \$4 million program in fiscal year 1959 will finance the excavation and lining of the single river-diversion tunnel at the dam site. Funds are also programed for the construction of an access road from the Flaming Gorge Government camp to the dam site and a second road from the camp to the river level at the powerplant location.

Construction of service facilities will be completed in fiscal year 1959, including permanent and temporary housing, utilities and streets, and water-supply system, all of which were started in fiscal year 1958.

Amount estimated last year by Bureau of Reclamation for 1959 work in Flaming Gorge, \$12,135,000.

A STRETCHOUT WILL ADD TO THE INTEREST TO
BE PAID BY WATER USERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me add that it is obvious from what I have already put in the RECORD that Flaming Gorge is not a new start. The first appropriation for the actual work leading to the construction was made for fiscal year 1957. The next one was made for fiscal year 1958. It was planned that the work would be finished in 1963, the engineering program advancing with the need in the appropriation bill and declining as it reached completion.

This was reported to me by the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation: For fiscal 1958 and fiscal 1959, \$12,135,000; fiscal 1960, \$11,770,000; fiscal 1961, \$11,402,000; fiscal 1962, \$10,892,000; fiscal 1963, \$5,207,000.

To build a big project of this kind takes a series of years, with every step of the way carefully outlined and carefully planned.

Congress, in attempting to make sure that this was an economically feasible project, provided that the users should pay interest on the amount of money that was spent during the period of construction. Therefore by the stretch-out, the amount of this interest would be increased to a far larger sum than was anticipated. I ask that the Department of the Interior, with the consent of the White House and the Bureau of the Budget, now take up where it left off last December, and begin the work with the money it has. Unless that is done, the burden of repayment upon the users and settlers will be greater than was planned.

ADMINISTRATION DELAY THREATENS COMPLETION OF PROJECT

Indeed, I think it is not too much to say that the stretchout is such that it will threaten the ultimate completion of the project. If that is true, then the people of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and

New Mexico, who would benefit from the utilization of the water that flows through their boundaries, will be the sufferers because of the failure of the administration to carry through to completion a public works program to which it was committed. I hope there will be an immediate change of attitude. I have already sent to the Department of the Interior my request that this shall be done, and I have also sent a message to the Chairman and the Council of Economic Advisers.

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

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

FEBRUARY 12, 1958.

The Honorable FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRED: On receiving word of the President's announcement of a \$2 billion public-works program to stop the recession, I wired Chairman Saulnier, of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, expressing the hope that the authorized call for bids on Flaming Gorge may be immediately made.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Council of Economic Advisers, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, in their testimony given last week before the Joint Economic Committee all adhered to the budgetary program devised in November and December last and presented to Congress in January. Today's announcement reverses all that, and since the appropriation has already been made for the development of the upper Colorado River project there is every reason to hope that the cutbacks in the upper Colorado River project ordered at that time will now be canceled. The development of natural resources, including the construction of reservoirs to store volumes of water now being wasted, will not only stimulate the economy of the areas affected but will result in the production of revenue for the Government.

When the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs met on January 23, I reviewed this whole matter and announced that I would ask the committee formally to condemn the policy of the Bureau of the Budget. The President has done that more effectively than I could have done it by announcing the \$2 billion project.

I am enclosing for your information a copy of my wire to Mr. Saulnier.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

FEBRUARY 12, 1958.

Dr. RAYMOND J. SAULNIER,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Mindful of our colloquy when you were testifying before the Joint Economic Committee on January 27, I now make the suggestion that, since President Eisenhower, after conference with you, the Council of Economic Advisers, and other top economic officials from Government agencies, has reversed the administration view of the gravity of the recession, it may now be possible to reverse the policy of the Bureau of the Budget which has resulted in a decision not to award a contract on Flaming Gorge for which funds appropriated last year are now available. Four days ago, in pursuance of the Budget Bureau policy, Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton announced that the Bureau of Reclamation had eliminated the

construction of 30 of the 80 housing units at Flaming Gorge for which a contract had already been made. This elimination was due to the failure of the Bureau of Reclamation, under Budget orders, to ask for bids for initial construction on the dam, although the funds were available and Congress had been assured that the contract would be let. This cutback of the authorized program for the development of the conservation project in the Upper Colorado River Basin was formally announced by the Bureau of Reclamation on January 15. Now that a broad program of public works is being announced to stop the recession, I confidently hope that immediate steps will be taken to proceed with Flaming Gorge. No action by Congress is necessary for the resumption of the program on this public work. It requires only action by the Executive.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senator.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I commend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for a very clear presentation of the conditions with which the people of Colorado are confronted. The program he has outlined and his comments about the necessity for a public works program—or merely the reestablishment of the program which had been approved by Congress—will be a great step forward. I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

RELIEF OF MARGIE C. STEWART

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and the Senate proceed to the consideration of a concurrent resolution coming over from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 266) requesting the return by the President of the United States of the enrolled bill (H. R. 8038) for the relief of Margie C. Stewart to the House of Representatives for the purpose of reenrolling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 266) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 8038), for the relief of Margie C. Stewart; that if and when such bill is returned by the President, the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President of the Senate in signing such bill is hereby rescinded; and that the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of such bill, to make the following changes: On page 1, line 9 of the House engrossed bill, strike out "such compensation to be paid at the rate received on the date of removal less any amounts earned by her through other employment during such period or paid to her as unemployment compensation."

OPPOSITION TO INCREASED INTEREST RATE ON LOANS TO RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I recently received from the San Luis Valley Rural Electrification Cooperative a resolution which typifies the feelings of rural Colorado families toward the threats which are presently being directed toward the operation of the REA. I shall ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, it has been clear for some time that the policy of this administration has been to throttle and to discourage the REA. At present there is pending another assault upon this worthwhile program. The administration has given notice that it intends to raise the interest rates on REA loans for the expansion and improvement of rural power and telephone systems. It also wishes to force the rural electrification co-ops to depend on private lending for their capital requirements.

All of us are aware of the situation which prevailed upon our farms before the inauguration of this program. Eighty-nine percent of our farm families did without the blessings of electricity. Whole areas of our Nation were condemned to darkness because the private power companies could not or did not wish to bring light and power. The inauguration and development of the REA and the rural electrification co-ops has brought the number of electrified farms to more than 90 percent. I would think that a program which has enjoyed such astounding success and which has won the unwavering support of farm and rural people—both Democrats and Republicans—would be loyally supported by both political parties.

The fact is, however, that the latest administration moves in reducing the budget for the rural electrification and telephone program and in attempting to increase the interest rate paid on REA loans, are actions hostile to the program and are intended to destroy the vitality of the REA. A year ago, Mr. President, the administration seriously impaired the capacity of the Director of the REA by requiring him to submit for approval loans of more than \$500,000. That action, plus the consistent reduction of budget funds, plus the attempt to increase interest rates, equals a planned and consistent policy of subversion toward the REA which will be bitterly resented and resisted by adherents of the great REA program.

I for one will do everything in my power to prevent an increase in interest rates for rural electrification co-ops and to protect this magnificent program which has more than paid for itself over the last 20 years. Apart from the fact that the co-ops are well in advance of their repayment schedule, this program has accounted for the great intangible benefits found in the health, welfare, and productivity of the American farmer and of American rural people. Moreover, the tax receipts resulting from greater productivity created by electrified farms

have richly rewarded the Federal Treasury for the investment which we have made. Such a program deserves a vote of confidence and the continued support of the Nation.

I now ask that the resolution I have received be printed in the RECORD.

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

The following resolution was presented to the annual meeting of the members of San Luis Valley Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., held at Monte Vista, Colo., on February 1, 1958, its adoption regularly moved and seconded and upon being put to a vote was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the income of the farmers has been steadily decreasing for the past several years; and

"Whereas the cost of items purchased by farmers in the production of their crops has been steadily increasing, which has contributed to the serious financial situation of the farmers at this time; and

"Whereas electricity purchased from rural electric cooperatives is a substantial item in the production costs of farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of San Luis Valley Rural Electric Cooperative in annual meeting assembled, go on record as being opposed to the Capehart bill or to any other legislation which would increase the interest rate on loans to rural electric cooperatives, therefore increasing the cost of electricity to farmers; be it further,

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Colorado Congressional delegation and to the chairman of the House and Senate Agricultural Committees."

I, John R. Wright, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of a resolution adopted at the regular meeting of the members of said association held at Monte Vista, Colo., on February 1, 1958.

Witness my hand and seal of said coöperative this 6th day of February 1958.

JOHN A. WRIGHT,
Secretary.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE ECONOMY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, there are three things which are not surprising about the President's statement on the economy yesterday.

First, the stock market, showing considerable sophistication, went down upon learning about the statement; second, the statement tried to breathe vigor into the economy merely by talking about "confidence," thus raising the shade of Andrew Mellon and projecting the shadow of Herbert Hoover; and third, the statement did not face the facts.

While none of these three things about the President's statement is surprising, all of them are serious; and the failure to face the plain fact is, of course, the most serious. The President said:

It is my conviction that the underlying forces of growth remain strong and undiminished.

What forces of growth?

In a comprehensive speech in the Senate on last August 30, I centered attention upon the fact that the forces of growth in our economy have been languishing seriously for a number of years under the misguided economic policies

of the current administration. Let us now bring this record up to date.

Our economy needs to grow about $4\frac{1}{2}$ percent a year—at the very least, $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent a year—to keep up with the increasing number of people, the increasing number of workers, and the rising productivity per worker; but the actual growth in our total national production, measured in uniform dollars, was only 2.3 percent on the average for the 5 years 1953 to 1957, and only about eight-tenths of 1 percent from 1956 to 1957. Our total national production actually went down 1.7 percent from the fourth quarter of 1956 to the fourth quarter of 1957, measured in uniform dollars. From the third to the fourth quarter of 1957, our total national production went down more than $6\frac{1}{2}$ percent at an annual rate, measured in uniform dollars.

At the base of our economy is consumption by the people. This also needs to grow by about $4\frac{1}{2}$ percent a year. But it grew only $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent on the average during the 5-year period of 1953 to 1957, only 1.7 percent from 1956 to 1957, and less than 1 percent from the fourth quarter of 1956 to the fourth quarter of 1957.

An increasingly higher level of business investment is also essential to our economy. But gross private domestic investments declined by 7.7 percent from 1956 to 1957, and declined by 14.4 percent from the fourth quarter of 1956 to the fourth quarter of 1957.

The industrial production index, according to the most recent figures, is now $7\frac{1}{2}$ percent lower than a year ago.

The incomes of the people have also been tumbling. Farm operators' net income, measured in uniform dollars, was more than 5 percent lower in the fourth quarter of 1957 than in the fourth quarter of 1956. The average per capita income of all the people after taxes, measured in uniform dollars, was $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent lower in the fourth quarter of 1957 than in the third quarter of 1957.

All of these downward trends are becoming worse month by month. The net result is more and more unemployment.

The President's statement of yesterday sheds some crocodile tears about the hardships of unemployment, but it does not even set forth the figures. The census count of unemployment was $4\frac{1}{2}$ million, according to a survey in the middle of January, contrasted with an average of 3 million for the fourth quarter of 1957. But it is now the middle of February, and everybody knows that unemployment has been rising at an accelerating rate. Allowing also for the temporary and part-time unemployment which is not included in the census count, it is very conservative to state that we now have a minimum of $5\frac{1}{2}$ million unemployed, and perhaps close to 6 million.

Practically every expert who has appeared before Congressional committees in recent weeks has estimated a considerable further rise in unemployment. And certainly much more in March than in February.

Practically no expert before any of these Congressional committees has expected an upturn of any kind before

much later this year, and most of these experts are now putting the date of the upturn further and further ahead of us.

So upon what foundation does the President rest his cheerful confidence that March "should mark the beginning of the end of the downturn in our economy"?

The second basis given by the President for his cheerful confidence is that "the firm policy of the Government is to foster this recovery in every sound way."

But the President proposes no vigorous or comprehensive new steps to foster recovery. The so-called fact paper attached to his statement, which I shall not here review in detail, is mostly a review of relatively trivial actions taken by the administration in the past, or mostly a restatement of intended actions already revealed in the weak messages which the President sent to the Congress last month.

So this so-called fact paper really does not introduce a new factor into the situation. In effect, it informs the public that the President and his advisers are hewing stubbornly to the line of their previous belief that all is fundamentally well. But because the economic community knows full well that all is not well, the only real consequence of the President's statement of yesterday is to make things worse, by revealing further the astigmatism of the administration about the whole economic situation.

A telling example of the confusion and stubbornness of the administration is contained in the part of the President's statement dealing with monetary policy and interest rates. In one breath he refers to the "dramatic results already achieved" by some slight modifications of the tight-money policy. But in the very next breath, he censures the Congress for not authorizing higher interest rates—which means still tighter money—on home mortgages.

On several occasions last year, before Congressional committees, on the floor of the Senate, and in other ways, I set forth the terribly damaging consequences of the tight-money policy, based as it is, upon faulty economic analysis, economic injustice, and plain lack of understanding of how our economy really works.

I wish that I might now say that I have been wrong, for the prosperity of our country is far more important than the vindication of any personal views. But month by month and day by day the sad deterioration of the economy has more than justified the action of those of us who early fought this tight-money, high-interest-rate policy, and will continue to fight it until it is abandoned.

At some future time, Mr. President, I hope to avail myself of a fuller opportunity to discuss the whole economic situation, to examine more comprehensively the economic failures of the administration, and to present some details of a specific program for the restoration of our economic health and the resumption of economic progress.

Mr. President, as I said last August 30, the first recommendation I shall

make is that the administration abandon its tight-money, high-interest-rate policy.

THE IMPORTANCE OF REDUCING THE RATES ON COAL SHIPPED TO FLORIDA

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I am hopeful that the Interstate Commerce Commission will speedily approve reduced rates on coal shipped to Florida. These rates from Appalachian to Florida points are now in effect, but only on a temporary basis, subject to further ICC action. Hearings on this question are to be held in Tampa, Florida, on March 11, 1958.

A brief review of the events which led to these hearings may be helpful to an understanding of the issues involved.

The Florida utilities depend in the main on oil as a source-of-energy fuel. In January, 1957, as a result of the Suez crisis, the price of fuel oil, both foreign and domestic, advanced rather sharply. This price advance threatened higher costs for the production of electrical energy among the private utility companies operating in Florida. Because of this situation, the executives of the Florida utilities were willing to explore the possibility of alternate fuels, including coal.

Since Kentucky coal would get its share of any expanded market in Florida, I became interested in this matter. I knew that the price of coal at the face of the mine in Kentucky had changed very little since 1948. I knew also that the energy requirements in the State of Florida were increasing at a more rapid rate than the national average. It seemed to me that the situation presented an opportunity to help the Florida electrical consumer, to help the coal industry in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, and to help the railroads serving the Southeast.

In cooperation with Mr. Joseph E. Moody, President of the Southern Coal Producers' Association, I invited the interested parties to a meeting in Washington. As a result of the meeting, engineering studies were made to determine just what needed to be done to expand the coal market in Florida. Subsequent meetings were held, and were attended by representatives of the coal producers, the Florida utilities, the interested railroads, and coal sales agencies.

It soon developed that in order to give the Florida utilities an alternate fuel source and to establish a coal market in Florida, three conditions would have to be met: First, a stable price for coal would have to be assured. Second, freight rates from the coalfields to Florida would have to be lowered. Third, considerable capital investment would be necessary, so that the generating plants in Florida could be equipped to handle and to burn coal as a source of fuel.

The stable coal price did not seem to be any great barrier. It was clearly demonstrated that coal reserves were adequate, and that increased productivity in the coal mines had kept pace with rising wages for the coal miner. Condition

No. 3 did not offer any major barrier, even though sizable investments were necessary. The utilities were willing to make these expenditures, provided fuel costs could be lowered sufficiently to justify them. Some of the existing facilities were already equipped to burn coal. Of those under construction, many were designed for the possible use of coal. The crux of the matter seemed to be condition No. 2—namely, freight rates.

Late last summer, to my gratification and that of others interested in expanding coal's markets, the Southern Railway System, joined by other railroads operating in the South, including the Louisville & Nashville Railroad, proposed rates that would make coal competitive in Florida. It appeared that our efforts had been successful.

The Interstate Commerce Commission at first approved the rates, but they were suspended on October 25, 1957. Later, because of the protest of the railroads and the coal interests, the suspension was vacated, and the rates were put into effect. But the ICC did not let go; the cloud of uncertainty continued to be held over the rates, as the ICC decided to continue to investigate, and now has announced the hearing to which I have referred. This, of course, could continue for a long time.

Obviously, in the present atmosphere of uncertainty, the utilities in Florida are unwilling to invest several millions of dollars in coal-handling facilities. It would be a misuse of their stockholders' funds if they made these investments without being sure that coal would be available to them at a competitive price. Today, they do not have this assurance, because the freight rate is under review. Until the ICC makes a final determination in this matter, it is impossible to develop the movement of coal to Florida to its full potential. Only the plants which now are equipped to handle coal are possible users, so long as uncertainty hangs over the freight rate.

Mr. President, it is generally recognized that the railroads of the Nation face a serious crisis. The relationship between costs and revenues is growing worse from day to day. Only bold steps can save the American railroads. In testifying before the Smathers subcommittee, prominent railroad executives pointed out that many of their troubles stemmed from excessive regulation and legal restriction. In this instance, we certainly have a case in point.

The railroads in this case took a bold and imaginative step which would increase their operating revenue, would protect the interests of the Florida consumer, and would put extra money in the pocket of the coal miner. The welfare of the miner and his family is of great concern to me. Coal is Kentucky's largest industry. The standard of living of hundreds of thousands of Kentuckians is geared directly to coal. My concern about the ICC hearings and the final disposition of this matter under review is therefore understandable.

I am informed that protest was filed against the new coal rate. The members of the ICC undoubtedly felt that an investigation should be made in ac-

cordance with the statutory responsibilities of the Commission. I feel sure that the evidence will conclusively show that the new rate should be approved. I hope the proceedings will be expedited to the fullest, in view of the many benefits that will accrue from the coal-to-Florida program.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL REGULATORY AGENCIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from some conversations I have held since I submitted my resolution earlier today, I recognize that there are those who believe that an investigation of the so-called independent agencies should not be conducted by the Senate, in view of the fact that such an investigation is now being conducted by the House of Representatives.

The submission of my resolution today has nothing to do with the fact that there has been a reorganization of the investigation on the House side and that the investigation there now will proceed under the direction of Representative HARRIS, of Arkansas. Yesterday I had a reassuring conversation with Representative HARRIS on this point, but it occurred subsequent to the announcement I made yesterday morning that I would press for a Senate investigation.

I wish to say that from what Representative HARRIS told me, I am satisfied that the House committee will make a thorough investigation and will endeavor to bring order into what I believe all would admit was a considerable amount of confusion in respect to the progress which was being made there in the investigation.

However, Mr. President, I believe that an investigation on the Senate side will prove to be of mutual assistance to the House, just as I believe that an investigation on the House side will prove to be of mutual assistance to the Senate. I am of that belief because of the many phases of the problem which need to be investigated. Therefore, I believe that independent investigations should be conducted by both Houses of the Congress.

It is my understanding that, under the able leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], last year a considerable amount of preliminary work was done with respect to a "look-see" investigation into the independent agencies. It is my further understanding, subject to correction if I am in error, that while our Senate committee was in the process of looking into the independent agencies, the House formally decided upon the investigation that became known as the Moulder investigation, and now the Harris investigation.

I think it is correct to say that a considerable amount of material that had already been collected on the Senate side was turned over to the House. At that time, it would appear, the position taken in this body was that the House investigation would be sufficient; and that may be, Mr. President, except perhaps for this one controlling fact which I believe places upon the Senate the obligation to go forward with an investi-

gation. It is that my telegrams and mail and telephone calls the last few days leave no room for doubt in my mind that the country is greatly concerned about what is happening in the administrative offices of this Government. I think the country is entitled to a dual investigation, and it is for that purpose that I propose to press for action on the part of the Senate and the leadership of the Senate in regard to this matter.

Mr. President, under circumstances that were not of my making, it happened that there came into my possession around midnight last Monday, certain papers that turned out to be Government papers within the jurisdiction, as I believed upon inspection, of the House of Representatives.

Those papers were delivered to my possession around midnight. I made very clear to those delivering them, after I conversed with them a few minutes, that those papers would have to go back to the House of Representatives. They were welcome to leave them in my apartment for safekeeping, and I would take jurisdiction over them, but I wanted it understood that those papers would go back to the House of Representatives. They were left at my apartment with that clear understanding.

Next morning, Tuesday morning, about 10:45 a. m., when I reached my office, I notified the office of the Speaker of the House that I had possession of such papers and that they were available to the House. Yesterday morning I had a conversation with the Speaker. Arrangements were made for the papers to be turned over to Representative HARRIS and Representative FLYNN at the noon hour. I think the papers actually left my apartment sometime after 1 p. m. Tuesday. I turned over to the two Representatives all the papers that Dr. Schwartz and his newspaper companions had left with me in the neighborhood of midnight Monday night.

When Mrs. Morse and I were not home on Tuesday, Mrs. Schwartz delivered to my apartment and turned over to our maid an envelope containing papers that I understood and believed were her personal papers. They were never put by the maid with the other papers, and I did not check those papers until a recent hour. Those papers have also been returned to Mr. HARRIS. When I got to the office this morning I told him those papers had been delivered to me in a separate envelope on Tuesday and that they were being sent to his office.

I want to comment on the contents of that envelope in one particular. I do it without criticism of anyone, but I do it for the RECORD. It is not for me to sit in judgment of anyone involved in this investigation, but in this separate delivery there were not only papers, but there was a wire recording. Mr. President, if my participation in this matter produced nothing else but proof, for my use, as to a practice that I abhor, then I shall always be pleased that I was used as a conduit in this very interesting instance, which I may say, as I have said to some of my colleagues, was

so fantastic that, if it had appeared in a Hollywood movie, no one would have believed it. But the record speaks for itself.

I am not, in these remarks, Mr. President, passing criticisms upon any individuals. I shall be very much surprised if any proof is ever offered that any member of the House committee was aware of this technique. I shall be very much surprised if this was not the idea of some individual staff member.

I want to serve notice that in the next few days I shall offer a bill which will make it completely clear that no investigator for any Congressional committee, at any time, under any circumstances, in regard to any matter, will ever be authorized to interview anyone, in or out of Government, and at the time of interview have concealed on him a recorder that is taking down the conversation unknown to the person being interviewed.

I simply cannot imagine, in a democracy, a situation of such a nature that can possibly justify the use of such a technique.

As the Senate knows, the practice violates all my convictions in regard to the doctrine of privacy. I do not believe the use of such a technique is ever necessary to get the facts, or is ever justified in getting the facts if that is the only way they can be obtained, because I happen to hold to the view that there are things worse than not being able to get the facts, and one of them is to adopt techniques that in my judgment violate personal privacy. I want the record to show that this is all I need to know. If it could happen once, it could happen many times in the future if something is not done to stop it. If it has happened once, who knows how many times it has happened heretofore?

That is all I am going to say about it, Mr. President. I sent the envelope that was delivered to my maid on Tuesday, with all of its contents, including this wire recording, to the House committee. I want to say that I hope that whatever the contents of that recording may prove to be, they will not be used in connection with any hearing involving the particular Government official who was thus tapped and his privacy thus invaded. I am against the invasion of anyone's privacy by any form of tapping.

I wanted to say that, because I think this is a clear illustration now to the Congress of the soundness of the position the senior Senator from Oregon has taken for some years in the Senate in opposition to all forms of wiretapping. I said once that what we needed was legislation which clearly made illegal all forms of wiretapping, and I was told we could not get such legislation passed. We are going to find out this session, Mr. President, because the Senate is going to have an opportunity to go all the way. I think now is the time for legislation to be introduced which will make it illegal for any form of wiretapping to be used in the administration of any phase of the Government of the United States. I shall never accept the theory that we have to use police-state methods in order

to catch certain people about whom we can get the facts in no other way.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to commend the Senator from Oregon for his observation that his desire to see the investigation continue is not meant in any way to interfere with or to cast any aspersion or insinuation upon the other body. The Members of the other body have a responsibility and an obligation, and they are going to assume it. The Senator from Oregon has been explicit on that point.

Mr. MORSE. May I interrupt the Senator at that point to say that I am satisfied the Members of the other body had no knowledge of the recording, because I read from the news ticker this comment:

Representative WILLIAMS, Democrat, of Mississippi, demanded to know why the committee had not been told previously of the existence of the recording.

That certainly makes clear in my mind that the members of the committee knew nothing about the recording.

Mr. CARROLL. I must say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I had reference to the entire investigation with which they are going to proceed.

May I say to my friend, the Senator from Oregon, that yesterday, before I knew the Senator was going to offer a resolution providing for a select Senate committee for investigation of this matter, I spent a considerable time with lawbooks to determine what, if any, jurisdiction the Senate Committee on the Judiciary had in this matter. I did not do so in a desire to interfere, to delay, to hinder, or to obstruct what the other body was doing in its investigation, but I desired to learn what might be done in the entire field of correcting some of the unethical practices which we have been hearing about for many years with reference to regulatory agencies. I wanted to study these agencies and the administrative law and administrative procedures under which they functioned.

I have come up with certain conclusions, but I certainly do not desire to interfere with the consideration of the resolution introduced by the Senator if the Senate desires to proceed independently on its own investigation.

Mr. MORSE. May I interrupt the Senator at that point?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I want to make perfectly clear that if the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Government Operations, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce agree among themselves as to which of these committees ought to go ahead with an investigation as a standing committee, I am perfectly willing to modify my resolution accordingly.

I am very frank to say to the Senator from Colorado that I introduced the resolution to provide for a select committee because I think that is an excel-

lent vehicle for such an investigation and, secondly, because I have been in the Senate long enough to know that it is rather difficult to get agreement among committees on jurisdictional matters. There is always a reticency or hesitation on the part of committees to give up what they consider may likely be their jurisdiction, because of the argument, "We cannot establish a bad precedent."

Of course, no bad precedent is established when the Senate as a body decides that because several committees have jurisdiction it is going to create what is known as a special or select committee.

May I say, while I am on this point, that there is one thing about the resolution which I want the press to understand. This resolution does not provide for one of the 50-50 committees. I am not a Member of the Senate who supports the policy of having committees where membership is equally divided between the parties.

I believe that whatever party is in the majority in the Senate has the majority responsibility. The majority party ought to insist upon having a majority of members on an investigating committee. My proposed select committee would not be a 50-50 committee. It would be a committee with a majority of Democrats on it, because I think the Democratic Party has a responsibility to the American people to conduct an investigation of alleged wrongdoing in the Eisenhower administration.

I have a sense of humor about it, although I see the tragedy of it, too. It was not so many years ago that a Democratic administration was being thoroughly pummeled by the other side of the aisle when the evidence was minute with regard to wrongdoing, compared with what I am satisfied is the wrongdoing of the present administration.

I think my party has an obligation to conduct a thorough investigation, with a committee on which there is a majority of Democrats, with all the minority rights reserved to Republicans, including their right to minority staff members to assist them. I think it is that kind of investigation which usually does the job. It is the kind of investigation which throughout our history has produced great cleanups in Government.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. There are standing committees with overlapping functions and overlapping jurisdictions. For example, it might be argued that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction over the approval of certain commissioners of regulatory agencies who are nominated by the President. It might be argued that the Government Operations Committee has jurisdiction, because it has to do with the economy and efficiency of the Government.

By the same token, the Judiciary Committee—and I offer this example only to stimulate the thinking not only of the Senator from Oregon, but of other

Senators who may read the RECORD—has complete jurisdiction in all judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, and jurisdiction over the Federal courts and judges. Among other matters over which it has jurisdiction are the revision and codification of statutes of the United States.

The question is, Does the Judiciary Committee have jurisdiction over quasi-judicial bodies? I contend that it does.

Twenty years ago, in 1939, Franklin Roosevelt created a commission to study the administrative procedures of a great and growing Nation. Since that time our economy has expanded from an \$80 billion national income to a national income of some \$360 billion. The Government has become the biggest business in the country.

I know that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon is not only an outstanding Senator, but an able lawyer. I had not intended to participate in this discussion until my attention was drawn by the mention of wiretapping.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator has participated.

Mr. CARROLL. What would happen if wiretapping occurred in the case of a Federal judge, or a judge of a State court, or a Supreme Court judge?

Mr. MORSE. Let me add to what the Senator says that the Administrative Procedures Act was the product of the commission appointed by President Roosevelt. My recollection is that that subject was under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly.

Mr. MORSE. So, in one sense, it could be said that the Judiciary Committee has a certain jurisdictional interest in any investigation which might be conducted with respect to the administrative bodies to which the Administrative Procedures Act applies.

Mr. CARROLL. Only recently the American Bar Association requested additional procedural rules and administrative law, and it is my understanding that a bill for that purpose now reposes in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The real point upon which I wish to comment has been emphasized by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. It is one thing to conduct an investigation into the question of malfeasance on the part of a particular individual. It is quite another thing to conduct an investigation into the appointment of individuals who are not passing upon small claims, as is very often done in State courts, but passing upon claims involving many millions of dollars. Such claims may involve not only individuals or industries, but sometimes entire communities.

For example, in the State of Colorado, we now have before the Federal Power Commission a case which has been decided against the company by an FPC trial examiner. The case involves some \$50 million. That case will be passed upon by the Commissioners. The Commissioners are appointed by the President.

The real point, which I do not believe has been sufficiently emphasized, is the fact that State courts, municipal courts,

and Federal courts are manned by lawyers, and the conduct of these lawyers, who have become judges, is regulated by statute in a very limited sense. A cursory examination of Federal laws discloses that, with respect to Federal judges, there is a law applying to bias and prejudice. Another statute applies to a judge who has a financial interest in a case. Still another statute deals with nepotism. However, through hundreds of years of tradition in the courts, there has developed a code of conduct which the judges must follow. For example, they must not confer privately with litigants in their chambers.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Oregon that apart from the specific acts of malfeasance, there is another category of offenses called misfeasance, or acts of omission. Acts of commission may be subject to investigation, but it seems to me that if we are to strike at the heart of the problem, we must begin to establish by statutory law standards for the conduct of the men who administer our laws.

Without criticism of Republicans, let me say that Democrats have been subjected to some criticism, too.

This question goes to the crux of the matter. That is why I am hopeful that the select committee, or the Judiciary Committee—which could very easily set up a new subcommittee—will go into the question of how to restore morality and good government and codes of ethical practices in the regulatory agencies which should be representing the people instead of some of the industries which they are supposed to regulate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I could not possibly agree more completely with the Senator from Colorado on any matter than I agree with the observations he has just made. I am glad he made them, because they bear directly upon a recommendation which I shall be making to the Senate in the not too distant future.

The other night, in a long conference which I was conducting with Mr. Berg, my administrative assistant, and Mr. Bernstein, who is counsel to a subcommittee of which I am chairman, we discussed exactly this point.

What is happening in our so-called independent agencies or administrative bodies is that they rely upon their separate rules and regulations, which they themselves have devised for governing their so-called professional conduct. That is fine. It is a good thing for them to do so. However, that does not relieve the Congress of the United States of the very responsibility which the Senator from Colorado has just pointed out.

In my opinion, long before this time we should have enacted a code of conduct binding upon the behavior of quasi-judicial officers serving in administrative tribunals. It is the old question of Caesar's wife being above suspicion. After all, the public judges Government agencies in no small measure by the extent to which they are free from suspicion.

There is much suspicion. This becomes a matter of cumulative effect. I am inclined to believe—at least I wish to believe, and I pray that this is the worst that can be shown—that the so-

called conflict of interest or misbehavior that may be developed by any investigation would be limited to rather minor affairs, which in and of themselves do not seem to be very important, but when they are repeated and repeated, over and over again, by various special interests in relationship to quasi-judicial officers, they place the officer and the agency under a cloud of suspicion. For example, Administrator X, serving on a regulatory body, speaks at a convention of a segment of the industry which is regulated by that body; the persons holding the convention pay his fare and the fare of his wife; they pay his hotel bill and the hotel bill of his wife, including the orchids; they give him wonderful hospitality, and expensive hospitality. Mr. President, that official can sit on that administrative tribunal, with that industry before him, and give an impartial judgment. I am satisfied of that. However, if there is an accumulation in the record of instances in which he engages in that kind of relationship with the people in an industry subject to the regulation of the body on which he sits, are we going to be shortsighted enough to think that he is going to meet the Caesar's wife maxim, that he can hope to keep himself above suspicion? I say that the public will become suspicious.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. As the Senator from Oregon knows, I have been a Member of the Senate for only 1 year. However I have had some experience in and around Washington, both by way of service in the House and in the executive branch of the Government.

I believe that if the President of the American Bar Association or if any member of the American Bar Association were asked today whether he could have a private conference in behalf of a litigant before one of the Commissioners of these important regulatory agencies, the answer would be yes. In other words, a custom and practice has grown up in regard to these agencies which I believe is detrimental to the public interest and to the private rights of a man. I believe something ought to be done about it. This is not a matter that has grown up only during the past year. It has been growing up over a period of years. That is why I say, no matter how desirable the House investigation may be, and no matter how desirable a special investigating committee may be for the time being, or for 6 months or 2 months, if we do not strike at the really cancerous condition beneath the surface, by promulgating some rules of conduct or a code of conduct which will call these people to account, something will happen again in a year or two.

We use the term quasi-judicial. The Commissioners of these regulatory agencies function in a judicial capacity, but they also function in a legislative capacity, because they promulgate rules and regulations. These positions call for a high type of individual who will know when he may talk about legislative business and when he must not talk to anybody about judicial decisions.

I am not sufficiently informed on this subject to say just what must be done. I have not had an opportunity to investigate this matter thoroughly. I worked on it yesterday, and have reached back into the books, trying to find precedents, to learn what is the jurisdiction of the various committees.

It must be remembered lawyers are not the only persons who have a high sense of ethics, or a high sense of morals in conduct of their profession. However, traditionally they have a great obligation placed upon them. Many times a technician sitting in a regulatory agency job does not understand the effect of years of litigation, and what a judge or a quasi-judge must or must not do.

Therefore, I believe an investigation into the conduct of quasi-judicial Commissioners would be helpful, even though it might not be as newsworthy as other investigations which are being conducted at the present time, valuable as they are.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe it would be helpful. I thank the Senator for his comment. It relates to the point that I was making, because we in Congress owe an obligation to these administrators which we have not fulfilled.

It is very easy to take the position that these administrators are doing what they want to do, or what they would prefer to do, in regard to the area we are discussing and in regard to their contracts with representatives of the industries they are regulating.

I have a hunch that they would throw their hats up in the air and figuratively shout "hurrah" if Congress were to pass legislation which left no room for doubt that, as the Senator has said, they could not have a personal conference with a lawyer and a litigant in regard to a case before the Commission; that they could not, for example, accept any form of hospitality of the representatives of any group that is going to be regulated; that we have laid down a rather strict code of professional conduct binding upon those administrative agencies; that when they received their confirmation from the Senate of the United States they knew that they automatically became bound by the code. I have a feeling that they would enthusiastically welcome such action.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Would the Senator from Oregon not say that they would welcome it, and that it might be good for Congress itself to be aware of such a code?

Mr. MORSE. I am coming to that in a moment. I have some suggestions to make with regard to Congressional behavior. I have felt this way for a good many years, and I will press my proposed legislation again.

However, I am talking now about people who hold quasi-judicial positions, who are not elected by ballot box voting; who are not elected officials but are appointed officials. I believe that we in Congress have the duty of providing them with legislation which will give them the direction in these matters they ought to have from us.

By singling out a specific incident, the situation takes on the appearance of being petty, minimus, and inconsequential; to wit: Who among us will say, if a member of a Commission accepts a couple of tickets for himself and his wife to My Fair Lady, and goes to the theater with the attorney, who may be a former bar acquaintance of the administrative officer, that there is any real justification for being suspicious as to whether any case that may be pending before the Commission within a short time will be voted upon by that Commissioner in any other manner than an impartial manner?

I am not going to be one who would say that the Commissioner could not do that and still be impartial. However, I will say that, outside of what the Senator from Colorado and I, as lawyers, know are the formal programs of a bar association meeting, where we come in contact with judges during those programs, and have the social relationships that go along with a convention dance or a convention banquet, or go along with other entertainment features of the convention itself, at which we move and have our being in the full view of all the other members of the convention, except for situations such as that, the out-of-the-court-room and the out-of-the-administrative-hearing-room relationship between an official and representatives of litigants and the litigants themselves should be one of arms' length.

I think it has to be that way if we expect to keep our Commissions, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that a practice has grown up—perhaps it is not true in Oregon, and perhaps not in Colorado—in which special pleading is conducted before the regulatory bodies, and Senators or Representatives are expected by certain constituents to attempt to influence the decision? Does the Senator from Oregon desire to comment on that situation?

Mr. MORSE. I have had a few—and I am proud to say only a few—constituents in 13 years whom I have had to help to educate along that line. But it is interesting that the Senator from Colorado should mention it today, because only yesterday morning I spent more than an hour in the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics with a constituent, with my administrative assistant, and with a member of the staff of the Select Committee on Small Business. We were there to discuss whether or not in the Pacific Northwest the Military Establishment was following a course of action which could be justified in view of the allegations which are being presented to the Oregon delegation that the States of Oregon and Washington are being discriminated against.

I asked for that appointment. In my 13 years in the Senate, I have never asked an administrative officer of the Government to come to my office, I may say in passing, because I used to sit in the executive branch of the Government and get telephone calls from irate Senators

and Representatives who, not too politely, said, "Get yourself up here." I would come to their offices, sit down, and listen to their complaints about what they considered to be the injustices of the War Labor Board.

I learned some very valuable lessons from those experiences. On the basis of those lessons, I resolved, when I came to the Senate, that when I had business with executive officials involving the interests of my State, I would go to them. The people in the administrative offices are just as busy as I am, and merely because I am a Senator I have no right, as we say, to drag them up by the heels. I resolved that I would go and talk to them entirely on one major premise, namely, the merits of my case.

I have always made it clear, as I did yesterday morning, that unless the evidence as presented by my constituents stands up on its merits, they are not entitled to a favorable decision; and I am just as much interested in the welfare of my country as a whole as I am in the welfare of my State. I made it clear yesterday morning that Oregon is not entitled to a thing that it cannot justify, on the merits, in regard to this matter under the jurisdiction of the Defense Department. We presented our case on that basis.

I mention this because the Senator from Colorado and I, and all the other Members of the Senate, too, have an obligation to make clear to our constituents that they have a stake in good government. We have no right, when they let a selfish interest of theirs blind themselves to the practice of good government, to support them in that myopia.

I may say, in behalf of the administrative agencies and departments of the Government, that I have found that when a person has a case on the merits, he can be pretty certain that he will win. It is very easy for people to get the notion that in the various administrative departments and agencies of the Government, such as the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and others, someone is constantly at work to see how much injustice he can do. Mistakes in judgment may be made; but, by and large, I am perfectly willing to testify that most of the time I feel the decisions I have received on Oregon problems have been decisions made on the merits. It has sometimes taken me longer than I had hoped to produce sufficient evidence to convince the particular body which had the right to make the decision that our case was meritorious; but this illustrates the very point which the Senator from Colorado is making.

I agree with him that we in Congress have no right to use what amounts, in common parlance, to political pressure in order to get something for our States, if on the merits our States do not deserve it.

Mr. CARROLL. I can understand, sometimes, the political pressure brought to bear on economic questions; but my question was really directed to what affects the property rights of the individuals, some of which may serve our own areas. But when we violate that

rule, we deprive someone else of those rights.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. They would no more think of asking a Member of Congress to go into a court in Washington to influence a judge than they would back home.

The quasi-judicial bodies, in an expanding population and an expanding economy, need competent persons, with high mental ability and complete integrity, persons who will draw the line as to what people can do and what they must not do to influence litigation.

I know that the Senator from Oregon wishes to proceed with his speech. He is making an excellent presentation. I say only this in conclusion: I do not profess to know about wire recording or wiretapping, but 20 years ago when I was district attorney in Denver, there was such a case. A microphone had been placed in the executive chambers of the Governor of Colorado. The persons who were involved were well intentioned. They thought they were going to save the community. But by their action they did more harm to themselves and to the community because all of them were later convicted in a court of law.

Wiretapping is not the proper way to expose misconduct. The way to do it is to continue to throw the spotlight of Congressional and law-enforcing agencies on misconduct in such a way that all persons can understand what is happening.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon for expressing his faith and confidence in Speaker RAYBURN, under whom I served for two terms. Speaker RAYBURN is the father of many of the regulatory bodies. I know personally how he feels. He wants them to be staffed by persons of integrity. He has watched these agencies grow, and I know he wants them administered according to the highest code of ethics.

However, I feel the time has come to have a full-blown investigation to strengthen the procedures followed in quasi-judicial agencies, to clarify and strengthen the policy of the Government, and to inform fully those who pass judgment on issues of vital interest to the Nation what is the code of ethics to be observed in quasi-judicial proceedings.

Mr. MORSE. I support the last statement of the Senator from Colorado. I am satisfied that both Speaker RAYBURN and Representative HARRIS have become rightfully concerned about, shall I say, the mess that has developed in connection with the investigation of the independent agencies. As they have said to the press, they are determined to see to it that on the House side a thorough investigation is made of the problem.

I think that similar proceedings should be instituted by the Senate, because I think we have a joint responsibility in the matter.

The Senator from Colorado made reference to the obligation of Members of Congress, also, to follow a code of professional conduct which will remove Congress from unjustifiable suspicion. I quite agree. My colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER],

has discussed this question on many occasions. I find myself in complete agreement with him that there is need for some legislation. For many years I have introduced in the Senate at each session, and shall press for it again at this session, proposed legislation which would require that there be a public disclosure of the source of income and the amount of income of all Members of Congress and of all members of Government agencies who receive a salary of \$10,000 or more. I believe there is no substitute for full public disclosure. The voters are entitled to be the judges as to whether there is any relationship, direct or indirect, between the record of a Member of Congress in respect to issues and the sources of his income.

They should be allowed to be the judges of whether there is any relationship, either direct or indirect, between the decisions made by one sitting on one of the regulatory bodies and the sources and amounts of his income.

Anyone who does not want such public information about his income to exist should not run for office. If he does not want to live in a glass house, so to speak, he should stay back home. I believe such a reform would be very helpful.

Congress should enact legislation along other lines of reform. Today there is not on the statute books adequate legislation to protect the people in the case of campaign contributions. That is another point which my colleague from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has discussed frequently. Just recently he did so, in a speech he made in Washington. I hope that at this session the Congress will pass some of the proposed legislation—which still is pending in committee—which seeks at least to improve that situation.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I have been very much interested in the Senator's remarks. I am particularly anxious, as he is, to have the Congress enact legislation setting up codes, so to speak, to be applicable to the quasi-judicial, independent agencies, as well as to all other departments of the Government.

I had some experience with travel and travel pay, when I served as an officer of the State Department. In the State Department, the numerous Presidential appointees were not permitted to travel to make speeches, unless they traveled at Government expense. For instance, if Under Secretary of State Murphy or if one of the Assistant Secretaries of State was requested to address the National Council of Churches at Cleveland, Ohio, or at Los Angeles, Calif., if he made the speech as an officer of the State Department, despite the fact that during some of those years the Department had a very limited budget to be used for travel expenses, the trip had to be made at Government expense, and the officer had to travel on a per diem allowance. That was a matter of State Department rule, not a matter of law. I believe that

rule has existed in the State Department for some time.

So I believe we are faced with a challenge in connection with this matter. I hope the Congress will enact legislation which will remove any question as to whether it will be proper or correct for a Member of Congress to be paid to make a speech. I hope that determination will be made by law.

I commend the Senator from Oregon for his discussion of this subject.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky and I had an interesting experience, this fall, in connection with this subject. Since that time I have not discussed the matter with him. However, I made a report on it to the Foreign Relations Committee. He and I, together with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], made a trip to India. In the course of that trip, there were placed upon me some responsibilities rather different from those which were placed upon my very able colleague, the Senator from Kentucky, and my very able colleague, the Senator from Kansas. As I said at the breakfast yesterday morning, at the conference both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Kansas made fine records, which I think were of great credit to our country.

As chairman of the group, I had the responsibility of signing the vouchers. As the Senator from Kentucky knows, we traveled most economically. However, I encountered one problem which will be of interest to both the Senator from Kentucky and to the Senate as a whole: I was surprised to find that some of our embassies and some of our consulates were so short of representation funds that the ambassadors or consuls general would pay from their own pockets the expenses of what actually were official representation functions or affairs. As one of them said to me, it would have been a matter of comment if such affairs had not been held. I said to the Foreign Relations Committee that I did not think a consul general or an ambassador should be called upon to pay from his own pocket for such functions.

One of them provided the necessary funds to the subordinates on his staff, because he said, his salary was larger than theirs. So when the agricultural attaché, for instance, had to go to a village, to participate in a function there, if our program was to be successful, the consul general paid the expenses out of his own pocket.

In the course of our trip, we participated in some affairs which I knew would otherwise be paid for out of the pockets of our embassy or consulate officials. However, I had authority to draw upon counterpart funds, in order to pay the bill; and that is exactly what I did. I am glad I did so. I reported the matter to the Foreign Relations Committee. It would have been most improper in my judgment, for the bill to be paid in that instance by the consul general.

Furthermore, as some Senators have heard me say on the floor of the Senate, I believe we should put the counterpart

funds to use, anyway, in the case of particular governmental activities. So that is what I did.

But as the Senator from Kentucky has stated, this matter relates to the need for a complete review of the entire question of expense allowances and per diem allowances—which, I believe, are far too small in some instances—and the entire question, as the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, of the making of speeches for honoraria. In a moment I shall have something to say about that, in the case of Members of Congress.

It seems to me there is a need at this session of Congress to make a complete review of the entire field of so-called professional conduct on the part of Government officials.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. On the subject of representation allowances, I hope we shall take a more realistic approach to that matter, in connection with our handling of the State Department appropriation this year. As the Senator from Oregon knows, the Senate has considerable trouble with the other body on that appropriation. The Senate has traditionally allowed a larger amount of funds for that purpose, but in conference the conferees on the part of the Senate have had to yield to the conferees on the part of the House.

I can state that when the time came for the big Fourth of July party to be given, one of the military attachés—for either the Air Force, the Navy, or the Army—often volunteered to pay the check, or a major portion of it, for the Ambassador's party.

Just think of a situation in which our ambassador, the official representative of the United States in a country—has to accept from one of our service attachés the stipend with which to pay for the Fourth of July reception for the American nationals who reside in that particular country.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to hear that statement by the Senator from Kentucky. When that matter comes up this year, I shall be able to present some testimony to the Foreign Relations Committee; and I know the Senator from Kentucky will join me in the presentation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe I understand the position of the Senator from Oregon and my good friend, the Senator from Kentucky, on this matter.

I happen to be a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I am sure the Congress does not provide sufficient amounts of representation money in order to allow our official representatives to carry out this function. I am one of those who take that view. Our Foreign Service is a good one. One has to travel in the field to realize that best.

In Buenos Aires our country was represented by a man who could afford to pay the entertainment expenses. However, in the majority of cases either the consul general, the Ambassador, or

whatever other official represents the United States, cannot afford to pay the bills. Generally he is a career man who has risen from the ranks.

At Buenos Aires the British had \$100,000 for representation money. But, although for years the United States has been sending money to the British, our Ambassador to Great Britain had, for representation purpose, only \$5,000.

I have seen the late Josephus Daniels entertain possibly 1,500 American citizens at the United States Embassy in Mexico City. Someone had to pay the bill, but I know it could not have been paid with the representation money our Government was allowing. So I agree fully with both Senators.

Incidentally, I agree completely with what the Senator from Oregon has in mind at the moment. I shall join him in voting for the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Speaking now as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. President, I wish to say that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], as a member of the Appropriations Committee, has always been of great help to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee when they have appeared before his committee to present this representation problem. I thank him for his assistance.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

FULL PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF SOURCES AND AMOUNTS OF INCOME OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CERTAIN OTHER OFFICIALS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is one other phase of this subject I had not intended to discuss this afternoon but it was raised by the distinguished Senator from Colorado. In the interest of a rounded discussion, I should discuss it. I have already said I think there should be full public disclosure of the sources and amounts of income of Members of Congress, as well as of other officials of Government who receive salaries of \$10,000 or more.

In some of the radiocasts and televisioncasts and news comments of recent days, there has been a discussion of the propriety of quasi-judicial officers accepting honoraria for speeches they make while serving on the bench, and speeches before conventions of groups that may be subject to the regulations of the particular commission concerned. Say these radio commentators, "What about Senators and what about Representatives?" Well, I think that my public-disclosure bill would certainly put the public in a position so that it could answer the question, "What about them?"

But I do wish to point out that there is a great deal of difference between holding an elective office and holding an appointive office. When one is appointed to an office, he is appointed to that position as his full-time occupation. That is his job. The salary designated is the one that goes with the posi-

tion. I think it can be said quite correctly that under those circumstances he should confine himself to the office to which he has been appointed; and it should be recognized, so far as the use of his time is concerned, as his full-time job in respect to income. A man elected to an elective office in the Congress of the United States has never in our history been understood to be one who was elected to a so-called full-time job in the sense that he is not free, within his ability in performing the obligations of his office, to supplement his income from other sources.

Many Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate maintain their positions in law offices, subject only to the rule of ethics of our profession that they shall not participate in any case involving a Federal question which might involve a so-called conflict of interest with their position in the Congress. Some of us in the legal profession who are in the Congress have taken the position that we would not maintain any financial connection with our law offices while we sat in Congress, but would become, if we were to maintain any connection with the law office, counsel to that office, which means there would be no participation at all in the economic activities and there would be no participation in the cases of the office. That was the position I took for some years here in the Senate, until I finally decided that I would go even a step further and resign from my law firm, which I did.

But, Mr. President, this particular job in the Congress carries with it a great many obligations, including the obligation of political education. I look upon my position pretty much as a teaching job. As an elected officer of the people of my State, it seems to me I have an obligation to inform the people in regard to the problems of Government as I see those problems. Therefore I, like a good many other of my colleagues, from time to time give lectures before universities, union conventions, employer conventions, service clubs, chambers of commerce, and other organizations, in which instances on some occasions an honorarium is received, which is, of course, a matter of public knowledge. If the law I propose should be enacted, everyone in my State will be the judge as to whether or not the supplementing of my income, by lectures or by articles, which some of us from time to time write, in any way gives rise to conflict with my duties here in the Senate.

As the present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. CARROLL] well knows, many of us here are, by and large, men without other sources of income than our Congressional salaries. The books are perfectly clear. We could not do what we should try to do if we did not supplement our incomes to some extent, unless we were willing to cut down on our senatorial work, which would mean cutting down some of the expenses in connection with our telegraph and telephone bills, and the like. I opposed a salary increase for Members of Congress because it has been my opinion that there should be legislation enacted so that it would not be necessary for Members of Congress to use out-of-pocket money for carrying on

the duties of one's office, but that there should be a publicly disclosed expense account sufficiently high to cover the actual expenses of serving as a Member of Congress, so that one would not have to do extra work in order to pay for the cost of performing his service as a Member of Congress.

I have discussed this question at other times in the Senate, but I wanted to bring it up at this time because of an editorial which appeared in the Grants Pass Courier. That is not a Morse paper, as most of the papers in Oregon are not, but that paper contained a scurrilous editorial which commented on the fact that I had been out to Oregon recently and had spoken at a Democratic rally in Portland, Ore. The question was raised, "Did the Government pay his expenses?"

Of course, I pointed out the Government had never paid my expenses on any trip that was not an official Government trip. If I took a trip that was an official Government trip, which this last one was, but did not limit myself entirely to Government business, then I paid my own expenses, as I did on this last occasion. On this last trip to Oregon, I carried out a pledge made last fall to inspect, with the Army engineers, the Reedsport Harbor at Reedsport, Ore. It was impossible for me to do it in December because I was in India with my friend from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who has arrived on the floor, and about whom I made remarks a few minutes ago with respect to the magnificent work which he and the Senator from Kentucky performed at the Inter-Parliamentary Conference at New Delhi. My trip to Reedsport had to be postponed, and I went to Oregon a while ago to keep that commitment. But I did not make it an official Government trip, as I could have, because I had accepted invitations to speak, while in Oregon, before three Democratic meetings. I did not feel I could ethically justify collecting any money from the Federal Government for a trip devoted in part to political activities.

For the benefit of this anti-Morse editor at Grants Pass, Ore., I told him I wanted him to know where I did get the money, because he seemed to think I was doing right well, if the Government did not pay my expenses, if I could take such a costly aircraft trip back home.

May I say the reactionary forces in Oregon hope I will stay broke, because they feel that is the best way to keep me in Washington so every time I do fly back to mend the fences, as we say, some anti-Morse editor raises the question, "Where did he get the money?"

So I satisfied the curiosity of this editor in a letter yesterday by pointing out that my ticket was paid for, along with reasonable travel expenses, by the Democratic Party of Long Beach, Calif., which I addressed on my way back from Oregon. I was told that was the largest Democratic banquet ever held in Long Beach, Calif., which I thought was pretty good, in view of the fact that the banquet was a fund-raising banquet at a cost of \$10 a plate.

I felt somewhat in this rather facetious mood because of the trend this dis-

cussion has taken, but now, in all dead seriousness, I say, Mr. President, I do hope that in this session of Congress we shall pass legislation which will make the financial activities of Members of Congress and other Government officials who receive \$10,000 or more a year a matter of public disclosure.

Mr. President, I now desire to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

OIL FOR EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss now oil for education. This is not a new subject for me on the floor of the Senate. I remember that I discussed it once for 22 hours and 26 minutes. The Press Gallery may relax. I expect to discuss the subject now only about 20 minutes.

Certain happenings in Texas of recent days have intensified my interest in this subject. We have not solved the problem of oil for education yet in regard to the Continental Shelf.

Perhaps the single, most outstanding issue which has earned for the Eisenhower administration the title of a "give-away" administration has been the issue of the submerged lands, the jurisdiction over lands off our shores beyond the mark of lowest tides.

This historic fight will be remembered from its relationship to the education of our boys and girls. When oil, sulfur, and other minerals were discovered under the sea off California and in the Gulf of Mexico it was proposed that the money from the rents, royalties, and bonuses payable to the Government under development leases be used for the improvement of the Nation's schools.

This was the famous oil-for-education amendment, and I have been proud to be one of its sponsors and among its most vigorous advocates. Devoting this revenue from the wealth in our public lands to education would have been in line with the Land Ordinance of 1785, which reserved one lot in every township in the Northwest Territory for support of the schools within the township and it would have been in keeping with the Morrill Act of 1862, whereby institutions of higher learning received areas of public land to manage, together with whatever proceeds the land brought in, to improve and expand their facilities. These became the great land-grant colleges and universities of today.

The oil-for-education proposal would have continued this principle of using the public lands for support of education.

It was a proposal that bore the name of the great Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and is commonly referred to as the Hill amendment.

I digress to pay tribute to the great Senator from Alabama, who during his years in the Senate has been one of the finest educational statesmen of America, because in the field of education we have pressed, and pressed hard, for legislation which would bring to the boys and girls of America those educational opportunities they must have if America is to carry out that great tenet of Thomas

Jefferson, namely, that a democracy can be no stronger than the enlightenment of its people, and their enlightenment in no small measure is determined by the quality of their education system. That is why the great giveaway that occurred when the Eisenhower administration sided with the States in their claim to ownership out to the 3-mile limit was a severe blow to our education system.

As a matter of fact, the giveaway pledge was given before Eisenhower ever took office. It was given while Eisenhower and the late Senator Taft were still the major candidates for the Republican nomination. Shortly before the convention, General Eisenhower sent a wire to one of his leading Texas supporters, Houston oilman H. J. Porter. In it he said:

I see no conflict in this responsibility [for national resources essential to the national security] which interferes with the vesting of title of tidelands in the States.

As President, Eisenhower followed up that campaign promise to the Texas oilman by backing legislation recognizing State jurisdiction out to what they claim as their boundaries, thus overriding the Supreme Court decision which had declared the Federal interest there to be paramount.

However, those of us who wanted to reaffirm the Federal supremacy in the submerged lands and use the income for education felt we had scored a partial victory when the Senate passed the oil-for-education amendment as applied to lands beyond the State claims. But the administration still was not satisfied. It put great pressure on Republican Senators to change their stand and oppose oil-for-education so the bill as passed by the House omitting this feature would be approved.

So it was that the schoolchildren of America were not permitted to benefit even from the oil in the outer Continental Shelf, because the bill that came back from the House did not include the Hill amendment applied to the outer Continental Shelf; and, as is well known now, the conference report was adopted in the Senate by a bare majority vote of two. That majority vote was represented by two Republican votes, which were changed after White House pressure was put upon those Republicans.

When the bill was before the Senate, those Senators made perfectly clear that they were for the oil-for-education amendment, but they subsequently publicly acknowledged—or one of them, on behalf of the two, publicly acknowledged—that they had changed their position after the White House had put telephonic pressure upon them. In other words, they voted contrary to what they said were their expressed convictions.

These royalties, rents, and bonuses from mineral leases in the outer continental shelf have totaled \$294,305,090. That is the sum that our education system could have been using to teach physics, math, and history, for example, to our boys and girls, had not the White House gone to special trouble to prevent final adoption of the Hill amendment.

Recently, another chapter in the give-away has been opened. Part of the Federal income under the Outer Continental Shelf Act has been impounded, pending the outcome of a new court case in which the States have renewed their efforts to gain control out to 10½ miles. The States bordering the Gulf of Mexico have again laid claim to submerged land out to what they called their historic boundaries, even though the Supreme Court ruled against them in 1948 and 1950. The money from leases already granted in this disputed region amounts to \$113,460,587. The future income from leases in this area will amount to many times that.

The Justice Department has asked the Supreme Court to rule once more on these State claims and put an end to the issue once and for all. Initially, it asked the Court to restate its earlier decisions that no State, or even national, boundaries can extend more than 3 miles from land.

But the President has now reversed his Justice Department. Once again he stated his view in a communication to his Texas oil friend, Mr. Porter. He wrote him a letter in December, saying that it has been and still is my considered view that Texas should have the right to explore and exploit those submerged lands which extend seaward of her coastline into the Gulf of Mexico for a distance of 3 marine leagues or 10½ miles.

It is astonishing to me that Mr. Eisenhower can continue to disregard, and in fact, oppose, a ruling on this matter by the Supreme Court of the United States not only as a candidate but as President. As President, as Chief Executive, he has no higher duty than to protect and defend the interest of the American people. In fact, his Solicitor General had already appeared before the court to claim for the United States exclusive possession of and full dominion and power over the lands, minerals and other things underlying the Gulf of Mexico lying more than 3 miles from land. Yet, in a letter to his Texas oil friend and supporter H. J. Porter, the President says he is willing to have the United States Government forgo that claim. With it, the United States Government would also forgo the future income from the wealth in those lands, wealth which still might be put to the critical needs of our educational system.

Thanks to the administration's opposition to the oil-for-education amendment, \$180,844,503 out of oil revenues that might have gone into the school system have instead gone into general Treasury funds. Now, with the remaining \$113,460,587 still held in a special fund as a result of the State-Federal lawsuit, Mr. Eisenhower is taking a position that puts this amount in jeopardy of being lost entirely to the American public. What he is in fact asking the Supreme Court to do is to find different seaward boundaries for different States; he is suggesting that the court should fix the boundary of Texas at 10½ miles even though the Federal boundary is only 3 miles from land. Of course, the Supreme Court has already refused to do this.

In addition to the unreasonableness of such a determination, and in addition to his failure to press the interest of the American people, the President is demonstrating a failure to understand the importance of education in today's world.

America can no longer afford to take the position that elementary and secondary education is solely the responsibility of State and local governments. The advances in science and engineering by the Soviet Union, surpassing in many fields what we are able to accomplish, put education right up at the head of the list with all defense expenditures. Financial aid to the States from the Federal Government is, in my opinion, among the most urgent defense measures we must take.

This administration has many failures for which it must account to the people, and to the judgment of history. But none is more serious in its implications than the administration's failure to understand that the Russian sputniks are but the culmination of an education program in Russia that has been going on for at least 10 years, but which we have tried to ignore. I am deeply concerned by the administration's failure even now to understand that education in America should be supported financially by the Federal Government as a measure of national defense.

The Eisenhower record on education and oil revenues for its support which I have outlined demonstrates that these are regarded instead as points for political bargaining. Oil and money belonging to the American people have been traded for political support. That is the blunt truth of the situation.

We know how this Texas oilman, Mr. Porter, works. He made it very clear in the letter which was published in the Washington Post the other morning when he sought Republican participation in a dinner down in Texas at \$100 a plate, in order to do honor to a Republican leader he felt had been of great help to Texas.

Any Republican or Democrat has my respect when, as a matter of conviction, he takes the position which this great Republican leader has taken on the gas-and-oil question. I wish to make that perfectly clear in these remarks. However, I have no respect for the H. J. Porters. It is people like them who seek to bring undue influence to bear upon the democratic process in America for their selfish economic advantage.

It is they who, in my judgment, by what they consider to be their operations within the law, represent what amounts in fact to a course of action which can best be described as political immorality.

I happen to hold to the opinion that the activity of the President's Texas oil friend, Mr. H. J. Porter, in regard to the \$100-a-plate dinner in Texas the other night has killed the gas bill. I pray that that is true. I pray that this year, on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats alike will say, "This is just too stinking for us." There is a stench, Mr. President. The odor will not be removed by passing the \$100,000 around from one Republican campaign organization to another. The odor will

not be removed if the national committee refuses to take it, but a committee to elect Congressional candidates does take it.

We now know the kind of political game H. J. Porter plays. He had his hand deep in the mire in connection with the oil-for-education program. He has his hand deep in the mire in regard to the question of the gas bill. I am perfectly satisfied as to what the overwhelming majority of the American people will say about the situation. There is something that tells me that Members of Congress will take note of that public resentment.

Let me say, in conclusion, that this is not a thing of the past, as evidenced by the communication of the President with his Texas oil friend. It is still going on. At a time when our education needs are the greatest, the President is still intent upon giving away our best means of meeting them.

I shall continue to raise my voice against this cynical political bargaining. I shall continue to support the oil-for-education proposal, and in fact, I shall continue to work for Federal grants to the States for education. A higher standard in education is a critical defense and foreign policy need of the Nation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if there is nothing further to come before the Senate—

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 13, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1040. An act to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940; and

S. 2920. An act to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, under the previous order, until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 17, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 13 (legislative day of February 10), 1958:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Donald E. Kelley, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 31, 1958.

Don A. Tabbert, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years, vice Jack Chapler Brown, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Archie M. Meyer, of Arizona, to be United States marshal for the district of Arizona for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires April 2, 1958.

Tom Kimball, of Colorado, to be United States marshal for the district of Colorado for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 6, 1958.

Vernon Woods, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 6, 1958.

Roy McKinney Amos, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indiana for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 31, 1957.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of sections 8306 and 8307, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Archie J. Old, Jr., 605A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Edward H. Underhill, 421A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Daniel F. Callahan, 579A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John P. McConnell, 611A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr., 624A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William O. Senter, 648A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William T. Hefley, 353A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. George E. Price, 475A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Donald N. Yates, 584A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frank A. Bogart, 585A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Ernest Moore, 586A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Jacob E. Smart, 592A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joe W. Kelly, 612A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert H. Terrill, 628A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Gabriel P. Disosway, 654A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Donald P. Graul, 455A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Donald J. Keirn, 462A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Troup Miller, Jr., 559A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Alfred F. Kalberer, 607A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Romulus W. Puryear, 637A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas S. Moorman, Jr., 644A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles W. Schott, 949A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin J. Webster, 974A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William T. Thurman, 1034A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John B. Cary, 1055A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William M. Canterbury, 1071A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Leighton I. Davis, 1111A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James H. Walsh, 1120A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Musgrave, Jr., 1129A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William T. Hudnell, 1171A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Moody R. Tidwell, Jr., 1553A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., 1211A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Richard H. Carmichael, 1214A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph J. Nazzaro, 1241A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John D. Stevenson, 1320A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, 1336A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Maurice A. Preston, 1337A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John D. Ryan, 1418A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William H. Blanchard, 1445A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Henry R. Spicer, 1487A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John S. Hardy, 1502A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. T. Alan Bennett, 1513A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James Ferguson, 1530A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. David Wade, 1582A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity, 1613A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Clyde H. Mitchell, A0263935, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Wilford F. Hall, 19026A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Brig. Gen. William L. Kennedy, 517A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James H. Wallace, 442A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Daniel C. Doubleday, 471A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles B. Dougher, 600A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Stanley T. Wray, 608A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John R. Sutherland, 617A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Albert T. Wilson, Jr., 1086A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Dolf E. Muehleisen, 1144A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles M. McCorkle, 1224A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Don O. Darrow, 1270A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Victor R. Haugen, 1292A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Sam W. Agee, 1346A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Broadhurst, 1350A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles B. Westover, 1351A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Don R. Ostrander, 1343A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ben I. Funk, 1500A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harold E. Watson, 1520A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Marvin C. Demler, 1550A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry Viccellio, 1728A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James V. Edmundson, 1863A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Charles A. Piddock, 625A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert J. Goewey, 910A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph F. Delaney, 998A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lee W. Fulton, 1107A, Regular Air Force.

Col. L. Render Braswell, 19065A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Gordon H. Austin, 1207A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William S. Steele, 1229A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John H. Jeffus, 1289A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ivan W. McElroy, 1338A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ernest H. Beverly, 1590A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert B. Miller, 1646A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John A. McDavid, 1652A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert E. Greer, 1672A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Perry M. Holsington 2d, 1694A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Melvin F. McNickle, 1891A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William R. Large, Jr., 1919A, Regular Air Force.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Foster B. Jones, Ashville, Ala., in place of I. E. Hodges, retired.
 Aaron Glinnie Weaver, Bay Minette, Ala., in place of C. T. Smith, retired.
 Blonnie R. Parker, Chase, Ala., in place of T. W. Naugher, retired.
 John C. Justice, Jr., Childersburg, Ala., in place of F. G. Rowland, retired.
 George S. Thomas, Eufaula, Ala., in place of L. J. Clayton, Jr., transferred.
 James E. Hughes, Jr., Geneva, Ala., in place of L. P. Adair, resigned.
 David L. Capps, Luverne, Ala., in place of W. M. Moore, retired.
 Gertrude J. McClurkin, Mount Meigs, Ala., in place of T. F. Raoul, resigned.
 Harold E. Carroll, Mulga, Ala., in place of T. W. Brock, removed.
 Woodward E. Davis, Selma, Ala., in place of C. S. Robbins, retired.
 Robert N. White, Valley Head, Ala., in place of E. A. Tatum, retired.
 John T. Davidson, Vinegar Bend, Ala., in place of J. T. Baxter, retired.
 William L. Glenn, Wetumpka, Ala., in place of Frank Poole, transferred.
 Gatewood M. Hatcher, York, Ala., in place of Maggie Winningham, retired.

ALASKA

Irene A. Begin, Aniak, Alaska, in place of Ernest Krinby, deceased.

ARKANSAS

William McKinley Huddleston, Batesville, Ark., in place of E. F. Crutchfield, transferred.
 Donald H. Travis, Judsonia, Ark., in place of W. H. Hembree, retired.
 Ruby R. Ryan, Magazine, Ark., in place of G. O. Thomasson, deceased.
 James R. McClure, Nashville, Ark., in place of J. B. Hill, deceased.
 James H. Creed, Rison, Ark., in place of J. G. Mosley, retired.
 Chester A. Garrett, State Hospital, Ark., in place of E. R. Moss, retired.
 Norman L. Wilson, Stephens, Ark., in place of F. H. Bond, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Muriel A. Graham, Bayside, Calif., in place of N. E. Johnson, retired.
 Claude B. Hetherington, Calexico, Calif., in place of J. G. Carroll, retired.
 Ellis H. Litynsky, Campbell, Calif., in place of I. H. Grim, retired.
 Fred G. Strong, Carmel, Calif., in place of F. J. Mylar, deceased.
 Darrel Lawrence Borgan, Claremont, Calif., in place of Jerome Beatty, retired.
 Robert H. Kingham, Felton, Calif., in place of O. W. Parkison, retired.
 Beulah M. Clark, Hercules, Calif., in place of A. Y. Brown, retired.
 Phillip W. Holmes, Littleriver, Calif., in place of E. F. Marks, retired.
 Wilbur H. Hartwell, Loyalton, Calif., in place of L. M. Hartwell, removed.
 Donald E. Rothrock, Mira Loma, Calif., in place of F. E. Watson, resigned.
 Robert T. Sheldon, Paradise, Calif., in place of B. L. Hunt, retired.
 Grace E. Shilling, Planada, Calif., in place of F. A. Osterhout, deceased.
 Freda H. Burgess, Rio Dell, Calif., in place of L. A. Ingraham, removed.
 Jack O. Starnes, Romoland, Calif., in place of B. E. Colahan, deceased.
 Alice E. Kitzelman, Running Springs, Calif., in place of A. M. Robertson, resigned.
 John H. Brass, Santa Maria, Calif., in place of Louis Sibillo, retired.
 Marion R. Hobbs, Soquel, Calif., in place of J. J. Mollinet, removed.
 Joseph R. Stanich, Sunnyvale, Calif., in place of H. E. Van Cleve, removed.

Silas A. Schellenger, Sutter, Calif., in place of S. R. McLean, retired.
 Robert J. Bloodgood, Twentynine Palms, Calif., in place of R. A. McWaid, resigned.
 Earl H. Chamberlain, Vacaville, Calif., in place of H. M. Talbot, retired.
 Fred W. Linneman, Watsonville, Calif., in place of F. H. Jenkins, deceased.

COLORADO

Ivan K. Clarke, Dupont, Colo., in place of S. M. Kinsall, resigned.
 Leon V. Beck, Fleming, Colo., in place of A. C. Bledsoe, transferred.
 Franklin B. Sample, New Castle, Colo., in place of C. M. Burrell, deceased.
 Clarence M. Godfrey, Walsh, Colo., in place of C. E. Raney, deceased.
 Harry B. Casten, Windsor, Colo., in place of G. A. May, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Horace Edward Leonard, Durham, Conn., in place of J. A. Jackson, removed.
 Charles W. Lindsay, Fairfield, Conn., in place of W. M. O'Dwyer, retired.
 Elsie H. Hatfield, Bear, Del., in place of H. E. Burris, deceased.

DELAWARE

Aubrey W. Pugh, Hockessin, Del., in place of C. J. Gormley, deceased.

FLORIDA

J. B. Benson, Chipley, Fla., in place of T. M. Love, resigned.

GEORGIA

James P. Burroughs, Colbert, Ga., in place of M. R. Leard, deceased.
 George T. Holloway, Midville, Ga., in place of R. H. Smith, resigned.

IDAHO

Robert H. Braithwaite, Arco, Idaho, in place of W. O. Putnam, retired.
 Edward L. Moberly, Middleton, Idaho, in place of G. E. West, retired.
 Boyd R. Moore, New Meadows, Idaho, in place of L. H. Witherspoon, retired.
 Melvin J. Snook, Orofino, Idaho, in place of Arthur Dinnison, retired.
 Floyd K. Libey, Potlatch, Idaho, in place of G. E. Van Buskirk, retired.

ILLINOIS

William F. Dettmers, Bethalto, Ill., in place of Kenneth Henkhaus, deceased.
 Ethel F. Hierman, Bluffs, Ill., in place of T. B. Meehan, removed.
 Wilbur C. Schwark, Bonfield, Ill., in place of O. C. Stehr, resigned.
 Gerard A. Marquardt, Bristol, Ill., in place of A. M. Coomes, retired.
 Leslie E. Smith, Colusa, Ill., in place of B. G. Jacobs, resigned.
 Harold G. Miller, Compton, Ill., in place of F. F. Donagh, retired.
 Roy Guy Yates, Flora, Ill., in place of J. P. McGannon, removed.
 Alice G. Woessner, Franklin Grove, Ill., in place of M. A. Howard, removed.
 Harold J. Larey, Galena, Ill., in place of W. A. Homrich, retired.
 Arnold E. Lewellen, Gilman, Ill., in place of E. P. Malone, retired.
 Walter W. Steinmann, Hamel, Ill. Office established April 1, 1956.
 Floyd S. Rollinson, Kell, Ill., in place of Lorraine Riley, transferred.
 Forest D. Slick, Kent, Ill., in place of J. E. Fox, transferred.
 John M. Albright, La Grange, Ill., in place of C. W. Farley, retired.
 Arthur Funk Lee, McLean, Ill., in place of S. A. Withrow, retired.
 Dale V. Cline, Mulberry Grove, Ill., in place of H. L. Roberts, retired.
 Cecil Moore, New Canton, Ill., in place of C. T. Gilbert, retired.
 Homer C. Lynn, Oakford, Ill., in place of Earl Allen, retired.
 Maxine S. Hayward, Olivet, Ill., in place of G. L. Hamer, removed.

Chester C. Scott, Osco, Ill., in place of G. W. Scott, retired.
 William L. Early, Penfield, Ill., in place of J. P. Early, retired.
 Arthur L. Erickson, St. Charles, Ill., in place of H. G. McCarthy, retired.
 Randall D. Page, Sesser, Ill., in place of Winsor Brayfield, deceased.
 Angus Keith Phillips, Shawneetown, Ill., in place of Basil Bennett, retired.
 Randall F. Tevis, Smithboro, Ill., in place of T. J. Marti, resigned.
 Delbert Hood, Jr., South Elgin, Ill., in place of M. L. Reinert, removed.
 Larry E. Myers, Tampico, Ill., in place of W. H. Darby, deceased.
 John A. Theodore, Urbana, Ill., in place of H. E. Bigler, resigned.
 James C. Thompson, Warsaw, Ill., in place of Esper Ziegler, retired.
 William R. Lashmet, Winchester, Ill., in place of Herbert Shibe, deceased.
 Ardelle H. Hanski, Worth, Ill., in place of D. T. Hanski, deceased.
 Thomas B. Malone, Wyoming, Ill., in place of K. L. Colwell, retired.
 Russell C. Spice, Zion, Ill., in place of H. G. Ingram, retired.

INDIANA

Charles E. Sweany, Crothersville, Ind., in place of H. B. Fultz, retired.
 Charles L. Oxley, Evansville, Ind., in place of J. E. Sachs, deceased.
 Twanette S. Coleman, Forest, Ind., in place of V. F. Webster, retired.
 Don Hubert Neff, Goshen, Ind., in place of L. Y. Cripe, retired.
 Gerald B. Eitner, Hillsboro, Ind., in place of A. E. Lighty, Jr., removed.
 Paul H. Miller, Macy, Ind., in place of S. S. Foor, retired.
 Russell F. Berkheiser, Ossian, Ind., in place of S. C. Hilsmer, retired.
 Max I. Ward, Spencer, Ind., in place of Golden High, retired.

IOWA

Lloyd L. Giltner, Agency, Iowa, in place of T. J. Leinhauser, retired.
 Bernard H. Richter, Ashton, Iowa, in place of H. S. King, retired.
 Paul E. Sanderson, Beaman, Iowa, in place of B. H. Rowe, retired.
 Roger M. Galloway, Cedar Falls, Iowa, in place of L. H. Hughes, retired.
 Paul E. Garthwaite, Charles City, Iowa, in place of B. F. Welsh, deceased.
 Paul F. Hoyt, Cherokee, Iowa, in place of W. H. Fishman, retired.
 John R. Johnson, Mallard, Iowa, in place of Sophia Hood, retired.
 John H. Pazour, Marion, Iowa, in place of C. D. Burns, retired.
 Thelma C. Voss, Marne, Iowa, in place of William North, deceased.
 James C. Houle, Mechanicsville, Iowa, in place of F. G. Ferguson, retired.
 Benjamin P. Flack, Jr., Osage, Iowa, in place of L. F. McGrane, retired.
 James L. Brown, Peterson, Iowa, in place of R. W. Reed, transferred.
 Helen T. Kernen, Ralston, Iowa, in place of M. S. Copenhaver, retired.
 Eugene F. Watters, Sanborn, Iowa, in place of E. W. Wayne, deceased.
 Norman O. Walk, South English, Iowa, in place of J. F. White, retired.

KANSAS

Thomas L. Kauble, Arcadia, Kans., in place of G. J. Roebach, retired.
 Francis W. Johnson, Argonia, Kans., in place of Etta Le Ford, retired.
 Gene C. Montgomery, Barnard, Kans., in place of E. A. King, transferred.
 William L. Pool, Bronson, Kans., in place of L. W. Love, resigned.
 Harold T. Stodard, Burlingame, Kans., in place of H. M. McCauley, retired.
 Emmett E. Sutherland, Galena, Kans., in place of J. O. Derfelt, retired.

Melvin H. Besancon, Lancaster, Kans., in place of E. N. Coleman, resigned.
 Ray D. Wiley, Lyndon, Kans., in place of W. J. Gray, transferred.
 Chalmers A. Hawks, Nickerson, Kans., in place of F. J. Lehman, retired.
 Harlin L. Hornbostel, Palmer, Kans., in place of F. M. Martin, deceased.
 Samuel P. Bell, Scranton, Kans., in place of Elizabeth Brackman, retired.
 Edward A. Fink, Stilwell, Kans., in place of H. C. Cave, resigned.

KENTUCKY

William H. Burgess, Arlington, Ky., in place of Z. G. Neville, retired.
 Lissa H. Tarter, Campbellsburg, Ky., in place of R. L. Kerr, resigned.
 William D. Gorman, Hazard, Ky., in place of A. M. Moore, retired.
 Jacob H. Weller, Owensboro, Ky., in place of S. B. Smith, retired.
 Charles B. Neville, Park City, Ky., in place of R. E. Doyle, removed.
 Garrett L. Robey, Stamping Ground, Ky., in place of H. H. Clark, transferred.
 D. Hess Vest, Walton, Ky., in place of C. F. Cleek, resigned.
 Julian B. Hays, Woodburn, Ky., in place of L. W. Hobbs, retired.

LOUISIANA

Doris L. Hebert, Baldwin, La., in place of E. B. Martin, resigned.
 Samuel D. Castleberry, Ferriday, La., in place of N. J. Browne, resigned.
 Louise M. Townsend, Gilbert, La., in place of A. B. Griffin, retired.
 Olive J. DeJean, Hodge, La., in place of E. A. McDowell, retired.
 Johnnie H. Mitcham, Leesville, La., in place of LeRoy Ford, retired.
 Andrew H. Ferguson, Marion, La., in place of M. K. Roark, retired.
 Wanza G. Keaton, Tangipahoa, La., in place of V. C. Kent, retired.

MAINE

Frances C. Sands, Bar Mills, Maine, in place of L. G. Sands, retired.
 Gerald B. Guay, Bingham, Maine, in place of H. C. Collins, deceased.
 Eleanor B. Foster, China, Maine, in place of J. H. Wentworth, retired.
 Marshall F. Holmes, Jefferson, Maine, in place of H. G. Hoffes, retired.
 Hubert A. Cowan, Newcastle, Maine, in place of L. L. Guptill, retired.
 Richard A. Smith, Northeast Harbor, Maine, in place of E. C. Davis, deceased.
 Ralph A. MacDonald, South Windham, Maine, in place of L. H. Bromley, retired.

MARYLAND

Hester S. Duff, Earleville, Md., in place of E. D. Loller, retired.
 Robert Joseph Sellner, Jessup, Md., in place of G. C. Kirn, deceased.
 Reba C. Warner, Lisbon, Md., in place of J. L. Donovan, removed.
 Eliot W. Sperry, Lutherville-Timonium, Md., in place of G. H. Johnston, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Althea M. F. Staples, Brant Rock, Mass., in place of M. L. Fletcher, deceased.
 Ernest A. Whitman, Centerville, Mass., in place of J. J. Pendergast, resigned.
 Arthur Edison Coakley, East Brewster, Mass., in place of M. L. Foster, retired.
 James J. Gallagher, Lowell, Mass., in place of C. H. Slowe, retired.
 Edward H. Morse, Mansfield, Mass., in place of J. E. Bellew, retired.
 Frank E. Dudley, Mendon, Mass., in place of Mabel Griffin, deceased.
 Margaret T. Baader, North Bellingham, Mass., in place of E. T. Camp, retired.
 Burton S. Young, Orleans, Mass., in place of J. D. Anthony, retired.
 William T. Bowden, Wales, Mass., in place of R. H. Lancaster, retired.

Samuel James Currie, Whitinsville, Mass., in place of W. F. McDonald, retired.

MICHIGAN

William Z. Todd, Allen, Mich., in place of Emma Keating, retired.
 Jack D. Dickhout, Boyne City, Mich., in place of Roy Winegarden, retired.
 Victor J. Haughey, Camden, Mich., in place of F. J. Brown, deceased.
 Olen O. Smith, Crystal, Mich., in place of J. D. George, retired.
 George A. Martin, Dearborn, Mich., in place of J. A. Yagley, retired.
 Thomas J. Butler, Emmett, Mich., in place of Elmer Brogan, retired.
 Elizabeth E. Ospring, Grand Junction, Mich., in place of P. E. Bolin, retired.
 Sayre H. Ostrander, Grand Marais, Mich., in place of E. L. Mulligan, retired.
 Neil G. Kalmbach, Grass Lake, Mich., in place of Olaf Christensen, retired.
 Frank E. Kline, Jones, Mich., in place of J. B. Seidl, resigned.
 Frank M. Townsend, Marcellus, Mich., in place of H. D. Sweet, retired.
 Harold L. Hande, Mattawan, Mich., in place of Marguerite Ryan, resigned.
 James L. Collins, Milan, Mich., in place of L. A. Butler, retired.
 Robert G. Brown, Monroe, Mich., in place of A. C. Maurer, retired.
 Leonard L. Swanson, Muir, Mich., in place of Coral Estep, deceased.
 Edmund B. Suleki, Napoleon, Mich., in place of Blanche McGraw, retired.
 Leo G. Smith, Newberry, Mich., in place of Joseph Villemure, retired.
 Ernest R. Steen, Shelby, Mich., in place of R. R. Royal, retired.
 Stewart E. Walter, Smiths Creek, Mich., in place of A. F. Lenart, retired.
 Orrin B. Powell, Stockbridge, Mich., in place of E. E. Lehman, transferred.
 Edward O. Perket, Traverse City, Mich., in place of H. B. Whitson, retired.

MINNESOTA

Norton M. Sorenson, Amboy, Minn., in place of A. R. Wilder, retired.
 Orvind P. Nichols, Borup, Minn., in place of E. O. Benthagen, retired.
 Donna J. Gross, Calumet, Minn., in place of P. F. Preice, retired.
 Dorothy R. Johnson, Gheen, Minn., in place of S. E. Brooker, retired.
 Howard C. Eichhorn, Hill City, Minn., in place of Zephia Taylor, retired.
 Delmer J. Larson, Hills, Minn., in place of E. M. Schellhouse, retired.
 Herbert M. Koster, Pequot Lakes, Minn., in place of H. E. Bye, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Bester L. Files, Ackerman, Miss., in place of E. M. Commander, retired.
 Andy J. Becker, Bay St. Louis, Miss., in place of F. L. Herlihy, retired.
 Calvin J. Meaders, Hickory, Miss., in place of E. M. Henton, retired.
 Dan C. McNeill, McNeill, Miss., in place of J. G. Dexter, retired.
 John T. Miller, Myrtle, Miss., in place of H. P. Megginson, transferred.
 Fred D. Rogers, Nettleton, Miss., in place of J. C. Young, transferred.
 Ola L. McMath, Sidon, Miss., in place of J. S. Defoore, retired.

MISSOURI

Russell E. Ray, Adrian, Mo., in place of D. L. Davis, transferred.
 Doyle L. Scott, Armstrong, Mo., in place of E. W. Mott, retired.
 Stanley H. Jarvis, Belgrade, Mo., in place of Belva Maxwell, retired.
 Bernice W. Holloway, Bragg City, Mo., in place of R. H. Hogue, Sr., retired.
 James R. McKnight, Calhoun, Mo., in place of M. R. Fewel, retired.
 Charles A. Barron, Clarksville, Mo., in place of K. C. Patton, retired.

Donnell E. Carey, Dawn, Mo., in place of Mabel Cunningham, retired.
 Don M. Anderson, Dixon, Mo., in place of J. D. Elkins, deceased.
 Harry L. Hibbard, Gilliam, Mo., in place of J. P. Payne, retired.
 Everette A. Westfall, Higbee, Mo., in place of G. M. Lenhart, resigned.
 Robert H. Horine, Norborne, Mo., in place of M. G. Kenton, retired.
 Robert L. Moseley, Rothville, Mo., in place of M. E. Vassar, resigned.
 Genoa E. Williams, Seligman, Mo., in place of B. P. Mitchell, retired.
 Harry H. Forman, Shelbyville, Mo., in place of L. A. Kaylor, deceased.
 Sylvester H. Brinker, Villa Ridge, Mo., in place of R. W. Disharoon, retired.
 Hobert W. Hunt, Wheatland, Mo., in place of C. E. Kleck, retired.

MONTANA

Willard W. Wilde, Bainville, Mont., in place of A. C. Coulston, deceased.
 Amelia E. Gerds, Garrison, Mont., in place of W. W. Welch, removed.
 Walter R. Richards, Hall, Mont., in place of F. M. Morse, retired.
 Frank F. Pisk, Terry, Mont., in place of G. L. Buckingham, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Ralph E. Skillman, Ainsworth, Nebr., in place of Salem Abraham, retired.
 Mildred M. Heikes, Dakota City, Nebr., in place of H. C. Paquin, retired.
 George A. Fenske, Jr., Dunbar, Nebr., in place of H. H. Ottens, transferred.
 Bryce E. Heckman, Hickman, Nebr., in place of Samuel Broekema, retired.
 Wilmer G. Tollefsen, Kearney, Nebr., in place of J. W. Boyd, resigned.
 Sheldon B. Mitchell, Nehawka, Nebr., in place of D. E. Waldo, resigned.
 Quintin L. Nicholas, Palmer, Nebr., in place of Lafe Simonson, retired.
 Donald C. Gillham, Sidney, Nebr., in place of D. R. Shipman, removed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Edwin F. Locke, Amherst, N. H., in place of V. P. Brine, retired.
 David R. Elder, Dublin, N. H., in place of W. E. French, retired.
 Philip M. Clark, Marlboro, N. H., in place of A. A. Croteau, retired.
 Allan H. MacDougall, Milan, N. H., in place of T. N. Taylor, retired.
 Josephine B. Larson, Newbury, N. H., in place of G. T. Berglund, resigned.
 Arthur J. Denault, Plaistow, N. H., in place of H. W. Ladd, retired.
 Leroy F. Barnhart, Wentworth, N. H., in place of B. W. Ray, resigned.
 William F. Haskell, Wilnot Flat, N. H., in place of F. R. Cutler, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

George M. Durso, Fort Lee, N. J., in place of D. A. Skelley, retired.
 Leslie J. Sherwood, Haworth, N. J., in place of B. W. Shaw, resigned.
 Timothy J. Flynn, Livingston, N. J., in place of W. M. Carner, retired.
 Guido V. Marsocci, Osbornville, N. J., in place of G. T. Osborn, retired.
 Frank Magill, Jr., Pompton Lakes, N. J., in place of J. V. R. Nichol, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Clyde B. Lee, Gallup, N. Mex., in place of Dominic Rolle, deceased.
 Sibyl S. Griffin, Reserve, N. Mex., in place of Irene Graham, resigned.

NEW YORK

Leighton C. Austin, Alfred Station, N. Y., in place of L. W. Palmiter, transferred.
 Merritt Pember Newberry, Canastota, N. Y., in place of L. J. Williams, deceased.
 Ralph Seaman Lansing, Castleton on Hudson, N. Y., in place of R. C. Kilmer, resigned.

Clarence H. Taber, Cato, N. Y., in place of D. J. Herrington, retired.

Frederick L. Gifford, Clifton Springs, N. Y., in place of K. G. Bement, retired.

Hampton B. Scofield, Cold Spring, N. Y., in place of B. W. Schatzle, resigned.

Clifford S. Kloos, Crown Point, N. Y., in place of H. S. Peck, retired.

Paul E. Wamp, Jr., Dansville, N. Y., in place of C. C. Curry, retired.

Wallace M. Whitley, Ellisburg, N. Y., in place of James Dick, removed.

Gordon Raymond Shepardson, Elmira, N. Y., in place of C. J. O'Connell, retired.

James George Dougall, Evans Mills, N. Y., in place of I. H. Cryslar, retired.

Heber Ashley, Jr., Grand Island, N. Y., in place of E. T. Sheehan, resigned.

Ella B. Siemerling, Granite Springs, N. Y., in place of C. F. Klingenstein, deceased.

Lillian E. Call, Great Bend, N. Y., in place of M. M. Humes, retired.

Anthony J. Wirmusky, Hoosick Falls, N. Y., in place of H. V. Allen, retired.

Joseph F. Clark, Hughsonville, N. Y., in place of Fred Churchill, retired.

Harriet M. Cole, Hurleyville, N. Y., in place of W. H. Toohey, deceased.

Everett W. Mussen, Keeseville, N. Y., in place of E. A. Laundree, deceased.

Nicholas W. Toborg, Leeds, N. Y., in place of J. G. Winans, retired.

Daniel J. Millicker, Mahopac Falls, N. Y., in place of G. W. Millicker, deceased.

Ronald T. Murphy, Napanoch, N. Y., in place of F. D. Hurd, retired.

Anna L. Butcher, North Chili, N. Y., in place of M. L. McNees, resigned.

Frank LaVigne, Ogdensburg, N. Y., in place of A. G. McLellan, removed.

James Norton Engleson, Ontario, N. Y., in place of E. E. Casey, retired.

Harrison M. Fairbanks, Portville, N. Y., in place of J. F. Cronin, retired.

George A. Gutterson, Rensselaer Falls, N. Y., in place of M. L. Jenkins, retired.

Florence R. Buckley, Rosendale, N. Y., in place of Marie Lamb, resigned.

James Joseph Barry, St. James, N. Y., in place of T. V. Sullivan, removed.

Robert L. Bower, Sanborn, N. Y., in place of W. H. Kline, resigned.

George J. F. Secor, Scarborough, N. Y., in place of G. O. Fountain, retired.

Nina B. Dickerson, Sheiter Island, N. Y., in place of A. A. Sherman, retired.

Roy G. Peterson, Southampton, N. Y., in place of E. W. Wolf, retired.

Harvie Coleman, Summitville, N. Y., in place of W. C. Budd, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Carlyle P. Matheson, Andrews, N. C., in place of Galusha Pulliam, removed.

James R. Frady, Candler, N. C., in place of B. E. Brenton, resigned.

John H. Hufton, Creswell, N. C., in place of E. S. Woodley, deceased.

Clifton W. Crispe, Cullowhee, N. C., in place of B. B. Long, retired.

William B. Mayhew, Davidson, N. C., in place of S. T. Stough, deceased.

Clemmie E. Norris, East Spencer, N. C., in place of M. T. Mason, retired.

John L. Pippin, Fremont, N. C., in place of C. G. Pike, deceased.

James E. Stack, Harmony, N. C., in place of Ovid Pullen, retired.

Ruth T. Smith, Havelock, N. C. Office established January 1, 1957.

Junius W. Rogers, Jr., Henderson, N. C., in place of W. C. Stainback, retired.

Carl L. Talley, Highlands, N. C., in place of C. C. Potts, retired.

Frank Conder, Jr., Indian Trail, N. C., in place of H. M. Orr, retired.

James F. Inman, Laurinburg, N. C., in place of H. M. McArn, retired.

Norman A. Randall, Leicester, N. C., in place of M. H. Current, retired.

Franklin R. Frisby, Marshall, N. C., in place of Grace Freeman, retired.

Azer Dow Baucom, Sr., Monroe, N. C., in place of S. H. Lee, resigned.

Robert Kelly Montague, Newport, N. C., in place of L. A. Mann, retired.

Charles C. Small, Sophia, N. C., in place of D. R. Bulla, retired.

Lloyd J. Parrish, Swansboro, N. C., in place of R. E. Stanley, removed.

NORTH DAKOTA

Donald G. Paul, Arthur, N. Dak., in place of E. B. Scott, retired.

Edward J. Ziman, Dodge, N. Dak., in place of M. E. Goetz, deceased.

OHIO

Robert N. Croskey, Amsterdam, Ohio, in place of L. M. Helphinstine, retired.

Paul R. Day, Atwater, Ohio, in place of E. C. Hillyer, retired.

Arthur E. Hill, Batavia, Ohio, in place of C. S. Coyle, deceased.

James F. Braig, Buckeye Lake, Ohio, in place of K. W. Lowrey, removed.

Carl I. Moser, Cridersville, Ohio, in place of Fred Reichelderfer, retired.

John W. Watson, Deshler, Ohio, in place of T. B. King, retired.

Paul L. Burkholder, Edon, Ohio, in place of P. W. Burkhardt, retired.

Martin Marshall Miller, Franklin, Ohio, in place of H. E. Mills, transferred.

Ralph J. Huff, Fredericktown, Ohio, in place of W. M. Doll, retired.

Paul L. Sailor, Jackson Center, Ohio, in place of R. E. Elliott, transferred.

Ralph Eugene Bresbach, Kingston, Ohio, in place of A. D. Etter, transferred.

Edward Seymour Ullum, Lebanon, Ohio, in place of C. S. Earnhart, retired.

Luster M. Barlow, Liberty Center, Ohio, in place of P. L. Seitz, deceased.

Howard M. Lawrence, Long Bottom, Ohio, in place of C. C. Marcinko, transferred.

Frances M. DeFosset, Loveland, Ohio, in place of R. V. Tracy, resigned.

Harold Ralph Thompson, McDermott, Ohio, in place of W. R. Shaw, deceased.

John B. Gibbs, Midvale, Ohio, in place of D. F. Dinger, deceased.

John B. Carr, Jr., Monclova, Ohio, in place of C. F. Metzger, retired.

S. Eleanor N. Cope, Neffs, Ohio, in place of R. E. Jackson, deceased.

Estella E. Ford, New Weston, Ohio, in place of J. E. Singleman, transferred.

Lilla M. McAfee, Owensville, Ohio, in place of C. A. Fetter, retired.

Luther L. Burnett, Patriot, Ohio, in place of Alice Clark, retired.

Raymond L. Brooks, Plymouth, Ohio, in place of C. E. Sourwine, retired.

Margaret A. Stanford, Randolph, Ohio, in place of M. F. North, removed.

Philip Milton Tozzer, Ross, Ohio, in place of J. C. Guard, retired.

Dale L. McDonald, Rushville, Ohio, in place of H. E. Morehead, retired.

John L. Zimmerman, Seaman, Ohio, in place of T. F. Short, retired.

Lester L. Stearns, Sherrodsville, Ohio, in place of C. A. Belknap, transferred.

Ray D. Hall, St. Clairsville, Ohio, in place of D. S. Shia, resigned.

Thomas A. Brayshaw, Tipp City, Ohio, in place of C. N. Wenzlau, retired.

Kathryn B. Thomas, Valley City, Ohio, in place of E. E. Arick, retired.

Helen L. Pratt, Woodstock, Ohio, in place of P. B. Hildreth, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Thomas H. Henderson, Fort Cobb, Okla., in place of W. S. Bird, transferred.

Walter G. Enfield, Jefferson, Okla., in place of L. M. Amick, retired.

James G. Maddox, Ponca City, Okla., in place of P. S. Badami, deceased.

OREGON

Ivan A. Olsen, Madras, Oreg., in place of G. W. Dee, removed.

Harley D. Naas, Myrtle Creek, Oreg., in place of Bryan Dieckman, transferred.

Irvin Lewis Wence, North Plains, Oreg., in place of G. R. Sandford, removed.

Bernice I. White, Parkdale, Oreg., in place of A. L. Boe, retired.

Joseph D. McKay, St. Paul, Oreg., in place of G. P. Connor, Jr., resigned.

Ruby A. Keller, Vida, Oreg., in place of W. C. Keller, deceased.

John L. Shetterly, Willamina, Oreg., in place of Esther Fawc, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Eugene Linton Sohn, Ambridge, Pa., in place of C. W. Goerman, deceased.

Francis C. Uffelman, Bakerstown, Pa., in place of C. W. Heckert, retired.

Walter H. Grier, Sr., Beaver Brook, Pa., in place of J. D. McNelis, retired.

Thomas G. Nestor, Brownfield, Pa., in place of R. G. Shaw, resigned.

Don A. Ducoeur, Charleroi, Pa., in place of G. H. Smith, retired.

Vida C. Rodham, Chinchilla, Pa., in place of J. J. Habeeb, resigned.

John G. Davidson, Christiana, Pa., in place of W. E. Russell, retired.

Albert Thomas, Clarksburg, Pa., in place of D. M. Henry, removed.

James George Lindsay, Cochranville, Pa., in place of T. C. Ferron, retired.

George D. Headrick, Colver, Pa., in place of D. C. Feighner, retired.

Ethel J. Nelson, Cooperstown, Pa., in place of E. K. McDaniel, deceased.

James H. Hulak, Danboro, Pa., in place of S. S. Myers, resigned.

Walter J. Alphin, Douglassville, Pa., in place of M. R. Becker, retired.

Mae A. Kester, East Texas, Pa., in place of G. V. Butz, deceased.

Robert A. Bushyeager, Girard, Pa., in place of R. F. Rick, retired.

French Cason, Sr., Greensburg, Pa., in place of M. M. Hughes, removed.

Robert L. Allen, Grove City, Pa., in place of G. C. Bower, deceased.

Victor R. Alderfer, Harleysville, Pa., in place of W. E. Schissler, resigned.

William J. Stivison, Homer City, Pa., in place of J. L. Kinter, retired.

Edmund B. Hebrank, Jeannette, Pa., in place of R. M. Hoffman, resigned.

John W. Aungst, Jr., Landisville, Pa., in place of J. H. Grube, deceased.

Bertye A. Boorse, Montgomeryville, Pa., in place of J. E. Chapman, retired.

Nellie A. Fish, Nelson, Pa., in place of N. M. Leonard, retired.

Marion J. Brown, Oxford, Pa., in place of R. C. Moore, resigned.

Everett Willard Anderson, Port Allegany, Pa., in place of M. C. Teater, retired.

Orpha G. Leitzel, Richfield, Pa., in place of J. H. Snyder, resigned.

George F. Yedlicka, Rillton, Pa., in place of D. H. Baughman, retired.

John M. Fox, Shanksville, Pa., in place of G. J. Allen, removed.

Reno Lincoln Mosier, Jr., Smock, Pa., in place of Bessie Havlichek, retired.

James W. Sullivan, Snow Shoe, Pa., in place of J. M. Gilliland, retired.

Horace S. Glover, Starrucca, Pa., in place of G. E. Carpenter, resigned.

Paul Eugene Ribble, Stillwater, Pa., in place of H. M. Smith, resigned.

Edgar S. Babb, Tatamy, Pa., in place of E. S. Happel, retired.

Charles W. Snyder, Thomasville, Pa., in place of C. D. Witman, retired.

Sophie D. Scipione, Tire Hill, Pa., in place of Pauline Strozak, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John C. Jutt, director, Lithuanian affairs, Knights of Lithuania, Worcester, Mass., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

O Almighty and Eternal God, ever present before us, we adore Thee as our creator and sovereign master and we give Thee thanks for the innumerable blessings of freedom which Thou hast given us.

O Heavenly Father, source of all authority, we humbly beg Thee to look down with paternal solicitude upon these Thy servants, the Members of this august body, the House of Representatives of the United States. Grant them, in whom Thou hast placed Thy authority, the wisdom by which, fortified in their deliberations by the inspirations of the Holy Spirit, they may be the constructive influences for the preservation of peace among those whom they represent and for the attainment of peace by those who unjustly are being denied it.

O Eternal Father, source of all freedom, regard with benign favor the sufferings and the hardships of the people of Lithuania. Please hear our prayer that precious freedom, to which all nations have an inalienable right and which comes to nations living in harmony and friendliness, may soon come once again to her. Through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 10, 1958, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that, on the following dates, the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On February 11, 1958:

H. R. 5938. An act to amend section 812 (e) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948;

H. R. 7762. An act to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies;

H. R. 8216. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax;

H. R. 8865. An act relating to the administration of certain collected taxes;

H. R. 9035. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee; and

H. R. 10146. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Richard Edwin Snell, Towanda, Pa., in place of Rosanna McGee, retired.

Noah W. Nase, Tylersport, Pa., in place of M. K. Leister, resigned.

Richard E. Sayres, Willow Street, Pa., in place of Florence Layman, deceased.

PUERTO RICO

Oscar Rios Santiago, Corozal, P. R., in place of A. M. Bou, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Charles A. Evans, Anderson, S. C., in place of R. H. Gaines, retired.

Sallie M. Hollins, Beaufort, S. C., in place of L. A. Hall, retired.

Daniel M. McCaskill, Camden, S. C., in place of Benton Sheorn, deceased.

Joe H. Giltner, Jr., Chester, S. C., in place of C. C. Wilkes, retired.

James B. Miles, Coward, S. C., in place of T. J. Lynch, deceased.

Lou Ann Wilder, Hemingway, S. C., in place of W. T. Hemingway, retired.

Robert Morris Clayton, Laurens, S. C., in place of M. J. Simpson, retired.

Robert W. Rutland, Rion, S. C., in place of A. M. Blair, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Milton H. Collmann, Isabel, S. Dak., in place of M. J. Matthews, retired.

Fred H. Knudsen, Viborg, S. Dak., in place of C. A. Hattervig, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Charles B. Gray, Afton, Tenn., in place of R. V. Earnest, retired.

Harold N. Tidwell, Bon Aqua, Tenn., in place of A. J. Frazier, resigned.

Elmer J. Atkinson, Clarkrange, Tenn., in place of E. M. Peters, retired.

Opal B. Wilkinson, Fayetteville, Tenn., in place of R. F. Buchanan, retired.

Keith L. Patterson, Friendsville, Tenn., in place of C. K. McDowell, resigned.

Eugene S. Mitchell, Limestone, Tenn., in place of H. B. Gillespie, retired.

Thomas Harold Wilson, Madison, Tenn., in place of D. I. Huggins, resigned.

William Hal Redmond, Maury City, Tenn., in place of H. B. Riddick, retired.

Erma J. Hall, Mayland, Tenn., in place of E. L. Phillips, resigned.

John C. Hamilton, Pikeville, Tenn., in place of Cecil Hitchcox, transferred.

TEXAS

Jake Fortenberry, Adrian, Tex., in place of A. J. Witt, resigned.

Gwynn A. Boswell, Athens, Tex., in place of E. M. Jackson, transferred.

Jean M. Barnhart, Cactus, Tex., in place of L. G. Cleveland, resigned.

Thomas D. McManus, Channelview, Tex., in place of L. L. Bradley, Sr., deceased.

James Ray Moore, Clarendon, Tex., in place of J. C. Estlack, retired.

D. L. Stoker, Jr., Crowley, Tex., in place of R. H. Chapman, retired.

Frances M. Harvey, Fort Davis, Tex., in place of J. W. Kemp, removed.

Etta L. Chamberlain, Goree, Tex., in place of C. R. Chamberlain, deceased.

Lloyd V. Keller, Lacoste, Tex., in place of A. E. Jungmann, retired.

Darrell R. Sherman, Leander, Tex., in place of J. S. Cluck, resigned.

Billy Wayne Newman, Moody, Tex., in place of C. C. Canuteson, retired.

James M. Sullins, Oglesby, Tex., in place of James Everett, Jr., transferred.

Homer B. Copeland, Palmer, Tex., in place of H. M. Culpepper, retired.

Helen R. Biggerstaff, Pierce, Tex., in place of E. D. Farmer, retired.

Carl F. Baumgartner, Refugio, Tex., in place of G. E. Warren, deceased.

William A. Farek, Schulenburg, Tex., in place of F. L. Herzik, retired.

Jake R. Demere, Sierra Blanca, Tex., in place of G. C. Stephens, retired.

Ila B. Hulme, Stowell, Tex., in place of Ethel Miller, retired.

Vivian L. McElligott, Terminal, Tex., in place of B. J. Beene, resigned.

William H. Summers, Trenton, Tex., in place of W. J. Huff, retired.

Horace M. Camp, Whitney, Tex., in place of M. E. Herrington, transferred.

UTAH

Rulon S. Wood, Cedar City, Utah, in place of G. L. Janson, retired.

VERMONT

James M. McCabe, Arlington, Vt., in place of I. M. Vaughn, retired.

Sadie R. Hamilton, Cuttingsville, Vt., in place of D. M. Stewart, deceased.

Raymond A. Petelle, Derby Line, Vt., in place of A. A. LaFrance, deceased.

Lawrence H. Riggs, Hinesburg, Vt., in place of M. C. McKenzie, retired.

VIRGINIA

James R. McLearn, Herndon, Va., in place of S. F. Hutchinson, retired.

James L. Kinzie, Troutville, Va., in place of E. L. Boone, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Harrison H. Holmes, Cosmopolis, Wash., in place of E. M. Davis, retired.

Lawrence B. Howe, Enumclaw, Wash., in place of W. A. Gross, retired.

Ione M. Jurgens, Kahlotus, Wash., in place of A. E. Buchanan, retired.

Hazel L. Buckingham, Mansfield, Wash., in place of M. M. Ward, retired.

Lawrence A. Winn, Oakesdale, Wash., in place of W. L. McClure, retired.

Randall L. Stroud, Puyallup, Wash., in place of Andrew Hunter, retired.

Joseph Everett Reed, Selah, Wash., in place of L. H. Saur, retired.

Harvey L. Jones, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishburne, retired.

Leslie J. Marsh, Wilkeson, Wash., in place of D. B. Hreha, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Rex A. Pygman, Huntington, W. Va., in place of Roy Lewis, resigned.

Thomas C. Booth, Littleton, W. Va., in place of Arthur Jackson, retired.

WISCONSIN

Francis H. Sumnicht, Appleton, Wis., in place of S. D. Balliet, retired.

Golden M. Barritt, Barron, Wis., in place of C. R. Lawton, deceased.

Arthur E. Reid, Boscobel, Wis., in place of M. P. Tierney, deceased.

Robert E. Dietrich, Cassville, Wis., in place of F. H. Kartman, transferred.

Lucille M. Radtke, Embarrass, Wis., in place of K. F. Baker, deceased.

Donald C. Swanson, Lakewood, Wis., in place of L. H. Hardebeck, retired.

Elmer E. Bressler, Menomonie, Wis., in place of C. V. Porter, retired.

Carl F. John, Montello, Wis., in place of C. J. McAfee, removed.

Arthur E. Rafferty, Mountain, Wis., in place of A. L. Olson, retired.

Ellen M. Schmidt, Newton, Wis., in place of H. H. Eberhardt, retired.

Harold A. Wendt, Owen, Wis., in place of R. C. Graham, retired.

Ruben G. Duchow, Potter, Wis., in place of O. A. Kasper, deceased.

Valentine H. Habel, Ripon, Wis., in place of W. J. Amend, deceased.

Vaughn W. Biles, Stockholm, Wis., in place of M. E. Johnson, deceased.

Leroy H. Graves, Sullivan, Wis., in place of K. G. Lynch, retired.

Marcella M. Wilke, Zachow, Wis., in place of W. J. Kreil, failed to return from military duty.