SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1958

(Legislative day of Monday, March 17, 1958)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Father Nicholas T. Stavrakis, St. Nicholas Greek Orthodox Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, in these days of anxiety and confusion we look to Thee for guidance we so greatly need. Consider our human talents before Thy infallible wisdom, and direct them in the shaping and execution of all policies.

Aid us in our individual and collective efforts to propagate the ideals of our democratic spirit within and without our Nation.

Grant us this day, our Father, Thy heavenly manna in much-needed clear vision, and Thy pillar of fire to guide our footsteps in the paths of righteousness.

Use us, we pray, to shape a better nation, a better world, and a brighter tomorrow.

With Thy benedictions upon us, we shall find true and restful peace in the knowledge of our tasks accomplished and successfully completed in Thy sight. These we seek in Thy heavenly name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 25, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Senate Finance Committee, the Antitrust and Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Foreign Relations Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

MILITARY PAY BILL—MEETING OF MILITARY PAY SUBCOMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Military Pay Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. President, as one of the reasons for the request just made, I announce that there is a substantial and very important problem pending before this subcommittee, namely, the question of raising the pay of those in the military service. We are losing a great many of our military personnel, for whose training a great deal of money has been spent.

On the other hand, members of the subcommittee tell me that many Senators have raised questions about the overall cost involved, and some feel there are so-called undesirable features of the bill.

We are trying to approach this subject with the thoroughness which is characteristic of any subcommittee headed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I announce to the Senate that there will be some delay in reporting the bill. We do not expect it to be on the calendar before the Easter recess, because it is possible that substantial changes may be made in the bill. So any Members of the Senate who are interested in the so-called Cordiner report, or the military pay bill recommended by the administration, or the Kilday bill, passed by the House yesterday, should know that there are some serious questions involved which must be resolved.

Hearings will be held during sessions of the Senate, as is being done today. However, I do not expect a report from the full committee until after Easter.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, during which Senators may introduce bills and transact other routine business; and in that connection, I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.

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

THE ROAD BILL—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ACTION OF REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE ON FARM BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that under the unanimous-consent agreement there is a possibility that in connection with the road bill—which I consider a very important antirecession measure—there could be 11 hours of debate on the bill itself and the two principal amendments. However, I do not believe that all that time will be used. I am informed that it is unlikely there will be many other amendments. Therefore, we hope to come to a vote on the bill today. We should like to have the staff and the Members of the Senate be prepared to remain here until a reasonable hour this evening—I would say perhaps as late as even 11 or 11:30 p. m., if that is necessary, to get the bill passed.

Mr. President, I am very proud of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for joining arm in arm to combat the difficulties which confront many of our fellow men who today find themselves without jobs. This road bill has in it provision for a potential of 520,000 jobs.

It may very well be that we shall have to take additional steps to alleviate further the serious condition which faces the country. I should like to have my colleagues know that the majority policy committee of the Senate and the leadership of the House of Representatives have under constant review certain possible steps. I do not think there is anything to be gained by issuing prophetic statements about what might happen. But we want the country to know that whatever is necessary to be done will be done to keep this recession from becoming any worse.

Mr. President, in this connection I wish to congratulate my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the vote they reportedly took on yesterday in the Republican conference. I hope all the people of the country will observe that vote. I know it is going to be welcome news to the American farmers that Members of both parties in the Congress are willing to come to their help.

Mr. President, I think the farm issue is one upon which Congress has passed. Leadership is needed on it right now. It is not something "down the road." It is time for everyone to stand up and be counted.

This is not an issue which should be partisan. Republican and Democratic farmers have been suffering alike from the harsh circumstances of recent years. Republicans and Democrats alike should try to do what they can to help solve these difficulties. I should like to commend my colleagues for avoiding the temptation which has arisen all too frequently in recent years. It is the temptation of inaction which results from always being a "friend" of the other fellow.

Mr. President, there are some persons who become friends of the farmers when bills affecting the workingmen are before the Congress. Frequently there subsequently comes a sudden shift of position by the same persons, who then become friends of the workingmen, when bills affecting the farmers are before the Congress. From such shifts, nothing is done to help anyone. I do not believe such shifts promote the prosperity of the United States.

I do not believe one group can be made prosperous at the expense of another group. Instead, I believe that all suffer when one suffers. When farm prices are low, the farmer loses his purchasing power, and cannot buy trucks, tractors, automobiles, and other products of labor. When working men and working women are unemployed, they lose their purchasing power, and then they cannot buy the products of other workingmen or the food and fiber which are produced by the farmers. Likewise, when businessmen suffer, our working men and and our farmers soon discover that both jobs and markets vanish.

The past few years have produced a most dramatic example of this trend. They are years in which farm prices have gone down and down and down and prices paid by consumers living in the cities have gone up and up.

The measure passed by this Congress is no more than an act of simple justice.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

It states only that the powers of this Government cannot be used—I repeat, Mr. President, it states only that the powers of this Government cannot be used—to force the farmer's income lower than it was last year. We are not asking for an increase in prices. We are asking only that prices not be forced lower than they already have been forced.

Mr. President, if we do justice to one, we do justice to all.

I should like to commend the distinguished president of the AFL–CIO, the great labor leader, Mr. George Meany, who speaks for millions of the working people of this country, for his statesmanlike stand on the farm bill, as evidenced by his communication to the President yesterday. Mr. Meany urged the President to sign this measure, because I think it is very heartening to the people of the country when those who speak for the workingman and the consumer urge that the farmer get a fair deal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, certain letters and telegrams have been sent to the President urging him to sign Senate Joint Resolution 162, the farm bill. I shall read into the RECORD these telegrams.

I yield myself such time on the pending bill as may be necessary.

The following telegram was sent to the President by Mr. George Meany, president, AFL–CIO:

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, I respectfully urge you to sign Senate Joint Resolution 162 freezing farm price supports at present levels. Simple justice and economic wisdom would be served by this action to prevent further drop in farmers' income.

Farm income has declined about one-third in the last 9 years. Declining farm income is a definite forerunner of a decline of the economy as a whole. Our farmers were in a depression 4 years or more before the great crash of 1929. Any further drop in farmers' income at this time would still further depress our present faltering economy. Until and unless other solutions to farmers' problems are developed, present price supports should not be reduced.

GEORGE MEANY,
President, AFL–CIO.

I shall now read the other telegrams:

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge you to sign bill freezing farm price supports. As workers in retail industry, our members know from personal experience the importance of maintaining purchasing power of all groups in American economy. Extremely important that income of farm families not drop further. Farm price support bill now before you will maintain farm income at present level.

KENNETH MEIKLEJOHN,
Legislative Representative, Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Union, AFL–CIO.

MARCH 24, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge you sign Senate Joint Resolution 162. Additional purchasing power for farmers will help create needed employment. Increasingly dangerous economic recession makes this legislation essential at this time.

J. A. BEIRNE,
President, Communication Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge strongly your support of the bill freezing farm price supports. Further lowering of farmers' income can only result in decrease of consumers' purchasing power. This will clearly have an adverse effect on the economy in general and cause further unemployment.

WILLIAM B. ALLEN,
Washington Representative, United Rubber Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

MARCH 25, 1958.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Continuous decline in farm income is a serious problem to workers, as it is to farmers. Billions of dollars of purchasing power, which could be used to stem the increasingly serious recession, have been lost because of policies which are forcing farm families into poverty. Stopgap measures are immediately necessary to stop further drops in the already depression-like incomes of farm families. We respectfully urge that you sign Senate Joint Resolution 162.

In fighting this measure, Secretary of Agriculture Benson is using the same technique which he has previously used against labor and about which we have previously complained to you. From 1955 to 1957, Secretary Benson attempted to blame workers' wage gains for farmers' economic plight. Now, he is trying to blame farmers' price supports for high food prices workers must pay. The attempt is to set one group off against the other, to incite one group against the other. We urge that you dramatically show your rejection of this extremely dangerous "divide and conquer" technique by signing the farm price-supports bill.

THOMAS J. LLOYD, *President,*
PATRICK E. GORMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have several other messages printed at this point in the RECORD, as soon as they are received from my office.

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

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

We appeal to you to approve Senate Joint Resolution 162, farm price supports. Our farmers need this help and our national economy needs this support.

GEORGE M. HARRISON,
President, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

If we are to achieve an expanding economy which will enable us to assume our proper role of world leadership in the struggle against communism, we must have a firm farm economy. Urge your approval Senate Joint Resolution 162.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH,
President, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

We ask you to approve Senate Joint Resolution 162. Our people are unemployed and increased purchasing power among farmers will help us.

W. A. FLEETE,
President, Switchmen's Union of North America.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington D. C.:

Farm purchasing power has fallen dangerously and we hope you will sign Senate Joint Resolution 162.

WILLIAM CALVIN,
President, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Blacksmiths.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

The Nation's unemployment problem demands a healthy farm economy if we are to recover. Please sign Senate Joint Resolution 162.

ROBERT BYRON,
President, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge you to approve Senate Joint Resolution 162. The fortunes of men working in the cities and men working on the farms are related and farmers need help.

JOHN DUFFY,
Vice President, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

I hope you will approve Senate Joint Resolution 162. Farm incomes are dangerously low and in need of immediate support.

A. J. BERNHARDT,
President, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

The Nation's unemployment problem requires immediate action on several fronts. We hope you will approve Senate Joint Resolution 162, to firm up farm incomes.

ANTHONY MATZ,
President, International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

Please sign Senate Joint Resolution 162. Farmers in need of immediate Federal income support.

JAMES P. TAHNEY,
American Railway Supervisor Association.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

Our association hopes you will sign Senate Joint Resolution 162. The economic well-being of the Nation's farmers is vital to our ability to produce the goods and services needed in the cold war.

A. E. LYON,
Executive Secretary, Railroad Labor Executives' Association.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Firmed up farm income vital to national recovery. Urge you sign Senate Joint Resolution 162. Farmers need this help.

G. E. LEIGHTY,
President, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Please sign Senate Joint Resolution 162. Shrinking farm income imperils national recovery. Farmers need help.

MICHAEL FOX,
President, Railway Employees' Department, AFL–CIO.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge approval Senate Joint Resolution 162. Long-term decline in farm income dangerous to our national and international security.

E. H. GILBERT,
President, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

The demands of survival in the world we live in require a strong farm economy. Respectfully ask your approval of Senate Joint Resolution 162.

GUY BROWN,
Grand Chief Engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Railroad men ask your approval, Senate Joint Resolution 162. Falling farm prices being reflected in weakening of economy in the farm States. This is directly reflected in the economy of workers.

W. P. KENNEDY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you will sign Senate Joint Resolution 162. Farm income has dropped rapidly and is not able to sustain its share of needed consumption requirements.

ROY HUGHES,
President, the Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Please sign Senate Joint Resolution 162. Farmers desperately need price support.

JESSE CLARK,
President, Brotherhood Railroad Signalmen of America.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

We ask you to approve Senate Joint Resolution 162. Unemployment cannot be solved without a revitalized farm economy.

MILTON SCHOCH,
President, Railroad Yardmasters of America.

MARCH 26, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you will sign Senate Joint Resolution 162, farm price supports. Farmers without income cannot buy to restore employment.

JOE SPRINGER,
President, American Train Dispatchers Association.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, again I wish to congratulate my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the action they took in their conference yesterday. The majority they registered will, I believe, hearten the farmers in every State of the Union.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am proud and happy to have the opportunity this morning to rise in the Senate and join the distinguished majority leader in his congratulations to the members of the minority.

Mr. President, the working people of Wisconsin and their elected leaders in union organizations have for a long time supported the position of having adequate price supports for farm products. We have a situation in Wisconsin in which all groups, not only farmers, but business and religious groups, have called upon me as their Senator to do what I can to protect the Wisconsin farmer by voting to keep support prices at the present price level. I have received letters and telegrams from chambers of commerce, Kiwanis clubs, and other organizations which, by and large, represent business people, urging such support.

Mr. President, only 6 more days remain before the scheduled cut in dairy prices is due to go into effect.

I am sure the farmers were as heartened as I was, Mr. President, by the wise and understanding action taken in the Republican policy committee meeting yesterday. According to press reports, a majority of the Republican Senators present voted to recommend to the President of the United States that he sign the joint resolution to require a 1-year moratorium on further reductions in farm prices.

I hope that President Eisenhower will give his earnest and sincere attention to the wise guidance of the distinguished Republican leaders who were among those voting against a veto of this emergency measure. I hope he will take into account their unusual grasp of their States' needs and interests, their sensitive understanding of the importance at this time of avoiding further depression-creating pressures in our economy, their humane appreciation of justice and fairness in our economic life. I hope he will heed the majority vote of the Republican Senate policy committee and sign our farm price "freeze" resolution to help avert further rural disaster.

MORNING BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Routine morning business is now in order.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from George C. Stiehler, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to governmental spending, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

REGULATION OF COMMERCE IN MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS—TELEGRAMS AND LETTERS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a few days ago we were considering S. 1356, relating to stockyards and meatpackers. At that time, Mr. President, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some telegrams and letters I have received relating to the problem of stockyards be printed in the body of the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for the information of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letters and telegrams will be received, printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The telegrams and letters are as follows:

EDGERTON, MINN., *August 10, 1957.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Take close look at bill that will take regulation of meatpackers out of Department of Agriculture and put it under Federal Trade Commission. Trade Commission may not look from farmers point of view. We don't want to lose any advantage the packers may be able to give us.

JOHN L. OLSON.

WORTHINGTON, MINN.

MONTEVIDEO, MINN., *August 10, 1957.*

Senator THYE,
Senate Office Building:

I hear there is a bill coming up which would move the regulation of the meatpackers from the Department of Agriculture to the Federal Trade Commission. I am against this bill because the meatpackers are in close contact with the farm, and I believe that the department responsible for farm and agricultural problems should be the ones to regulate the meatpackers. Also, I am inclined to think that the Federal Trade Commission is apt to favor the consumer in the relation to those of us who produce, market, and produce livestock.

B. E. BONN,
First National Bank.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *August 9, 1957.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

In regard to S. 1356, transferring jurisdiction over packers from United States Department of Agriculture to Federal Trade Commission, strongly urge you to oppose this bill. Farmers want control in Department of Agriculture.

J. L. MORTON,
President, Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation.

PRESTON, MINN., *August 10, 1957.*

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Information has been brought to my attention that there is a bill under consideration whereby the regulation of the meatpacking industry would be taken away from the Department of Agriculture and put under control of the Federal Trade Commission. This seems entirely wrong to me, as I believe

that meatpacking and livestock farming, being so essential to each other, should both be advised and regulated by the same department which is, and should be, the Department of Agriculture. Also the Federal Trade Commission might be inclined to forget about us fellows that are producing and marketing the livestock and look out for the consumer only.

Sincerely,

HILMAN ERICKSON,
Preston, Fillmore County, Minn.

ELMORE, MINN., *August 10, 1957.*

EDWARD J. THYE,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Understand a bill to transfer regulation of meatpackers from United States Department of Agriculture to Federal Trade Commission is pending. We feel this may harm rather than help the great livestock industry.

C. W. MEYERS,
Director, Minnesota Swine Producers.

JACKSON, MINN., *August 10, 1957.*

Senator ED J. THYE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

I understand there is a bill under consideration which would take regulation of meatpacking out of the Department of Agriculture and put it under Federal Trade Commission. I don't think this is the way to do it because meatpacking is pretty close to the farm and it seems that the agency that looks into farm and agriculture problems ought to be best able to regulate the meatpackers. Although the Federal Trade Commission might look out for the consumers and tend to forget those of us who raise and market livestock.

ELDON H. SUMMERS.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *August 9, 1957.*

Senator EDWARD THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe the interest of the livestock producer is best served by jurisdiction over meatpackers being left under the Department of Agriculture, who supervise and regulate public stockyards. Your vote against transfer to Federal Trades Commission will be appreciated.

A. L. OLSON,
President, St. Paul Union Stockyards Co.

WEST CONCORD, MINN., *August 9, 1957.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I understand there is a bill now being considered which would take the regulation of meatpackers away from the Department of Agriculture and put it under the control of the Federal Trade Commission. I don't think this is the correct thing to do because meatpacking is very close to the farm and it seems that the agency looking over farm and agriculture problems should be best equipped to regulate the meatpackers; also the Federal Trade Commission might look out only for the consumer and tend to forget those of us who raise and market the livestock.

SANDEN SENJEM.

FOOD RETAILERS ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., August 15, 1957.

Hon. EDWARD THYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As you can well realize, the recent court decision which removed chainstores who own their own meatpacking plants from the jurisdiction of the FTC has created a very dangerous situation within the food industry.

With the chains responsible to the FTC the competitive situation within our industry has been such that the individual operator has a reasonable opportunity to survive. The Department of Agriculture, to whom such chains are made responsible under the decision, has neither the means nor the interest to restrain the multiple operators from monopolistic practices.

S. 1356 places large chains who own their own meatpacking plants under the regulation of the FTC and restores the competitive balance to our industry.

We urge in the strongest terms that you actively support passage of S. 1356. This is especially important to Minnesota where large chains do not yet dominate the market.

Cordially,

EARL F. ALTNOW,
Executive Secretary.

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., August 16, 1957.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: The National Milk Producers Federation is interested in and strongly supports legislation designed to confer on the Federal Trade Commission authority to regulate the unfair trade practices of the entire food industry in connection with advertising, wholesaling, and retailing operations of meats and other food items.

In our recent statement presented to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary we pointed out the unfairness and inequity of the present situation. Under existing laws, one part of the food industry—including dairy cooperatives—is subject to the regulation of the Federal Trade Commission. Another part, which owns or has an interest in meatpacking facilities—including large dairy companies—is subject to the regulations of the Department of Agriculture under the Packers and Stockyards Act.

In other words, dairy cooperatives and others under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission find themselves subject to a degree of regulation not applicable to their packer competitors. We maintain that a double standard has been set up. Justice and fair play demand that this situation must be corrected.

We urge you most earnestly to approve legislation in line with S. 1356, in order to accomplish our objective to have the entire food industry, including dairy cooperatives, meatpackers, and others, subject to the same set of rules and regulations on merchandising trade practices.

Sincerely,

E. M. NORTON,
Secretary.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *August 12, 1957.*

Senator EDWARD THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request you oppose S. 1356 and support Dirksen amendment to that bill to best serve interests of agriculture. Appreciate your consideration.

J. P. KLUG.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *August 12, 1957.*

Hon. EDWARD THYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand S. 1356 to transfer jurisdiction over meatpackers from Department of Agriculture to Federal Trade Commission is due for vote today. We respectfully request your opposition to S. 1356 and support the Dirksen amendment to that bill.

ARMOUR & CO.,
R. W. ELDRED,
General Manager.

ALBERT LEA, MINN., *August 12, 1957.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Suggest you oppose bill S. 1356 and support Dirksen amendment to that bill.

W. F. GROOS,
Desota Creamery and Produce of Albert Lea.

ROCHESTER, MINN., *February 18, 1958.*

The Honorable EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: We understand that the packers and stockyards bill, S. 1356, along with Senator YOUNG's amendment, is expected to be called up for debate in the Senate in the near future.

Your support is requested on the passage of this legislation, along with the clarifying amendment. We believe that this will eliminate misleading advertising and discriminatory pricing which is harmful to the dairy industry today.

We appreciate the work which you are performing for the dairy farmers of our State.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES STUBE,
General Manager, Rochester Dairy Cooperative.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. Res. 273. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service;

S. Res. 277. Resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

S. Res. 279. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the interim report of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field; and

S. Res. 281. Resolution authorizing the printing of the committee print "Recruitment and Training for the Foreign Service of the United States" as a Senate document.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2146. A bill for the relief of William F. Peltier (Rept. No. 1419);

H. R. 7057. An act for the relief of Henryk Bigajer and Maria Bigajer (Rept. No. 1420); and

H. R. 7503. An act for the relief of Harry J. Madenberg (Rept. No. 1421).

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

S. 165. A bill for the relief of Arthur LeRoy Brown (Rept. No. 1422);

S. 400. A bill for the relief of Paul Thury (Rept. No. 1423);

S. 488. A bill for the relief of Eva S. Winder (Rept. No. 1424); and

S. 1879. A bill for the relief of Casey Jimenez (Rept. No. 1425).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 2617. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended (Rept. No. 1426).

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

S. 3093. A bill to extend for an additional period of 2 years the authority to regulate exports contained in the Export Control Act of 1949 (Rept. No. 1427).

MARGARET C. PRIDE

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 282) to pay a gratuity to Margaret C. Pride, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Margaret C. Pride, widow of Andrew J. Pride, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 3561. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to exempt real estate loans guaranteed by States from its provisions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3562. A bill to increase temporarily, as part of a general effort to overcome the current economic recession, the amount of insurance benefits payable to individuals under title II of the Social Security Act; and

S. 3563. A bill to provide an 8½ percent reduction of individual income taxes for 1958 and to provide immediate tax relief by establishing a 1-month moratorium on the imposition of the withholding tax on wages; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3564. A bill to accord coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain temporary rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3565. A bill for the relief of Ellen B. Mueller; and

S. 3566. A bill for the relief of Arthur B. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 282) to pay a gratuity to Margaret C. Pride, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HENNINGS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 24 OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT, TO EXEMPT CERTAIN REAL ESTATE LOANS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3561) to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to exempt real estate loans guaranteed by States from its provisions, introduced by Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. PAYNE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Last year the State of Maine set up a special State agency—Maine Industrial Building Authority—to assist in financing industrial development in Maine by guaranteeing mortgage loans made by lending institutions to local nonprofit development corporations. MIBA is empowered to issue its own bonds to meet any obligation arising from loan guarantees. The full faith and credit of the State of Maine are pledged to guarantee repayment of the mortgage loans.

The Maine law permits loans by lending institutions up to 90 percent of the property valuation for periods up to 25 years. Under section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act mortgage loans made by national banks, however, are limited to a maximum of 66⅔ percent of the property valuation for no more than 20 years duration.

National banks are a price source of mortgage funds in Maine. If national banks in the State are to be permitted to participate fully in the MIBA program, section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act will have to be modified. Since the full faith and credit of the State is pledged to guarantee loans under the MIBA program, modification of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act can be made for this limited class of loans without detriment to the national banks concerned. The proposed amendment has been carefully drafted in consultation with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States Department of the Treasury and Mr. Sewall Strout, chairman, legislative committee, Maine Bankers Association.

The proposed amendment is as follows:

"That section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the third sentence a comma and the following: 'and shall not apply to real-estate loans which are 100 percent guaranteed or insured by a State or by a State authority for the payment of the obligations of which the faith and credit of the State is pledged, provided that under the terms of the guarantee or insurance agreement the association will be assured of repayment in accordance with the terms of the mortgage'."

EXTENSION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO CERTAIN TEMPORARY RURAL CARRIERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, temporary rural carriers normally are not covered under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

First, they were excluded from coverage by executive order of the President. Later, they have been excluded by regulation of the Civil Service Commission. However, there was an exception to this practice during the war years, primarily because many temporary carriers served on a continuous basis for long periods of time. Under the regulations in effect at that time, for a temporary carrier to be covered under the retirement act, certain action was required of his supervising postmaster. Because of unfamiliarity with the retirement act, some postmasters failed to take the necessary action with respect to a limited number of temporary carriers. This omission had the effect of depriving some temporary rural carriers of coverage under the retirement act, whereas other temporary carriers acquired coverage.

I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill designed to correct this inequity. The bill does nothing more than make it possible for all such carriers who served during the war years to be treated alike.

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

The bill (S. 3564) to accord coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain temporary rural carriers, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3414) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act approved June 29, 1956, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

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. WILEY:

Address delivered by him on the subject of Education for Peace.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

Address relative to the rural electrification program, delivered by Senator KEFAUVER at the 22d meeting of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, Madison, Wis., on March 24, 1958.

By Mr. POTTER:

Article entitled "Challenges for Nurses Ever Increasing," written by him and published in the Michigan Nurse of February 1958.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Article entitled "Seaton Hopes for Early Statehood for Alaska," written by Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, and published March 13, 1958.

GREAT LAKES BASIN COMPACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the capacity of the eight States in the Great Lakes region to deal with the problems and opportunities presented by the opening of the great St. Lawrence Seaway will be enhanced if the Congress consents to the Great Lakes Basin Compact. A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, presided over by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], is holding hearings on the question now.

This morning I shall make a statement in support of the compact before

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

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in support of granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin Compact.

The Great Lakes States, indeed, the whole Midwest, stand on the threshold of a future of dynamic change that promises to bring immense development. Within a few years the St. Lawrence Seaway will create another seacoast 2,400 miles long, bordered by eight States of the Great Lakes region. In these eight States there are close to 60 million people—approximately 35 percent of the population of the United States. Backed up against them, so that they are a part of the region served directly by the seaway and the Great Lakes, are nine other States with a population of more than 13 million people.

The citizens of these States are the people whose lives will be most directly affected by the new route to the sea. These are the people who plant the grain, who mine the coal and the iron ore. They refine the petroleum products that will flow in an ever-widening river of commerce to the far places of the world. These are the people whose lives will be changed by the magic of low transportation costs for imports from other lands.

Today no man can foresee what vast benefits will flow—to all Americans—because of this great new link with the rest of the world. And no man can foretell what the problems will be. Some of the problems will require national solutions. Many of them will yield best to the initiative and first-hand knowledge of the States whose people are most directly affected by them.

If the Congress permits the States to develop the means to solve their regional problems it will not be pure generosity on our part. The alternative is to solve them here. That means that committees will sit endless hours fretting with local details. I am sure that is not a prospect that appeals to anybody on this committee. So this is a bill of responsible and sensible decentralization.

The time to get ready to solve problems is before they overwhelm us. What is proposed here is that the eight States bordering the Great Lakes should be permitted to enter into a compact so that they may establish an institutionalized way to confer and work out their problems together.

I am sure you know that six of the eight States that will be parties to the compact have already ratified it. The State of New York will ratify it as soon as the legislature, which has passed one ratifying measure, can pass another that satisfied some technical objections raised by Governor Harriman, who strongly favors the idea of a compact. The proposal has the support of the White House and the Departments of State, Justice, Defense, and Interior.

I think that the principle of a Great Lakes Basin Compact has great merit and I hope that your subcommittee recommends that the Congress give its consent.

VILIFICATION OF THE CLERGY MUST STOP

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in the course of the current hearings before the McClellan committee, certain reflections were cast upon the integrity of clergymen by Mr. Emil Mazey, a top officer of the United Automobile Workers.

The Reverend T. Perry Jones, minister, First Methodist Church, Sheboygan, Wis., immediately made several forthright observations in a written reply to a belated attempt at an apology by Mr. Mazey. The communication of the clergyman was addressed in care of the McClellan committee, and I wish to present the words of this respected clergyman to my colleagues of the United States Senate for their consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the reply of the Reverend Mr. Jones be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

DEAR MR. MAZEY: Your telegram of apology for your irresponsible reference to the clergy of Sheboygan County arrived too late to be of any consequence. In fact, it is 2 years too late. The UAW-CIO, through its strike bulletins, and your intemperate statements in public speeches in Sheboygan, vilified the clergy for one reason only.

We were expected to support every word and every technique used by the union. When the clergy turned away from this snide invitation to be spokesman for the union, then we were accused of being spokesmen for the Kohler Co.

Obviously, your greatest insult is to assume that the clergy of Sheboygan County are so lacking in self-respect that they would be stooges for the Kohler Co. or any other group in the community. Whatever faults you may recognize in the Kohler Co., the clergy of this county can assure you that Kohler Co. officials have never tried to influence the churches. We are, Mr. Mazey, as free a group of clergymen as you will find in any part of the country and in spite of your inference, we intend to remain that way.

Had you been as just and honest as you demand others to be, you could have made reference to the many meetings and hours of labor put in by four members of the clergy in an attempt to find an area of usefulness, and to convince the union in its strike techniques that they should be men of integrity.

Because we did not follow the leadership of the union we were castigated for months in the daily strike bulletin and by inference we were accused of cowardice. I do not recall that you came to our defense during this period of intimidation.

It grieves me, Mr. Mazey, that a man of your experience and important office in the union should maliciously poison the minds of labor and alienate the great number of union members from their spiritual leaders.

Sincerely,

T. PERRY JONES,
Minister, First Methodist Church.
SHEBOYGAN, WIS.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the recent statement of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], whose forthright rebuke of the UAW leadership and whose courageous and unqualified defense of the clergy was made in this body on March 18. The statement, in part, by the Senator from Wisconsin, a distinguished new Member of the Senate, follows:

I deeply regretted it when a top representative of the United Automobile Workers called in question the integrity of the clergy of Sheboygan. I believe this was most unfortunate and unfair, because I know personally many of the leading religious leaders in that community, and I know that they are men of absolute integrity and of deep conviction.

Mr. President, the actions of Mr. Mazey should not be permitted to reflect on the rank-and-file members of the UAW-CIO, who are all decent, hard-working Americans. They are churchgoers and have a profound respect for the conscientious and idealistic clergymen who minister to their spiritual needs. Nor should the recent actions of Mr. Walter Reuther, a coleader with Mazey of the UAW-CIO, reflect on the attitudes and intelligence of the membership.

As will be recalled, Mr. Reuther obtained the use of the caucus room of the United States Senate some days ago, and used this location to pour forth a torrent of personal abuse and unrestrained invective directed at the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. The same Mr. Reuther then had the effrontery to propose, in a letter to the Senator, that six clergymen judge the moral rightness of their respective actions.

A few days later, I received by mail a copy of the Detroit Free Press, whose editors described Mr. Reuther's letter to Senator GOLDWATER as a "shoddy try for a fast recovery of ground thrown away by the Mazey revelations of UAW philosophy as he understands it."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Senator GOLDWATER's reply to Mr. Reuther's letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

Mr. WALTER REUTHER,
President, UAW-CIO,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. REUTHER: Your letter, an 11-page public relations release, has been received by my office. I note with interest that more attention was given to timing your release for the Sunday editions of the newspapers than was devoted to insuring the delivery of this material to the person to whom it was ostensibly addressed.

In your letter you express some fears that this, your most recent personal attack on me, may be, to use your words, construed as a "public relation gimmick." I believe your fears are well grounded.

Let me make clear to you at once, that issues of grave public importance are presently being weighed by the committee set up by the United States Senate to explore such matters as the UAW-CIO strike against the Kohler Co. Social evils already disclosed by testimony given under oath go far beyond any question of personalities. For you to attempt now to frame the situation in terms of a personal vendetta is, in my opinion, an attempt to obscure the shocking facts disclosed by the present investigation of the strike against Kohler.

The issue is far too important to be viewed in the light of any personal controversy. The people of the United States are now, among other things reviewing your activities and the activities of your fellow officials of the UAW-CIO, through the investigating activities of a committee of the United States Senate. You are not required to defend yourself to me. You are required to explain your methods, aims and activities to the people of the United States, as represented by the present committee.

You are not answerable to me for any crimes you or your officials or hired men may have committed. Nor are you answerable to any group of six clergymen, distinguished as they may be. You are answerable to the peo-

ple of the United States through their representatives in Congress who have granted to you a position of special privilege and exemption from the law which requires in you a degree of self-discipline and social responsibility far beyond that of the average citizen.

Since you profess to be concerned with the problem of social responsibility, I would suggest that you carefully review the sworn testimony of your own people as presented to date before the present committee hearing. Your tolerance of and acquiescence in such activities would be a measure of your sense of social responsibility.

As one example I would direct your attention, particularly, to the case of William Vinson. This husky young man standing over 6 feet tall and weighing some 230 pounds was turned loose on the village of Sheboygan, Wis., apparently without instructions. He says he was there to "build morale."

In his morale-building duties on June 18, 1954, Mr. Vinson visited Zapetto's Tavern in Sheboygan Falls, Wis. At approximately 11:30 p. m., Mr. Willard Van Ouwerkerk, a small, middle aged local resident, entered the tavern with his wife. The sworn testimony of the record is the most reliable source for the brutal, vicious and unprovoked assault by your UAW-CIO representative upon this local citizen:

"Mr. KENNEDY. On or about June 18, 1954, did you visit a tavern, Zapetto's Tavern?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I did.

"Mr. KENNEDY. In Sheboygan Falls, Wis.?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. That was about 11:45 p. m.?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. If I remember right, yes.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Approximately that time?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Approximately, yes.

"Mr. KENNEDY. While you were there, was there a conversation with a woman?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. There was.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And did that woman identify herself as Mrs. Robert Burkhart?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Would you relate to the committee what occurred during that conversation and then what happened?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. She asked me who I was and I told her.

"Mr. KENNEDY. What was Mrs. Burkhart doing at that time?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I wouldn't know.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Was she just in the tavern?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I imagine she was.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Where did you see her?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. She came up to us.

"Mr. KENNEDY. You were sitting at the bar, were you?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I was sitting at the bar with my wife.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And she came up and started talking to you?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. She did.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Continue, please.

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Well, she asked me if I belonged to the union and I said no. Well, she wanted to know why not, and I told her that—well, I just didn't believe in it, that I figured that if the lines were open, I had a family to support, and I thought I was going to support them. So, then we were talking a little while longer. I don't just remember the conversation.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Did she identify herself at that time?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. She did.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Did she know who you were?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. She knew from somebody. I don't know who.

"Mr. KENNEDY. She said you were Willard Van Ouwerkerk?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right. She introduced herself as Mrs. Robert Burkhart.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Continue.

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Well, we talked a little while longer and finally she said, 'Well, I will call somebody.' I don't remember the name. I said, 'No, that wouldn't be necessary.'

"Mr. KENNEDY. Why did she say she would have to call somebody?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Well, I suppose she wanted somebody else to talk to me. I don't know.

"Mr. KENNEDY. She started to talk to you about not working at the plant?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. She did.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And then she said she was going to get somebody else to talk to you, and she was going to call someone?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Yes, I told her that wouldn't be necessary because we were leaving.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Was it antagonistic at that time?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. No, I wouldn't say it was.

"Mr. KENNEDY. But you didn't want to get into any kind of an argument?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I didn't want to get into anything. Then as I got off of the stool, somebody hit me from behind, in the back of the head.

"Mr. KENNEDY. You were struck on the back of the head.

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I was.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And you never saw the person who struck you at all?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I never saw him.

"Mr. KENNEDY. You were knocked down then?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I was knocked unconscious. I was on the floor.

"Mr. KENNEDY. You were knocked unconscious?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I was.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Is that right?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And when did you regain consciousness?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I regained consciousness outside.

"Mr. KENNEDY. You regained consciousness outside?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Afterward, was it related to you as to what happened when you were knocked down to the floor?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Yes; I heard about it afterward.

"Mr. KENNEDY. What did they tell you as to what happened?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Well, they told me that this person had worked on me with his feet on my back.

"Mr. KENNEDY. With his what?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. With his feet.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Once you were knocked to the ground from behind, the man then began to kick you; is that right?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And he kicked you in your ribs?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. My ribs; yes.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And continued to kick you until they pulled him away?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And finally somebody carried you outside?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Yes.

"Mr. KENNEDY. When you regained consciousness, did you subsequently go to the hospital?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Do you mean directly?

"Mr. KENNEDY. Well, directly, you did not go?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. No.

"Mr. KENNEDY. But subsequently you did go to the hospital?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I did.

"Mr. KENNEDY. The following day?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. This was on a Friday night. I went to the hospital on Sunday.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Did they take X-rays at that time?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That I ain't sure of. I couldn't answer that.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Well, did they find, anyway, that you had any ribs broken or any broken bones in your body?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Yes; through X-rays.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Through X-rays?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. How many ribs did you find were broken?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERKE. It was either three or four.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Three or four of your ribs?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Were you beaten in any other place?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Well, I had a punctured lung, and then I contracted pneumonia from that lung.

"Mr. KENNEDY. You contracted pneumonia from that lung?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. How long were you in the hospital?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I was in there some twenty-odd days. I think it was 22.

"Mr. KENNEDY. So you were knocked down by an unknown assailant and when you were down on the floor, he proceeded to kick you, and you were kicked and knocked unconscious. You were carried outside and ultimately went to the hospital and found that you had three or four broken ribs, had a punctured lung, and ultimately contracted pneumonia; is that right? Was there anything else regarding that?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. In what way?

"Mr. KENNEDY. Well, I mean anything else that happened to you, not that that is not sufficient, but was there anything else regarding this incident?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. No; I wouldn't say so.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Now, subsequently, charges were brought against this man?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. They were.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And that was found to be Mr. William Vinson?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And he is an international organizer for the UAW?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. He did not come from Sheboygan?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. No.

"Mr. KENNEDY. He was brought in from Detroit?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. The way I understand, he was.

"Mr. KENNEDY. But he had not worked in the plant?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Not to my knowledge.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And you identified him as an international organizer of the UAW; is that correct?

"Mr. OUWERKERK. Well, I heard he was.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And subsequently there was a trial held and he was found guilty.

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. And the judge sentenced him to 2 years.

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I believe that is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. That was Judge Schlicting?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. That is right.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Was Judge Schlicting denounced by Mr. Emil Mazey, of the UAW?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. They had a lot of trouble, I don't know what it was.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Did you understand that he was denounced by Mr. Emil Mazey of the UAW?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I couldn't answer that.

"Mr. KENNEDY. You don't have any personal knowledge of that?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. No; I don't.

"Mr. KENNEDY. I expect we will go into that.

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand that after you received this beating from an international representative of the union, that the court was criticized for the decision it rendered?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. To my knowledge it was.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether any action was ever taken by the international to condemn or to reprimand or to in any way punish Mr. Vinson for his vicious assault upon you?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. No; I don't.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether Mr. Vinson is still a representative of the international union?

"Mr. VAN OUWERKERK. I wouldn't know.

"The CHAIRMAN. Will we be able to show these facts by the witness?

"Mr. KENNEDY. Regarding the attack by Mr. Vinson?

"The CHAIRMAN. The question arises in my mind: Did the international union condone and approve the action of its international representative in making this assault?

"Mr. KENNEDY. We will have testimony on that.

"The CHAIRMAN. All right. Proceed.

"Mr. KENNEDY. I might read from the Supreme Court in upholding Judge Schlicting, circuit court judge, it states: 'The violence of Mr. Vinson's attack on Mr. Van Ouwerkerk, the continuation of the attack by kicking while Mr. Van Ouwerkerk lay helpless on the floor, the serious injuries which Vinson inflicted, the disproportion in the size and age of two men, which removed fear of personal danger to Vinson from reprisal by Van Ouwerkerk, are matters of evidence which the jury was entitled to consider when reaching a conclusion concerning Vinson's state of mind while he carried on the assault. It is quite impossible to conclude under such circumstances that in so doing, Vinson lacked an intent to hurt Van Ouwerkerk and hurt him badly. Contrary to appellant's contention, the evidence and the inferences from which it was the province of the jury to draw, established beyond a reasonable doubt that the assault was made by Vinson with the intent to inflict great bodily harm on Van Ouwerkerk.' "

The events above are shocking enough but the people of the United States will be even more shocked, I believe, by the assault which followed upon the judicial system of the United States, by top officials of the UAW-CIO.

The UAW-CIO set about to punish the judge who sentenced Mr. Vinson by going into the judge's hometown to destroy the judge both financially and professionally. As a leading member of the committee stated to Mr. Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW-CIO, after hearing the sworn testimony: "* * * you were leading a powerful and rich organization in a demonstration to intimidate courts in this land."

Outraged by this attack upon the very foundations of our social system, the Roman Catholic clergy of Sheboygan, Sheboygan Falls and Kohler Village, Wis., issued the following public protest:

"There comes a time when silence is imprudent, and may even be harmful to a community, such as Sheboygan, and that time is now. A resident of Sheboygan County was attacked and severely injured by another man. The attacker was tried in circuit court and convicted by a jury of assault with intent to do grave bodily harm.

"The judge of the circuit court, F. H. Schlicting, sentenced the convicted man to prison. The attorneys for the convicted man openly in court complimented the judge for his fairness in the conduct of the trial.

"The State supreme court denied the convicted man a stay of execution of the sentence. In the face of all these facts, the secretary-treasurer of the UAW-CIO, Emil Mazey, closing his eyes to the fact that the injured man was in danger of dying, has accused the judge of obvious bias shown against organized labor.

"He even presumed to question whether the judge is qualified to serve as a judge in this community. He has attacked the integrity of a major court in this country, and deserves to be called decisively to task for his insolence.

"Lawlessness is the result in any society or community when law and order are disregarded and flouted. It is the beginning of anarchy. Is the secretary-treasurer advocating either one?"

The names of the clergy who signed the protest are: John J. Carroll, pastor, St. Clements Parish; Robert M. Hoeller, pastor of St. Peter Claver Parish; Anthony J. Knackert, pastor of Holy Name Parish; Louis Koren, pastor of Ss. Cyril and Methodius Parish; Charles J. New, pastor of St. Mary's Parish, Sheboygan Falls; John A. Risch, pastor of St. John Evangelist Parish, Kohler; James J. Shlikas, pastor, Immaculate Conception Parish; William Weishaupl, pastor of St. Dominic's Parish.

The Sheboygan County Ministerial Association, comprising the Protestant ministers of the local area, also protested this ruthless attack upon the foundations of our democratic society by your organization, the UAW-CIO:

"A very grave issue confronts the community. It is not the issue of the strike at Kohler. It is the issue of an attack upon fundamental institutions which undergird our common life.

"Let us again state the facts which underlie the issue. Mr. Emil Mazey of UAW-CIO, has attacked the integrity of the highest judicial authority of this county, and has at the same time announced an action to punish the judge for sentencing a man convicted in open court by a jury of his peers.

"The sentence was within the discretion of the court as determined by law. Further the attorneys for the defendant commended the judge for his fairness in the conduct of the trial. And, finally, the convicted man has a remedy for judicial error in appeal to a higher court.

"But the basic remedy for an attempt to intimidate the court can only be found in the stern indignation of the community. Surely a leader of labor betrays his fellow workers when he seeks to destroy or weaken that judicial power which is the bulwark of all groups against injustice, even by the Government itself. Destroy the structure of our liberties and the first group to suffer will be the worker.

"This is the road to lawlessness and violence.

"As ministers of the church who must be concerned with justice and the rights of every individual, we are under compulsion to speak this word."

The Protestant ministers who signed the protest are as follows: Arno Duchow, Baptist Church, Sheboygan Falls; Wildord H. Evans, First Congregational Church; William Genszler, First United Lutheran Church; John Gerber, Ebenezer Evangelist and Reformed Church; T. Parry Jones, First Methodist Church; Clarence Koehler, Zion Reformed Church; Marvin Lehman, St. Paul's Evangelical and Reformed Church; James Saint, First Presbyterian Church; Henry Vermeer, Hope Reformed Church; Richard Werner, First Baptist Church.

The local bar association, the local medical association, and other responsible bodies also expressed their sense of outrage at this attempt by the UAW-CIO to wreak revenge upon a judge whom the clergy, as well as all other responsible elements of the community, and, in fact, the State supreme court, recognized as having merely carried out his judicial responsibilities.

Your secretary-treasurer, Mr. Emil Mazey, when asked to comment on this rebuke by the clergy had this to say, under oath:

"Mr. MAZEY. It is my opinion that the company influences all of the clergy who signed their name to this particular statement.

"Senator CURTIS. Now, Mr. Mazey——

"Senator MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

"Senator CURTIS. I will finish this list and before I go to another one I will yield to you.

"Before we started to go over that list one by one, you made the flat statement that the company controlled some of those clergymen. Is that still your statement?

"Mr. MAZEY. I said that in my opinion the company controlled the clergy of Sheboygan, Sheboygan Falls, and Kohler Village, in my opinion.

"Senator CURTIS. Do you mean by that they are not men of integrity?

"Mr. MAZEY. If they are controlled by the Kohler Co., they couldn't be.

"Senator CURTIS. Which ones are you referring to that could not be men of integrity?

"Mr. MAZEY. I said that in my opinion——

"Senator CURTIS. I know what you said. I am talking about which individuals are you saying are not men of integrity?

"Mr. MAZEY. All of them.

"Senator CURTIS. I will yield to Senator MUNDT.

"The CHAIRMAN. Did the Senator yield?

"Senator MUNDT. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Senator MUNDT.

"Senator MUNDT. I would like to say for the record, so that my silence will not lead to assent of this performance, that in over 17 years of serving on Congressional investigation committees, starting back with the Dies committee when we were dealing with Communists, I have just heard the most shocking statement from a witness I have heard in 17 years.

"When a witness says that there isn't a single man of integrity in the Catholic clergy of Sheboygan, Kohler Village, and Sheboygan Falls, if he does nothing else he certainly wins whatever kind of award should be made to a fellow who says something which is the most shocking statement I think a Congressional committee has ever had to listen to."

The distaste for Mr. Vinson's activities in Wisconsin, so unanimously expressed by local residents, was evidently not shared by the UAW-CIO in view of the money payments made to Mr. Vinson by your union during the 14 months that he spent in prison. It should also be noted that Mr. Vinson's attorney's fees and legal expenses in his criminal trial were paid for with UAW-CIO dues money which you hold as trustee.

It is clearly beyond the bounds of propriety that matters of such importance to the whole Nation should be considered only within the framework of a personal debate between two individuals.

May I remind you that I represent in the United States Senate along with my respected colleague, Senator HAYDEN, the State of Arizona, and my time is devoted to serving the people of my State in Washington. To the extent that certain national problems impinge on the interests of the people of the State of Arizona or are of sufficient national importance to merit attention I must consider them. Your attempts to gain public relations points by vilifying me, or to destroy me politically by sending your paid political operators into my State, are not within the scope of my present attention.

There are published reports that your political action group is coming into my State in an attempt to do me damage with my

people. I know Arizonians, and they do not take well to carpetbagging union leaders from the big eastern cities who come into Arizona to destroy Arizona candidates or to manipulate Arizona elections.

Whether the activities of you and your union, the UAW-CIO—whether the irresponsible exercise of power by you and your officials—constitute an important danger to our democratic institutions has already been answered in the affirmative by distinguished members of the clergy who know the facts. This whole crucial realm of public decision is not, however, the province of any pair of individuals or of any group, no matter how distinguished. Judgment on matters of such importance and of such danger to the institutions of this country can properly be made only by the people of the United States.

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there have been many evidences of deep public shock at the disclosure of the attitudes of the leadership of the UAW-CIO toward Roman Catholic and Protestant clergymen. In Detroit, headquarters of Mr. Reuther and Mr. Mazey, the Free Press, a newspaper which prides itself on its independence on all public matters, summed up the situation in clear, unmistakable terms, in an editorial entitled "With Everybody Looking, Mazey Peeled the Veneer Off."

I ask for unanimous consent that a portion of this thoughtful comment from the Detroit Free Press of March 15, 1958, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Getting back to the premise that a clergyman has no integrity if he refuses to become a mouthpiece for the UAW party line, what are we going to think of political candidates who have UAW support?

It appears to us that the same thing must apply to officeseekers that applies to clergymen so far as the UAW is concerned—and that therefore a candidate who gets UAW help is, through the offices of Mr. Mazey's testimony, advertised as one who will jump when Mr. Mazey whistles at him.

HIGH DAMS ON CLEARWATER RIVER, AND FISH AND GAME VALUES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, ever since proposals were first made years ago to blockade Idaho's Clearwater River with high dams, I have urged that any action should await a thorough study of the valuable fishery spawned in this important tributary of the Columbia River system. The Fish and Game Department of the State of Idaho has now completed such a survey, and I am pleased that the report of this State conservation agency vindicates my belief that the Clearwater should not be violated with high dams because of their ruinous effect on migratory fish and big game.

The report of the Idaho Fish and Game Department confirms the belief that Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliff Dams would cause untold damage to wildlife values. The Idaho State department urges that the dams not be built. I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks a story from the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune of March 16, 1958, detailing the results of the Idaho Fish and Game Department study opposing Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliff Dams. It is headed "State Report Against Clearwater Dams Because of Harm to Fish, Wildlife."

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

STATE REPORT AGAINST CLEARWATER DAMS BECAUSE OF HARM TO FISH, WILDLIFE

BOISE.—Idaho Fish and Game Department experts said Saturday that two proposed northern Idaho dams would cause severe fish and wildlife losses and should not be built.

The dams would be at Penny Cliffs on the Middle Fork of the Clearwater and at Bruces Eddy on the North Fork. Congress has not appropriated funds for either of the proposed Army Engineers' structures.

Two teams of biologists from the fish and game department studied wildlife aspects of the proposals, beginning in 1954. One team studied effects on big game and the other looked into effects on fish.

The principal recommendation of both teams was the same: The dams should not be built.

Each team recommended a wide range of protective measures for fish and game in the event that either project is built.

MEASURES ASKED

The fisheries team, Leon Murphy and Ted Keating, recommended that any authorization for either dam should include these things:

1. Facilities for passage of anadromous fish to and from their upstream spawning grounds.

2. Mitigation for losses which might occur at the dam to up or downstream migration.

3. Development of sport fishing in the reservoir by control of undesirable fish species.

4. Adequate and continual flow of water from the dam to the mouth of the Clearwater River.

5. Adequate study funds to accomplish these things.

6. Inclusion of fish and recreation as declared purposes of the dam, with their public access assured.

7. Consultation with fisheries agencies on any aspect of planning of the dam which affect fish life.

The fish team said the dams should not be built because "the steelhead trout fishery contributes so importantly to the economy of the area."

The game team said they should not be built because they would adversely affect big-game populations in the drainage area and surrounding areas.

GAME MEN RECOMMENDED

If either dam is built, the game researchers said, the following things should be done:

1. All land in the area of the project, except that needed in connection with operation of the dam, should be made a wildlife area under management of the State fish and game department.

2. Adjacent winter range lands should be purchased to make up for those inundated by the dam. These lands would also be managed by the fish and game department.

3. The agency or agencies building the dam should provide funds for a study of big game management problems arising from its construction.

The big game study was made by Elmer Norberg, assisted by Elmer Trout.

Ross Leonard, Idaho fish and game director, said the Clearwater drainage supports the Nation's greatest elk herds.

"We are aware that water is the life blood of the West," said Leonard, "but the recreational aspects of these proposals also must be considered."

FISH STUDY DETAILED

The fisheries report established that trout comprise the great majority of the fish caught in the drainage studied. The biologists contended that young steelhead make up a sizable portion of the trout catch. The migratory steelhead run presumably would be damaged by the construction of the proposed dams.

The study included the Clearwater's mainstem and all principal tributaries except the South Fork. Data was gathered through creel census, streamside interviews with fishermen and mailed questionaires.

The estimated total annual catch of fish in the census area was about 133,000. About 25 percent of the fishing done in the North Fork, Middle Fork and the mainstem during the general season occurs outside of the areas checked.

The report places annual fishermen's expenditures in the drainage accessible to anadromous fish at $412,073.

The census showed the tributaries above the sites of the proposed dams were heavy contributors to the total available fishing in the area.

The Lochsa River contributed more than one-third of the annual catch (48,395 in the area penetrated by the Lewis & Clark Highway; 9,433 in a 20-mile stretch accessible by road above and below the Powell Ranger Station). The catch in the Selway River totaled 16,601.

The North Fork produced 36,236 fish in a 69-mile stretch above Bungalow Ranger Station; 6,381 from a 10-mile stretch of the Little North Fork plus 7 miles of the North Fork, above and below the mouth of the Little North Fork.

MOSTLY TROUT

The catch in these tributaries was predominantly trout (up to 98.8 percent). The catch in the Clearwater's mainstem was 56.5 percent trout, 2.5 percent adult steelhead, 12 percent whitefish, and 29 percent smallmouth bass.

"Evidence from age-growth studies and sexual maturation observations indicates most of the small rainbow trout in the Clearwater drainage are of steelhead trout origin," the report states.

"If resident rainbow trout (nonmigratory) existed in large numbers in the North or Middle Fork drainages it seems probable that more of the larger rainbow trout over 10 inches in length would appear in the harvest. Cutthroat trout in these same waters attain lengths of 20 inches and fish over 10 inches long are common.

"Should the wild rainbow trout (juvenile steelhead) be lost to the fisheries of the North and Middle Forks, it would be necessary to plant catchable-size hatchery trout annually in these areas in sufficient numbers to replace, in the creel, the present catch."

The biologists estimated the average annual expenditure of fishermen seeking steelhead—both adult and juvenile—in 1955 and 1956 was $250,000 annually, and saw potential for a tremendous increase in this resource.

THE BILLBOARD AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief comment, prior to the start of the discussion today, regarding the amendment in the highway bill which deals with billboards. I listened attentatively yesterday to the long debate which occurred on the Senate floor. I was particularly impressed by the very able, vigorous,

and statesmanlike defense of the bill and of the signboard amendment which was made by the distinguished chairman of the Public Roads Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

One further matter impressed me most strongly. The opponents of signboard regulation legislation indulged merely in fly specking, in pointing out frivolous and capricious objections to the wording of the amendment. There was little or no discussion of the basic issue or question involved. That question is, Shall the billboard companies be able to plaster a 40,000 mile Interstate Highway System with their signs for private profit and exploitation? It seems to me today we must discuss the fundamental issue, which is whether the United States Government has some equity in assisting the 48 States to protect the scenery along the Interstate System.

NATIONAL EPILEPSY LEAGUE'S TESTIMONIAL DINNER

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I was privileged to attend a dinner given by the National Epilepsy League at the Washington Club on February 28. On that occasion Robert Hurleigh delivered an address which was most impressive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the body of the RECORD, since it is most informative.

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

ADDRESS BY ROBERT HURLEIGH

RAY HENLE

Ladies and gentlemen, because one of the men to be honored here tonight must, for good and sufficient reason, leave before we get into our program, I should like to take this moment to pay him his due. The multiplicity of appeals with which members of Congressional committees are deluged, has given rise to a new kind of art, that of presenting testimony. And one of the highest practitioners of this art is a man whose outstanding testimony in behalf of the neurological disorders may well stand as a model of that new art, Mr. Ray Henle.

SENATORS HILL AND THYE

In the gyrations of political fortune, two Senators take turns as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. And while the Democrats may win or lose, the cause of epilepsy never loses. For while each is chairman they unite to aid the overall neurological needs, and thus aid epilepsy. Both have particular backgrounds that help give them a profound understanding of this medical program.

Senator EDWARD THYE gained his through the noteworthy department of neurology at the University of Minnesota when he was Governor of that State.

Senator LISTER HILL gained his through his father, who was a doctor.

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

One of the greatest barriers to normal living for the epileptic are the outmoded laws on the statute books of many States and even in Federal legislation.

State legislators throughout the land are working to up-date these laws in the light of modern medical findings, while here in Washington the National Epilepsy League's champion in efforts to amend the immigration law as it applies to the denial of admission to our shores of epileptics is Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.

Present this evening to accept his citation is his administrative aide, Mr. Julius Cahn.

SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES

With the passing of Senator Robert Taft there arose the imperative need for someone else to act as personal advisor to Mrs. Tankersley. The man who so ably and skillfully filled that void and so often used his tremendous influence in the Senate most successfully on legislation pertaining to the Neurological Institute and other legislative matters was Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN E. FOGARTY

Perhaps the strongest and most consistent friend the National Epilepsy League has in the House of Representatives is the gentleman from Rhode Island, JOHN E. FOGARTY. So keenly has he felt about our cause that he has many times taken it to the floor of the House. We know we share with him other important health problems, but we wish to assure him we are happy, indeed, to count him as a friend of ours.

MAXWELL RABB

One of the most informed men in the country on the plight of the epileptic, particularly in the area of employment and the right and ability to become self-supporting, and thus a taxpayer instead of a tax eater, is the Secretary of President Eisenhower's Cabinet. For his tireless role in helping to interpret the controlled epileptic to industry, the league must be forever grateful to Maxwell Rabb.

SENATOR WILLIAM KNOWLAND

Every Congressman carries a workload and is subjected to pressures that would amaze their constituents—if they only knew.

Certainly, one of the busiest of the men on Capitol Hill is Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND. But withal he managed to find time to lend his personality and the prestige of his high office to a most important function of the National Epilepsy League—the annual Little Christmas Town fund-raising campaign.

This is the story of seizures—of a sickness that time forgot.

It goes back to the beginning of mankind, even before the coming of man, for animals, too, have seizures.

It is a story that, in recorded history alone, was 40 centuries a-borning.

Two thousand years before the father brought his convulsive son to Jesus of Nazareth, the Code of Hammarabi dealt with laws regarding the marriage of these people and the validity of their court testimony.

In those ancient times, when all men believed the world to be peopled by unseen spirits, it is not surprising that they saw an epileptic attack as an omen, an evil curse, a spell cast upon the luckless victim.

And so, in these ancient times, the treatment, quite naturally, was exorcism.

Skulls of men who lived before writing show evidence of crude surgery to relieve epilepsy. Trepanning of these skulls indicates efforts of primitive man to release the gods or devils possessing the person with seizures.

The ancient Greeks called it "the holy disease." Martin Luther named it "the demon disease." In Scotland, in the middle ages, the epileptic woman who became pregnant was buried alive.

Only occasionally, the gleam of a scientific mind would shed a little light.

In 450 B. C. Hippocrates made astute observations regarding epilepsy. He considered epilepsy a disease of the brain, due to natural and not supernatural causes.

But all through the ages treatment of epilepsy was ineffective. It was generally believed that people with epilepsy required custodial care, either in prisons or almshouses, and, more recently still, in hospitals or colonies for epileptics.

In fact, not even partially effective treatment for epilepsy was known until 100 years ago. Then, in 1859, it was found quite by accident that the bromides reduced the frequency and violence of seizures. No further advances were made in medical treatment of epilepsy until 1912, when barbiturates were introduced, but they did not come into general use as anticonvulsives until about 1922.

These medicines were, of course, depressants. While they reduced the frequency of seizures in many cases, too often the effective dose was also the toxic dose, so that the person, although possibly seizure-free, was so lethargic he could not hope to lead a normal life.

So, with the first quarter of the 20th century, a time when everyone in this room was already living, we may say that the first chapter in the history of progress in epilepsy was written. In fact, many of its authors are with us tonight.

The first major breakthrough for success in epilepsy occurred after a young medical missionary for the Rockefeller Foundation, working in China, became interested in the problem. Upon his return to the States his interest quickened and he began a long program of activity in Boston, where he was connected with the Harvard Medical School and Children's Hospital.

Truly, it may be said that the modern medical era for epilepsy began at this time under his leadership.

For with his enthusiasm and devotion he attracted brilliant young men around him and together they pondered the causes and treatment of seizures. This man should rightly be called the father of modern attempts to deal with epilepsy. This physician, author, crusader for public understanding of this ancient neurological disorder is William G. Lennox. Most regretfully, he is unable to be with us tonight. Yet, at 74, he is still working tirelessly on another book on epilepsy.

Now real progress was being reported. Developments followed developments in swift succession, as though to say, time had stood still long enough.

One of the most dramatic accomplishments occurred 21 years ago when two young medics codetermined the effectiveness of the first modern anticonvulsive medication.

This new medicine, produced by a major pharmaceutical house, proved to be effective in reducing or even eliminating seizures in many cases and had the great advantage of not being a depressant.

Now people, treated with this medication, their seizures stopped or greatly reduced, found themselves able to carry on normal activities.

Surely, discovery of this medicine must rank in the annals of medical science with the developments of the more widely publicized Salk vaccine.

For this new medicine helped bring more alleviation of suffering than any discovery in the age-old history of the disorder. The young medics are now distinguished neurologists. They are Tracy Putnam and H. Houston Merritt.

Quite understandably, while the attack on the medical front was going forward there began to be highlighted a cruel lag in public understanding of the plight of these people suddenly brought within reach of normal living—only to discover that social and economic barriers still stood to be surmounted.

Clearly there was a need for organized work in these areas.

And now the tempo of our story speeds up. Where we had been talking in terms of centuries, now we can report major developments every few years.

The first successful anticonvulsant was discovered in 1937.

Five years later the first seeds of the lay movement were sown. Many of Dr. Lennox' patients, enthusiastic and grateful for the medical miracle that permitted them to resume, or begin, normal life, wanted to make the same opportunities available to others.

So, in 1942, they formed a not-for-profit voluntary health organization known as the Laymen's League Against Epilepsy. It is in this early group that you find the foundation of the present National Epilepsy League.

The name of the voluntary organization was changed to the American Epilepsy League in 1946, and to the National Epilepsy League in 1950, when the National Association to Control Epilepsy of New York City and the American Epilepsy League of Chicago were merged to form at last a single, overall permanent national organization.

One of the present members of the board of directors of the National Epilepsy League was the second president of the American Epilepsy League, Mrs. Wheaton Kittredge, at that time Mrs. Brooks Potter.

A woman of unusual courage and wisdom, Mrs. Kittredge was one of the first persons willing to tell her story about epilepsy publicly, its handicaps and what the modern treatment of seizures could mean to the person afflicted with this disorder. A great milestone was reached with the publication, in a national magazine, of her signed article, Woman Without Fear.

To understand the degree of courage required to announce publicly that one is an epileptic, we need only pause to try to name a single person with epilepsy in any field of public life in our time who has done the same.

Yet we know they exist, high in government, in sports, in industry, entertainment, and the arts.

And they can protect their secret because of modern medical know-how. One can only speculate, of course, on what the kings, and emperors, and great men of early times with epilepsy would have given for medication obtainable today for little more than the cost of each day's newspaper.

Or what greater gifts could have been bestowed upon the world had the seizures of these men been placed under control by medication.

Look at the roster of some of the world's greats who were epileptic:

There was Mohammed, and Caesar, and Peter the Great, Alexander the Great, Louis XIII of France, Charles V of Spain, Ferdinand of Castile, Archduke Charles of Austria, William III of England. There was Lord Byron, Gustave Flaubert, Swinburne, Paganini, Pascal, Dostoevsky, Berlioz, and Guy de Maupassant; and Swedenborg, Socrates, Cardinal Richelieu, Van Gogh, and Handel.

Such a rollcall must be a source of encouragement to epileptics everywhere, but what greater challenge to overcome their handicap would arise from the knowledge that great people today have won high honor.

But the success stories of these people are lost to us because of the stigma of epilepsy.

At about the same time that Drs. Merritt and Putnam were testing the effectiveness of the first modern anticonvulsant medicine, another of the young men in this group was pursuing a somewhat different line of investigation.

A few years earlier a German psychiatrist had invented a machine to measure electrical discharges of the brain. Medical men, long frustrated by the difficulty of working with that most inaccessible part of the human body, the brain, must liken this development to scientists' present probing of outer space.

And the young physician who applied that machine, called an electroencephalograph, in the diagnosis of epilepsy, is Dr. Frederic Gibbs, now of the University of Illinois Medical School and Consultation Clinic on Epilepsy in Chicago.

His studies helped open up an entirely new avenue of progress in proper and more accurate diagnosis and speedier control of seizures. Happily, this progress has encouraged other medical experts to enter the field and now electroencephalography is almost a medical specialty in itself.

As word of success of modern medical treatment began to spread, one of the most important side developments has been the accumulation of more accurate facts about epilepsy.

For the first time in history it began to be possible to get statistical data on the personality, intelligence, educational, vocational, and social situation of people with epilepsy.

Now the National Epilepsy League was able to understand more fully the effects of the disorder on the lives of its victims.

The league now knew that epilepsy was a major health problem, affecting 1,500,000 people in this country.

It knew that these people came from every geographical area, from both sexes, all economic groups, all intellectual levels. And that it can affect anyone at any age.

As the National Epilepsy League's study of the problem progressed, it became apparent where the real tragedy in epilepsy lay.

Although modern medical treatment was now effective in 4 out of 5 cases, it was available in only 1 out of 5 cases.

Think what it would mean if only 1 in 5 children obtain Salk vaccine, or if there was a cancer control available to only one-fifth of its victims.

The reason why this situation obtains in epilepsy is simply the scarcity of trained physicians and of clinics to provide the treatment.

And then, as though this shortage were not torment enough, still another problem of tragic proportions arose. Thousands of letters poured in to the league office from those who had received treatment that resulted in control of their seizures.

Were these paeans of joy and triumph? No. The league now learned that the psychological, social and economic consequences of being known as an epileptic were—in many respects—more devastating than the seizures.

The writers said:

"I am still shunned by my neighbors."

"My son is denied an opportunity to attend public school."

"I am refused employment I am qualified to hold."

So it was that about a decade ago the National Epilepsy League decided it would work toward solution of the two most basic problems:

1. The tremendous shortage of medical experts and treatment and research facilities necessary to serve 1,500,000 patients with epilepsy.

2. Although effective medical treatment in the majority of cases had been discovered more than a decade earlier, children were still denied their legal rights to an education in the public schools.

With a budget of $25,000 and a staff that consisted of an executive and a clerical force of 1½ persons, the league tackled these huge jobs. What was lacking in manpower and funds was compensated for in large measure by the dedication, insight, and diplomatic skills of the league's national director, Ben Gray. Let me pause here to say that his genius in making that tiny amount of money move mountains and in guiding the league over its first plateau must stand as one of the outstanding feats of voluntary health agency work of our time. So high has been his achievement and so clear the course he has helped to chart that his successor must be forever grateful that Ben Gray went before. And for the thousands upon thousands of victims of epilepsy who have directly or indirectly come to know his kind of understanding and wisdom, Ben Gray's contribution to the modern era of epilepsy is firmly inscribed.

Now it also became clear that because of the tremendous size and many facets of the problem, only a recognition of the disorder as a major public health problem, with support by tax funds, could result in its solution.

A solution of the medical problems in epilepsy is basic to a solution of all other problems. The league came to the conclusion that a National Health Institute, similar to those established for cancer and heart, with annual appropriations by Congress, was needed.

At this time many bills had been presented in both Houses of Congress proposing the setting up of splinter institutes in the neurological disorders.

There was a bill for the establishment of a National Institute on Cerebral Palsy; one for a National Institute on Muscular Dystrophy; one for a National Institute on Multiple Sclerosis, and so forth.

Year after year, in spite of great effort, the bills never got out of committee.

Then the league's president, Bazy McCormick Tankersley, made it possible for Ben Gray to discuss the problem with Senator Brooks, of Illinois. That was in 1949.

The Senator advised that success of efforts to secure necessary legislation was dependent upon the degree to which the administrator of the Federal agency which would carry out the purposes of the legislation approved the plans.

The then Surgeon General, as Administrator of the United States Public Health Service, was unalterably opposed to the creation of these splinter institutes. Mrs. Tankersley and Mr. Gray agreed with him that any new health institute concerned with epilepsy or any other specific neurological disorder should be one that included all of the more than 200 neurological entities. And the Surgeon General did believe it was important for the Federal Government to support programs of research, teaching, and training in the neurological field.

Then Mrs. Tankersley and Mr. Gray talked with Senator Taft. The Senator said it was his opinion that regardless of the merits of the case, Congress would not support the expenditures of Federal funds on a program designed to provide medical treatment services in epilepsy or other disorders and diseases. He indicated, however, that he and other Members of Congress were rather generally agreed that the use of Federal funds to encourage research, teaching, and training was an important and legitimate use of Federal tax funds.

He felt that legislation designed to achieve this end would receive favorable consideration.

As time went on Senator Taft's guidance and interest was, in a large measure, responsible for our ultimate success. I. Jack Martin, then his administrative assistant, is here tonight so that we may inform him of the league's resolution to place a wreath at the Senator's monument at the Capitol in memory of his service.

The league began to create a climate in which every agency concerned with a neurological disorder could and would work together toward a common goal.

First, the Director of the National Health Council was persuaded to call together representatives of the various voluntary health agencies concerned.

Agreement was reached that a bill would be presented at the next session providing for establishment of a National Institute of Neurological Disorders.

To this end, its most important function was to conduct a program of education with Members of Congress.

Dr. Abe Baker of the American Academy of Neurology was named chairman and Mrs. Tankersley was appointed to head up a steering committee with specific responsibilities for informing Congress and planning the hearings before the Appropriations Committees in the Senate and House.

An expert in the mechanics of this type of activity, which, to the uninitiated, could prove disastrous, was prevailed upon to help. The smoothness and dispatch with which he served at this critical phase was in large part responsible for what came next. The expert—Col. Luke Quinn.

And victory came the next year.

In August 1950 Congress authorized establishment of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, with an appropriation of $1,250,000.

A leading neurologist and administrator was named Director and in 1952 the Institute was activated.

The first direct appropriation was received in 1954 in the amount of $4,380,000.

Now in addition to direct studies carried out in epilepsy, research in neurology is going forward day by day to provide some of the answers to a solution of the treatment problem.

For example, studies in the regeneration of nerve tissue have been supported. If a solution to this problem develops it would mean that people whose epilepsy had resulted from destruction of brain tissue in an accident might look forward to a more successful treatment program.

As a direct result of the teaching and training programs instituted here in Bethesda, chairs of neurology are being established at major medical schools.

Today, both because of scholarships and because of the prospect of research funds, there are more young neurologists going into practice than there are neurologists going out of the field through death and retirement. In time we can look forward to having a sufficient supply of medical personnel not only for a larger research program, but a more complete treatment program in all communities.

Here at Bethesda itself there is employed a complex coordinated approach in which many specialists work together as a team.

The team carrying out the research program is composed of a neurosurgeon, neurologist, electroencephalographer, a psychiatrist, and a biochemist.

And the man responsible for putting all this together, the brilliant and farsighted administrator of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, is Dr. Pearce Bailey.

At the close of the league's first decade of effort, directed toward finding a solution to the problem of research, teaching, and training in behalf of epilepsy, it may be said that they have achieved a great success.

Now what transpired with the other major problem selected for attention—the problem of educable children with epilepsy being denied their legal right to an education in the public schools?

Ten years ago school administrators largely believed that children with epilepsy were not educable and were properly a subject of custodial care in State institutions.

In fact, there was only one city in the United States that had developed a special program for children with epilepsy in its public-school system.

That was the White Special School and the city was Detroit.

One of its early principals was a woman who fought doggedly to prove that the educable child with epilepsy belonged in the public-school system. So well was her work done that today the White Special School, for children with epilepsy, has gone out of business, for all of its students are now attending the regular public schools closest to their homes. Educators in many parts of the country have a new and healthy respect for her theory of education. That former principal is Mrs. Carlotta Teagan.

Because epilepsy affects so many children in the United States and because from a medical standpoint they are just children with a minor health problem that is treatable, the league addressed itself to changing the attitude of the public-school administrators.

In 1948 the president of the International Council on Exceptional Children was Ray Graham, director of special education for the State of Illinois. The problems and unmet needs of children with epilepsy in the public schools were discussed with him in many conferences, and Mr. Graham became convinced of the need to explore the matter further.

The subject of epilepsy was placed on the agenda of the next annual meeting of the International Council on Exceptional Children, Dr. Gibbs accepted the speaking assignment, and from that time forward an excellent working arrangement has flourished between the council and the league.

The league has paid expenses for meetings of a permanent committee on epilepsy within the council and has produced publications developed by the committee. Ben Gray was the first secretary of the committee, which had had a most distinguished group of leaders in the field of special education.

Foremost among those who have served as directors of the committee and who have gone on, determined to focus attention of the people in education on the need for programs discussing the problems of children with epilepsy, were two career Government people. Quickly they grasped the magnitude of the problem and year after year they strived to make it meaningful as they implemented their thoughts with their deeds. Because of them the prospects of an education and eventual self-support for victims of epilepsy is bright, indeed. Their names—Dr. Romaine Mackie, Chief of Special Education for the Federal Office of Education; and Dr. Arthur J. Lesser, Director of the Division of Health Services of the Federal Children's Bureau.

As a result of the committee's activity, the old attitude toward providing educational services for these children has changed in every section of the country, for today school administrators rarely deny their responsibility toward them.

There is a genuine demand arising that the National Epilepsy League and the International Council on Exceptional Children provide specific suggestions as to the necessary special services and programs needed to be supplied by the public schools in helping these children adjust in the classroom.

Evidence of this change are the highly successful summer workshops on epilepsy initiated by the director of special education of, and jointly planned and financed by Syracuse University and the National Epilepsy League. Out of these workshops have come fully informed educators who have returned to their home States equipped to work as consultants within their State office of public instruction.

The man who early foresaw the need of educating the educators on how to handle the problem of epilepsy in their schools is one of the leading special education administrators in the country, for his skills and determination overcame the dread specter of apathy. He is the director of special education at Syracuse University, and his name is Dr. William Cruickshank.

One of the most important extra dividends arising from the work with educators has been the development of interest on the part of the Federal Children's Bureau in planning medical and related services that will make it possible for the public schools to handle the problem of epilepsy.

The educators believe they could handle the problem if necessary medical and related services were available to all of the children who needed these services.

They rightly believed this was not the schools' responsibility but the responsibility of the local communities and the Federal, State, and local public health agencies.

Dr. Lesser agreed, too, and quickly recognized the justice of the need and arranged for Ben Gray and other experts to speak to his staff in Washington, as well as at local and regional meetings of his agency around the country.

The results have been little short of phenomenal.

1. For a number of years now the Federal Children's Bureau has made grants of around $25,000 annually to the Consultation Clinic of the University of Illinois and the Children's Seizure Clinic in Boston.

The purpose of these grants was for the teaching and training of medical and related personnel that could be used by States wishing to provide services for children with epilepsy.

2. The Federal Children's Bureau made a direct grant to the Department of Public Health of the State of Maryland to plan and carry out a pilot program of services for children with epilepsy in that State.

As a result of this program, Maryland has become the first State in which it can be said that every child with epilepsy can obtain modern medical treatment, and every educable child with epilepsy in the State can attend the public schools.

An added dividend from this program has been the accumulation of statistics.

In Maryland today the names, addresses, and diagnoses of more than 1 in 200 children with epilepsy in the total child population are on file.

In one county, where a more intensive program in case finding was conducted, accurate information is known on more than 1 in 100 children who have epilepsy. This has proved most important in testimony before appropriations committees in State legislatures and in the Federal Government.

3. Programs of medical and related services have been inaugurated in 10 States with funds provided by the State and Federal Governments through the Federal Children's Bureau program.

Although Dr. Lesser's office has been doing what it could to encourage more activity on the State level in calling attention to the unmet needs of children with epilepsy, it has been hampered by a lack of citizen interest so necessary in the securing of an appropriation by the State to set a program in motion.

Now a solution to the problem of education for children with epilepsy is well along, firmly based because it is the educators themselves who have made the recommendations, and our program has become their program.

For this portion of the league's activity there is no physical plant and no appropriations of millions of dollars each year to stand as a symbol of progress in the fight against epilepsy. But all over the land children with epilepsy are sweeping aside the centuries-old stigma and are learning and playing side by side with other children, growing up unashamed and useful citizens.

And the nonepileptic child who is learning to live with a child who has seizures will grow up to accept the adult with seizures.

In this way the stigma of epilepsy could disappear in a single generation.

This, then, is a little of the history of epilepsy, and its story is still being written. For most of the authors of the first chapter of the modern era of our subject will continue to fill the pages, while those who come after will find here the shining seed of new growth and new determination to add to this literature of a part of humanity.

COMMENTS OF WAUSAU BRANCH OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN ON UNITED STATES RELATIONS WITH AFRICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the other day I was pleased to receive a most interesting evaluation by one of the fine Wisconsin branches of the American Association of University Women.

This particular branch, in Wausau, has an international relations study group which, after very considerable work, has prepared a policy statement, focusing attention on the problems of what has, heretofore, been known as the Dark Continent—Africa. But it is a continent which we had best learn more about, and fast, if we are to help it and help ourselves adequately in this challenging age.

I believe that these grassroots reactions of women who have taken the time to study an important phase of United States foreign policy will bear the interested attention of my colleagues. I do not agree with all the observations made by the group, but I do endorse their keen recognition of the urgency and significance of improved United States relations with an understanding of Africa. Here is a region of great and rising importance on the world scene, a region of ferment and change.

I send, therefore, to the desk the text of the statement from the AAUW branch. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

WAUSAU, WIS., *March 19, 1958.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATORS: For the past 7 months the international relations study group of the Wausau branch of the American Association of University Women has been studying Africa and its problems.

The group has arrived at several conclusions which it believes the United States might pursue to serve its own best interests and to improve the social and economic position of the great African Continent.

The suggestions which the study group wishes to pass along for your consideration include:

I. Take a new look at Africa and its peoples, not through the eyes of our allies, the French, British, etc., as in the past. We must put ourselves intellectually and emotionally in their place. We can help and give guidance, but not impose our pattern on them.

II. Learn more about Africa. American universities should increase interest and activities in Africa. We need trained people, especially those who can speak the native languages. We should increase the exchange of students and community leaders. A cultural interchange is badly needed.

III. Adopt a creative, constructive, and long-term policy toward Africa.

(a) Extend more economic aid. We believe increased sums should be allocated to technical assistance, and that a greater proportion of the economic aid fund should be directed to the underdeveloped countries of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.

(b) Expand trade and commercial relations with Africa. It is most important that the Reciprocal Trade Act be extended. If we do not expand trade with these underdeveloped nations, they will be forced to trade with U. S. S. R. dominated countries and the world balance of trade will fall away from our favor.

(c) Strengthen in every reasonable way the role the United Nations can play. The United States should devote far more time to the Trusteeship Council and the Committee on Information for the Non-Self-Governing Territories which deal with the colonial questions. Neither has ever been taken as seriously here as in Asia and Africa. One encouraging aspect of our leadership was our sponsorship of the special projects fund in the 12th session of the General Assembly.

(d) Send more technicians to Africa. We desperately need contact at the grassroots or bulldozer level.

(e) Improve and expand our information program in Africa. We believe, as the United States Advisory Commission recommended in its annual report, that if we are to meet the Communist propaganda challenge and wrest the initiative from them, we must expand our efforts.

IV. Deemphasize the cold war in favor of competitive coexistence.

(a) War has become obsolete in international relations. Intensification of the nuclear arms race in itself offers no hope for freedom and is extremely costly. We should recognize this and apply ourselves to the challenges presented by competitive coexistence. We realize this means the continued existence of both the two great systems of social and political organization.

(b) We should lay our nuclear cards on the table and negotiate with the Russians. This does not mean we should let down our defenses, because armaments are important not just for what can be done with them in time of war, but for the psychological shadows they cast in time of peace.

Finally, we agree wholeheartedly with George Kennan when he said: "Would we not be better off today if we could put our military fixations aside and stake at least a part of our safety on doing the constructive things for which the conditions of our age cry out and for which the stage of our technological progress has fitted us?"

Respectfully yours,
MARY A. FREUND
Mrs. W. J. Freund,
DOROTHY WEST MANSON
Mrs. C. L. Manson,
Cochairmen, International Relations Study Group, Wausau Branch, AAUW.

P. S.—At the regular monthly meeting of AAUW last evening, our committee presented a report on its study of Africa, including the recommendations on foreign policy. Several members and friends also wished to signify their approval of these recommendations, so their signatures are on the attached sheet. Those names marked with an asterisk are members of our international relations committee: *Mrs. T. H. Langford, Mrs. M. E. Gjetson, Barbara Ellen Joy, Clara L. Ruder, Marjorie Camp, *Virginia Hulbert, Mrs. H. P. Gutzesell, *Mrs. Elmer Peterson, *Ethel B. Scheurman, *Dorothea M. Krause, Harriet Steel, Mrs. Marion Winnig, Mrs. Edith Winkelman, *Mrs. Edward Pryzina, Mrs. George Lesch, Mrs. Marie Bannon, *Mrs. Sol Oestreicher, Katherine B. Fisher, Jean Conover, and *Mrs. Thurl Burr.

RESOLUTION OF LAND O' LAKES CREAMERIES AND SPEECH OF SENATOR WILEY IN MADISON ON REA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, it was my pleasure to address the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, representing 30 rural electric cooperatives of my State.

My theme was The Importance of the St. Lawrence Seaway to Wisconsin Agriculture.

I also addressed myself, however, to the problems of Wisconsin REA's.

Coincidentally enough, I have received a resolution from one of the dairy organizations of my State, commenting on the very type of REA material which I had personally discussed.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution from the annual meeting of Land O' Lakes Creameries be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, to be followed by the text of my address in Madison.

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

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—RESOLUTION APPROVED AT THE LAND O' LAKES CREAMERIES ANNUAL MEETING, MARCH 14, 1958

1. Whereas there are bills before the Congress to raise interest rates on loans to rural electrification cooperatives; and

2. Whereas the authority of the REA administrator has been limited in approving loans within the Department of Agriculture; and

3. Whereas many dairymen, members of Land O' Lakes, are served by REA-financed cooperatives: It is therefore

Resolved, That Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., at its annual meeting on March 14, 1958, requests that—

(a) The interest rates not be raised.

(b) The REA Administrator be given full authority to approve loans, which authority was granted to him in the original REA Act of 1936.

It is therefore

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators and Representatives of the States in which Land O' Lakes has members, and that a copy be sent to the REA Administrator, Mr. Hamil.

SENATOR WILEY OPPOSES INCREASING INTEREST RATES ON REA'S—URGES SPEEDED UP SEAWAY CONSTRUCTION TO BENEFIT WISCONSIN ECONOMY—OUTLINES 3-POINT ANTI-RECESSION PROGRAM

(Address by Senator WILEY)

I am happy to be with you tonight. It is a real privilege to have the opportunity to address this annual meeting of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative.

As directors, managers, and delegates of our State's cooperatives, you are indeed to be commended for your fine work in serving our Wisconsin communities.

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

I greatly appreciate, of course, having the opportunity to discuss with you two programs in which I have a very deep interest: The REA and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

In addition, I should also like to touch briefly upon the farm outlook, the unfortunate rise in unemployment, lags in business and industrial activity, and related issues.

NEED FOR OVERALL OPTIMISTIC OUTLOOK

In these days of challenge and problems, there is an unfortunate—and I believe unhealthy—tendency to look only at the gloomy side of the picture.

All of us, of course, realize that we are faced with problems—serious problems in Wisconsin, in the Nation, and in the world.

Nevertheless, let us remember that we have faced critical times before, and emerged triumphant. To deal effectively with these problems, we need practical and realistic optimism—not defeatist pessimism.

TRIBUTE TO REA

Before I discuss our problems, let me pay well-deserved tribute—as I am always happy to do—to the rural electrification program. Let me also pay tribute to you—each and every one of you—who have shared in bringing the benefits of this wonderful program to rural Wisconsin and America.

You and I know that the REA has magically transformed farm life. The farmer and his family now enjoy most of the comforts and conveniences of modern living available to his urban neighbors.

FINE RECORD OF WISCONSIN CO-OPS

All of us, of course, can be proud of the fine record, and responsible role, of our Wisconsin electric co-ops in bringing service to more and more consumers. For example:

1. The quality of electric service continues to be high.

2. All our electric cooperatives are on schedule in making loan payments, without a single cent of delinquency. In fact, about $2 million have been repaid ahead of time.

3. The availability of electric power in rural areas through electric co-ops is benefiting not only the farmers, but also has encouraged small business activity.

4. In our State—as elsewhere—it should always be emphasized that the electric co-ops have served, and are continuing to serve, "marginal areas" that are not economically attractive to private power companies.

These, of course, are only a few of the outstanding attributes of the REA program.

REA PROGRAM EXPANDING

Nationally, too, this program is making real contributions to rural development and progress.

As you know, it is fortunate that nearly 95 percent of our Nation's farms now have electric service.

Currently, there is a substantial increase in applications for loans for heavier distribution lines and for power generation. Why? So as to fulfill many needs for more power both for farms and nonfarm consumers.

Interestingly, the new nonfarm consumers annually being served by REA-financed electric systems are outnumbering farmers nearly 3 to 1. However, in Wisconsin, this trend is not so rapid; about 1 out of 4 electric co-op members is nonfarm.

Currently, as you know, our 30 electric co-ops are bringing light and power to more than 92,000 consumers.

There is no need, of course, for me to elaborate further on the advantages—including power for light, tools, refrigerators, stoves, and other conveniences—that this program is bringing to our rural people. For you know them as well as I.

However, as a farmer—boy and man—before REA, let me assure you that no one—and I repeat, no one—appreciates more than I the wonderful change which rural electrification has brought to farm living.

THREATS TO REA FROM PROPOSED HIGHER INTEREST RATES

You and I agree, of course, on the merits of the REA. This program, I believe, has a bright future.

However, there are some challenges—perhaps, real threats—on the horizon.

For example, an attempt may be made to tamper with the REA financing program.

As we know, the low 2 percent interest rate has been a real benefit in stimulating REA service.

Currently, however, serious and far-reaching legislation is pending in the Congress that would raise the interest rates from 2 percent to the going rate.

We recognize, of course, that the Federal Government now pays more than 2 percent on money it borrows. Thus, there is some feeling that REA interest ought to be raised to the level paid by the Government.

In reviewing this situation, there are some hard facts to be considered:

1. The farmer is already hard hit, with an income far too low in relation to his high costs of operation. To raise his costs still higher would hardly make sense at the present time.

2. Make no mistake about it, increased interest rates on loans, of course, would inevitably be passed along to farm and nonfarm users.

3. The general economy, as well as the farm economy, is lagging, and antidote measures are now essential. I repeat: antidote measures, helpful, not harmful actions.

In view of these facts, I believe the Congress will not—in fact should not—now increase interest rates on REA loans.

Currently, too, overall interest rates are dropping. This trend should lessen pressures for increased rates on the REA program.

DON'T FORCE REA DEPENDENCE ON PRIVATE MONEY MARKET

You are, no doubt, familiar with the fact that it has been proposed in some quarters that REA should be forced to rely on future borrowing on the private-loan market.

I very definitely do not feel that there is justification at the present time for rigidly forcing REA to turn for its capital requirement to the private-money market. Any such abrupt change in Federal policy would, I believe, judging from the strong evidence now available, slow down REA's remarkable progress toward financial self-sufficiency. It would increase administrative time and expense in carrying out the program. Basically, any such arbitrary change in policy would have the effect of putting a damper on prompt, much-needed investment in REA capital improvements.

The private-money market, as you know, has been tight. And I don't think that the present difficult condition of American agriculture, with milk checks so seriously below what they should be, allows for an alteration in our basic policy toward REA financial needs.

AVOID HARMING THE NATION'S CO-OPS

I want to turn to one other phase of the problem of cooperatives, as such.

You and I observe that, unfortunately, REA and other co-ops are still being attacked on the tax front. "Hit them with taxes," co-op enemies say. Well, the fact is that REA and other co-ops already pay taxes—lots of taxes. Over $500,000 in taxes were paid by Wisconsin's 30 electric co-ops, alone, last year.

Naturally, as a matter of principle, all of us are interested in a fair distribution of the Federal Government's tax burden. But, you and I know that co-ops already pay taxes that corporations and other businesses pay. So we ask: Why saddle cooperatives with still heavier burdens at the present time? Aren't our farm co-ops already laboring under enough difficulties amidst the present decline of our United States economy?

A strong co-op movement is one of the pillars of a revitalized economy—it is an antirecession measure in itself. United States co-ops should be strengthened, rather than weakened.

I, for one, of course, would strongly oppose any efforts that would put so great a financial burden on our co-ops as to destroy their ability to serve their members. And I do not think that the Congress would do any such thing.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY ESSENTIAL TO FARM PROSPERITY

Now, I turn to another subject that is of tremendous importance to the future of our beloved Badger State: the St. Lawrence Seaway.

At completion, this great tradeway will, as you know, bring 2,300 miles of 27-foot deep-sea shipping to our Wisconsin shores.

As a result, our Wisconsin farms and industries will have cheaper routes to more United States and Canadian and world markets. In addition, our businesses and service establishments will also benefit.

Is this really important to our rural economy. Very definitely, yes.

Why?

SPECIAL MEANING OF INCREASED TRADE TO WISCONSIN

As you know, our Wisconsin exports now provide an outlet for a sizable chunk of our State's production. This volume of export is making a substantial contribution to our State.

1. Our export of dairy products—now amounting to $18 million annually—will have better access to more, less expensive to reach markets.

2. Experts indicate the prospect of a 5-cent to 15-cent a bushel saving on grain shipments.

3. Other State-produced products, too, will be provided an improved market, thus benefiting the general economy. The value of a few of these exports is estimated as follows: Paper products, $20 million; automobile exports, $45 million; machinery, $175 million.

There is, of course, a wide variety of other Wisconsin goods exported annually. In fact, perhaps almost as much as one-half of Wisconsin's industries are engaged—directly or indirectly—in foreign trade and can be expected to benefit from the seaway.

4. The completion of the seaway, too, will mean that our Wisconsin ports will serve increasingly as terminal points for commerce to and from our neighboring States to the west and south of us. This will stimulate Wisconsin's economy through requiring expansion of local services to help accommodate the increased trade and commerce.

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S HEARTLAND

5. The basic effect of the St. Lawrence Seaway is to help facilitate the building up of the Midwest, which is already the heartland of America, in its industrial and commercial strength.

Wisconsin will take one new luster, new prestige, as a sound location for new factories; once the seaway is available. With the seaway will come, therefore, we hope, new jobs in our cities, towns and villages.

Why? Because, as transportation costs for raw and finished materials are lowered, factories based in Wisconsin gain equality with or a competitive advantage over factories located elsewhere in our country.

More jobs spell more income. I need not remind you that Wisconsin needs to develop consumer markets for consumption of its dairy, and other products. Eighty-five percent of Wisconsin's milk, for example, moves to interstate markets. As new jobs are created here in Wisconsin, we will drink still more of our own milk. Standards of living in the whole Midwest will be raised. People will come to drink more milk, eat more cheese, and other healthful nutritional Badger products. All along the seaway route, there will be expanded purchasing power to buy Wisconsin farm products, which might otherwise end up as so-called surpluses in Commodity Credit Corporation warehouses.

WHAT WILL IT TAKE TO CAPITALIZE ON SEAWAY

The seaway, however, is not going to bestow benefits on our economy magically or overnight.

It will take hard work. The ingredients for achieving future benefits from the seaway are four in number:

FIRST OF FOUR STEPS: SPEED CHANNEL WORK

1. We must speed up the rate of engineering work for deepening and improving the Great Lakes channels.

I am, speaking very frankly, deeply concerned about failures to date to step up

completion of the connecting channels to the Upper Lakes States. Until we get these channels beyond Lake Erie deepened to 27 feet depths—instead of the present 25 feet downbound, 21 feet upbound—we will not have in the upper Midwest, full access to deep-sea commerce. Thus, the real benefit of this great program will still be partly denied us.

CURRENT CHANNEL BUDGET TOO SMALL

Unhappily, the funds provided in the 1959 budget under the proposed schedule of expenditures, mean that the completion date will be set back a number of years. This is definitely not in the best interests of Wisconsin or the upper Midwest of the Nation.

As we know, the 1959 budget contains only about $18 million. An additional $5½ million will be allocated from funds provided in supplemental appropriations—bringing the amount to about $23½ million.

However, if the connecting channels are to be deepened by 1962, at an estimated overall cost of about $140 million, more money—approximately $30 million to $35 million annually—will be needed.

The seaway appropriations are now pending before the Appropriations Committee. To provide the needed money, I am requesting the committee to write in additional money to carry forward the construction work at maximum speed.

It would be shortsighted, indeed, to get the seaway along so far, and then dillydally with its completion—to the detriment of Wisconsin and the whole upper midwestern area.

However, in spite of this channel problem—which I believe can and will be favorably resolved—the seaway holds great promise for us, when, as early as 1959, 14 feet will no longer be the controlling depth.

IMPROVE PORTS AND HARBORS

2. We must improve Wisconsin's cities' own port and harbor facilities. A deep-draft seaway, leading to shallow-draft harbors, can hardly mean maximum traffic.

Right now, only 3 of the 13 Wisconsin harbors can accommodate modest-sized seagoing vessels. These three harbors: Ashland, Milwaukee, and Superior, now have channel depths about the same as the seaway.

That is why new improvement work on these and other ports and harbors is essential.

3. A fair rate of tolls on all types of cargoes are essential. I believe that there will, indeed, be an equitable toll system announced by the Seaway Development Corporation.

As you recall, the original Wiley-Dondero law provided for repayment of the construction indebtedness by payment of tolls on traffic.

The task is to set tolls at a level that will encourage maximum traffic through this great waterway, and at the same time contribute to repayment of the construction cost.

PROMOTING AND SELLING THE SEAWAY

4. The fourth challenge is salesmanship and promotion of the seaway. We must acquaint industrialists and other shippers all over the country as to the advantages, in specific economic terms, of the seaway.

Our basic problem is that businesses all over the United States have traditionally developed the pattern of shipping through the eastern and gulf coasts. They are not going to change that pattern easily, overnight, especially for a seaway which operates in but 8 of the 12 months of the year. Therefore we must do an education job in relation to these businesses, pointing out that they can achieve higher profits through lower costs thanks to the eight opportunity-filled months of the seaway season.

The locks of the Sault St. Marie, operating, we should remind everyone, only in the ice-free season, have long moved far more traffic than passes during all 12 months of, say, the Panama Canal.

Phony arguments as to the seaway's alleged limitations simply will not stand up, if we provide the necessary facts.

THE PROBLEM OF 5,250,000 UNEMPLOYED

And now we come to what will be the concluding portion of my remarks.

I want to refer to the economic situation facing our country, generally; and particularly, as it affects the farmers of Wisconsin and the rest of the Nation.

I need not remind you of the 5¼ million American unemployed. Unhappily, this now amounts to over 5 percent of the labor force in Wisconsin. In some communities, the figure goes upward toward 15 percent.

In the future, I believe the seaway will help to provide for increased industrial activity and jobs and to help avoid the recurrence of such dips.

But 15 percent of even 5 percent unemployed today—now presents an acute problem. I need not tell you in detail of the significance of these unemployment percentages in relation to lowered consumption of farm products.

Of course, before proceeding further, let me remind you that we must keep unemployment figures in proper perspective. Never before in peacetime have we, fortunately, had so large a civilian labor force as we have today—well over 67 million people.

Moreover, there are indications that there should be, and will be, a seasonal upturn in our economy.

EVERYONE MUST ACT AGAINST RECESSION

But we can hardly be smug. We cannot count upon luck; we cannot sit back, twiddling our thumbs—waiting and merely hoping. We must act. I mean everyone must act; each within his proper sphere.

That means that we of the Congress must act, as we have already acted, to help cope with the recession; particularly with the farm-price problem.

It means that State governments must act to help cope with conditions inside their respective States. It means that local communities must act. I refer to the need for grassroots development of community action self-help programs so as to mobilize local brains, manpower, and resources.

FOREMOST RESPONSIBILITY OF BUSINESSMEN

And finally, we need most important of all, sound action by United States private enterprise itself. I mean that private businessmen have the greatest responsibility of all to face the future with confidence and faith and not pessimism and despair. They need to invest, to expand and not to retreat in fear.

CONGRESS' SAVING ACTIONS TO BOOST EMPLOYMENT

Now what, specifically, has your Congress done to cope with the recession? A good deal, I am glad to say.

To meet urban problems, we have passed a $1.8 billion emergency housing bill. We are enacting a new river and harbor bill. We are enacting a speedup in the Nation's highway program.

SPEEDING UP REA USE OF APPROVED LOANS

As you know, on the REA front itself, President Eisenhower has urged the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage electric and telephone cooperative borrowers to proceed rapidly with the construction of $740 million worth of projects, for loans that have been approved.

Such sound spending will pump new economic vitality into our economic machine.

DAIRY PARITY ISSUE STILL LOOMS LARGE

In still another action, so far as the farmer, himself, is concerned, we of the Congress have rightly acted to prevent the arbitrary slash in dairy parity supports, which might, otherwise, occur this coming Tuesday, April 1.

The ultimate decision as to the level of dairy parity, as you know, still hangs in the balance.

You are all aware that, if dairy parity unfortunately is slashed to 75 percent, Wisconsin farmers, alone, will lose $43 million to $46 million more per year.

I say that we simply cannot afford to lose that much income.

Far from losing that much income, we should long since have acted to expand dairy income by that much and far more.

So we earnestly hope that the President will not veto the sound bill which would suspend the dairy parity slash.

In any event, the fact is that whatever happens, or does not happen, on April 1 represents but one phase of an overall larger and continuing problem facing Wisconsin agriculture.

FEED STOMACHS, DON'T FILL WAREHOUSES

The paramount job facing the Wisconsin dairymen is to make sure that there is a greatly expanded market for farm products. I mean a market in 173 million people's stomachs, and not in CCC warehouses; a market in people's stomachs, overseas as well.

I know of no farmer who wants to produce for the purpose of filling up warehouses. Our farmers are interested in feeding people. Wisconsin farmers know that they have the greatest products in the world, especially the Nation's first food, milk. Milk is a product, which dollar for dollar, pound for pound, glass for glass, represents the finest possible investment by every American family in its own health.

THE CHALLENGE OF JUNE DAIRY MONTH

Just 2 months away is June Dairy Month. Let us hope that June, 1958, will signalize a greatly increased dairy sales and promotion program.

Let us hope too, that we can speed the development, of sterile, canned, concentrated milk as one means of improving consumption of milk. It is, likewise, a means of increasing the farmer's very own share of the consumer's dollar.

Let us hope, as well, that other scientific research and merchandising research will help to open up new markets for Wisconsin farm products.

CONCLUSION—ACHIEVING THE MIRACLES NOW POSSIBLE

I want to conclude on this firm and sound basis of hope in the future. "The past is but prologue," reads the sign on a Washington building.

So, I have stressed the future needs of Wisconsin's electric cooperatives in serving the expanding needs and wants of the rural population of our State.

Just ahead is atomic energy for the generation of electric juice. Just ahead too, are other scientific miracles waiting us, if we but have the ingenuity, the courage, and the enterprise to develop them.

We Americans are going to snap out of the present slump in which our country finds itself, and we are going to advance to still brighter horizons tomorrow.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway symbolizes that brighter tomorrow. Let us capitalize on it and on all the other fine opportunities which are ours.

EAST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at my request, there have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles relating to the controversy with respect to the reconstruction of the east front of the original Capitol building, which had appeared in the Sunday and Monday editions of the Washington Evening Star.

Two additional articles have since been printed in that newspaper. One,

entitled "East Front Dangerous as Stone Deteriorates," appeared in the Tuesday issue of the Star, and another, under the heading "Four Answers Offered to the East-Front Riddle," is printed today.

I ask unanimous consent that these last two contributions to an understanding of what is involved in the proper preservation of a structure in which all Senators have a deep interest be printed as part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Evening Star of March 25, 1958]

SENSE OR SENTIMENT?—EAST FRONT DANGEROUS AS STONE DETERIORATES

(By George Beveridge)

One of the three reasons for extending the east front of the Capitol is the severe deterioration of the old sandstone facade, with its noble columns and elaborate, historic ornamentation.

The two other reasons are correction of a long-controversial architectural defect and the provision of additional Capitol space—and these are the two on which opponents concentrate their attacks.

The critics, led by a small group within the American Institute of Architects, don't say much about the deterioration. And what they do say is long on speculation and short on facts.

The east front, the critics say, obviously needs repair. But the condition of the front as a valid argument for extension they brush aside with sharp ridicule.

PICTURED AS DANGEROUS

The Architect of the Capitol and private architectural and engineering consultants at work on the expansion project, on the other hand, state flatly that the east front today is dangerous.

At a Senate hearing last month, John F. Harbeson, of Philadelphia, one of the most prominent of the architects who have worked 2 years on the Capitol extension, was asked if the east front really were dangerous.

"Yes, sir; decidedly. I think it is only a question of time until we will have to rope off the front and build a plank walk going in with sufficient thickness to keep people safe."

What are the facts?

To begin with, the extension proponents mean two things when they say "dangerous."

The first involves a number of physical conditions about the building, which they say raise the threat of actual physical danger from parts of the old sandstone facade that may break loose and plummet to the ground.

EVIDENCE OF EROSION

The other involves the steady ruination of the east facade through erosion, crumbling, and splitting of the soft sandstone. All over the front are the evidence of this in gaps, chips, cracks, and crumbled surfaces of the historic sculpture.

It is ironic that both sides of the controversy say they want to preserve the architectural detail which reflects the work of the Capitol's early architects, Thornton, Latrobe, and Bullfinch.

The opponents say this can be done only by leaving the wall where it is. When the present sandstone wall disappears from view, they say, the work of the old masters no longer exists.

Extension advocates, however, insist that erosion, chipping, and spalling of the front is destroying before their eyes the very values they want to preserve. In addition, much of the fine detail of the front already has disappeared beneath countless coats of paint. They contend the only way the original work truly can be preserved is by an identical archaeological reproduction in marble, which will remain forever.

They propose that the new wall be built 32½ feet eastward. This, they say, also permits much of the present old facade to be preserved—for purposes of sentiment—as an interior wall of the building, which would be structurally safe and protected from the ravages of weather.

GAP RECALLS FALL

The danger sign most often cited about the front is a 60-pound piece of sandstone on the Senate side of the wall which fell to the ground in 1934. The gap it left near the central portico is easily seen from the ground.

Another danger sign was spotted several years ago by painters, giving the front one of its regular 4-year coats. They noticed that one of the huge stone "capitals" at the top of the portico column was held in place by loops of cable.

One extension opponent called accounts of these fictitious, and said they were isolated excuses, selected in desperation to prove a danger which they challenge.

The Capitol's consultant architects, however, insist these are facts it would be foolhardy to ignore. They do not contend another 60-pound stone will fall on the heads of Capitol visitors tomorrow or next year. But they do contend that these precedents—and other signs of weaknesses—give them no logical reason to assume that others won't fall. And they say there is little chance of spotting such an occurence in advance, without constant inspection of every stone and ornament.

FEAR HIDDEN DEFECTS

Their main concern, however, is not with obvious defects, easily seen. What they fear most are things they can't see—the hidden threat of dozens of large cracks, bulges, and deterioration buried beneath the paint. These things, they say, are signs of progressive decay which eventually will doom the east front.

The New York engineering firm of Morgan, Proctor, Mueser & Rutledge recently completed a study of east front conditions. They reported numerous through-wall cracks in all parts of the front which they said have a definite continuity for the height of the wall.

The engineer experts said the many cracks had created such structural conditions that if the wall received any sudden shock it was most certain that many parts of the stone would fall.

These are their written conclusions:

"1. All of the exterior walls have a large number of vertical cracks passing through practically their entire surface.

"2. It is certain that the many coats of paint hide a large number of additional smaller cracks.

"3. The separation of individual parts of the stone work by the numerous major cracks has created a condition throughout most of the walls that should they receive a sudden shock or concussion, it is most certain that many parts of the stone would fall.

CAREFUL WATCH URGED

"4. Where movement in stone has occurred in the architrave and lintels (elements of the wall near the roof), very careful watch should be kept and shoring done, if necessary, to prevent stone from falling.

"5. In the portico no stone work above the level of the capitals should be in any way disturbed without complete shoring up of the architrave concourse.

"6. Extremely close watch should be kept on the bowed out north and south sections of the main east wall."

The bowed-out sections refer to a positive bulge which has been discovered near the roofline of the east front. On the side nearest the Senate, the bulge extends outward nearly 5 inches.

In the past, it generally has been thought that this bulge resulted from an explosion within the Capitol in 1898, which caused great interior damage. A careful study of the old records analyzing explosion damage, however, shows no reference at all to the bulge. Does this mean it may not have resulted from the explosion, but may have taken place gradually, over the years since the explosion? The Capitol consultants say they don't know. But they say it is another of the signs which raise serious question about the safety of the present east front—signs about which those who ridicule any danger have no knowledge.

In another investigation, the National Bureau of Standards last year studied 9 cores of east-front sandstone, 2 inches in diameter, which is removed at random from the wall. The Bureau reported considerably less evidence of deterioration than Capitol officials have claimed.

In general, the Bureau concluded that the cores were not deteriorated significantly to a depth of more than half an inch beneath the surface. In view of this, the Bureau suggested the old stone was sufficiently sound to justify further service if about half an inch of the surface were removed, and the new surface painted. That recommendation, and others made by opponents of the extension for repairing the present wall in its present position, will be discussed in an article in this series tomorrow.

The Capitol consultants question some of the Bureau's report, not as to the cores of sandstone studied, but as to applying the findings to the wall as a whole. Wall conditions and the quality of stones, they say, vary too greatly for such generalizations to be made.

The Bureau also reported that frequent painting has proved a mixed blessing and curse to the east front. On the one hand, paint has protected the stone somewhat from weather. On the other, the report said, it has sealed in moisture which seeps into the wall through cracks and defective joints. In cold weather, the moisture freezes and pushes out areas of paint and stone.

MARBLE A REMEDY

The Capitol consultants contend this is a problem which never will be solved with the soft sandstone, and only a marble front would cure. Even marble, however, if placed over the large cracks, might well split in the same places the stone has, they say.

The Bureau report noted that the Capitol sandstone has stood the ravages of time far less well than similar stone on the White House, of similar vintage. One possibility, it said, is that the White House may have been more thoroughly painted, and Bureau studies showed only 11 coats of paint on the Capitol cores.

Capitol historians, however, insist their records indicate that as many as 35 coats of paint have been put on the east front, and that painting was begun as early as 1819 for the specific purpose of halting deterioration.

There is no dearth of past warnings about east front defects. In 1935, testifying before a House committee, Architect of the Capitol David Lynn cited it as a reason for extending the east front and rebuilding it in marble. Mr. Lynn noted a number of defects and added:

"I consider the whole stonework is deteriorating progressively. The ornamental parts—the moldings, balustrades, and cornice—are badly damaged in some places and offer some possible prospect of danger in the not very remote future. For example, a large piece of the cornice at the internal angle of the portico fell about a year ago. If that had been over the steps, it might have been serious."

Other records, dating back to the early days of the 19th century, report complaints of the quality of the walls, and difficulties of maintenance.

MARBLE INTENDED

William Thornton, the architect who drew the original design which was accepted by George Washington as the pattern for the east front, intended that the front be constructed of marble. He was overruled for reasons of economy, however, and the builders turned to the soft Aquia Creek sandstone which even then was being discredited as a lasting, permanent material for classical construction.

The people who want to extend the Capitol today say that, had Mr. Thornton's wishes been met, there might be one less reason now to argue for the extension they say is essential if the east front really is to be preserved.

It is significant that, in their voluminous testimony against the extension, critics have generated little fire against the claim that something has to be done about the east front's deterioration. One charge they have generated is that J. George Stewart, the present Architect of the Capitol, is not an architect.

And that's true. For several years before his appointment in 1954 Mr. Stewart was a politician (a Member of Congress from Delaware and a Congressional employee). But Mr. Stewart also is an engineer, and he made his money from a family construction firm which specialized largely in the virtually lost art of stone masonry.

That early experience, Mr. Stewart says, is one of the things that give him a healthy apprehension about the state of the Capitol today—and a downright distrust of the alternative proposals of some of his "expert" critics.

[From the Evening Star of March 26, 1958]

SENSE OR SENTIMENT?—FOUR ANSWERS OFFERED TO EAST FRONT RIDDLE

(By George Beveridge)

The people who oppose extending the east front of the Capitol have suggested four different approaches to deal with the problem of the front's deterioration.

They are:

Remove the entire sandstone facing and replace it with a marble facade where it stands.

Shave half an inch or so off the present facade—as a National Bureau of Standards report has suggested—and paint the new sandstone surface.

Keep a close watch on the old facade, and periodically replace those stones and ornaments which need replacing.

Leave the front as it is except for regular painting and routine maintenance repairs for safety.

All these ideas have a common goal—the sentimental desire to preserve the Capitol's exterior facade in its original form.

PRACTICALITY CHALLENGED

The experts who want to extend the east front 32½ feet forward—and reproduce in lasting marble the precise details of the old front—contend that none of the above alternatives is practical. Let's look at their reasons.

The most drastic of the alternatives is to reface the wall with marble at its present location. The Capitol's architectural and engineering consultants raise three major points about this. They are:

1. This would require destruction of the entire original sandstone facade of the east front—the very thing which many opponents say they want to avoid in the extension. If the east front is extended and reproduced in marble, on the other hand, a major portion of the original will be retained as an interior wall.

2. This replacement—because of construction problems involved—would cost at least half as much and possibly as much as the complete extension itself, estimated at $10.1 million, with none of the added benefits of increased Capitol space.

QUESTION OF SAFETY

3. Serious questions of structural safety are raised if the exterior wall stones are removed to make way for a new marble face.

The last point, the Capitol consultants say, is the one that worries them most.

The threat to structural safety which they stress was substantiated by James M. Gongwer, of the Washington engineering firm of Gongwer, Kraas & Webb, who investigated the proposal. Mr. Gongwer, from 1940 to 1951, was consulting engineer for the remodeling of the House and Senate Chambers and roof reconstruction on the two wings.

To understand Mr. Gongwer's report, it is necessary to know something about the Capitol's construction. The Capitol, as the consultant experts explain it, was built almost entirely with large stones—set one on top of the other and held in place mainly by their own weight and mass. The builders had no steel beams, no concrete, and not even cement mortar to hold the stones together.

The exterior walls really are composed of two portions—a sandstone exterior face and an interior face of rough stones, both bonded with lime mortar. Between them was placed sand and rubble stone, held together loosely with lime mortar. Some of the wall stones are longer than others—about 12 inches in length—and extend into the loosely poured wall interior, to provide a bond for the 3 wall sections.

BRICK ARCHES INVOLVED

Now, in order to reface the existing east front with marble, Mr. Gongwer said, the exterior stones—containing all the ornamentation of the front—would have to be removed to make way for the new face. On the interior sides of the walls, however, are brick arches which, as part of the original Capitol construction, serve to support the floors and ceilings. And it is these arches which cause the structural problem, because they depend for their strength on the ability of the exterior walls to withstand their stresses.

Mr. Gongwer's report explains the threat this way:

"The stability of these arches depends upon the ability of the walls to resist the thrust imposed upon them by the arches. A slight outward movement of the walls would be sufficient to change the stress distribution in the arches and could conceivably result in serious impairment of their strength, and possibly their loss.

"Since the forces in these structures are indeterminate, one cannot state with certainty what the result would be. It is my opinion, however, that it would be unwise to weaken the walls by the removal of 12 inches of their thickness. The inevitable jarring of the remainder of the wall during the removal of the facing stones would aggravate the condition still more."

CONSULTANTS CITE REPORT

Consulting architects who have worked for the last 2 years on the east front problem stress that they do not contend it would be impossible to put a marble front on the present facade. But they cite the Gongwer report as typical of the problems of expense and danger, which are not known to most opponents of the east front extension—led by a group within the American Institute of Architects.

Douglas Haskell, editor of Architectural Forum magazine, for example, told a Senate committee last month that "only a fool would deliberately move such a wall * * * merely to repair it."

The architectural consultants say there are more reasons than structural difficulty, of course, behind the east front move. But it is comments like Mr. Haskell's which have roused their ire. They note that most proponents of the extension are men who have an intimate knowledge of the Capitol's problems. And most of its critics, they say, have a fleeting visual acquaintance with the building.

In a new report to House Speaker RAYBURN, Chairman of the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol, the consulting architects yesterday estimated that a refacing of the east front in its present location would cost at least $5 million, and that it might easily cost $10.1 million or more, depending on structural problems encountered. The $10.1 million figure is the estimated cost of the entire east front extension project.

STATEMENTS QUALIFIED

In the new report, the architects reduced and qualified flat statements they made at Senate hearings last month that refacing the present front would cost more than the $10.1 million needed to extend it.

Yesterday's report, based on new studies, said a refacing would involve "too many intangibles to permit an accurate (cost) estimate to be made. There are many cracks which extend from parapet to footing and some of them extend completely through the wall. What underpinning, what tie rods and braces, what shoring and needling would be required would only be known as the work progressed."

On the east walls alone, however, the architects said a conservative cost estimate would be $2.5 million. And at least another $2.5 million, they said, would be needed to replace the big central portico, with its columns and pediment.

Against this minimum $5 million refacing cost, the architects said, the actual cost of building the extended east walls and portico would be $4,750,000. But the $10.1 million figure for the project also includes $3.5 million for interior work within the extension and $1,850,000 for related work inside the main Capitol and for a contingency margin.

ALTERNATIVE PROBLEM

The consultants say that just as a refacing of the existing east front presents serious problems, so would the second alternative cited by critics—a piecemeal replacement of isolated wall stones and ornaments as they show signs of needing it.

When, for example, should the replacements be made? the new report asks.

"Should it be necessary for a stone to fall out of place? Pieces have fallen and others may fall at any time. Should ornamental features be permitted to erode to oblivion before they are replaced? If so, what will serve the carver as a model? One of the portico capitals (the huge ornaments above the portico columns) is wired together—should it be replaced now?

"And what of the cornice above these column capitals? There is unquestionably, some sort of dowel or anchor between the capital and cornice and between the capital and column. To remove a capital, these dowels or anchors must be sawed through and the means of anchoring is forever lost. As one capital after another deteriorates and is removed, there will be a series of unanchored columns * * * devoid of any lateral stability, tottering in every gale.

"PROGRESSIVE DETACHMENT

"Perhaps the greatest problem is not in the matter of ornament, but in the simple masonry of the walls. When one outside stone is removed and replaced, there is no way by which the new stone can be anchored to the inner wall. As stone after stone is cut away, there will eventually develop great

areas in which the outside masonry is no real part of the wall, contributing nothing to its strength. In effect there would be ultimately a free-standing wall * * * which we could only hope would be able to support and resist the load against it—a vain hope in view of the vertical cracks now apparent.

"Finally, all of the stones set under the watchful eyes of Thornton, Latrobe and Bullfinch will eventually be replaced and only the design will remain.

"Shall the replacements be of enduring stone or of the same soft sandstone? In any event, the passing years would see the east front as a hodgepodge of new, old and medium-aged stones, some with 3 coats of paint, some with 50; some details sharp, some dull, some gone altogether. Is this to be the future of the Capitol?"

PLAN RIDICULED

A number of critics of the extension proposal have picked up as a good idea, the third alternate approach to deal with the east front—simply to scale half an inch or so of deteriorated sandstone off the old east front.

This suggestion came in a Bureau of Standards report, in an analysis of several cores of sandstone. The report said painting had protected most of the stones' interiors by sealing them off from the weather. Therefore, the report said, the problem of deterioration might be solved simply by cutting away the rotten outside.

This scheme gets the shortest attention from the Capitol's consultants because, they say flatly, it is ridiculous.

It's ridiculous because the Capitol's facade is not flat. It is a continuous maze of elaborate ornamentation, of carved sculpture, and columns, cornices and scrolls. Trim a half inch off some of them and nothing is left. Shave a half inch from the columns and their architectural proportions are gone. The entire, well-loved appearance of the building would be changed. Even the window frames woudn't fit.

The fourth alternative—to do nothing at all with the east front except paint it regularly and practice regular maintenance—is rejected by the consultants with equal vigor.

Capitol Architect J. George Stewart was asked at last month's hearing whether he had enough maintenance money to keep the building in shape. He said the problem wasn't maintenance, but that the east front's condition arises from such basic structural deficiencies that more drastic correction is essential.

CALL FOR PROTECTION

If the east front remains in its present condition, the consultants insist, the areas below either should be roped off to pedestrians or some sort of protective scaffolding put up.

Julian Berla, Washington architect and chairman of a Committee to Preserve the National Capitol, suggested to the Senate committee that deterioration purposely might have been permitted to continue in order to present another argument for east front extension.

It is probably true that if the extension project had never been in the picture, Architects of the Capitol long ago would have proposed some other drastic program to deal with the deteriorating front.

But there is no evidence that any Architect of the Capitol—as Mr. Berla implied—has closed his eyes to anything which could be corrected short of a major overhaul of the entire front. Indeed, as Mr. Stewart and Capitol Architects before him have warned, the real dangers lie not in the defects that are visible today, but in the problems which may crop up as the result of hidden defects tomorrow.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, yesterday was the 137th anniversary of the independence of Greece, and today our invocation in the Senate was offered by the head of a great Greek Orthodox Church, Father Nicholas Stävräkis. It is with much personal pride that I call attention to the fact that Father Stävräkis is from my own State of Maryland—from St. Nicholas Greek Orthodox Church of Baltimore.

The celebration of independence days are always of great significance. Especially is this true with the celebration of Greek Independence Day.

Greece was the cradle of freedom, and the Greeks were the people who evolved the idea of freedom and gave it a living form. In the long and glorious history of the Greeks there are many important dates, but in their modern history the great date is March 25. On that day in the year 1821, Greeks revolted against their oppressors and proclaimed their national independence.

One hundred and thirty-seven years ago yesterday, a band of brave Greeks under the leadership of a dauntless archbishop in Päträs unfurled the banner of revolt and proclaimed their national independence. From that day on, for more than 8 years, Greek warriors fought bravely against the forces of the Ottoman Empire. At times, the Greek cause seemed hopelessly lost. Against heavy odds the Greeks held their own, even when they witnessed the butchery of their loved ones. These horrors were enough to rouse the powers of the West. Western powers discarded their neutrality and in 1827 began to help. Final victory came in the naval battle of Näverino on October 10, 1827.

Personally, I have always been keenly interested in the people of Greece. I like to consider myself one of their warmest sympathizers and sincerest champions.

The people of the United States recognize the great debt of all mankind to the land from whence came our inspiration for independence. We have helped the Greeks financially and with technical assistance and in a military way.

The people of our country have joined with those of Greece in celebrating their day of independence.

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF FORMATION OF STATE LEGISLATURE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is a proud day in the history of the legislature of my native State of South Carolina. At 4 o'clock in the afternoon of March 26, 1776, our general assembly, or State legislature, was born. This date becomes significant when we recall that it was not until 3 months thereafter that our Nation's Declaration of Independence was declared. It was more than 11 years prior to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States in 1787. Delegates from all the districts in the Colony of South Carolina, having been previously elected, assembled in Charleston on January 11, 1775, and organized a temporary Provincial Congress. On February 1, 1776, these delegates prepared a formal declaration, the essence of which provided that South Carolina "was now and by her own act a free and independent State."

It was on the 26th of March 1776 that John Rutledge was elected president and Henry Laurens vice president of the assembly. The terms "governor" and "lieutenant governor" were shortly thereafter applied to these respective offices. A State Constitution had already been considered and adopted by the delegates. By this formal, legislative act of a free assembly not only was the State legislature created, but also at the same time all allegiance to any domination by an English assembly was renounced.

The members of our State legislature have every reason to be proud on this 182d anniversary. The stress and strain of current problems weigh heavily upon all of us. Yet we do well to pause and reflect upon the experience of the past. The courage with which our forebears met their trials and tribulations, affords us a lamp to light our paths for the future. A knowledge of the history of our legislative growth, of the sacrifices and challenges of those who charted its early development gives us a fuller understanding of our present duty and responsibility. We must at all costs keep our record unsullied and unmarked by the distractions that would thwart our course of plain duty. We shall remember these great events. We shall repeat and dare not forget them. Our children must be taught these lessons.

Who were our pioneers? Henry Laurens, after serving as lieutenant governor, was called to larger responsibilities. He was designated by the Continental Congress as its second president, succeeding John Hancock. Henry Laurens served from 1757 as a representative in the English Commons house assembly in South Carolina, along with Lynch, Pinckney, Gadsden, and others. This experience served him well. These first elected legislators of South Carolina were deeply grounded in constitutional liberty. They loved freedom. They hated tyranny. They were men of eminence, judgment, foresight, and ability. The history of our legislature has been enriched by the touch of genius given to it by such men. John Adams, after only a month's acquaintance with Henry Laurens, said of him in a letter to Mrs. Adams:

> I feel a strong affection for South Carolina for several reasons:
>
> I think them as stanch patriots as any in America; I think them as brave. They are the only people in America who have maintained a post and defended a fort. They sent us a new delegate whom I greatly admire, Mr. Henry Laurens, their lieutenant governor, a gentleman of great fortune, great abilities, modesty and integrity, and great experience, too. If all the States would send us such men, it would be a pleasure to be here.

Great tribute is due the early founders of our legislature. Our legislative system, which they established, affords our people the most nearly perfect means of expressing their will. Sover-

eignty, as we know it, and all sovereign power are vested in our citizens. It is inherent in them. Our legislature constituted by them is empowered to give full and meaningful expression to the sovereign powers of our people. The separate and independent autonomy of the State and its maintenance and preservation as an indestructible unit of our National Government are as great a concern today as they were on the day of their creation. The measure of our duty and responsibility as individuals is no less sacred or important. Through the years our State legislature has maintained with dignity and honor the sacred trust which has been our cherished heritage.

I salute the members of the State Legislature of South Carolina as I remind them of the birthday of the first free legislative assembly in the United States. I may proudly say that the legacy given us has not been treated lightly. We respect the traditions of the past which show us the way for the future.

The accumulated wisdom of our forefathers, the painful sufferings and bitter experiences which were theirs to bear are a constant source of strength and inspiration to all of us who are privileged to follow the high standards they set. The solution of the problems we face today and those which will arise tomorrow is made less difficult by a better appreciation of our inheritance. May the members of our legislature be ever mindful as they have always been, of the great responsibility resting upon them as the duly elected representatives of the people for the expression of the sovereign power of our citizens. Their labors will not be in vain, but will be fruitful in the years to come. Then He, who is the source of all our light, hope, and strength, will be and abide with us in all our worthwhile undertakings.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REVERCOMB in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, business is concluded; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3414) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act approved June 29, 1956, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being taken from either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. 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. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Newbegin, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Honduras.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Horace H. Smith, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Sudan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, during the period I have served in the Senate, many thousands of executive nominations have been considered. I have supported the great majority of these appointments following the recommendation of the committee which had reviewed the qualifications of the nominee. Even on occasions when I have been less than enthusiastic about particular nominations, I have sometimes gone along with the view that the appointment had to be made and, after all, our best people were not interested in public service.

This afternoon, however, it is a pleasure for me to support an exceptionally well-qualified person who is being named to represent the United States in one of the troubled areas of the world. I refer to James S. Moose, Jr., who has been nominated to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Sudan, to succeed Lowell C. Pinkerton, the first American Ambassador to Sudan. In this case, we are not having to swallow mediocrity because Ambassador Moose is an old pro who knows his diplomatic business.

Ambassador Moose is a native of my State, having been born in Morrilton, Ark. He attended the Kentucky Military Institute and was graduated from the University of Missouri in 1922, where he was a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

After graduation from college, he traveled to Mexico and enrolled in the Universidad Nacional de Mexico, and it was here he developed his interest in international affairs. In January 1928, he was appointed a Foreign Service officer. After a tour of duty as vice consul at Salonika, Greece, Mr. Moose was assigned to L'Ecole Nationale des Langues Orientales Vivantes at Paris for special instruction and became one of our first Arabic language officers in the Foreign Service. As evidence of his attainment, at the conclusion of the course, the principal of the school included in his customary progress report his desire to appoint Mr. Moose a member of the faculty.

After this special schooling, Mr. Moose was assigned at Beirut in 1932, with other Near Eastern postings following at Baghdad, Teheran, Jidda and Damascus. In 1942, he opened the American Legation at Jidda and later became Minister Resident, thereby becoming the first American envoy to reside in Saudi Arabia.

He served as Chief of the Division of African Affairs and Deputy Director of the Office of African and Near Eastern Affairs in the Department of State.

In 1952, he was appointed Minister to Syria. When the post was made an embassy, Mr. Moose was elevated to the rank of ambassador and was promoted to the rank of career minister.

Mr. President, I have known Ambassador Moose for many years. He is an erudite and dedicated Foreign Service Officer. He had a goal in life, prepared himself by studying difficult and unusual subjects, and is now succeeding in the fulfillment of that high standard required of our ambassadors.

Mr. President, Ambassador Moose was reared in the central part of my State. He has acquired the ability of speaking, reading, and writing of French, the art of speaking and reading Arabic and Persian, and the reading of both Spanish and Turkish.

Ambassador Moose has a keen and deep understanding of the people of the Arabic world, and the problems they face. And yet, Mr. President, despite the fact that Ambassador Moose has devoted his life serving our country in all parts of the world, he has still maintained close relationship with his native State. On every possible occasion he returns to Arkansas and it is a source of inspiration to our people to learn of his experiences in diplomatic relations throughout the world.

While in Syria, where he served from 1952 to 1957, Ambassador Moose was confronted with one of the most difficult assignments in th Near East. As we all

know, during this period, Syria was going through a chaotic political period which resulted in the overthrow of the Shishakli regime in 1954. Also during this period, there were numerous changes in the Government and an excessive amount of foreign interference in Syrian affairs with the preponderance of such influence working against the United States objectives in Syria.

With his long experience in Near Eastern affairs, his familiarity with Arabic, and his unusual knowledge of the psychology of the peoples of the Near East and of the political trends in the Arab world, Ambassador Moose was extraordinarily competent in assessing and dealing with the most difficult and complex situations prevalent in Syria.

Ambassador Moose has been nominated as this Nation's envoy to the Republic of Sudan, which achieved independence on January 1, 1956. The Sudan covers an area roughly one-third the size of the continental United States and has an estimated population of twelve million. Although industrial development in the Sudan is extremely limited, the Sudanese Government officials have expressed an interest in foreign assistance directed toward their economic development.

To this ambassadorial assignment, James S. Moose brings a rich background of many years' experience and proven ability in dealing with Near Eastern peoples.

He has served in practically all of the Arab capitals at various times and is on friendly terms with political, cultural, and spiritual leaders of the Arabic world. It is my belief these people will profit from their association with Ambassador Moose. They will find him a scholar, well informed, with the ability to understand their problems and to convey an understanding of our way of life. We in Arkansas are proud of Ambassador Moose and of the fulfillment of his aspirations. We know our country will be proud of him as our Ambassador to Sudan. Through this mutual association with the peoples of Sudan, the spiritual, cultural, and educational welfare of the entire world will be greatly enhanced.

It is my hope the Senate will favorably consider the confirmation of the nomination of James S. Moose, Jr., to be Ambassador to the Republic of Sudan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11470) to adjust the method of computing basic pay for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services, to provide proficiency pay for enlisted members thereof, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11470) to adjust the method of computing basic pay for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services, to provide proficiency pay for enlisted members thereof, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3414) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act approved June 29, 1956, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the Kerr amendment is the pending question. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the Kerr amendment proposing to strike out a certain section of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, 2 hours of debate are reserved to the proponents, and 2 hours to the opponents. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma, if he is ready, will now allot to himself such time as he may desire.

Mr. KERR. I allot myself 10 minutes at this time.

Mr. President, yesterday there was a good deal of discussion as to whether words mean what they say or mean what the authors of the words would like to have them mean. Statements and repetitions were made by my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] about safety and about effectiveness, and he referred especially to subsection 3 of the bill, beginning at line 18 on page 21. He talked about how unsafe signs were. Then he said that subparagraph 3 was only a part of a portion of the standards which had to be prescribed and promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce. The language of the bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce must prescribe rules and standards which will provide for "signs not larger than 500 square inches."

I am placing some signs of that size at the rear of the Chamber. I submit to Senators that they would constitute a safety hazard, not a safety device. I submit that people driving along the highway, if it is the time of day when they are looking for directions to a motel or a service station or a restaurant, or some other facility, will be looking for a sign along the road directing them to the facility of which they are in need or about to be in need. I submit it is utterly ridiculous to prescribe by law that a sign on a highway, calculated to be of service to a traveling citizenship, cannot be larger than 500 square inches. Instead of being a safety factor, it would be a device calculated to result in danger and accident and damage.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. When the 500-inch amendment was offered in committee, will the Senator tell the Senate whether he voted in favor of the amendment or against it?

Mr. KERR. I voted for it. Now I should like to ask the Senator a question. When the amendment was finally approved by the subcommittee and offered as an amendment to the bill, did the Senator from California vote for it or against it?

Mr. KUCHEL. I voted for it.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. KUCHEL. I voted for the bill. I voted against the amendment.

Mr. KERR. The Senator voted against the amendment which is now a part of the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes; and the Senator from Oklahoma voted for the amendment.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma voted for the 500-inch amendment because the Senator from Oklahoma is against the entire amendment. He believes it is a piece of folly. He thinks it is the result of a mistaken concept of the purposes of the act.

Mr. President, I was comforted for many years in the Senate by the feeling that my friend from California, with his eminent ability and capacity, was alined with me and the forces of freedom. One of my great disappointments since I came to the Senate is that my friend from California has become a casualty in the fight for that cause.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the Senator replace on the easel the Jo Doakes sign? Is that an actual sign, or has it been made up for illustration purposes?

Mr. KERR. All these signs are samples. I asked that some samples be prepared which would be calculated to present to the traveling public infor-

mation on hotels, motels, restaurants, and so forth.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course the size of the signs and the shape of the signs were selected by the person who made them. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did that person also take care of the spelling of Jo Doake's name?

Mr. KERR. I am unable to answer that question. If there is any error in the spelling, I must take the responsibility for it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was wondering whether the Jo Doake's garage is being operated by a man or a woman.

Mr. KERR. If there is an error in it, the Senator from Oklahoma must take responsibility for it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not want to place any responsibility on the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I have advised the Senator from South Dakota that I did not prepare the sign. Neither am I acquainted with Jo Doakes. Not being acquainted with Jo Doakes, I would have no more ability to advise anyone as to the sex of Jo Doakes than would the Senator from South Dakota, and perhaps not so much.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thought perhaps the "e" had been misplaced in the name.

Mr. KERR. Where would the Senator place the "e"?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would have put it after "Jo." I would spell the name "J-o-e."

Mr. KERR. I ask unanimous consent that the "e" in "Doakes" be transferred so as to become a part of the name "Jo." The sign would then read "Joe Doaks."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I object. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Objection is heard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. KUCHEL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is again heard.

Mr. KERR. Another objection was heard, but not the same one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Another objection is heard.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may say to my distinguished friend from Oklahoma that I am not able to stay in the Chamber at this time because of another commitment. However, I wish to assure my friend from Oklahoma that all Republicans have not deserted the cause of freedom. I am one Republican who intends to stand with the Senator from Oklahoma on his amendment.

Mr. KERR. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona, and I say to him that his statement in this regard is entirely consistent with the very worthy record he has made of standing four-square in protecting what rights the States still have from further encroachment by the Federal Government.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. KERR. Certainly. However, I must warn the Senator from California that he does so at his peril.

Mr. KUCHEL. Perhaps that is why I am a little nervous this morning.

I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona whether he has been correctly quoted to the effect that he intends to offer a national right-to-work amendment which will apply to every State in the American Union. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is incorrect in that statement. I have not offered a national right-to-work amendment in any sense of the word. I have offered an amendment which would remove the 30-day clause of the Taft-Hartley Act. If the Senator indicates by his question that he wishes to stand with me on that ground, I welcome him.

Mr. KUCHEL. In suggesting that I stand with the Senator from Arizona let me ask whether it is the Senator's belief that Congress should enact legislation to provide for the right to work across the country?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. I have said on the floor of the Senate that I do not believe in national right-to-work legislation. I believe in voluntary unionism. I believe in the freedom of the workingman to join or not to join a union.

If the Senator from California is trying to read into my suggested amendment a national right-to-work proposal, he is a little far afield.

Before I could answer him further, I would have to ask his permission to drink some of the water his State takes from my State, so that I would have the strength to go forward with a discussion on the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. I yield myself an additional 10 minutes. I will welcome any questions which my good friend the Senator from California wishes to ask me; but, in the future, if he wants to wander aside into fields of exploration unknown to him and foreign to the subject the Senate is considering, I urgently request that he give serious thought to doing it on his own time.

Mr. President, there are a few things about the amendment which I think Senators would be interested to know. To begin with, S. 3414, which is now before the Senate, is, although some of its sponsors seem to be unaware of it, an emergency highway construction bill. It is in the form of a grant.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is it not probably true that if it were not for the unemployment in the Nation at present, Congress would not be considering a highway bill at this time?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator please repeat his question?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. If it were not for the unemployment in the United States at present, is it not doubtful that a highway bill would be under consideration at this session of Congress?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Pennsylvania is eminently correct. If it were not for the critical situation relating to increasing unemployment, certainly the bill would not now be before the Senate; and there is no way to determine definitely that it would have come before the Senate at all this year.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that the section to which the Senator from Oklahoma is now referring does not have anything to do with relieving unemployment, but is really a police or a legislative matter, in the form of a directive to the various States?

Mr. KERR. It is a hybrid product, I may say to my friend from Pennsylvania. I would not want to limit myself to saying that either of the terms fully describes it; but all of the terms are applicable; yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The bill before the Senate provides for emergency highway construction. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] said that, when implemented, it would provide 500,000 jobs. I wish that were correct. I am convinced that it will provide an additional 200,000 jobs, so far as its emergency features for accelerated highway construction are concerned. But while it is stepping up the employment of men on the highways, it will create unemployment in many other businesses now operating in the United States. The tragedy is that the section now under consideration has no connection with the purpose of S. 3414, which, as I said a moment ago, is to provide additional grants of money in aid to the States.

Section 12 seeks to be the instrument to grasp power from the States. The bill provides for a highway construction program; yet it is sought to make it a bill to regulate billboards. It is a bill to speed up the construction of defense highways. If Senators will refer to the Highway Act of 1956, they will find that Congress declared a policy of seeking to erect a system of interstate and defense highways.

The sponsors of section 12 seek to make the highways created by Congress and started by the people as defense highways into a sort of dream world, an esthetic Alice in Wonderland, to conform to a dreamful fancy totally dissociated from the requirements of reality and the purposes of the enactment of the program of building a system of interstate and defense highways.

S. 3414 is a bill to halt and reverse the recession now bedeviling the Nation; to give employment, as was suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], to the hundreds of thousands now unemployed. The proponents of section 12 would make it an instrument to create unemployment. They would make it an instrument to put tens of thousands of people now employed out of work.

S. 3414 is a bill designed to reinforce the opportunities of small business without limit. When we contemplate what will result from the building of all 41,000 miles of interstate and defense highways; when we contemplate the additional opportunities for the reinforcement of existing small businesses and the starting of new ones; we get a great thrill out of a very constructive feature of a road-building program. Yet the sponsors of section 12 would create an instrumentality for the destruction of thousands of small businesses. They would make it a juggernaut of Federal control in a realm or a field where the Federal Government has never yet dared to put its foot.

In 1944 Congress adopted the Randolph amendment, which provided that under no circumstances could Federal funds, appropriated as grants-in-aid to the States for the construction of highways, be used as an instrumentality of coercion and intimidation in the relationship between the Federal Government and the State governments.

The sponsors of section 12 would put the needle—the hypodermic needle—into the States, inoculating them with twilight sleep. While the States were in that twilight zone of semiunconsciousness, the proponents of section 12 would steal from the States the power the States now have to regulate what is to be built along the highways within their boundaries. When the States awakened from the twilight sleep which would be imposed upon them, they would find that the power they had had from the creation of the Union to be the sole regulatory power of what was built along their highways, had been stolen from them by the Federal Government. What would they have received in return? The same thing that Judas Iscariot received for the betrayal of his Master—pieces of silver. For the first time since I have been a Member of this body, an effort is being made to offer the sovereign States pieces of silver in return for their sovereignty. The proponents of section 12 are seeking to empower the Secretary of Commerce to be in the posture of saying to State highway departments, "Come unto me. If you want a little more money, and if you will make with me a contract whereby you will endeavor to surrender the police power and the sovereignty of your State, I will give you, in return, a few million dollars."

Mr. President, I submit that if the Federal Government can buy State sovereignty with reference to the control of the State highways, then the Federal Government can buy State sovereignty with reference to everything else which men now seek to keep within the control of their States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 more minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Would not it be just as reasonable for the Department of Defense to offer certain financial inducements to the National Guard in the various States?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Pennsylvania is eminently correct. There would be just as much justification to pass a law providing that the Secretary of Defense could make with the adjutant general of a State, a contract by means of which the adjutant general of the State would be empowered to surrender to the Department of Defense, in return for money, the sovereignty of the State with reference to some phase of its own National Guard.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am trying to point out that this is a dangerous precedent. Regardless of how one may feel about the control of billboard advertising along the Interstate System, this is a dangerous precedent.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, if men wish to control billboards along the highways, let them have the courage to do 1 of 2 things: Either implement a program of purchasing from the owner, of the right along the highway, his property, and thus pay him for it; or pass a law whereby, under the recognized process of eminent domain, an effort would be made to acquire it.

Mr. President, I do not think the Federal Government has the power, nor do I think a State has the power, to implement the principle of eminent domain to acquire an interest in a person's property for an esthetic purpose. I do not think that is contemplated under the law of eminent domain.

But if men have courage, and if they favor the control of areas along a highway, they should approach the matter in the American way, either by exercising the power of sovereignty to obtain control on the basis of paying for it, as adjudicated by a court; or by seeking to purchase it from the owner, on the basis of negotiation and barter, whereby he would be paid for it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oklahoma in giving me this opportunity to make this statement at this point in his remarks. I certainly wish to say now, as I said on yesterday, that I do not believe the Federal Government has the right, under eminent domain, to take property for the purpose of preventing the erection of billboards. I believe the Federal Government, with the consent of the State concerned, may acquire rights-of-way for the construction of a highway. I do not believe it has the right of eminent domain, nor do I believe it has the police power to prohibit billboards off the right-of-way of a highway, on the private property of the persons who own the land along the highway. I so stated during the hearings.

In fact, at one point during the hearings, when there was presented the argument that the Federal Government could prohibit the erection of billboards, I challenged the person who was making that statement to cite any Supreme Court decision which would show that the Federal Government had such a police power. The only decision cited, in answer to that challenge, was a Supreme Court decision affecting the District of Columbia. I pointed out at once that that proved the point, inasmuch as Congress has full power to legislate for the District of Columbia, by virtue of the Constitution; but Congress does not have a comparable police power with respect to rights in the States.

Mr. KERR. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I could not be in more complete agreement with him.

I do not believe the Federal Government has the power to exercise the right of eminent domain to acquire real estate for the purpose of prohibiting the erection of a billboard on it; nor do I believe that a State has that constitutional power. Furthermore, I do not believe that the sponsors of section 12 believe that either the Federal Government or the State has such power. But what they seek to do by means of section 12 is to seduce the State highway department, for money, in return for pieces of silver, to put a pistol in the hand of the Secretary of Commerce and to let him do, by means of the pistol, what neither the State nor the Federal Government now has the constitutional authority to do.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I wish to observe that when the States were included among the governmental bodies which cannot exercise eminent domain in a case such as this, for the purpose of preventing the use of signboards on adjacent property, the denial of that right is based upon the fact that the negative easement involved in that sort of proceeding is not a taking of property within the Constitution and within the laws of the several States pertaining to eminent domain. Am I correct about that?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct, and the sponsors of the amendment are aware of it. Many of them are distinguished lawyers. Mr. President, they are trying to legalize between a State highway department, which has no such authority, and a Secretary of Commerce, who has no such authority, a contract between two parties, neither one of whom has any such authority, whereby they will be able to deprive third parties who are citizens of the United States of their private property without compensation.

Mr. President, this is the first time since I have been a Member of the Senate that Senators have seriously tried to deprive American citizens of their property without compensation. It is the first time since I have been a Member of the Senate that Senators have seriously tried to seduce States into bartering their sovereignty in return for pieces of silver.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is the Senator from Oklahoma aware of a similar instance, whereby an officer of a State highway department has sought to enter into a contract with the Secretary of Commerce, the effect of which would be to nullify and set aside State laws, city zoning ordinances, and so forth, which are applicable in the States?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has described in clear, concise, and accurate words a part of the effort presently being made; and I appreciate his statement. If Government has no respect for the sacred rights of property of individuals, how can Government expect people to abide by the laws? If Government seeks to have a State highway department, without any authority to do so, arm a Cabinet officer in Washington, whose future identity is indeterminable, with a pistol to take property from citizens without compensation, to nullify existing zoning ordinances of cities, municipalities, and local governments, without compensation, but by coercion and force, how can Government expect citizens to have regard for law?

If Government undertakes to arm its agencies with the means to ride roughshod over legally vested interests, depriving citizens of what belongs to them, depriving States of rights which by the Constitution were retained for them, how can Government expect citizens to respect the integrity and the dignity of Government?

I noticed the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] when he spoke about protecting the rights of California, at the time he was introducing his bill. He said:

> In California, the enactment of legislation dealing with the use of property has always been recognized primarily as a function of local government.

He said further:

> The point I make is that the State government of California under its constitution can exercise—

And I invite the distinguished Senator from California to listen to this——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KERR. The distinguished Senator from California said this on the floor the other day——

Mr. KUCHEL. What is the Senator reading?

Mr. KERR. I am reading from page 1547 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 3, 1958:

> The point I make is that the State government of California under its constitution can exercise its authority in the field of property use only in the areas of my State which lie outside incorporated cities.

Yet, the Senator from California seeks to provide his State highway department with the ability to give to the Secretary of Commerce a power which under the State of California constitution his State does not have.

I glorified in his defense of the Constitution the other day. I am shocked now to see him sponsoring an amendment which, if valid and enforced, would leave the constitution of the State of California in a shambles.

I remind Senators similar provisions are in the constitutions of many of the States, provisions which would reserve to the States or give to their local communities certain rights of local self-government. Yet, if section 12 shall be enacted, and shall be held to be valid, the Secretary of Commerce will be armed with a pistol to make tatters of State constitutions, to make tatters of local zoning ordinances, to make worthless pieces of paper out of titles to property.

We are talking about a strip of land 660 feet wide along 41,000 miles of highway, or a total of 1,320 feet. If the Secretary of Commerce could induce or seduce highway departments of States into entering into a contract, section 12 would enable him to proscribe and prohibit the use by the owners of that 1,320 feet along 41,000 miles of interstate highways and it would enable him to take from those owners and their descendents at the point of a pistol, without paying them, the rights in perpetuity to make legal and valid use of that property.

The proponents say they are doing that to protect culture. What kind of culture? The culture of the supremacy of a Secretary of Commerce over the rights of the sovereign States, over the property rights of individuals, over municipal ordinances? In heaven's name, what kind of culture is that? I will tell you, Mr. President. It is the kind of culture one can find in Russia. It is the kind of culture Hitler went down the drain for trying to implement in Germany. Local rights and State rights and vested rights would be kicked out the window and flushed down the drain by a Secretary of Commerce armed with a pistol, given him by a State highway department. That is the kind of culture it would be.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I should like to add to the Senator's very vivid description of the 1,320-foot strip of land in various places of our country, that in addition thereto there is the road itself, consisting of 330 feet, which would be taken from people in the various States of the Union.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct; and often that would be done against the will of the people. They would be compelled to sell the property under the right of eminent domain. When the people go before a jury of their peers, seeking to get compensation for a right-of-way, how many times have we heard the attorneys of those seeking to obtain that property by eminent domain say, "Yes, we are taking this property away from this man and his family and children, but consider the fact that we are going to increase the value of the adjacent property. One of the intangible values this man is going to receive is the enhancement of value on that part of the property remaining to him."

That has been the argument ever since eminent domain has been in effect. In this instance it is sought, by contract between a highway commission and a Secretary of Commerce, to arm the Secretary with a pistol with which to nullify consideration in the mind of a jury, when it fixes compensation for a right-of-way, of the fact that the effort is to strip the property owner of one of the rights, one of the assets, one of the elements of value remaining to him in that land which he owns adjacent to the particular right-of-way.

In the name of culture, Mr. President, in the name of esthetics—whatever that is [laughter]—it will be a grave day in this country when we reach such an esthetic pinnacle that men are willing and able to ravish a State constitution, to nullify a local ordinance, and to deprive citizens of their vested rights, without compensation.

Mr. President, I say that if those in charge want the right-of-way, let them buy it. I say that if they want to exercise that police power, let them do it according to the constitution of the State, by a State legislature responsible to the people of the State. I say that if they want to prohibit something being done with a man's property, they should do it in accordance with law and order.

We stand for law and order. No organization in this Nation has a higher reputation for safeguarding the integrity of law and order than has the Senate. Then, in the name of all that is holy, how can we, in the name of esthetics and culture, seek to pass legislation the purpose of which is to wreck State sovereignty, to destroy the ability of a local community operating under the constitution of a State to pass zoning ordinances, and violate and hold for naught property rights of individuals?

This bill does not refer only to rural areas, Mr. President. Nearly 5,000 miles of the highway will go through cities, towns, and municipalities.

Calculate the value of 1,320 feet along 4,500 miles of highway, the rights-of-way through cities and towns. Look at the sign yonder; in size it is 500 square inches. That is what the bill provides can go within 660 feet of either side of an interstate highway, if the Secretary of Commerce says so.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. First, I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that there is a provision in the pending bill—placed there, I believe, by an amendment offered in the committee by the Senator from New Hampshire—to aid the States in purchasing from the adjacent landowners, if they choose to sell, the advertising rights. Is that provision not in the bill?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. I take it from what the Senator says—and I am inclined to think I agree with him—he believes that in most of the States of the Union under the State constitutions it would be impossible

and unconstitutional to deprive adjacent landowners of their advertising rights by eminent domain or any process against their will. If that be true, that provision of the bill would be entirely inoperative, and 100 contracts between the Secretary of Commerce and the highway departments of States, or 1,000 contracts, would not enable them to get such advertising rights by eminent domain. Is that not correct?

Mr. KERR. Yes; the Senator is correct.

The Senator from Oklahoma then says, Why in heaven's name should we hold up for weeks, and perhaps months, an emergency highway bill, in order to try to include in it a section which is an utter futility? Why should we take the time of the Senate? Why should we delay the implementation of the emergency program in order to strive to satisfy the esthetic yearnings of some cultured soul who can find expression only in assaulting the sovereign right of States and the sacred rights of its citizens?

The Senator from New Hampshire said that he suggested an amendment which would help in the buying of such rights. I am going to read the language. It is a very important provision of the bill. It is a part of the colossal amount of evidence of the futility of section 12.

Mr. President, it is found on line 24 of page 23:

> Whenever a State shall acquire by purchase or condemnation the right to advertise or regulate advertising in an area adjacent to the right-of-way of a project on the Interstate System for the purpose of implementing this section, the cost of such acquisition shall be considered as a part of the cost of construction of such project and Federal funds may be used to pay the Federal pro rata share of such cost: *Provided*, That reimbursement to the State shall be made only with respect to that portion of such cost which does not exceed 5 percent of the cost of the right-of-way for such project.

Let us imagine 4,500 miles of highway through municipalities. The State and Federal Governments are to spend on that portion, and on the rest of the highway, $5½ billion to buy the rights-of-way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The Senator says the committee adopted a provision to help the States buy the advertising rights. There are rights-of-way 660 feet wide on either side of the highway.

Let us consider the highway through the city of Richmond, or Oklahoma City, or New York City. How much does the Senator think could be accomplished in an endeavor to buy the advertising rights for the 1,320 feet alongside the highway at 5 percent of the cost to buy the right-of-way?

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. By a rough calculation, if we assume 5,000 miles of the Interstate Highway System in urban areas—it is in excess of 4,500 miles, and not quite 5,000 miles—and if we assume a cost of acquiring the rights-of-way of $5 billion, that will mean there will be about $50,000 a mile available for the purchase of the advertising rights. Is it the idea of the Senator from Oklahoma that such a sum would be ample for the purpose intended?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from New Hampshire, in his sober moments [laughter]—which are all of them, I must say—in his moments of silent contemplation in his fine office, in that wonderful homespun, philosophical way of his, chuckles to himself and says, "Isn't that a gesture of generosity on the part of the Federal Government, to say, 'Now, if you buy this, we will pay 5 percent. We will pay a part of it, so long as it does not cost more than 5 percent of what it costs to buy the right-of-way.'"

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. In reference to the Senator's observation, let me make a comment. I hope the Senator will correct me if I am wrong in my understanding. It is my understanding that in the bill on page 22, lines 17, 18, 19, and 20, there is a provision whereby there can be no question as to purchasing the advertising rights adjacent to the Interstate System passing through the city of Richmond or any other large city.

Land adjacent to the highway in those cities or those municipalities is already exempt from the operation of the act, if the bill is passed. Am I incorrect in my understanding?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is certainly incorrect. The land is exempt from the provisions of the act only in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce. Where is the city which wants to let its future rest upon that slender reed?

Oh, go home and tell the people in the cities—I do not intend to go home and make a fool of myself trying to tell the people of Oklahoma City—"Have no fear. The Secretary in his discretion may exempt you." The people have had experience in such matters. They have been waked up at night to find out that they have not been exempted by a Federal agency which could have done so within its discretion.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. In the first place, the words indicate the intent of the Congress. In the second place, any Secretary of Commerce who had any discretion at all would know it would be utterly impossible to purchase advertising rights on a highway passing through a huge city for any such sum as 5 percent of the cost. That would be entirely out of the question.

Mr. KERR. I would no more indulge the presumption that the present Secretary of Commerce has such knowledge than the Senator would indulge the presumption that his successor—who will be from our party—will have such knowledge.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from Oklahoma has referred to the provision regarding reimbursement to the State to the extent of not exceeding 5 percent of the cost of the right-of-way as being a meaningless gesture. In the first place, it does not preclude the State, if the State is interested in controlling or limiting the advertising, from paying more, so long as it does not seek to collect the 90 percent from the Federal Government. Is not that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is correct; and that is one of the evils of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes.

We are declaring a policy—a policy to obtain the right to regulate all areas along the highways; and the States are to be seduced by the millions of dollars which will be offered to them to sign these contracts. They will start on the program, and they will then bog down, because they cannot buy such rights. When they try to use their police power, all hell will break loose. Then what will happen? They will say to the Federal Government, "You declared this policy. In your moment of devotion to esthetics and culture, you paid us this money and induced us to sign the contract. We are now in the middle of the stream, bogged down in the quicksand into which you enticed us. Now we want you to help pay for the cost of the program."

When the highway bill was passed in 1956, these were called defense highways. Now they are called parkways of scenic beauty, and esthetic marvels of culture. Under God, what will they be called 2 years from now if we seduce the States into signing these contracts, and they cannot buy the rights for the amounts we propose to give them?

They cannot exercise their police power, because the people will revolt and run them out of the State. Then they will come to the Federal Government.

My friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and others will say, "We got the States into this difficulty. It will cost $5 billion, but we must honor our policy. We must honor this culture. We must dignify these esthetics. It will cost us a little money, but honor compels us to follow that course." The words used are words of honor which would seek to create an agency of seduction armed with pieces of silver from the Secretary of Commerce.

Let me make one further point with regard to the 5-percent provision. I was a little surprised when the Senator from New Hampshire offered the 5-percent provision. Some bad things have been said here about 5 percenters. It is sought to make a 5 percenter out of the Secretary of Commerce, and to legalize the action. The language is as follows:

> Whenever a State shall acquire by purchase or condemnation the right to advertise—

And so forth. Senators know that the States cannot condemn such a right. Senators know that in no State of the Union can such right be condemned; and every sponsor of the amendment knows that it cannot be condemned. It is a futile gesture, offered to induce me to legalize governmental seduction, to put a pistol in the hands of the Secre-

tary of Commerce, to cut down and shatter States rights, local self-government, and the rights of citizens.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON and Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Texas yield time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agreed to yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Minnesota. Does the Senator from Virginia desire to speak?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to take 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

I send to the desk to have printed and lie on the table 3 amendments, 2 of them dealing with the financing of the interstate roads. They would eliminate all the new money, and return the situation to the 1956 pay-as-you-go basis.

The third amendment would eliminate the new formula for the removal of utility facilities, and return the situation to the 1956 formula, namely, 90 and 10 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the sponsors of the language under discussion, one question, for purposes of establishing the legislative intent.

There are four subdivisions of section 12, which will become section 122 of the 1956 act. One of the subdivisions deals with a size limitation to 500 square inches.

Another deals with "signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public."

The specific information would relate to gas and oil, overnight lodging, food, and so forth.

There is some misunderstanding as to the language "not inconsistent with the national policy." As I read the language, and as I understand the intention of the framers, the States would have the right to prescribe signs which they considered adequate. If one is passing such a sign at 60 miles an hour it must be larger than 2 feet if one is to read it; and if it is located immediately adjacent to the turnoff, the driver will have only a few seconds to act. Under subparagraph (4) the State could authorize what it considered to be a suitable sign for the convenience of the traveling public, which is paying the bill for these roads.

I ask the framers of the provision as to the legislative intent. Which subparagraph would control? Would it be subparagraph (3), providing for a 2-foot sign placed within 12 miles of the point to which it applied, or could the States prescribe a sign which they considered adequate at the turnoff point?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] responded in writing to the able Senator from Virginia. I think that response should be made a part of the RECORD.

Let me say, as a cosponsor of the amendment, that in my judgment the language "500 square inches" applies only to subparagraph (3), and does not apply in any fashion to subparagraph (4), under which the States would have all reasonable control to make the decision.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I concur in what the Senator from California has said. We stated, in our separate views, that we felt that way.

The Senator from California has suggested that my letter to the able Senator from Virginia on this particular question be made a part of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

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

MARCH 24, 1958.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Thank you very much for your letter of March 21 concerning section 12 of S. 3414, the billboard control amendment to the highway act proposed by Senator THOMAS KUCHEL and me. I very much appreciate the interest in this amendment which has prompted you to write us, and I am more than pleased to answer the question which you have raised in your letter.

The specific point about which you ask is "whether or not a State could get the proposed incentive if it restricts all advertising in accordance with the bill except the size of the signs at the turnoff points."

The answer to your question is "yes."

Your inquiry is a good example of the unfortunate confusion which Senator KUCHEL and I felt was introduced in the bill by the amendment of the third class of permissible signs which was made in the committee. As you may recall from the text given in the separate views which we sent you, the original definitions of the third and fourth class of permissible signs were:

"(3) Signs advertising activities being conducted upon the property on which such signs are located.

"(4) Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public."

In this original draft, the purposes of the two provisions were different. The provision numbered (3) was intended to take account of the reasonable rights of landowners to advertise their own activities on their own land. The provision numbered (4) was—and still is—intended to permit the individual States—in the legislation which they must necessarily adopt to qualify for the benefits of this bill—to include specific authorizations and regulations covering signs of the type about which you ask; that is to say, signs advertising facilities and establishments of specific interest to travelers that might be located at the approaches to the exits, so as to inform motorists in advance about such facilities that may be reached from the exit in question. As you say, this provision does not include any limitation on the size of permissible signs. All that would be required is that the regulations of the State which authorize such signs reasonably comply with respect to the shape, design, lighting, frequency and locations of such signs, with the overall policy standards to be promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce.

We have no doubt that the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads between them could easily work out reasonable standards for such signs which would offer an opportunity to off-highway establishments and facilities, such as motels, hotels, resorts, etc., to let the approaching motorist know of their existence and location before he reaches the exit closest to them.

The manner in which we contemplate the application of this bill is the following: To take advantage of the benefits of section 12, a State would presumably have to have or adopt legislation that would control and regulate billboards along the interstate highways within its borders. (I know that your State government has already been active in developing a billboard control program, although I do not know the details of it so as to comment on its relationship to the proposed incentive plan.) Pursuant to such legislation, the State would then enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Commerce, which would spell out in some detail the segments of the interstate highways in the State to be covered by the national policy, on which the one-half percent bonus would be payable, and also the regulations and standards under which permissible signs of the four identified classes would be erected along the highways. If any State and the Secretary of Commerce failed to reach agreement, of course, the State is wholly free to remain outside of the proposed program.

But, to repeat the specific point about which you ask, a State could qualify for the proposed incentive payments if it made reasonable regulations with respect to the kinds of signs about which you ask, without being limited to the small size specified in the third class as amended. That class, you will note, is not limited to signs in the specific interest of the traveling public, but is rather tied to the notion of activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located.

We hope that this letter will answer your question to your satisfaction. You will find a complete analysis of section 12 in my speech in the RECORD of today's date, and in my discussion with Senator KUCHEL during this speech. I sincerely hope that you will find it possible to join us in retaining this worthwhile protective measure for our new highways in S. 3414.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield himself some time?

Mr. KERR. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Subparagraph (4) reads as follows:

Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But it has just been stated that that means that standards for the turnoff are different from the standard of the 24-inch sign.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator take the word of the sponsors, or the language of the bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON. They are supposed to know what the language means.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is indulging a presumption which may lead him into a very bitter disappointment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my remarks in the 5 minutes allotted to me will not be directed toward particular sections and subsections of the bill. They will be directed toward the subject with which the bill is concerned, namely, the recession, and the efforts on the part of the Congress to take active and effective measures to curb and stop the economic decline.

I have listened to the arguments with attention and interest. The highway bill needs to be passed as an effective instrument in the move against the recession.

The first real test of the administration's willingness effectively to use the powers of Government to combat the recession now lies on the President's desk, after having been duly passed by both Houses of Congress.

It is the joint resolution passed by both the Senate and the House to prevent any reductions in farm price supports this year, a resolution which I had the privilege of authoring and sponsoring through the Congress.

If the President vetoes this measure, as has been threatened, it will be a serious blow to American agriculture, an open invitation to further undermining of rural purchasing power, and it will further shake and weaken the confidence we need in our entire economy.

If, on the other hand, the President accepts the judgment of Congress and signs the measure, his action will provide belated but effective and convincing evidence that the Government is determined to protect our economy from further economic deterioration, bolstering confidence of the public in our eventual full recovery from the present dangerous economic decline.

Mr. President, I have noted with satisfaction that even a majority of the President's own minority party in the Senate, in caucus, has voted to urge the President to sign the measure. I also noted that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], according to reports in the press, said that had he been present at the caucus he, too, would have urged this very sound and constructive action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to advise the Senator what has been called to my attention. I believe the Senator from Minnesota said that a majority of the Senators in the caucus so voted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Not a majority of the party in the Senate, because there were several absentees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I said a majority of those in attendance at the caucus. I believed the vote was 18 to 14. It was 17 to 14, and if the distinguished Senator from Nebraska had been present, the vote would have been 18 to 14.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator let me comment at this point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In a moment I shall be glad to.

Mr. BUSH. I should be glad to yield myself a minute for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the action of the Republican caucus is further evidence that Congress feels it imperative to prevent any further decline in rural purchasing power at a time when we are trying to mobilize all the forces of the Nation to combat a recession. I compliment those members of the President's party who took that forthright action. It was a heartening sign for the Nation, and an expression of confidence and encouragement to our farm population.

Mr. President, as the author of the joint resolution, I sent a night letter to the President of the United States, urging him to consider carefully the impact of his pending action on the country's economic conditions. I ask unanimous consent that the message I sent to the President urging him to sign the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Whatever differences may exist over agricultural policy, I sincerely urge you to carefully consider the impact on our entire economy of a veto on the legislation enacted by the Congress to prevent further cuts in farm prices this year. As author of the resolution now awaiting your signature, I assure you it was offered in good faith as a hold-the-line effort to protect the farm economy while we in Congress design improved long-range farm legislation.

Your approval of the resolution will do much to restore confidence in rural America. It will signify a determination to use the powers of Government to check the economic decline. On behalf of thousands of farm families in Minnesota—and millions throughout our country—I appeal to you to accept the decision of Congress that a temporary price freeze be invoked on all commodities, including dairy products.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I conclude by saying that this is the first effective antirecession measure to come to the President's desk. I feel that every Member of Congress wants to do something to curb the recession. This is not a partisan matter. It is a question of taking care of the interests of the American people. It is an effort to provide some kind of protection and assistance to the American economy.

For example, we have heard the Vice President on several occasions enunciating policies and programs which he believes would be helpful to the economy. In many of those instances I have agreed with the Vice President; in others, I have had some disagreement with him, particularly as to whether we should have a tax reduction. On that question his position has been a little indefinite. However, I wish to compliment the Vice President on his forthright leadership in such fields as foreign policy. While I disagree with him on the matter of interest rates for GI housing—he insisted that those interest rates should be higher than I thought was necessary—he at least proclaimed himself.

Mr. President, I ask that every man stand and be counted. I hope that the Vice President, who has been praised so frequently for his courage and his leadership and his frankness and I may say, for his persuasiveness in the councils of the administration—a persuasiveness which I am sure he possesses—will give us the benefit of his advice and counsel. I say this most respectfully. I hope that his advice and counsel will be to encourage the President's signature on the joint resolution.

However, whatever his advice may be, I believe the American people want to know where the leaders of America stand on this first effective antirecession measure.

I notice that the majority leader, over the weekend, as reported in the Monday morning newspapers, said that he felt the President should sign the joint resolution. Why? Because it is an antirecession measure.

Let me add one further thought: The joint resolution does not provide for higher prices than are in existence at the present time. It is not a special tax concession. It is not a profit-sharing measure. It does not increase someone's profits. At best it is a hold-the-line measure. The least we can expect at this time is a frank statement from those who are our responsible leaders in the Government, in the Senate as well as in the other body, so that the President of the United States may have the benefit of counsel and advice from all sources.

Therefore I appeal to the Vice President of the United States—as he has done in the instance of foreign aid, as he has done in the instance of the summit conferences, as he has done in the instance of the tax policy, and as he has done in the instance of the housing measure, including the interest rates—to say to the President of the United States, in the councils of the White House and the Cabinet, that it would be to the national interest for him to sign the joint resolution. At least I ask the Vice President to give us his views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair wishes to address an inquiry to the majority leader, concerning the time taken during the colloquy by the junior Senator from Virginia. Does the Chair correctly understand that that time was yielded by the junior Senator from California?

Mr. KUCHEL. I think it should have been.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so recorded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the generosity of the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield time?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the members of the committee who are on the floor would have any objec-

tion to considering taking up by unanimous consent the perfecting amendment which I proposed yesterday to the billboard section, to provide that any segment excluded from the application of the standards under the discretionary clause of the Secretary of Commerce, applicable to municipalities or areas under their control, should not be considered in computing the increase in the Federal share payable on account thereof. Is there any controversy or difference of opinion with respect to that amendment?

Mr. HRUSKA. I think it would require some explanation or a little foundation. This is not exactly the right time to consider the amendment. I think it is illustrative of many other clarifying amendments which should be placed in section 12, if that section is to make any sense and is to be legal or constitutional at all. I think this is not the proper time to consider the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I have another minute?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield another minute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The matter came up yesterday when the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] pointed out that a considerable portion of the Interstate Highway System in his State would go through municipally regulated areas. The question was debated at that time, and I thought there was an agreement that the amendment was not intended to exclude the provision making one-half of 1 percent applicable to any areas.

It is a preferential or perfecting amendment, which would be entitled to consideration before the amendment to strike. I thought that if there could be an agreement on my amendment, we might save the hour's time to which the amendment would be entitled under the unanimous consent agreement. However, I shall not press the matter now, but shall confer with the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators to see if some agreement can be reached.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. If a vote is taken on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and other Senators, and the amendment is rejected, would it then be in order to offer an amendment such as that to which the Senator from South Dakota has just alluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to strike out section 12 is a separate amendment. However, the language that is proposed to be stricken out is subject to amendment, and an amendment to it will take precedence over the amendment to strike out.

Mr. KUCHEL. So the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, were he so minded, could be offered now or at any other time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the other amendment were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Except by unanimous consent, the amendment suggested by the Senator from South Dakota would have to wait until the time on the Kerr amendment has been consumed, or until time was yielded.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It could be offered before the vote on the Kerr amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; at any time before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from California had inquired whether, if the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma were defeated, my amendment could then be offered. Of course, I assume it could be offered as an amendment to the bill, but I shall certainly insist upon the right to have it considered ahead of the amendment to strike section 12.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I shall address myself to the charge or claim that the proposal to regulate signboards on the Interstate Highway System will cause unemployment in the United States. To begin with, the Interstate System of 41,000 miles is only about 3 percent of the surfaced roads in the Nation, which total about 1,500,000 miles.

Second, these will be predominantly new roads. How can unemployment be caused by forbidding, regulating, or controlling signboards on roads which, mainly, have not yet been constructed?

There is the further argument that the controlling of signboards will cause unemployment in the restaurant and motel industries along the new roads. That is not consistent with the expert testimony which was received by the Subcommittee on Roads and Highways, presided over by the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. Signboards are not allowed on the great New York State Thruway. The Federal Highway Administrator is Hon. Bertram D. Tallamy, who had charge of the construction of the New York State Thruway. I read from Mr. Tallamy's testimony given before our subcommittee in the spring of 1957:

Senator NEUBERGER. This is the question that I want to ask, after obtaining that information. As you probably know, a great deal of the testimony given to this committee in opposition both to the administration billboard control bill, and my particular billboard control bill, was the claim that roadside business would suffer, whether they were motels, hotels, restaurants, coffee shops, and so on. By roadside, I mean those accessible to the interstate highway.

Have you in your experience in the State of New York had complaints from commercial establishments and facilities near the New York Thruway that their business and income have suffered as a result of the restriction of advertising on the throughway?

Mr. TALLAMY. Not as a result of the lack of advertising on the throughway. I have had complaints from some that they have lost business because of the fact that traffic was taken to the throughway from the existing highway. But I have had a great many more state that their increase in business has been very great because of the throughway.

A little later I said:

Senator NEUBERGER. Thank you very much, Mr. Tallamy.

I want to again repeat one question because there was a little confusion at the start, and I think your answer to this is certainly one of the most important pieces of information that the subcommittee could have.

Again let me ask: You have had no complaints that business has been lost as a result of advertising restrictions along the throughway?

Mr. TALLAMY. I have not.

Senators have risen in the Senate to make random, indiscriminate, and arbitrary charges that the regulation of billboards will cause roadside establishments to lose business, and therefore will cause unemployment in those establishments. Yet Mr. Tallamy, who administered the construction of the great road in the most populous State of the Union, testified before our committee that he had received no such complaints from roadside businesses along the New York State Thruway, or that the businesses had lost clients or trade because of the restrictions on signboards.

The charge was made that section 12 was "Russia" or "Hitler." I regretted hearing that charge made about a very mild amendment—perhaps too mild an amendment. It is very peculiar to me, a relatively new Member of the Senate, that it is complete democracy for the Federal Government to tell a farmer how much corn or cotton he can plant, but that it is "Russia" or "Hitler" to have a State highway department or a State government to work out a mutual agreement to restrict or limit or forbid signs on land along public highways of the Nation.

Concerning the matter of indiscriminate sizes of signboards on the Interstate Highway System, I read one paragraph from the magazine Printer's Ink of February 22, 1957. This is the magazine of the advertising industry:

What are the unique features of outdoor advertising as defined for purposes of the Starch survey? The first characteristic is its massive size. Outdoor advertising is the largest medium in physical dimensions. In addition, outdoor posters are read and seen in a different way from other major mediums. Radio, TV, magazines, and newspapers all go to the people, but people go to the poster board. Therefore, a poster may be seen several times in the course of a 30-day display period, whereas ads in most other mediums get only one viewing. Finally, there is a timeless quality about outdoor advertising. People spend time reading a newspaper or magazine, or in watching TV and listening to the radio, but outdoor posters register their messages while people are going about other business.

Together with the distinguished junior Senator from California and the able Senator from Tennessee, the chairman of the subcommittee, I do not want to deliver over the motorists on 41,000 miles of highways as a totally captive audience for that kind of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 3 minutes more to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 3 more minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, no one disagrees with the philosophy of the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Tennessee, or the Senator from California. But as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I am so deeply interested in the passage of the road bill that I would hesitate to have it placed in jeopardy by including in it something which does not belong in it. I should like to have a road bill passed during this session of Congress, the sooner the better. However, the information I have received in good faith, is that we will not have a road bill if it is proposed to include something else which should be considered separate and apart and on its merits.

Let me say that I agree in many instances with the ideas of the Senator from Oregon with reference to billboards. But section 12 does not belong in this road bill. If we wish to put people to work, I beg my good friend not to tie section 12 to this bill, or else a road bill will not be passed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in reply to our very good friend, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I should like to say that I know how sincere and conscientious he is in the argument he has voiced to us today.

I wish to say to him very earnestly that, in my opinion, when the Federal Government specifies all the standards regarding these roads—when it specifies what the width shall be, what the curvature shall be, what the maximum grade shall be, what the strength of bridges and culverts shall be—and when the Federal Government is paying 90 percent of the cost, I believe it is pertinent and germane to such a road bill that the Federal Government express in the bill some very mild concern for the roadside scenery and grandeur.

In conclusion, let me say that if the addition of a mild signboard-regulation provision will impel some persons to take action to hold up the entire road bill, that responsibility will be theirs, not that of those of us who believe that good highways should also permit those who travel on them to have some clear views of the glories of the American countryside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 1 more minute, in order that I may make a further statement?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield again to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there is no question about what the Senator from Oregon has in mind, and personally I respect him for his views.

But, regardless of whether he dreams or whether I dream, the fact remains that the essential purpose of the road bill is to put people to work. That was one of the reasons why the Senate passed the 1956 highway bill.

What is the reason for this road bill? It is to accelerate the 1956 program, for the purpose of putting people to work.

If section 12 is included in the bill, section 12 will put out of work painters, carpenters, metalworkers, and persons in many other groups. Yet my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, also wishes to put people to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, thus we see that the philosophy of section 12 is entirely contrary to the philosophy of the first part of the bill, which is to put people to work. The purpose of section 12 is entirely contrary to that.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 1 additional minute to me, in order that I may reply very briefly to the last statement made by the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, previously, when I rose to make a 5-minute presentation, I said I did not see how any joblessness could be caused in connection with roads which are yet to be built. In other words, if the roads are to be built so that people can have jobs—jobs building roads, not plastering them with signs—then I have a correct conception of the bill. I regard the purpose of the bill was to put people to work building roads, not putting up signs along the roads.

I am fully in favor of a bill which will put people to work building roads, and our measure will surely do that. I admit that the bill will not put people to work plastering signs along the roads. But that is not the purpose of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree that the purpose is to put people to work on roads. But, by the same token, inasmuch as more than five million of the American people are now out of work, are we, in connection with this bill, going to do something which will put people out of work in almost every other line of endeavor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Oregon has once more expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 1 additional minute to me, in order that I may answer the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I simply do not understand why the inclusion of the billboard-regulation provision, as sponsored by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and myself, would delay the taking of action on this road bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It should not delay action on the bill, insofar as the bill itself is concerned. But we are talking about the overall unemployment situation; and there is no question that the inclusion of section 12 will result in unemployment. There is no question whatever of that.

I am not thinking only of roads; I am also thinking of the unemployment situation as a whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my previous remarks there be printed in the RECORD a total of 62 telegrams and letters I have received opposing the billboard control section, section 12 of the bill.

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

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge you drop section 122 of the Gore bill.

DESERT AIR MOTEL,
EBER MCKINLEY.

ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX.

RATON, N. MEX., *March 24, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Raton Chamber of Commerce would like to commend you for your opposing vote in the committee action of section 122 of the Senate bill 3414. We hope that you will continue to oppose this bill.

RATON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

RATON, N. MEX., *March 25, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you will continue to work to eliminate section 122 of Gore bill which opposes outdoor advertising. I strongly believe it is impractical and un-American. Suggest the entire bill be checked for other such ill-considered provisions.

NIXONS SPECIALIZED SERVICE,
WILLIAM G. DOTY.

RATON, N. MEX., *March 25, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you will continue to oppose section 122 of Senate bill 3414, and work toward its defeat. This legislation against outdoor advertising along highways would soon mean the end of our business, having 15 employees, which has thrived in this territory for over 30 years. It is further infringement of

rights of property owners. It is favored by only a minority group and is contrary to the best interests of all business. It would further handicap communities about to be bypassed, many of which expect to cushion the blow by use of roadside advertising.

RATON SIGN CO.,
DON F. PARTRIDGE.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your opposition to the amendment controlling areas adjacent to the Interstate System is appreciated. I believe that the practice of paying the State to cripple any industry is basically unsound. We need better highways, but the expense of acquiring an aesthetic view will certainly delay completion. We hope that Senate bill 3414 will pass without section 122.

HARRY FORBES.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Your opposition to the amendment controlling areas adjacent to the Interstate System is appreciated. I believe that the practice of paying the State to cripple any industry is basically unsound. We need better highways, but the expense of acquiring an aesthetic view will certainly delay completion. We hope that Senate bill 3414 will pass without section 122.

D. E. GIBSON III.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We appreciate your opposition to section 122 of Senate bill 3414 and respectfully ask your continued support before the Senate. We do not oppose the purpose of S. 3414 excepting the amendment which provides for a bonus to be paid to the State to cripple our business. We believe that New Mexico is capable of effecting adequate legislation on this matter.

THE LLEWELLYN CO.,
BRUCE A. GERRY.

RATON, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I congratulate you upon the stand you took concerning section 122, Senate bill 3414 recently reported favorably by Senate Public Works Committee. I feel strongly that this is crackpot legislation and I hope you will continue to oppose the same actively in the Senate.

HERBERT B. GERHART.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your opposition to the amendment controlling areas adjacent to the Interstate System is appreciated. I believe that the practice of paying the State to cripple any industry is basically unsound. We need better highways, but the expense of acquiring an esthetic view will certainly delay completion. We hope that Senate bill 3414 will pass without section 122.

ROY B. RAYMER.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your opposition to the amendment controlling areas adjacent to the Interstate System is appreciated. I believe that the practice of paying the State to cripple any industry is basically unsound. We need better highways, but the expense of acquiring an esthetic view will certainly delay completion. We hope that Senate bill 3414 will pass without section 122.

HARVEY ATKINS.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate:

I request you vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

BROADWAY COURT,
ROSE BUTLER.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate:

We urge you vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

CACTUS MOTOR LODGE,
NORM WEGNER.
TUCUMCARI.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate:

Will you please vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

EL DON MOTEL,
DAN W. EITZEN.
ALBUQUERQUE.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate:

I urge you vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

WESTERN MOTEL,
RUDOLPH BABINS.
SANTA ROSA, N. MEX.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate:

We urge you drop section 122 from the Gore bill.

THUNDERBIRD LODGE.
GALLUP, N. MEX.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate:

I urge you vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

MOTEL STEVENS,
SLICK CHILDRESS.
CARLSBAD.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate:

I urge you vote down section 122 of the Gore bill.

TAOS MOTOR LODGE,
JACK DENVER.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate:

We urge you drop section 122 from the Gore bill.

PIONEER LODGE,
MARK SELLERS.
CLOVIS N. MEX.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge you vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

DE ANZA MOTOR LODGE,
JACK DILLON.
ALBUQUERQUE.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge section 122 be dropped from the Gore bill.

SEQUOYAH MOTEL.
S. H. KNOTT.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge section 122 be dropped from the Gore bill.

PARADISE MOTEL,
NORMAN NELSON.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you drop section 122 from the Gore bill.

BEL AIR MOTEL,
ROY BUEBUSH.
DEMING, N. MEX.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

MISSION MOTEL,
ERNIE BRUCE.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge section 122 be dropped from the Gore bill.

CORONADO COURT.
WM. ANGIER.
SANTA FE.

ROSWELL, N. MEX., *March 21, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Am opposed to section 122, Senate bill 3414, States should control this phase. This will severely hurt all sign manufacturers and cause more unemployment.

TESCO NEON SIGNS, INC.,
R. L. TESSIER, Jr., *Vice President.*

ROSWELL, N. MEX., *March 21, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Section 122, Senate bill 3414, not business of Federal Government. Establishment such regulations belongs to individual States.

BERT BALLARD.

ROSWELL, N. MEX., *March 21, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We oppose section 122, Senate bill 3414, it restricts private enterprise and will contribute to further depressed economy.

Bill Suggs, Dan Chapius, Al Moran, Al Williams, Ed Taylor, Everett Powell, Bill Morrison, Fred Covert, Frances Jones.

ROSWELL, N. MEX., *March 21, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Section 122, Senate bill 3414, bad for national economy, unemployment will result if passed. Please vote no.

FRANK YOUNG, Jr.

CLOVIS, N. MEX.,
March 23, 1958.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The motels, restaurants, service stations, all roadside business in New Mexico ask you and subcommittee honestly consider Senate bill 3414 effect on established business, New Mexico, western stations. When interstate right-of-way moved, impossible travelers find established business. Signs of 500 square inches, section 122, inadequate. Please change your 1957 stand on Neuberger bill. Thousands in New Mexico and Western States isolated. For New Mexico industry.

PIONEER LODGE,
MARK SELLARS.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX.,
March 23, 1958.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge you to vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

BEL AIR MOTEL,
W. J. HEATH.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX.,
March 23, 1958.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge you to vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

ROYAL MOTEL,
CLARENCE MAUS.

ROSWELL.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX.,
March 23, 1958.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge you drop section 122 from Gore bill.

GRANDE COURT,
SAM MARSH.

TUCUMCARI.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX.,
March 23, 1958.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge you to drop section 122 from the Gore bill.

DOROTHY CROTHY,
DESERT AIRE MOTEL.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX.,
March 23, 1958.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge section 122 be dropped from the Gore bill.

PARK MOTEL,
LORETTA ANDERSON.

CARLSBAD.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge section 122 be dropped from the Gore bill.

AKE COURT,
ROSCOE AKE.

SOCORRO, N. MEX.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I hope you see fit to strike section 122 from the Gore bill.

VILLA MOTEL,
MERLE EAGAR.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We request you vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

DEL PRADO MOTEL,
GEORGE DUSHANKE.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We request you vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

EL REY MOTEL,
L. C. MATHEWS.

SANTA FE, N. MEX.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to drop section 122 from the Gore bill.

TOWER MOTEL,
IRA SMITH.

SANTA ROSA.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge that you vote to drop section 122 of Gore bill.

SANDS MOTEL.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge you to vote down section 122 of the Gore bill.

EL TAOSENA,
TERRY MONYHAN.

TAOS.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge you to vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

EL RIO MOTEL,
C. M. REES.

SOCORRO.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 23, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We hope you will vote section 122 out of the Gore bill.

ROYAL MANOR MOTEL,
A. C. BINDEL.

CARLSBAD.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

At a special, well represented motel meeting here today, we were unanimous in the belief section 122 should be dropped from the Gore bill.

C. E. NEFF,
President, Motor Hotel Association of New Mexico.

ROSWELL, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Section 122, Senate bill 3414, usurps States rights and will do great harm to private enterprise and further economic recession. Fifty persons would be directly affected in Roswell.

ERNEST C. TUCKER,

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 24, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We of the New Mexico Restaurant Association hope that you see fit to vote out section 122 of the Gore bill; we feel highway advertising is vital to our business and it's the American way to advertise the way we please; many people will be jobless if this section 122 goes through.

Sincerely,

CHARLES NEFF, Jr.,
President of New Mexico Restaurant Association.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Section 122 of the Gore bill will hurt us terribly. Please vote it down.

CASA LINDA MOTEL,
JIM WITHERS.

GALLUP, N. MEX.

GALLUP, N. MEX., *March 19, 1958.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Allied Motor Courts Association, with members operating in seven States, want you to know that we protest the passage of billboard bills S. 3414 and 3218 as an invasion of private property and detrimental to the future welfare of the motel industry.

J. H. WITHERS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

GALLUP, N. MEX., *March 19, 1958.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The 66 Tourist Service Association, consisting of Gallup businessmen engaged in the motel, restaurant, curio, and service station business protest the passage of billboard bills S. 3414 and 3218 as an invasion of private property and detrimental to the future welfare of our business.

J. H. WITHERS,
President.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 20, 1958.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We request your careful consideration on Senate bill 3414 especially section 122 having to do with advertising within 660 feet of edge of rights-of-way. There are over 1,200 motels in New Mexico, many of these small operators will be seriously affected if they are deprived of contact with motorists on Interstate System.

GEORGE MILLER,
President, Albuquerque Motor Court Association.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your opposition to the amendment controlling areas adjacent to the Interstate System is appreciated. I believe that the practice of paying the State to cripple any industry is basically unsound. We need better highways, but the expense of acquiring an esthetic view will certainly delay completion. We hope that Senate bill 3414 will pass without section 122.

AL J. CHAVES.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your opposition to the amendment controlling areas adjacent to the Interstate Sys-

tem is appreciated. I believe that the practice of paying the State to cripple any industry is basically unsound. We need better highways, but the expense of acquiring an esthetic view will certainly delay completion. We hope that Senate bill 3414 will pass without section 122.

E. G. WELLS.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 20, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Monday, March 24, Senate will consider Senate bill 3414. Section 122 prohibits advertising within 660 feet of edge of rights-of-way of Interstate Highway System. Exemptions wholly inadequate. Exemptions permit roadside business signs within 12 miles of location but cannot be over 500 square inches—repeat, 500 square inches. Urgently request your cooperation in defeating section 122 of this bill and leave matter to State controls.

LLOYD P. BLOODWORTH,
Manager, New Mexico Restaurant Association, New Mexico Motor Hotel Association.

GALLUP, N. MEX., *March 20, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Gallup Motel Association want you to know that we protest the passage of billboard bills S. 3414 and S. 3218 as invasion of private property and detrimental to the future welfare of the motel industry.

DINO GONZERLA, *President.*

ROSWELL, N. MEX., *March 18, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Naturally we favor S. 3414, and naturally we believe section 122 is definitely unfair to not only the outdoor advertising industry but also merchants of New Mexico. The tourist trade in this State is a great business potential and outdoor advertising is one of the best mediums to secure this business. Please do whatever is possible to delete section 122 and thereby leave State control of outdoors to the individual States.

W. B. ZACHARIAS,
Pecos Valley Outdoor Advertising Co.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 18, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference is made to the proposed Senate bill which would eliminate billboard advertising on interstate highways. Your valued support in killing this vicious legislation is respectfully requested. Costs for buying antibillboard easements would be prohibitive. We as owners of an outdoor advertising company, our employees, suppliers of equipment and materials, insurers, the property owners who receive rental for their ground, and the advertisers, do not want this restrictive legislation passed. Those opposing outdoor advertising are truly in the minority. We have an adequate safety law in New Mexico regarding billboard placement. No hazard exists. To satisfy the esthetic objection of some, millions of dollars of investment will be destroyed, and thousands of people deprived of income and thrown out of work. Can we afford this to gratify the desires of a minority and Scripps-Howard? Please refer to our correspondence of February 1957 for further information. We know we can count on your continued vigorous support and effort to kill this legislation, and assure you it will be greatly appreciated.

DALTON CARTER,
New Mexico Sign & Advertising Co.

COVIS, N. MEX., *March 15, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We again ask that you oppose the outdoor section of the Gore bill S. 3214 which was passed by the committee. The highway section bill is just fine but the amendment attached to is no good. I expect your help.

RALPH R. JOHNSON,
Hardward Bros. New-Tex Outdoor Advertising Co.

DENVER, COLO., *March 23, 1958.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Re: Senate bill 3414.

Please strike section 122 from this bill. Let individual States handle roadside advertising. 3414 proposes to stimulate business and create jobs but section 122 would put many individuals and companies out of jobs.

GLENN D. HOPKINS,
Director, American Motor Hotel Association, Representing New Mexico.

CHICO, CALIF., *March 22, 1958.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Section 122 of Senate bill 3414 not bill to beautify highway system. Makes no attempt to regulate junkyards, used car lots, slaughtering houses, gasoline stations, garbage dumps, grease rendering plants, open-pit mining, meat processing plants, saw mills, lumber yards. Ban billboards and permit above classifications by deliberately omitting from bill prima facie evidence sponsors not so much interested in beautifying highways as attempting to discredit and smear major advertising medium by trying to make billboards nasty word despite fact legal legitimate business. Major advertising medium making substantial contribution to Nation's economy. If 122 becomes law Senate will in effect say to people Congress has no faith in integrity or competence of elected city, county officials to use own police powers in making, enforcing, comprehensive zoning laws. Reflection which Senate knows not fact. Is it intent of sponsors to pass to States matter regulating all commercial activities omitted from bill? If true, why not pass to States matter of zoning billboards, too. How can they say in good conscience city-county officials competent to zone garbage dumps but incompetent to zone billboards?

BUTTE COUNTY MOTEL ASSOCIATION.

WHITE CITY, INC.,
White City, N. Mex., March 18, 1958.
The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senator from New Mexico,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Thank you for your favorable vote on committee action of section 122 of Senate bill 3414. This section, as you remember, deals with increased Federal appropriation to the State highway programs that include regulation and restriction of road and highway signs.

As the most recent report from the State Tourist Bureau reveals, the tourist industry is the second largest industry in the State of New Mexico. It can easily become the first with proper publicity and appeal to the Nation's traveling public. Elimination of highway signs would virtually eliminate all tourist industries. Other fields such as entertainment and automobile services would be greatly affected. Highway signs promote off highway travel in New Mexico, induce travelers to take advantage of food, lodging, and car service available in New Mexico, and inform travelers of sights and events that are taking place in our State. The loss of tax revenue from gasoline sales alone would seriously hamper our road building and highway maintenance. In fact, the economic effect upon the State of New Mexico would be drastic.

Furthermore, as we are sure you will agree, State governments as we have in New Mexico are perfectly capable of governing and legislating for their own State, without Federal supervision or directives. State governments will soon become obsolete if this Federal trend of control is continued.

As you are already on record as opposing this section, we urge you to exercise all possible influence to have this section defeated in the Senate. The results of the Senate action will certainly have a permanent influence upon the economy of the State of New Mexico.

Thank you for your many favors and assistance of the past.

Yours truly,

CHARLIE WHITE.

Whereas the Senate Roads Committee has before it, Senate bill 3041 and Senate bill 3218, which if passed will prohibit and control roadside advertising on private land adjacent to the Interstate Highway System and eliminate any billboards within 600 feet of the right-of-way; and

Whereas it is the belief of this organization that the passage of these bills will seriously influence the economy of the tourist trade; will prevent such towns as Grants and other communities from advertising their facilities available to the traveling public and will abolish the right to inform strangers where such services are offered: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Grants and Western Valencia County Chamber of Commerce goes on record as opposing these bills and thereby respectfully requests your cooperation in taking the necessary action to defeat the measures and allow signs along the Interstate Highway System.

This resolution adopted at a regular meeting on Wednesday, March 19, 1958, by a majority vote of the members present.

GRANTS AND WESTERN VALENCIA
COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By MARVEL PRESTRIDGE, *Secretary.*

VALENCIA COUNTY,
Bluewater, N. Mex., March 20, 1958.
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: It has been brought to my attention that Senate bill 3041, introduced by Senator BUSH, Republican of Connecticut, and Senate bill 3218, introduced by Senator KUCHEL, Republican of California, are to eliminate billboard advertising along the Interstate Highway System.

Since a large part of the income of New Mexico is derived from the tourist industry, I feel it would be against the best interests of New Mexico to eliminate highway advertising except where it would create a driving hazard such as at an intersection or on a bad curve.

I would like to urge defeat of these bills when they come before you. Anything you can do to defeat them would be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

JANE HYDE COSPER,
Vice Chairwoman.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD 7 telegrams from the other side, favoring section 12 of the bill.

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

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
March 24, 1958.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The members of La Noche Garden Club request that vote for the bill which limits billboards.

MRS. BERNARD LOWENSTEIN,
President, La Noche Garden Club.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a citizen of New Mexico I urge you to support Senator NEUBERGER's bill to regulate billboards on new Federal highway system.

A. E. WHITE.

SANTA RITA, N. MEX., *March 24, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Members of New Mexico Garden Club, Inc., and their thousands of friends are depending on your vote and support for the billboard amendment.

MRS. HORACE L. BOUNDS,
President.

SANTE FE, N. MEX., *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully urge you to use your influence in behalf of legislation intended to keep our new Federal highways free of advertising billboards.

OLD SANTA FE ASSOCIATION,
JOHN G. MEEM, *President.*

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *March 24, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.:

Do hope you favor Senate bill 3218 limiting billboards on Federal highways. Please. Please.

ALLISON VON WEDEL.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 25, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We the members of Hillcrest Garden Club, Albuquerque, N. Mex., representing a memship of 30 would appreciate your support of section 122 of the highway bill dealing with billboards on interstate highways.

MRS. THERESA M. HOWARD,
President, Hillcrest Garden Club.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 25, 1958.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Representing 700 Garden Club members we urge your support billboard control bill including section 122.

MRS. RALPH T. OSBORN, Jr.,
President, Albuquerque Council of Garden Clubs.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, today the Senate is proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement limiting to 4 hours the debate on the billboard-control amendment. In point of fact, however, the debate began last night, and proceeded for several long hours then.

Yesterday the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] made a very excellent and clear presentation of the highway bill which now is before the Senate. His presentation was rather lengthy. I regret that most of my colleagues in the Senate apparently had other things to do, and were not present at that time.

As the able Senator from Tennessee proceeded to the point where he began to comment on the billboard provisions, not very many Senators were present. Suddenly I saw my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], slowly rise from his seat and ask the Senator from Tennessee to yield for a question. The Senator from Tennessee did so. I was sore afraid; I knew full well the excellent ability as a lawyer and the great reputation which my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, possesses in tremendous degree. I recognized that there was about to begin what perhaps would be a critical and unhappy assault upon proposed legislation which I had been delighted to help fashion.

The Senator from Oklahoma proceeded, and gently asked his questions in well modulated tones. I observed the skill of a fine lawyer with a legalistic scalpel in his hand, questioning, probing, trying to find a weakness if at all possible, in this measure. I continued to be afraid.

Time went by. The Senator from Tennessee fended off the probing, and honestly and forthrightly answered the questions. After a while, I began to be less afraid; it seemed to me that the questions and the answers afforded an opportunity for all who would read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to see that all we have done is to try—successfully, by this amendment—honestly and forthrightly to afford protection to the highway system of the United States, to the extent of 41,000 miles as to which the people of the United States, through the Federal Treasury, pay 90 percent of the bill.

Mr. President, on the other hand, today my able friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, and there is no Member of this body for whom I have a fonder regard, has taken a different and far more vigorous approach. Today my friend from Oklahoma stood, not as he did yesterday, in courtesy, in well modulated terms, but rather in stentorian tones, with a blunderbuss in one hand and a shillalagh in the other, and aimed his blows at those of us in the Senate of the United States who had the temerity to try to represent the people's interest. Said the Senator from Oklahoma to the junior Senator from California, "I listened to the Senator from California extol the California constitution and say he wanted to protect it, but he violates it in this bill. He has thrown it out the window; and," said the Senator from Oklahoma, "for a few pieces of silver the Senator from California and the Senator from Oregon would let the State constitutions be broken and would let our State governments be seduced and ravaged and debauched.

I am glad my able friend from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is present in the Chamber. There is no man in the Senate who does not need to have his credentials in favor of States rights less verified than does my able friend from Louisiana.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Not yet.

Mr. KERR. For one question?

Mr. KUCHEL. No. I am still a little afraid. [Laughter.]

I have again and again in the Senate seen the able Senator from Louisiana arise and extol, as it is his right and duty, the greatness of the theory of the rights of States, so I am glad we who favor this amendment have a champion of States rights defending our proposal in this debate.

Yesterday I thought, with particular and telling clarity, the Senator from Louisiana asked, What is wrong with the Federal Government's laying down a policy under law by which moneys will be allocated to the States for such high purposes as hospital construction? Is there anyone today in the American Congress who objects to the Federal unemployment compensation statutes, under which, if the States agree to abide by that which the Congress has decreed, Federal moneys are made available to them? What, indeed, is wrong with the present Federal highway legislation, under which, if States agree to abide by Federal standards, they are permitted to receive 90 percent of the cost of constructing an Interstate Highway? The answer is, there is nothing wrong with it, at all.

I think the words which are in the RECORD of last night, iterated by my able friend from Louisiana, demonstrate conclusively the paucity of logic which has been voiced today by my friend from Oklahoma.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. All this amendment means to me is that if a highway is going to be built for a million dollars, the Federal Government will put up $900,000 and say to the States, "In addition to the $900,000, we will give you an extra $5,000 if you try to keep the highway beautiful." That is all it means to me. The State can either take the extra $5,000 or permit $50,000 worth of signs to be constructed on the highway, which may make it so ugly that nobody will want to drive on it except by necessity.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I am still a little afraid.

Mr. KERR. But not too much? I remind the Senator that I yielded to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Oklahoma now touches me in a place which I find overwhelms me. With great trepidation, I yield to the able Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The statement made by the distinguished Senator from California has disarmed the Senator from Oklahoma. I want to say to him he is the last man on the floor I would either harm or seek to harm, because of my affection and respect for him. The Senator re-

ferred to the similarity between the Federal Government's participation in the proposal now before the Senate, and that pertaining to local hospitals.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Can the Senator name for the Senator from Oklahoma a single other Federal program of participation in construction, whether it be for hospitals, schools, or whatever it may be, where the facilities on which the Federal Government or the State is to construct the facility makes any approach other than by paying the citizen who owns the property where the facility has been built or is to be built for his property, in accordance with the law and in accordance with the value of the property to be obtained from the citizen?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am frank to give the Senator—and I desire to develop that point in the comments I shall make—the reasons why we are endeavoring to give States an incentive either to purchase advertising easements, or, if they so desire, to exercise their constitutional police powers.

Mr. KERR. And do so without paying for the property?

Mr. KUCHEL. As the Senator well knows, the police power of a State, if it is exercised in a reasonable fashion, constitutes a part of the law of this great Republic.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator able to point to a hospital which has been built with Federal funds, the location for which was obtained by police power?

Mr. KUCHEL. I cannot.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier this morning my able friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, arranged to have brought into the Senate Chamber some signs, and in referring to them, he denounced the provision of the bill which, with respect to one aspect of the philosophy of the amendment, limits signs to 500 square inches. He was utilizing that feature of the amendment as an argument, as he saw it, for rejecting the entire amendment.

I was puzzled. I asked the Senator about it, because I did not want to rely on a faulty memory. I said, "How did the Senator vote in committee on the 500-square-inch amendment?" The Senator from Oklahoma said, "I voted for it." I was more puzzled then than before, because my able friend had voted for something in committee, and having been on the prevailing side, now used that for which he voted in committee as an argument on the Senate floor against the proposal. The simple truth is that while language must be susceptible to honest interpretation, I say the language in the bill is sufficiently clear as to defy misrepresentation to reasonable minds.

On the point of subparagraph (3), with respect to the 500-square-inch provision, I think the letter which the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] placed in the RECORD, and the short colloquy in which we both participated with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], make it abundantly clear what the intention is. Beyond that I think a mere reading of subparagraphs (3) and (4) ought to make it clear to Senators what the intention is.

What, in a word, are we trying to do? We live in a Nation, 48 States, which has streets, roads, highways, and thoroughfares embracing millions of miles and extending across the continent.

There is one system which was fashioned in the Congress 2 years ago to provide for a 41,000-mile, high-speed, limited-access Interstate and Defense Highway System, which Congress determined to pay for to the extent of nine-tenths. A portion of that system is in use today. Indeed, some of it was actually being used to the time the bill was passed in 1956.

The amendment, which the committee has approved by a majority vote, prescribes a national policy which the President of the United States has endorsed and which Gov. Adlai Stevenson in principle has endorsed. It is a national policy by which we say, "It is in the interest of the safety of the driving public and it is in the interest of protecting the scenic beauty of the areas traversed by these thoroughfares that the highway system should be protected from indiscriminate outdoor advertising." That is all we say. That is all we honorably seek to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 more minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. After proclaiming the national policy we except that part of the highway system which does not require additional rights-of-way and which was in being prior to the effective date of the statute in 1956.

We had the problem of home rule to consider. Cities in my State, for example, have a constitutional right under the State constitution to exercise the police power, as they have done, are doing, and will continue to do in the future, and thus the State could not speak for such cities in any agreement to apply a national policy. So in the bill we excepted incorporated cities.

We did something more. We provided that if a State was interested in adhering to an agreement which would be worked out between the Secretary of Commerce and the State itself, we would accept a decision by the State as to what areas constituted industrial or commercial or business areas through which the interstate highway might run, and there the national highway policy would not apply.

Mr. President, we are making an attempt to meet a basic issue and meet it fairly. It seems to me that no one can quarrel with the reasonable terms in which the amendment has been fashioned. I hope most sincerely that the amendment will be adopted overwhelmingly and that the amendment of my able friend from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and other Senators will be defeated.

I close by reading into the RECORD a statute dated 1285 A. D. It is the Statute of Winchester, 13 Edward I. It is entitled, "The Breadth of Highways Leading From One Market Town to Another."

And further, it is commanded, that highways leading from one market-town to another shall be enlarged, whereas bushes, woods, or dikes, be so that there be neither dike, tree, nor bush, whereby a man may lurk to do hurt, within two hundred foot of the one side, and two hundred foot on the other side of the way, so that this statute shall not extend unto ashes, nor unto great trees, for which it shall be clearly out of this. (2) And if by default of the lord, that will not abate the dike, underwood, or bushes, in the manner aforesaid, any robberies be done therein, the lord shall be answerable for the felony; and if further be done the lord shall make a fine at the King's pleasure. (3) And if the lord be not able to fell the underwoods, the country shall aid him therein. (4) And the King willeth, that in his demean lands, and woods within his forest and without, the ways shall be enlarged, as before is said. (5) And if perchance a park be taken from the highway, it is requisite that the lord shall set his park the space of two hundred foot from the highways, as before is said, or that he make such a wall, dyke, or hedge, that offenders may not pass, nor return to do evil.

I do not propose that we do evil in the Senate today. I propose we do something good for the people. I ask Senators on both sides of the aisle to defeat the amendment to strike out the incentive legislation for billboard control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes, or such amount of 10 minutes as he may desire, to the able junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it is not my intention to review and rehearse the arguments already made in connection with the provisions of the pending bill which apply to the control of highway advertising. I wish to say, however, that the issue has been rather beclouded this morning by impassioned pleas which go far beyond the commonsense, down-to-earth interpretation of the provisions.

As has already been pointed out, the provisions in the bill relating to billboard advertising are essentially restricted to the portions of the Interstate Highway System which are outside the commercial areas, outside the metropolitan areas, and outside the areas which are within the incorporated towns, where advertising is already permitted and in many cases, if not in most cases, already controlled by local or State regulations.

The provisions of the bill are clearly pointed toward the Interstate System which in part, has been constructed, other parts of which are about to be constructed, or are in the process of being constructed, through the rural areas, in most cases where no highway has heretofore existed. The design and purpose are to preserve and protect the system, into which the Federal Government will be pouring vast sums of money, from indiscriminate, uncontrolled advertising.

Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate now what I will explain again briefly when I call up my amendment. I intend to offer an amendment, which will not be in order, of course, until the time has expired or been yielded

back on the amendment of the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to strike from the bill the provision under discussion. This amendment will make more clear and will further limit the application of the billboard provision of the bill.

The provision on page 22 of the bill as it is now before us reads:

Any such agreement may, within the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, consistent with the national policy, provide for excluding from application of the national standards segments of the Interstate System which traverse incorporated municipalities wherein the use of real property adjacent to the Interstate System is subject to municipal regulation or control, or which traverse other areas where the land use is clearly established by State law as industrial or commercial, or which are built on rights-of way.

Mr. President, I invite particular attention to this wording: "wholly acquired before July 1, 1956."

That provision might apply to a portion of the Interstate System where an existing highway has been somewhat widened. It will be my intention to offer an amendment to strike out the words "rights-of-way wholly acquired" and, so as not to leave the matter to the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, to insert a limitation on the effect of the bill to those parts of the Interstate System in which the rights have been wholly acquired since July 1, 1956. In other words, it would limit the control of advertising under the act to those parts of the Interstate System which are wholly new, built through rural areas where no highway has heretofore existed.

I am unable to ascertain, and the Bureau of Public Roads is unable to inform me as to the exact percentage which this provision would cover. Seventy-two percent of the proposed Interstate System is, in their eyes, new, virgin highway. But some small parts of the system consist of highways which have previously been in use.

I am offering this amendment, first, because I believe in controlling advertising on the new highway system. I supported such a policy last year. I supported it when the highway bill first came before the Senate, and regretted that the provision was stricken out. I supported it in the committee, when we were unable to obtain a majority vote to report it to the Senate; and I am supporting it now.

I believe it will be an effective provision. One advantage of it is that it will mean that no present advertising facilities will be torn down, that no rights of advertising which were in existence before the act went into effect on July 1, 1956, will be harmed, that no one who has his money invested in motels, restaurants, gasoline stations, or any industrial or commercial enterprise, or who has his signs on highways in existence, will be deprived, either by purchase or by exercise of police power, of the advertising rights he now has.

It will mean that at least 65 or 70 percent of the entire Interstate System which is to be constructed through the countryside will, from the very beginning, be under control so far as advertising is concerned. So far as we in the Federal Government can bring it about by national policy, and so far as it can be brought about by paying our share of the purchase price, such highways will be controlled with respect to advertising.

I believe that the adoption of such an amendment would make this a stronger bill, and that there would be a better chance of getting it through the Senate and the other body.

Second, I think it would grant protection against unbridled and unrestrained highway advertising, and accomplish all that is necessary to preserve the beauty of the landscapes of the countryside. I believe such an amendment would make the bill better and more logical.

It would have the added effect of applying only to those parts of the highway where there is no existing advertising facility, which locations are not attractive to advertisers until the highway has made it so. When we build a highway in an entirely new location, where no highway has previously existed, through the countryside, we are not depriving anyone of any rights which he has theretofore had, because there was no reason for advertising when there were no highways.

The Federal Government, which is paying 90 percent of the cost of these highways, is justified in protecting its investment by using every reasonable and legitimate means to limit and control advertising in that area.

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

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator think the Federal Government now has the power to exercise control whether or not there is a sign in an area which is not a part of the right-of-way on which the highway is built?

Mr. COTTON. I do not; and there is no such provision in the bill.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COTTON. There is no provision by which the Federal Government is attempting to exercise such control.

The bill merely provides, first, that if the State has the right to control advertising, and decides to control it, the State will receive additional aid from the Federal Government; and second, the bill provides that if the State chooses to purchase, in connection with the purchase of the rights-of-way, advertising rights, and pay for them, the Federal Government will pay its share, so long as the advertising rights purchased do not cost in excess of 5 percent of the cost of the rights-of-way.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does the highway department in the State of New Hampshire have the authority to prevent the erection of signs on property of private citizens in areas adjacent to, but not a part of, the right-of-way for a highway?

Mr. COTTON. It does not. I doubt whether the highway department of any State has such a right. Whether the legislature has such a right or not is another question.

Mr. KERR. I asked the Senate if the highway department had such a right.

Mr. COTTON. Certainly not; and if the bill is passed, the highway department will not have any more rights than it previously had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COTTON. May I have 5 minutes more?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 5 minutes more to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. KERR. I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the bill provides that if a contract is made between the highway department and the Secretary of Commerce, the control is implemented. Is not that the provision of the bill?

Mr. COTTON. I am not sure that I understand the Senator's question.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a provision of the bill that this regulatory program shall be put into effect if the State highway department makes a contract with the Secretary of Commerce permitting it?

Mr. COTTON. If the State highway department made such a contract and carried out the contract, it would be put into effect. But the State highway department cannot carry out such a contract if it has not the authority to do so.

Mr. KERR. Does the bill state that the implementation of the policy is dependent upon the State highway department having such authority?

Mr. COTTON. Anyone with ordinary commonsense, in reading the bill, would know that if the highway department is unable to carry out the provisions of the bill, they will not be carried out.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator believe that laws should be written so that only those with commonsense can understand them? Or does he think they should be written so that those not blessed with commonsense may understand them?

Mr. COTTON. Those with commonsense should shed light for those not blessed with commonsense.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator think we should place that burden upon them?

Mr. COTTON. I think it would not be an impossible burden.

Let me say to the Senator, in as plain language as I can, that if I can read English correctly, the bill merely provides that, if a State chooses to regulate advertising, and has the constitutional power to do so, it shall be paid one-half of 1 percent more from the Federal Government; and if it does not choose to exercise that right, and prefers to purchase the right, and does purchase it, the Federal Government will pay 90 percent of the cost. That is all the bill provides.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. COTTON. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. I recognize the Senator's complete knowledge of and familiarity with what is in the bill, and his great ability and understanding. The Senator from Oklahoma does not possess those

qualities in the proportion the Senator from New Hampshire does.

Mr. COTTON. That is not so.

Mr. KERR. As a favor to the Senator from Oklahoma, would the Senator from New Hampshire now show the Senator from Oklahoma where that language is in the bill?

Mr. COTTON. What language?

Mr. KERR. That which provides in effect, that if the State has a right to act, and in the exercise of its constitutional authority it does act, thus and so happens.

Mr. COTTON. The bill does not contain such specific language, because, as a matter of constitutional fact, neither the Senate nor any other body can confer upon the States an unconstitutional privilege. Obviously it is only if the State has the power to act, and does act, that it can proceed under the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. KERR. Does not the bill authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into agreements with State highway departments? Is not that language contained in the bill?

Mr. COTTON. Yes.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from New Hampshire says the highway department does not have the authority and the Secretary of Commerce does not have the authority. The Senator from Oklahoma, therefore, would like to know how the two, contracting together, can create an authority which neither of them possesses.

Mr. COTTON. They cannot. That is a safeguard which should console and comfort the heart of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COTTON. May I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I shall say one more thing in my own time. If the Senator from Oklahoma can get me more time later, I shall use it to answer his questions further.

Mr. KERR. I would not want to encounter the difficulty of securing additional time. I would not want thus to impose on our good friend from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have just yielded an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. KERR. For the use of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. What is the official time situation at the moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 71 minutes remaining. The opposition has 65 minutes remaining.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from California has 71 minutes remaining, and he gives me only 2 minutes?

Mr. KUCHEL. Three minutes.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. He has always been the soul of generosity. He leads me to suspect that he is so reluctant to give me more time because he is afraid that what I may say will be a liability to his cause rather than an asset.

Mr. KUCHEL. What I am afraid of is that when the 3 minutes have expired there will be a request for 3 more minutes, as there have been already 2 requests for 5 minutes each.

Mr. COTTON. I wish to add one more thought. It is what I was about to say when the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma interrogated me. A great deal has been said on the floor of the Senate this morning about the rights of the people living adjacent to the proposed Interstate System, and about the value of their advertising rights and such rights being taken from them. The answer to that, first, is that such a right cannot be taken from them unless the State has the right to do so and exercises it, or pays for it.

Another answer which should be borne in mind is that the citizen who is the real sufferer from the construction of the Interstate Highway System is not the citizen who might want at some future date to sell to some corporation the privilege of putting up an advertising sign on his property. Rather, it is the citizen who finds his home shut off without an access to the highway, or with no access, perhaps, for 3 or 4 or 5 miles. To be sure he has been paid, but the highway may run between his farmhouse and his barn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. They are the people who have already suffered. The matter of advertising is not something which justifies anyone in tearing his hair. It is my hope that my amendment will be adopted. It will narrow the question down to the new, virgin highway where no highway has existed heretofore, where no advertisements have been in existence. In that way we will be able to protect the freedom—there has been said about freedom—of those who will travel on the highways in future years, and who will not become captives of a long line of advertising signs.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have received a number of telegrams and letters from persons throughout Idaho favoring the enactment into law of section 12 of the present bill. I ask unanimous consent that these expressions of popular support for the principle of billboard regulation, as embodied in section 12, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LEWISTON, IDAHO.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: After reading Marquis Childs' article in March 22 Tribune, I want to thank you for supporting the anti-billboard amendment of Senator NEUBERGER. I have not talked to a single person in the past 2 days but who approves of your stand and are pleased to be represented by someone who will support such an amendment.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY F. LYONS.

GRANGEVILLE, IDAHO, *March 22, 1958.*

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHURCH: This is to let you know that we are in favor of no billboards on the transcontinental highway. If all signs could be small and scattered in desert or plains country and be amusing like The Stinker's in southern Idaho, there would not be so much objection; but permitting one opens the way for others and it is enough to have only regular direction and standard highway signs.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. E. M. DOWNING.

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *March 23, 1958.*

The Honorable FRANK CHURCH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Merri-Tiller Garden Club with a membership of 18 of the Idaho State Federation of Garden Clubs, greatly desire your continued support of a bill prohibiting advertising billboards along the highways.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. H. G. MARSHALL,
President of Merri-Tillers Garden Club, First Assistant Director of Panhandle-Clearwater District.

REUBENS, IDAHO, *March 23, 1958.*

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: As a garden club member and Panhandle-Clearwater district director of Federated Garden Clubs, I would like to add my plea for myself and our garden clubs to keep our highways free of billboards.

We are working to beautify our State and highways, and certainly billboards do not add to the beauty of our State, which we are striving to make a place we can be proud to have people travel through.

We hope you will help us in this matter when this bill is presented.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. SAM I. QUINN,
Panhandle-Clearwater District Director.

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *March 24, 1958.*

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Nez Perce County Democratic Women's Organization asks your continued support of the Neuberger and billboard amendment for the national highway bill.

Mrs. GILBERT WILLIAMS,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

POCATELLO, IDAHO, *March 24, 1958.*

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your support of section 12, bill S. 3414, billboard control.

LULU JOHNSON,
Vice President, Idaho Federated Garden Clubs.

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, *March 23, 1958.*

Senator CHURCH,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support of section 12, Senate bill 3414, billboard control.

Thank you.

Mrs. LAWNIE HOOKER,
District Director, Southeast District, Idaho Federated Garden Clubs.

POCATELLO, IDAHO, *March 24, 1958.*
Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge your support of section 12, bill S. 3414, billboard control.
MRS. E. R. BUEHLER,
Chairman, Roadside Development, Idaho Federated Garden Clubs.

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, *March 23, 1958.*
Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge your support of section 12, Senate bill S. 3414 billboard control. Thank you.
MRS. GLEN WADSWORTH,
President, Idaho Falls Flower and Garden Club.

WEISER, IDAHO, *March 24, 1958.*
Senator FRANK CHURCH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Vote "yes" on bill S. 3414, control billboards on highway.
Respectfully.
WEISER GARDEN CLUB,
GARDEN CRAFTS GARDENING WORKSHOP.

OROFINO, IDAHO, *March 24, 1958.*
Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We as a group are opposed to billboards along the highway.
THE SOD BUSTERS GARDEN CLUB.

PAYETTE, IDAHO, *March 24, 1958.*
Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Vote "yes" for bill S. 3414, control of billboards on new highway.
PAYETTE FLORAL CLUB GREEN GARDEN GALLS.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment to delete section 12 from the pending bill.

First of all, I wish to say that I am thoroughly in sympathy with the declared objectives of the bill. All of us, I am sure, will subscribe to the idea that it is much better to have scenic beauty and grandeur than things not beautiful and grand. I believe I come by the desire to have scenic beauty and grandeur preserved as honestly as anyone else, because my family and I have always enjoyed the beauty of nature, not only along highways but also in camp, whether in the open or under the shelter of a tent. We have spent many happy weeks and even months in that type of activity.

However, in this instance, as in any other instance, we are entitled to have the legislative objective achieved by a workable plan, a plan which is legal and constitutional, a plan which is acceptable in method and feasible financially, and one which both parties will be able to carry out.

I submit that section 12 does not have any of those qualifications. To put it affirmatively and positively, I say that section 12 does not present a workable plan. It is not legal or constitutional. It is not acceptable in method and it is infeasible financially. Furthermore, it is a plan which will result in agreements being entered into by the States and the Secretary of Commerce which cannot be performed and carried out on the part of the States themselves.

It is interesting to observe the evolution of the proposed legislation. Originally, when this type of legislation was proposed and considered, it involved the concept of direct Federal action. It was very early discarded on that basis, because the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce wrote an opinion which definitely held that the Federal Government does not have the authority to control advertising along the Interstate System. The opinion further stated that the Federal Government may not participate in the acquiring of advertising rights, except in limited instances, under section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of 1940, as amended, where the acquisition of such rights alone would be sufficient for the preservation of natural beauty. The opinion further held that the Secretary of Commerce was not authorized to acquire advertising easements with Federal aid highway funds.

Therefore the concept of having the Federal Government interest itself directly in these efforts was abandoned. It had to be abandoned. When it was found that these powers were not enjoyed by the Department of Commerce, that the Federal Government had no police power in this respect, and that it had no power to control this advertising, a shift in techniques was made, and a new maneuver was resorted to.

In section 12, we witness an effort to resort to indirection to achieve that which cannot be achieved directly. In this proposal, authority is granted to the Secretary of Commerce to "enter into agreements with State highway departments to carry out the national policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section with respect to the Interstate System within the State."

What is that national policy to which reference is made in the authorizing language of the bill? If we refer to the language on page 21, lines 6 through 24, we have it before us. I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the bill to which I have just referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

It is hereby declared to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, or devices within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main-traveled way of all portions of the Interstate System should be regulated, consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary, which shall provide for:

(1) Directional or other official signs or notices that are required or authorized by law.

(2) Signs advertising the sale or lease of the property upon which they are located.

(3) Signs not larger than 500 square inches advertising activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located.

(4) Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

Mr. HRUSKA. Among other things which the national policy embraces is a listing of national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce, which shall provide for four kinds of signs: First, directional or official signs; second, signs advertising the sale or lease of the property upon which they are located; third, signs not larger than 500 square inches advertising activities being conducted at a location not farther than 12 miles from the location of the signs; fourth, signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of section 12, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public—whatever that means.

The question has arisen in the debate as to whether or not the enumeration of those four types of signs is exclusive, or whether they may be amended or added to.

It had been my understanding, until yesterday afternoon, that those four types of signs were the only signs which could be authorized under the regulations which would be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce. But it was submitted yesterday and is now contended, as I understand, by the authors of the bill, that those four types of signs are not exclusive; that they are mandatory; that they have to be in the regulations, but they are not exclusive.

So the Secretary of Commerce can add to the size of the signs. He is not limited to 500 square inches in specifying their size. He may authorize signs as large as 30 by 60 feet, if he so chooses, so far as it is within reason, whatever that means. I shall discuss that in a moment.

I should like to consider the question of the four types of signs first as being exclusive and then, as not being exclusive. First, I wish to consider the alternative of their being exclusive, and that the Secretary of Commerce is bound by them and cannot add anything more to the list. If the four types of signs are exclusive and cannot be departed from, it means that whenever an agreement would be entered into by the Secretary with a State highway department, there would be a setting aside and a nullification of any and all State and local laws and ordinances relating to zoning regulations pertaining to the advertising signs within the area embraced in the agreement, because the agreement, by the language of the bill, must include provisions regarding the regulation of signs in conformity with the standards established in accordance with subsection (a). This includes the four subparagraphs to which I have referred. If it does that, and if those four subparagraphs may not be added to or changed, it means that if there are any signs in the area subject to the agreement signed by the Department, such signs become illegal because they do not comply with the national policy.

It is interesting to observe, as has already been brought out in the debate, that there are about 4,500 miles of Interstate System in urban areas. Virtually every one of those areas has some type of zoning. It said that those areas

are excluded from the operation of the bill. I submit that that is not true. If it were true, simple language to that effect could have been included in the bill, but such language is not in the bill.

There is simply a provision that the Government, in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, may exclude those portions, if he sees fit to do so. He does not have to do so. He may choose to do so, or he may choose not to do so. He may consider that the zoning ordinance of a particular city or village is not sufficient for his purpose. He may say, "We will not allow that particular segment of interstate highway to be excluded from the national policy, which is limited to the four types of signs enumerated in the statute." If he does that, then necessarily any sign embraced in that area will remain within the scope of the agreement which was signed.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not the Senator's judgment as a lawyer, based upon his very complete and intimate knowledge of the provisions of the bill, that the Secretary of Commerce cannot exercise his discretion, except as provided in lines 16 and 17, page 22, "consistent with the national policy"?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct. That provision is written into the bill.

Mr. KERR. That is the purpose of the phrase being put into the bill, is it not?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is exactly correct. He can provide in the agreement exclusions of certain parts of the Interstate Highway System which are located within incorporated villages if it is consistent with the national policy, as declared within the four subparagraphs to which I have referred.

If there is advertising within that area which does not comply with the 4 subparagraphs, and if they cannot be changed, that advertising must be removed, or else the agreement with the State cannot be carried out successfully.

Mr. KERR. In other words, regardless of the amount of discretion the Secretary of Commerce may have as provided in the bill, whatever he does have is limited by the language which requires him to use the discretion so that the result will be consistent with the prescribed national policy.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is what the language of the bill provides.

Mr. KERR. One of the elements of the national policy is that a sign cannot be within 660 feet of either side of the highway and of a size greater than 500 square inches.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes. I should like to refer to colloquy which occurred at the instance of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who made inquiry as to whether or not subsection 4 is modified by subsection 3.

Mr. KERR. Or otherwise—vice versa.

Mr. HRUSKA. Or otherwise—vice versa. Subsection 4 is plain. It reads:

> Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

There is a reason for including "not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section." "This section" means all of section (a). It necessarily must be so. Included in this section is a prohibition of signs larger than 500 square inches.

I suggest that when the authors of the bill say that subsection (4) is not modified or qualified by subsection (3), and if they are in good faith on that score, they will not object to subsection (4) being modified to read:

> Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization under State law, and regardless of size, and designed to give information of specific interest to the traveling public.

I would urge that such an amendment be adopted.

It seems to me that would be an excellent test of good faith on the part of those who seek to construe that language as they have indicated here on the floor earlier today.

Mr. KERR. In other words, if they are sincere in their statement that paragraph 4 is not limited by paragraph 3, all they would need to do to evidence good faith in the matter would be to agree to include in paragraph 4 language which would make it clear that it is not subject to the limitation of paragraph 3. Is that correct?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct. I submit that that could be achieved simply by inserting the words "regardless of size or proximity to the place advertised." Then we would have clearly in mind that paragraph 3 would not apply to section 4.

With the proposal of such an amendment, I believe we would have an interesting time if consideration were given by the authors of the bill for adoption of that amendment.

If the four paragraphs of subsection (a) are mandatory and exclusive, and if an agreement which is signed is contrary to the present zoning ordinances, and so forth, of a metropolitan area or subdivision, we shall run into the following situation: It will be necessary for the State to purchase the advertising rights which exist within the System. But obviously there would not be sufficient funds with which to do so.

There would be many instances in which the owners would not be willing to part voluntarily with that right, that their property could be used for advertising purposes. And condemnation would not be applicable, because we know that such proceedings are not available for such a purpose when no taking of property is involved; when it is sought to acquire only a negative easement or its equivalent.

Yet the use of the property for such advertising purposes is legal, and such right would have to be disposed of in some way in order for the State to be able to comply with its agreement.

It is difficult for me to envision that the mere signing of an agreement between the State department of highways and the Department of Commerce would interfere with that legal right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBLITZELL in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. KERR. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 more minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield for a brief question, inasmuch as my time is limited.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator from Nebraska propose to offer the amendment he has just suggested?

Mr. HRUSKA. I may do so a little later; yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will thus bring up the issue.

Mr. HRUSKA. I may do so a little later, because apparently that would clear up a great deal of the fuzzy thinking regarding the relationship between paragraph (3) and paragraph (4).

Mr. President, it is said that the bill provides that—

> Any such agreement may, within the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, consistent with the national policy, provide for excluding from application of the national standards segments of the Interstate System which traverse incorporated municipalities wherein the use of real property adjacent to the Interstate System is subject to municipal regulation or control, or which traverse other areas where the land use is clearly established by State law as industrial or commercial, or which are built on rights-of-way wholly acquired before July 1, 1956.

Again I should like to point out that the exclusion therein stated would be based upon the Secretary's discretion only. That is a very slender reed upon which to depend, as has already been pointed out during the debate.

Now let us consider the view that the enumeration in the four paragraphs of subsection (a) is not exclusive, and that language can be added to or subtracted therefrom.

Mr. President, when we proceed on that assumption, we really get into trouble, because if the national standards prepared and promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce were to contain those 4 provisions and any number of others, then we would run into the field of the delegation of legislative power and the exercise of discretion without providing any proper guideposts, standards, or tests.

The delegation of power is often resorted to in connection with legislation, and it has to be. But in each instance when that is done, there is something tangible by which the person to whom the delegation is made, is governed.

However, that would not be true in this case. For example, if the Secretary of Commerce decided that a sign 30 feet by 60 feet was to be allowed in a certain location, there would be nothing upon which to predicate an appeal to a court, nothing on which to base a charge that the issuance of a license for construction

of such a sign was an abuse of the discretion allowed. There are no standards upon which to predicate an appeal.

If one were to say that such a sign would interfere with a traveler's enjoyment or convenience in traveling along the highway, it might be that that would also be the view of the Secretary of Commerce or the employee under his jurisdiction who makes the decision for him. But, on the contrary, such a sign might be pleasing to someone who traveled down the road; and the court would have no way to tell which of the views to approve. It is an utter impossibility to state anything tangible in connection with an effort to describe the meaning of those words in the minds of all persons.

The most serious aspect of the entire matter is the idea of vesting in the Secretary of Commerce—the present one and those to follow him—the vast, czaristic power which the bill would vest them with. There would be no limitations whatsoever on the power of either; there would be no standards; there would be no guidelines.

Mr. President, now I come to the consideration of a subject——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 45 minutes remaining.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, during the debate on the floor of the Senate, the following question was asked: What is wrong with the payment of Federal funds in this instance to States, under the provisions of the bill?

In that connection I should like to make a differentiation between the situation under this bill and the situation in connection with construction of a hospital or a highway. When Federal money is advanced for the construction of a hospital, by way of a grant-in-aid or by way of having the Federal Government make funds available to the State government, the money is used for construction of the hospital—to pay for the bricks, the cement, the mortar, the wood, and the hardware which go into the hospital. But that is not the case in this instance. In this instance, however, the Federal money would be paid if a State entered into an agreement to deprive property owners of certain rights in their property. Under the provisions of the bill, the money would then be available upon the signing of the agreement; and it could be used for any purpose in connection with construction of the highway proper on the right-of-way. It seems to me that is different from the situation in connection with the construction of a hospital or a highway proper or any other facility which would be the subject of a grant-in-aid or of a matching program.

Mr. President, again I suggest that I am in sympathy with the objectives of the bill. But it is my thought that we have the responsibility of seeing to it that these declared objectives are achieved by means which are valid, legal, constitutional, and which constitute a workable plan.

Mr. President, the pending bill will not provide such a plan.

I urge that section 12, which embraces this plan, be stricken from the bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, no one appreciates more than I the unsurpassed grandeur of the American countryside. I also appreciate the fact that the efforts of the authors of section 12 of the bill under consideration are inspired by a noble purpose and laudable intentions. However, the drafters of the Constitution wisely limited the powers and authority of the Federal Government to the areas vital to the existence of a Central Government, rather than to grant the power to act to the end that a desirable social purpose be accomplished.

This is a matter which should be left to the States to decide, without the influence of economic pressure in the form of a Federal grant.

Those powers reserved to the States in the Constitution have been and are being constantly reduced to a minimum by a gradual erosion process. One of the principal methods used by the Federal Government to erode the rights of the States is by Federal purchase through grants to the States, accompanied by an ever increasing Federal preemption of tax sources. The sugar coating of a grant makes the pill of usurpation no more palatable than were the usurpation accomplished by force. The use of Federal funds in an attempt to entice the States to surrender their rights only emphasizes a prevailing disregard for sound economy and an irresponsibility with the taxpayers' money.

I shall vote for the Kerr amendment to strike section 12 from the highway bill. I urge those who would stand fast for the preservation of the States as sovereign entities rather than subdivisions of the Federal Government to do likewise.

STATE CONTROL ADVERTISING ON FEDERAL-STATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I want to join the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] in their amendment, submitted on March 24, to S. 3414, on the matter of State control of advertising along Federal highways.

Mr. President, section 12 of the bill (S. 3414) adds a new section 122 to the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, the act under which the new National System of Interstate Highways is being constructed. It is my understanding that this section prohibits all outdoor advertising within 660 feet of the right-of-way line along all Federal highways.

This seems to be a very definite barrier against the use of any outdoor advertising, because it would be impossible for anyone using the highways to see any signs constructed beyond the 660 feet restriction as imposed by this section.

Although the Federal Government is contributing a majority of the funds for Federal highway construction, it must be remembered that the States are partners in this venture and are contributing a share of the cost. In regulating the use of outdoor advertising, the land area of the State, its population, and, among other things, those economic factors that are peculiar to the State and confined within its borders must be taken into consideration.

The tourism of my own State of Nevada would not appear to lend itself to the type of restriction provided by section 122, whereas the residents of a highly industrialized community like Detroit, Mich., may feel the provisions of the section are satisfactory and proper. If this is true, then it seems to me that the various State legislatures should be allowed the privilege of determining what kind of controls should exist on outdoor advertising along the highways that pass through their States. This matter of local concern should be legislated closer to the business of the respective States than Washington, D. C., and to my way of thinking, Federal intervention is an infringement of States rights.

I repeat, the outdoor advertising situation differs in the several States—that is, densely populated areas or States may want regulation of outdoor billboard advertising, whereas sparsely populated areas with widely separated communities, like Nevada, may need easily recognized highway guides to restaurants, hotels, motels, service stations, and the like, for the benefit of the tourist or traveler utilizing these modern, fast roadways.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have included in the RECORD, telegrams and other correspondence I received from residents of my State on this subject.

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

RENO, NEV., *March 21, 1958.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senator from the State of Nevada,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You will recall that I called you yesterday and spoke to you with regard to section 122 of Senate bill 3414 and advised you I was calling at the request of Heywood Advertising Co. You indicated that you desired I send you a letter with regard to this matter so that you would receive it by Monday, which is the day this matter will probably be voted on by the Senate.

It is my understanding that section 122 provides that all outdoor advertising is pro-

hibited within 660 feet from the right-of-way line along all Federal highways. This would seem to be a very definite prohibition against the use of outdoor advertising along Federal highways because it would be impossible for anyone using the highways to see any signs constructed farther than 660 feet from the right-of-way line. Although the Federal Government is contributing a majority of the funds for Federal highway construction, it must be remembered that some State funds are expended even though in a minor amount. It would seem proper to also remember that the taxpayers who contribute both the Federal and State funds live in all of the several States. These taxpayers, all living in different areas of the country and interested in different endeavors, would probably want different types of restrictions on outdoor advertising than contained in one piece of legislation. The tourism of Nevada would not lend itself to the type of prohibition provided by section 122, whereas the highly industrialized area around Detroit, Mich., may feel the provisions of the aforementioned section proper. If this be true, then it would seem that the various State legislatures should be allowed the privilege of determining what kind of controls should exist upon outdoor advertising along the highways that pass through their States.

This matter of local concern should, therefore, be legislated closer to home than Washington, D. C. Although the State of Nevada has no restrictive legislation on outdoor advertising, this is due to the fact that our unpopulated wide-open spaces lend themselves to the allowance of outdoor advertising. Some of our sister States have seen fit to enact restrictive legislation in one form or another and Nevada may some time come to this. Until it does, however, it would not seem proper for the National Legislature to impose any burdens on the free use of land along Federal roadways.

I sincerely hope that you will see fit to vote against the adoption of section 122 of Senate bill 3414.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL B. FRANCOVICH.
Attorney at Law.

RENO, NEV., *March 20, 1958.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator, Nevada,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Am advised that section 122 of S. 3414 comes up for Senate consideration Monday. Since my business is advertising, believe this bill discriminatory and contrary to States rights principle which we in Nevada advocate, as well as a restriction of property rights. Hope you will vote for elimination of section 122 from otherwise good bill.

JACK MYLES.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 20, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Our company is positively and specifically opposed to enactment of section 122 Senate bill 3414. No Federal control of our Nevada desert for business purpose is worth the inducement. Please confirm your receipt of this wire.

LEIGH ELLSWORTH,
President, Beneficial Agencies.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 20, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Outdoor advertising is a vital media for the automobile dealers. Request you vote against section 122 of Senate bill 3414.

TOD KILL LINCOLN-MERCURY, INC.

RENO, NEV., *March 20, 1958.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator, Nevada,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Board of directors of Reno Chamber of Commerce earnestly request that you vote against section 122 of Senate bill 3414 which we believe discriminatory and an infringement of States rights.

WILLIAM BRUSSARD,
General Manager, Reno Chamber of Commerce.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 20, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am strongly opposed to section 122, Senate bill 3414, and resent Federal pressure to influence State rights in regulating highway signs. State of Nevada can properly handle this matter. Will appreciate your vote against section 122.

ROACH DISTRIBUTING CO.,
JAMES E. COSTELLO.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 23, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We protest section 122 of Senate bill 3414 and solicit your support in defeating it as we feel it would result in widespread unemployment among sign painters and allied trades.

CARL PRUTER,
Business Representative of Sign and Pictorial Painters Local Union, 1844.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 24, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Many of your friends and mine join with me to urge you to defeat amended section No. 122 of Senate bill 3414. We consider the amendment to control outdoor advertising along our public highways another step by our National Government to control that which can be best handled by each State through which the national freeways shall run. Not to mention many other reasons that have direct affect on our national business economy.

JACK YOUNG NEON PRODUCTS.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 21, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Will appreciate your vote against section 122, Senate bill 3414. This section would seriously affect tourist industry of southern Nevada. Highway signs can be adequately controlled by State of Nevada without Federal pressure contained in section 122.

BOB GRIFFITH.

RENO, NEV., *March 21, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In regards to Senate bill 3414 to be voted on March 24. The Nevada State Motor Hotel Association in convention March 3, 1958, passed resolution: "NMHA opposes Federal legislation controlling roadside advertising."

PAUL ARGERES,
Secretary, Nevada Motor Hotel Association.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 21, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Senate bill 3414, providing funds for highway construction, is worthy of your support as an aid to employment. Respectfully request, however, that Senator NEUBERGER's amendment, section 122, be eliminated from bill and control of outdoor advertising signs be left in hands of individual States. Such signs, properly controlled, have definite value to many types of business. Their regulation should be on a local rather than national basis.

HORSESHOE CLUB,
JOE W. BROWN.

RENO, NEV., *March 21, 1958.*

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MOLLIE: I urge you to vote against section 122, bill S. 3414. I feel that it is discriminatory against we in the outdoor advertising business. Bessie joins me in regards to yourself and Ruth.

JAY ELLIS.

RENO, NEV., *March 19, 1958.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator, Nevada,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Section 122 of S. 3414, prohibiting outdoor advertising along freeway, would seem another infringement upon States rights. Urge opposition to section 122.

Regards.

OLIVER THOMAS.

RENO, NEV., *March 19, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to vote against section 122 of Senate bill 3414, which tends to regulate outdoor advertising on a national basis, as a user of this advertising medium in Nevada. Believe States rights and local zoning should prevail.

LUCE & SONS, INC.,
WM. LUCE.

RENO, NEV., *March 18, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently request voting against section No. 122 of bill S. 3414, we strongly protest this amendment as it is an infringement of States rights and is discriminatory against outdoor advertising. We believe this should be State and local zoning rather than Federal as we in Nevada depend on our number one business—the tourist.

COSGRIFF SIGN COMPANY OF NEVADA,
WALTER MCDONALD.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 20, 1958.*

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am opposed and protest the amendment in section 122 of bill 3414 prohibiting the use of outdoor advertising adjacent to Interstate Highway System. As a businessman and advertiser I contend it is not in the interest of modern business practices to prohibit this useful form of advertising.

ARNOLD CHRISTENSEN,
Clark County Commissioner.

RENO, NEV., *March 18, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MOLLY: Understand section 122 of bill S. 3414 relating to elimination of outdoor advertising on all Federal highways will be on Senate floor this coming Monday. I believe it is an infringement on States rights. Each State should be allowed to handle its own zoning. Nevada is a tourist State and I believe would be hurt by this bill. Please advise if I can do anything further.

CHARLES W. MAPES, Jr.

RENO, NEV., *March 19, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a user of outdoor advertising for our clients in the State of Nevada, we urge you to vote against section 122 of Senate bill 3414.

DOYLE-MCKENNA ADVERTISING AGENCY,
GENE MCKENNA,
HOWARD DOYLE, JR.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 20, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you vote against section 122, Senate bill 3414. We are opposed to misuse of Federal funds to induce State to regulate or prohibit highway signs. State of Nevada is qualified to handle this matter in the best interest of property owners, working people, and the primary industries who depend on signs to invite tourists to this area.

NEVADA OUTDOOR ADVERTISING,
LEO A. ELKINS, *President.*

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 20, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a property owner, taxpayer, and long-time resident of Nevada, I sincerely urge you to vote against section 122, Senate bill 3414. Please protect my job as well as jobs of hundreds of fellow workers. Passage of this section 122 will only swell the unemployment rolls.

Respectfully,

Mrs. L. D. WREN.

WHITNEY, NEV., *March 18, 1958.*

MR. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate:

As one of our Senators of our great State of Nevada, I wish to ask you a small favor in support of some of us people that make our country what it is. The Senate is voting on bill 3414 March 24, introduced by Senator Gore, which will help a lot of people.

But the amendment No. 122 should not be even included at this time. What right has a few men to take away some of the better things the American people enjoy? It's our livelihood to hundreds of us. We are all anxious to see work and progress, but section 122 in bill 3414 is all out of reason. Advertising should be governed, but it's State, county, and city, not a national law.

I am in favor of bill No. 3414 but I hope you do not vote for the section No. 122 of it. Would like for you to support bill No. 3414 but not section 122.

Thanking you and trusting you will do your utmost to help us small people exist.

Yours truly,

LAVERNE HAWKINS.

RENO, NEV., *March 19, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MOLLY: I have had calls from interested people indicating that Senator NEUBERGER's bill, Senate bill 3414, restricting poster advertising along national highways will come up for vote next Monday. There seems to be considerable opposition, which I believe I can understand, to section No. 122 of this bill, and I should like to add my voice—as a highway advertiser—to theirs in opposition to this restriction.

Another angle: It appears that NEUBERGER, representing the Federal Government, is trying to take on another function that should be handled by the States. I hope you are opposed to it.

Regards,

JOHNSON CHEVROLET CO.,
MARSH JOHNSON.

P. S.: Thanks for your wire regarding excise tax legislation. I still think it is a crying shame that these excise taxes are not eliminated immediately.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 21, 1958.*

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MOLLY: On Monday, March 24, our United States Senate, we understand, will vote on Senate bill 3414. This bill, introduced by Senator GORE, of Tennessee, provides additional foundation for speed of the Interstate Highway System as an aid to the existing system, etc. This is a worthy purpose and one which will probably receive popular support, however, we note that Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, and other opponents of outdoor advertising signs have attached an amendment, section 122, having for its purpose the elimination of outdoor advertising along the Interstate System. It provides an inducement to increase the 90 percent Federal share of the cost of construction by one-half of 1 percent if a State acts to curtail billboards or highway signs within 600 feet of the edge of the right of way. Outdoor or advertising signs for years have been recognized as good mediums by all local and national advertisers, and we feel have a proper place in the business life of the Nation. There are those who would eliminate commercials from radio and television because it is unpleasant to them. However, we do not agree. We believe, MOLLY, that you are well informed of what the opposition to this medium presents, such as prohibiting the view of scenic vivification and so forth, but these boards do not to any degree obstruct view to service stations, garages, and other types of roadside businesses.

We are convinced that this medium helps all businesses and enables advertising men to get their message across to the buying public to create and intice within and motivate the openings of their purse strings, which we need not say to you that this no doubt is good for the economy.

MOLLY, there are hundreds of people working and owning outdoor advertising businesses, skilled workers, officeworkers, maintenance men, who contribute generously of their space to contribute to support the Red Cross, Community Chest, Traffic Safety, Cancer Fund, Heart Fund, etc.

Outdoor advertising helps the resort hotels, the gambling industry, which is the backbone of our State. They have been proven to be an invaluable aid to induce people to come to Las Vegas and southern Nevada.

We are asking you, providing you agree, to vote against section 122, bill 3414. We are opposed to the payment of extra money to any State as an inducement to prevent highway signs and force us out of business. Let the individual States handle all their own necessary billboard regulations.

The time is short and in our busy life here, my only regret is that we did not contact your office sooner. At your convenience, I would appreciate an expression as to how your office feels concerning the above mentioned matter.

Very respectfully yours,

PIONEER DISPLAYS CO., INC.
JOHN DELUCAS, *President.*

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 19, 1958.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: I have recently read that a bill will soon go before the United States Senate for vote which, should it be passed, will provide additional funds for the construction of the Interstate Highway System. This appears to me to be a most worthy purpose.

I do feel, however, that the attached amendment, section No. 122, which provides for the control and even the possible elimination of highway signs along the Interstate System is not justifiable as it now stands since its provisions not only ignore the individual State's ability to control and regulate highway advertising, but also interferes with private business' inherent right to act competitively by not permitting them to advertise their establishments or merchandise to travelers within commercial areas.

We have used outdoor highway advertising for the greater part of the time that we have been in business and find that it is essential not only to our business but also to the community which, through outdoor advertising, is able to show the traveler what that community has available.

I feel strongly also that the individual property along the right-of-way has and should have the right to permit highway signs to be constructed on his property and receive any income available from leases or rent on such signs.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would give your sincere consideration to eliminating the undesirable provisions of section 122 of the Senate bill 3414.

Sincerely yours,

SMITH & CHANDLER, INDIAN TRADERS,
KENNETH N. CHANDLER.

JONES & PURSELL,
Las Vegas, Nev., March 19, 1958.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MOLLY: About a year ago I had occasion to write you protesting the inclusion within the Federal highway bill of a clause prohibiting outdoor advertising on property bordering the Interstate Highway System.

I am now advised that the emergency bill now before Congress, Senate bill 3414, contains a provision prohibiting outdoor advertising on property adjacent to the new Federal highway.

I consider this prohibition against advertising to be very detrimental to the interests of several of my clients and to the public at large. As you may well know, many Nevada businesses depend for their patronage almost entirely upon the appeal of outdoor advertising signs. Not only that, but many property owners in these sparsely settled Western States, particularly where the properties are unimproved, depend upon the revenue they receive from outdoor advertising signs to pay the taxes on their property. Without this revenue, in many instances, their properties would become worthless and taxes would be in default. The outdoor advertising business is an established business in America and provides a useful service to our free-enterprise system. Our motels, hotels, liquor and gaming industries rely heavily upon this form of advertising. I earnestly urge that you cast your vote to defeat this rider to Senate bill 3414.

I would like to say, however, with the exception of this rider against advertising, I am highly in favor of the passage of the bill.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT E. JONES,
Attorney at Law.

ROBINSON HOTEL APARTMENTS,
Las Vegas, Nev., March 20, 1958.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator, United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: As a property owner, I am very much opposed to Federal

pressure and use of Federal funds to influence States rights to regulate signs on private property along interstate highways.

I request you vote against section 122, Senate bill 3414.

Very respectfully yours,

W. S. ROBINSON.

THE MELVIN CO., INC.,
Las Vegas, Nev., March 20, 1958.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I strongly urge your negative vote to section 122 of Senate bill 3414 which comes up for vote on March 24. Passing of this section will cause severe damage to the economy of the major industry of advertising and will hurt bad enough to balance the good that bill 3414 is intended to do in helping the present recession.

Should section 122 be passed, it will be necessary for hundreds of outdoor advertising companies throughout the country to curtail their personnel and even force many small companies out of business.

It will result in the loss of thousands of dollars to major industries who have prepared outdoor campaigns and went to the expense of having their advertising agencies produce such advertising.

It will also further the curtailment of personnel of many advertising agencies throughout the country and severely damage their financial condition.

Having been in the advertising business for 25 years, I am qualified to advise you that the present State and local laws all over the country, and particularly in Nevada, are supposed to prohibit unnecessary advertising signboards.

Further, such regulatory stipulations as planned in this amendment will only lead to illegal posting of signs, which in the advertising industry is called "sniping". Such "sniping" results in far more cluttered up highways than under normal advertising boards being allowed with legal licenses issued by State, county, and city governments under proper laws and ordinances.

I strongly urge both you and Senator BIBLE to cast a negative vote.

With best personal regards.

Very respectfully yours,

JACK MELVIN,
President.

TAYLOR & GUBLER,
Las Vegas, Nev., March 19, 1958.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senior Senator from Nevada,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: It is my understanding that Senate bill 3414 introduced by Senator GORE, of Tennessee, for the purpose of providing additional funds for the construction and acceleration of the building of the Interstate Highway System to combat recession and to aid employment, together with an amendment proposed by Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, for the purpose of controlling or eliminating outdoor advertising along the Interstate Highway System, such amendment being section 122 of the bill, will be voted on in the United States Senate next Monday, March 24. I am heartily in favor of Senate bill 3414 for the reason that I believe that it will materially assist in accomplishing the objects sought including the facilitation of the construction of the highway system, which I am certain will be of great assistance to the United States economically, militarily and otherwise. I am equally strongly opposed to section 122 for the following reasons:

(a) In my opinion the same is an unnecessary encroachment on the right of the States to govern their domestic affairs; and

(b) It is my opinion that permitting outdoor advertising along the Interstate System will benefit all concerned: (1) the traveling public, by supplying means of information as to desirable lodging, eating and other business establishments, (2) the owners of vacant property along the highway system by providing some means of income with which to help defray taxes and other expenses incident to the ownership of vacant land, and (3) residents and business people, particularly in the State of Nevada, which is so dependent on tourist traffic, by affording them the opportunity to advertise their places of business and to encourage patronage by the traveling public.

In addition, it is my opinion that advertising of this type is essential to the success of roadside businesses which are so integrally a part of our economy. Most of us recognize that there have been abuses in outdoor advertising and resultant detractions from the natural beauty of the countryside. However, it is my feeling that the problem is one for State and county regulation and that prohibiting billboards in other than commercial zones or districts, as is the rule under the county zoning ordinance in Clark County, affords a satisfactory solution.

I shall appreciate very much your giving consideration to the foregoing and in the event you deem proper shall appreciate your vote in favor of Senate bill 3414 and against section 122.

Sincerely yours,

V. GRAY GUBLER,
Attorney at Law.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the cooperation of the States in any Federal program is indispensable.

It is imperative to respect the rights of such States and leave all power possible to the respective legislatures to coordinate the Federal-State interests.

The State control of advertising fitting the area's needs and the taxpayer's wishes into the building program is very important to Federal-State relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have always had a strong feeling that States should be privileged to govern themselves. I think, however, the national highway system is of great importance, and I believe the bill as reported by the committee safeguards the States' positions, and also gives to the States certain credit if they cooperate with the National Government to keep under proper control certain areas immediately adjacent to the road right-of-way. It is for those reasons that I shall speak briefly on the proposal.

Mr. President, I am in full support of the accelerated construction features of the pending proposal, and I think that this expanded program is something which is needed to bolster our Nation's economy. I do not hesitate to give my unqualified support to the construction features of S. 3414, and there has never been any question in my mind on this count.

Section 12 of this bill, however, has aroused a great deal of public interest, and I am sure that my colleagues have received hundreds of letters and telegrams, as I have, concerning the question of regulating advertising along the Federal Interstate System. This question does not present a clear-cut issue, and it is difficult to say that it can be answered with a simple yes or no.

I should like to point out that I am supporting the bill as amended in committee so as to provide an additional Federal reimbursement to the States for costs of acquiring easements along the Federal Interstate System. I want to emphasize the point that section 12 of this bill does not apply to the regular Federal-aid primary, secondary or urban systems. It applies only to the Federal Interstate System authorized in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956.

I wish to present some significant facts regarding section 12. It should be emphasized that the States retain decision as to whether highway advertising will be regulated within their borders on the Interstate System. This regulation is not to be imposed by the Federal Government, according to the provisions of section 12.

A bonus of one-half of 1 percent of the Federal contribution toward the construction costs of the Interstate System will be provided if a State decides to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Commerce to establish regulation of advertising. Section 12 proposes that these regulations would extend to an area of 660 feet on each side of the right-of-way. The State can be reimbursed by an amount equal to 5 percent of the cost of the easements on this land.

Section 12 does not propose to eliminate all signs along the Interstate System.

First. Official signs authorized or required by law and signs erected according to the provisions of State law designed to give information in the interest of the traveling public would be permitted.

Second. Signs advertising the sale or lease of property upon which they are located will be permitted.

Third. Signs no larger than 500 square inches advertising activities at locations within 12 miles of such a sign would also be permitted.

This last provision would give an opportunity for business concerns such as hotels, motels, and restaurants to inform the traveling public of the services which they have to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the possibility that the regulation of highway advertising would lead to unemployment in the advertising business has caused

me some concern. In this respect, however, it appears to me that the provision for an accelerated construction program on all Federal-aid highways will provide a new market for highway advertising signs in the unrestricted phase of the Federal highway program.

In conclusion, it appears to me that when S. 3414 is considered in its entirety, as reported by the committee, it is worthy of my support. I should like to see some regulation of highway advertising along the control access Federal Interstate System, but I would not support such regulation if I could foresee its working a hardship on businesses serving the traveling public or if it caused undue hardship among those who earn their living in the advertising business. It is my sincere conviction that S. 3414 will not result in such hardships, and will at the same time provide for a reasonable means of preventing unrestricted use of the Interstate System's right-of-way for outdoor advertising.

For the reasons I have given I could not support the amendment of my good friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], but I do intend to support the bill as reported from the Public Works Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a few letters and telegrams which I have received be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks to illustrate the views of individuals and businessmen in my State of Minnesota with regard to the question of regulating highway advertising.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, some of my very best friends in the business field have opposed any restriction, as will be found in the group of letters and telegrams which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Equally, Mr. President, there are those who by telegram and letter have supported regulation.

I ask unanimous consent that all the letters and telegrams be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

GORDON ELECTRIC CO.,
Albert Lea, Minn., February 18, 1958.

Hon. EDWARD THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the past several months I have been reading a great deal about the proposed legislation to eliminate advertising of any type along the new interstate highway systems. As a merchant and landowner who would be affected by this legislation, I wish to take this opportunity to ask that you do not pass any legislation that would eliminate outdoor highway advertising.

I know that there are many arguments, both for and against, eliminating outdoor advertising, but it seems to me that the one important basic argument is that the passage of such a bill would be discriminatory against a very important segment of our business world. I for one would certainly object to passing laws which would be harmful to any one part of our economy.

I might add that I personally am not a strong believer in a lot of outdoor advertising and we do very little of this type of advertising ourselves. I do believe that it is a fundamental right of people to choose the methods of advertising which they want to use, and the right of landowners to determine how they should use their property. Any restrictive legislation which would limit these rights would have a negative effect on our economy and would also be another step backward in limitation of our individual freedoms of action.

I respectfully request that you do everything in your power to defeat any proposed legislation to eliminate this type of advertising.

Respectfully yours,
BERT L. GORDON.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *March 25, 1958.*

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
Senator From Minnesota, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

If section 122 is not deleted from Senate bill 3414, many thousands of jobs are in peril not only in our own company but thousands of small-business operators throughout the Nation trying to exist in the outdor advertising business and keep their men employed. This is certainly no time for Congress to consider discriminatory controls that will destroy legitimate American enterprise and place more men on the relief rolls.

With your apparent longstanding interest in small business we must expect that your vote on this question will be cast in their interests and in the retention of jobs for those who, if this bill passes, will be among the already too large lists of unemployed. I strongly urge your vote against this measure and your wholehearted effort to see that it is defeated.

MINNESOTA MINING &
MANUFACTURING CO.,
A. E. EGGERT, *Vice President.*

DULUTH, MINN., *March 18, 1958.*

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
Washington, D. C.:

The Duluth Hotel Association recommends the Gore bill, No. S. 3414, but strongly disapproves of Neuberger amendment section 122 as discriminatory to certain businesses requiring billboard advertising.

SPAULDING HOTEL,
C. R. MCLEAN, Jr.

MINNEAPOLIS CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 18, 1958.

Hon. EDWARD THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: The Minneapolis Central Labor Union is strongly opposed to the enactment of a proposed amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act known as Senate bill 3414 regulating outdoor advertising.

While the act itself is in the best interest of the entire economy of our Nation, and will go a long way toward halting the recession in which we now find ourselves, the amendment would have just the opposite reaction on our economy.

Therefore, we urge that you do everything within your power to defeat the proposed legislation because of the adverse affect this amendment will have on our membership.

Very truly yours,
WALTER R. CRAMOND, *President.*

CORN BELT DISPLAY,
Fairmont, Minn., March 20, 1958.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator from Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. SENATOR THYE: Section 122 of Senate bill 3414, which is expected to come before the Senate on March 24, would be a death blow to free enterprise in our State of Minnesota and all other States in the Union. This section will give the Federal Government control of private ownership, and if allowed to pass will be the beginning of the end of our constitutional rights.

All we ask is that these rights be preserved by the defeat of section 122 of Senate bill 3414.

Yours very truly,
RODNEY BRANDT,
KENNETH E. EVANS,
Partners.

VIRGINIA, MINN., *March 20, 1958.*

Senator EDWARD THYE,
Washington, D. C.:

Opposing section 122 Gore bill, a crippling blow to our tourist trade on the Iron Range.

POHAKI LUMBER CO.

ROCHESTER, MINN., *March 18, 1958.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please oppose section 122 and ask that it be stricken from Senate bill 3414 when it comes before the Senate for vote next week. We vigorously oppose this section only of the bill and are writing in detail by letter today our reasons.

NAEGELE SIGN CO.,
B. W. VOGEL, *Vice President.*

MOORHEAD, MINN., *March 20, 1958.*

EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Regarding section 122 to the Gore bill (S. 3414) please do not legislate our small business out of business. We feel this bill is vicious, discriminatory and very unfair to so many big and small businesses alike. Polls taken prove that the majority of the public wants highway signs and the loss would be tremendous to many.

Trustingly yours,
HEGLAND SIGN CO.,
ANTON HEGLAND.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 24, 1958.*

Hon. Senator ED THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Representing the Minnesota Federation of Garden Clubs with a membership of 3,000 we urge you to vote in favor of Government billboard control.

FEDERATED GARDEN CLUBS
OF MINNESOTA,
Mrs. FRED MULTALER, *President.*

FAIRMOUNT, MINN., *March 21, 1958.*

Senator THYE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THYE: I am thoroughly opposed to billboard advertising on our national highways. Billboards look cheap, they prevent an untrammeled view of the beauties of nature and their being placed on curves prevent drivers from seeing what is coming. I trust you will vote against them.

Yours truly,
Mrs. MARCUS E. TEETER.

HASTINGS, MINN., *March 24, 1958.*

Hon. ED THYE,
Senator from Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your support for amendment Senate bill 3414 for billboard control section 12. Consider imperative that control measure accompany speedup legislation for highway building which we are sure you support.

LAWS VALLEY VIEW NURSERIES,
KEN LAWS.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *March 24, 1958.*
Hon. EDWARD THYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Pleased to hear of the speedy consideration of Senate bill No. 3414. I strongly urge the retention of section 12 of this bill as now written.

Respectfully yours,
J. V. BAILEY NURSERIES,
VINCENT K. BAILEY.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *March 24, 1958.*
Senator EDWARD THYE,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep amendment in highway bill and do not weaken it.

MRS. TRUMAN P. GARDNER,
President, St. Paul Garden Club.

MOUND, MINN., *March 21, 1958.*
Senator EDWARD THYE,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your support of bill to keep billboards off Federal highways.

Mr. and Mrs. DICK GALE.

WAYZATA, MINN., *March 21, 1958.*
Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to keep billboard amendment in the highway bill.

MRS. DONALD D. DAVIS,
MRS. STANLEY PARTRIDGE,
MRS. L. B. NEWELL,
MRS. DWIGHT YERXA,
MRS. FRANK PLANT,
MRS. PHILIP WINSTON.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged against either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. 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. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF INTERIM REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a unanimous-consent request, and that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 279.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 279) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field 2,500 additional copies of the committee's interim report to the Senate pursuant to Senate Resolutions 74 and 221, 85th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have consulted with both the majority and the minority leaders. From their viewpoint there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 279) was agreed to.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3414) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act approved June 29, 1956, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank my friend from California.

Mr. President, as discussion of the billboard regulation proposal comes to a climax, I believe certain aspects of the issue might be emphasized and clarified.

We have heard today opponents of the billboard regulation proposal contend that we are involved in a question of States rights. They charge that the measure jointly sponsored by the distinguished Senator from California and me is an invasion of States rights. They say the matter should be left entirely to the States, and the Federal Government should take no interest whatsoever in the problem.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize the particular point that, as a former member of the State legislature of one of the great States of the Pacific Northwest, when I was a member of the Oregon State House of Representatives in 1941, I sponsored the first billboard control measure ever offered in that body. As a member of the Oregon State Senate some 10 years later, I sponsored, jointly with my wife, who was then a member of the Oregon House of Representatives, another billboard control measure. In that particular field we were trying to regulate signboards at the State level.

What did the billboard lobby do then? In the Oregon State capital of Salem the billboard representatives said, "This is an invasion of the rights of municipalities, of counties, and of localities." In other words, Mr. President, the billboard people simply do not want any regulation at all.

In the Congress of the United States they say, "Leave it to the States." In the State capitol of the State of Oregon they said, "Leave it to the counties, and leave it to the municipalities."

Mr. President, the Federal Government is going to pay 90 percent of the cost of these highways. The Federal Government through the Bureau of Public Roads is to specify standards of construction for the highways. It seems to me reasonable and logical—just as logical as that the night shall follow the day, to use a very trite expression—that the Federal Government should take some interest in the protection of the scenery along the roadsides of the 41,000 miles of interstate highways.

Mr. President, I want to stress another fact which must be in the minds of Senators when we vote this afternoon. We are talking about limited access highways. We even had some protest about that when we were considering the original interstate highway bill several years ago, when it was sponsored by the Senator from Tennessee and some of the rest of us. These are limited access roads. No motel can have access to these roads. No restaurant can have access. Not even a farmer who owns land beside the road can drive out on these limited access interstate highways.

It perhaps will be true that some farmer or rancher near these roads will have to drive 8, 10, 12, 20, or even 25 miles to an interchange where he can go through a cloverleaf to the new highways. In other words, no business is going to have access to these roads. Restaurants will not. Hotels will not. Motels will not. The farmer who owns land beside the road will not.

But we are told in the Senate today we should defeat the Kuchel-Neuberger amendment in the bill, so there will be one exception—so there will be one business only which will be permitted to have access to these roads. What business is that Mr President? It is the signboard business. They want access to the roads through visibility.

If we allow signboards along the interstate highways we will be saying, "Motels, restaurants, farms, and ranches cannot have access to these limited access highways, but the billboard business can have access through the huge, massive signs which the motorists will have to see as they drive along the highways."

I want to point out a further fact before I conclude this brief presentation, and that is the fact that the motorists will be delivered over to the signboard industry and to the outdoor advertising industry as a captive audience unless the Kuchel-Neuberger amendment is left in the bill which is presently before us.

When members of the American public buy their morning newspapers they are not compelled to read the advertisements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Will the Senator from California yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When members of the American public buy their weekly or monthly magazines, they are not compelled to read the advertisements. We are not compelled to listen to radio commercials. We can turn our eyes away from television commercials. But when

one is driving over the 41,000 miles of the Interstate System, if he does not look at the signboards on that system he risks death for himself and the other occupants of his car, and everyone else on the highway at that time.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, some very effective, pertinent, and informed messages which I have received from people in my State and in the State of California who share our desire to protect the roadsides along the Interstate Highway System.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks some very effective newspaper editorials from the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, the Denver (Colo.) Post, the Detroit (Mich.) News, the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, and the Adirondack (N. Y.) Daily Enterprise.

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

DOD RANCHO,
SANTA FE, CALIF., *March 24, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of this resort hotel, I am strongly against all road signs not specifically designed for the safety and convenience of the motoring public. Users of the highways should not be treated as a captive audience. Scenery is the chief asset of the tourist industry and the public should be allowed to enjoy it. This corporation is a heavy buyer of legitimate advertising but we do not use billboards because they damage our business. I heartily endorse the fight for proper regulatory legislation.

CLIFFORD C. EWING,
President, La Valencia Hotel Corp. of La Jolla, Calif.

MEDFORD, OREG., *March 19, 1958.*
The SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: We came across the plains of western Texas in 1925, where the billboards were used as outhouses. That is the only useful purpose that I have known them to serve.

We no longer need them in that capacity. Please allow us to enjoy unobstructed views of our beautiful scenery.

Tourists long to get away from billboards, and Oregon wants tourists.

Yours very truly,

ETHEL M. THOMPSON
(Mrs. Horace).

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 20, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

At the March 18 meeting of the American Institute of Architects, Oregon Chapter, Inc. (members over 200), a resolution was unanimously passed supporting the proposed amendment, section 122 of Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 for billboard control.

ROBERT C. DOUGLAS,
Secretary.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 19, 1958.*
Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

All success to you and Senator KUCHEL in your concern for the preservation of one of our most important natural resources, the peace and beauty of our countrysides, as we are entitled to enjoy them from our highways.

Sincerely,

GLENN STANTON,
Fellow of the American Institute of Architects.

CORVALLIS, OREG., *March 25, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Eighty-five hundred members urge your support of billboard section pending legislation controlling billboard on major highways. This is an important part of our State program.

OREGON FEDERATION GARDEN CLUB,
Mrs. A. O. FLOYD,
President.
Mrs. B. I. BRADER,
Vice President.
MEDFORD, OREG.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 20, 1958.*
Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We know you are doing everything possible to keep billboard amendment in highway bill. We strongly endorse and appreciate your efforts.

Mrs. HEDLEY HILL,
President, Portland Garden Club.

CORVALLIS, OREG., *March 25, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Santiam District Garden Club members urge your support on billboard legislation opposing billboard on Oregon highways.

Mrs. J. W. SCHEEL,
Santiam District Director, Oregon Federation Garden Club.

MEDFORD, OREG., *March 25, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: I represent the 24 garden clubs of Siskiyou District No. 4, of the Oregon Federation of Garden Clubs, Inc., with a membership of over 800. We wish to support legislation controlling advertising along interstate highways.

Mrs. IRA FITZGERALD,
Siskiyou District Director.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 20, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on billboard amendment. Hope for adoption with no further weakening.

Mrs. GEORGE J. BEGGS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 21, 1958.*
Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Giving our wholehearted support to your billboard legislation.

(Mrs. C. M.) HARRIET B. BISHOP.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 20, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Billboard control essential to modern freeways. We captive-audience motorists wish to enjoy our beautiful country. Good luck.

LEWIS P. CRUTCHER.

SHERWOOD, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please accept our thanks your active support, section 12, bill 3414.

MARY ELWERT,
Tualatin Valley Nurseries.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Offices,
Washington, D. C.:

Asking your support on section 12, Senate bill 3414.

JUNAYS GARDEN CENTER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 25, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference to section 12, bill 3414, to ban billboards on freeways our firm is backing this bill.

KLUPENGER NURSERY,
J. H. KLUPENGER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support of section 12, Senate bill 3414. Anything you can do to assist in the passage of this bill will be greatly appreciated.

R. V. VAN HEVELINGEN.

TROUTDALE, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly support section 12, Senate bill 3414, on highway signs. Your effort will be appreciated.

J. FRANK SCHMIDT & SONS.

HILLSBORO, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Commend your stand re billboards. Strongly urge passage section 12, S. 3414.

RICH & SONS NURSERY,
SAM RICH.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Oregon Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request your full support section 12, Senate bill 3414.

PACIFIC COAST NURSERY,
MARTIN HOLMASON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly request your full support of section 12, Senate bill 3414.

PORTLAND WHOLESALE NURSERY CO.

FAIRVIEW, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your support for section 12, Senate bill 3414, to prevent despoiling of natural beauty along our highways.

A. MCGILL & SON.

MILTON, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to support section 12, Senate bill 3414, and thus preventing the spoiling of the natural beauty along our highways.

MILTON NURSERY CO.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

To keep Oregon green we urge your active support of section 12, Senate bill 3414.

DOTY & DOERNER, INC.,
PAUL E. DOTY.

ST. HELENS, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Asking your support on section 12, Senate bill 3414, our opinion is vital to beauty of our highway.

E. P. DERING.

SCAPPOOSE, OREG.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

To protect the public's investment in our new modern highway system and to assure that the beauty of these highways are not marred by a polyglot of unsightly signboards. We most emphatically urge that you vote for passage of the billboard control bill.

Mrs. A. O. FLOYD,
Mrs. BERNIE I. BRADER,
Mrs. E. G. TAYLOR,
Mrs. T. R. FETTIS,
Mrs. LYLE BAYNE,
State Officers of the Oregon Federation of Garden Clubs, Inc.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 24, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

To protect the public's investment in our new modern highway system and to assure that the beauty of these highways are not marred by a polyglot of unsightly signboards, we most emphatically urge that you vote for passage of the billboard control bill, S. 3414.

PORTLAND DISTRICT, THE OREGON FEDERATION OF GARDEN CLUBS.
MRS. MARVIN R. AMBUHL,
State Roadside Chairman.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *March 26, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please keep up your fight against roadside advertising. It is pernicious form of publicity. The roadside advertising association is essentially a lobby working in all States and with the Federal Government. It is largely backed by Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., of St. Paul, Minn., any costs of the association above, dues is contributed by three thousand. The outdoor advertising association is also very active in lobbying. I hope you can prevent or at least control roadside advertising by your amendment.

WILLIAM SEARIGHT.

TOLEDO, OHIO.

SALEM, OREG., *March 19, 1958.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: As a member of a garden club I wish to commend you for your stand against billboards on the public highways and hope you will continue to work against them.

SUE H. VAN CLEVE
MRS. JOSEPH B. VAN CLEVE.

[From the Portland Oregonian]

BILLBOARD FATE AT HAND

A compromise provision worked out under the bipartisan leadership of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER (Democrat, Oregon) and Senator THOMAS F. KUCHEL (Republican, California), represents the furthest advance Congress has yet made toward establishing a Federal interest in preventing excessive billboard invasion of rural roadsides.

By a narrow margin of 7 to 6, the Senate Public Works Committee has retained the Neuberger-Kuchel billboard control features of the new highway bill. The legislation now goes to the Senate floor, where the billboard section will have heavy opposition. Failure there could be fatal to billboard regulation along much of the projected 41,000 miles of interstate freeway.

The bill would not apply Federal controls. It would merely encourage application of State controls by offering a Federal premium therefor. Without such encouragement it is unlikely that many legislatures will act in 1959 sessions in time to have effect on initial sections of the cross-country network. The United States Senate may thus within the next few days settle the fate of billboard regulation along the Interstate System.

[From the Denver Post of March 20, 1958]

THE FIGHT TO PRESERVE SCENERY

Presumably because they are not interested in scenic grandeur, Senators KERR, of Oklahoma, and HRUSKA, of Nebraska, are bent on amending the United States highways bill to delete what is left of its antibillboard measures. Senators KUCHEL, of California, and NEUBERGER, of Oregon, still are fighting for the compromise billboard regulations that would ban big display posters but permit smaller advertising signs along the 41,000-mile Interstate System.

KUCHEL and NEUBERGER figure that too little regulation is better than none, since passage of even a watered-down billboard ban represents the first successful attempt to establish Federal interest in protecting roadside scenery. That is, unless KERR and HRUSKA, knuckling under to the outdoor advertising lobbyists, manage to kill that token of interest.

How foolish is this giving in to the advertising companies is indicated in Averell Harriman's recent discussion of the subject in The Reporter.

"Banning billboards along the new interstate highways could scarcely be called a heavy blow to the advertising industry," says Harriman. "There are 3,400,000 miles of streets and roads in the Nation, most of which remain open to as many billboards as advertisers are willing to pay for. The Interstate System will add a mere 1.2 percent to the total mileage. Moreover, the small businesses such as motels and restaurants that use billboards to advertise their whereabouts can do so at the exits, which are the only points where travelers can turn off the highways anyway."

The lobbyists hacking away at the Federal bill, as well as those fighting State regulation of sign-placing on the new system, may eventually regret their achievement. In Colorado, one prideful community, Aspen, has found a way to impose more far-reaching and drastic control of billboard blight under existing Colorado law, which is similar to laws of other States.

Working through the city council and the Pitkin County commissioners, Aspenites have attracted national attention as they fought offensive billboards through new county zoning rules. If other Colorado counties now follow the Aspen plan, the result will be billboard regulation in areas far off the interstate network the lobbyists have been trying to take over for advertising. They stand to lose more than they can win.

The new superhighway system will be the world's largest, and it can also be the most beautiful—41,000 miles of new national park. Most of it will be over new rights-of-way, where no previous roads have existed. Colorado, whose scenery is as much an asset as is oil in Oklahoma or corn in Nebraska, has a stake in protecting the national network from the blight of shaving jingles and soft drink art. NEUBERGER and KUCHEL, not KERR and HRUSKA, are thus working in this State's interest.

[From the Detroit News of March 21, 1958]

CURVE AHEAD

Legislation to keep billboards off the interstate highways that are to be 90 percent paid for by the Federal Government has taken a step forward—a very small step but a surprising and welcome one nevertheless.

By a margin of one vote the Senate Committee on Public Works has at last reported favorably a compromise and minimum-control bill. This sets standards to keep the highways from the blight of the hucksters and authorizes each State enacting the appropriate restrictions to receive an additional ½ percent in aid. Cooperating States may also charge off to Washington the cost of acquiring scenic easements—a sort of lease on the view—up to 5 percent of total acquisition costs.

If one thinks of the handful who have a material interest in defacing the countryside, contrasted to the millions who prefer it the way God made it, if one considers the democratic principle that the public has the clear, logical and constitutional right to regulate the use of projects built with public funds, then the victory in the Senate appears to be so modest as to be ludicrous.

What has to be considered, however, is the political reality: that the billboard lobby is well organized, rich, skillful, and tenacious, and that against it stand only the unformulated wishes of perhaps 150 million people. Such an articulate, well-heeled minority is always more impressive to practical politicians, because it seems to care so much while the silent citizen seems to care so little.

In that consideration, moreover, lies a warning. Despite Senate action, the opposing lobby remains immensely, disproportionately powerful. The Senate must still vote. A companion bill must still be pried out of committee in the House and voted there.

Nor would success in each of these steps mark an end. Robert Moses from long personal experience warns against underestimating the billboard gang. Any battle lost in Washington will certainly be fought again among the State legislators, where both the odds and the advantages of the undercover boys may be something like 48 times greater.

MARCH 19, 1958.

JAMES LOEB, Jr.,
Publisher, the Adirondack Enterprise,
Saranac Lake, N. Y.:

The Advertising Federation of America, believing that an attack on the rights of one legal medium of advertising soon can be translated into attacks on all other mediums, strongly protests the action of the Senate in attaching the antibillboard section to the Gore accelerated public-roads bill. AFA believes this is another step toward Federal restriction and control of advertising and violates basic constitutional law by a discriminatory usurpation of private property. We respectfully solicit your editorial comment on this vital issue.

ROBERT M. FEEMSTER,
Chairman of the Board, AFA.

[From the Adirondack Enterprise of March 21, 1958]

BILLBOARDS AND US

The advertising federation, referring to wire from the chairman of the board of the Advertising Federation of America, asking us for editorial comment on the vital issue of billboard advertising.

The Advertising Federation, referring to the action of the United States Senate in attaching an antibillboard section to Senator GORE's bill for accelerated public roads construction, wants us to join with it in protest. The AFA calls this action another step toward Federal restriction and control of advertising which violates basic constitutional law by a discriminatory usurpation of private property.

The federation appeals to us on the grounds that an attack on the rights of one legal medium of advertising soon can be translated into attacks on all other mediums.

We agree thoroughly with the Advertising Federation that this is a vital issue. At that point, our agreement stops.

In the first place, we do not feel that an issue of this nature should be decided purely on the basis of the one criterion: What's in it for us? More important than the question of what is good for the advertising business is the matter of what is good for the American people. Indeed, we rather resent being appealed to on this selfish basis.

In a similar way, we receive appeals from certain agencies interested in pay-as-you-go television. We are asked to support that development, not because it is good in itself (which it may well be), but because it is supposed to be good for newspaper advertising as against its television competition. In this case, too, we think the issue too important to be decided only on the basis of whether it is good or bad for newspaper advertising.

In the second place, and so that no one will think that we are being so high and mighty about this issue, we must confess that restrictions on billboard advertising, as far as we can see, would have no adverse effect on newspaper advertising. Indeed, if such restrictions had any effect at all, it would be favorable, on the principle that less of the national advertising dollar would be spent in other mediums.

Nevertheless, we like to think that we can reach an opinion on this issue without regard to the narrow interests of our immediate pocketbooks.

So far as the issue itself is concerned, we offer our enthusiastic support to those Senators who, in the interest of the vast majority of our people, are pushing for some kind of restrictions.

We in the Adirondacks are less bothered by the curse of billboards than many areas, because there are restrictions within the so-called blue line of the Adirondack State Park.

But we travel in other areas and know just how disconcerting and unsightly an overdose of billboards can be. Perhaps we should be against the restrictions on the grounds that, if the rest of the country were covered with billboards, more people would come to the Adirondacks to appreciate the scenery here.

Not only do we favor the restrictions because of the effect they have on America the beautiful, but also for reasons of justice. The advertising space which billboards occupy is created for the advertisers by public funds. The readers of billboard advertising are attracted not by anything the advertisers do, but by what the government does, Federal, State, or local. We do not suggest that all billboard advertising is wrong, or necessarily a desecration of our country. But we do say that the beautiful new highways built by public funds should not be cluttered up with billboards which divert the attention of the driver, mar the scenery, and create long, thin, and endless Coney Islands throughout the land.

Finally, we believe that the Advertising Federation's argument about a discriminatory usurpation of private property is so much hogwash. Are restrictions against building factories in residential areas also usurpations? Is it suggested that all zoning laws are unconstitutional?

Owners of private property have rights. The public has rights, too.

We regret our inability to cooperate with the Advertising Federation on this issue. We think they are wrong, dead wrong.

[From the St. Petersburg Times of March 20, 1958]

PUNY TACTICS AGAINST BILLBOARDS

Congress is acting like timid parents of a delinquent teen-ager, insofar as combating the roadside billboard evil.

Instead of penalizing States which do not control billboard advertising along Federal-State highways, a Senate subcommittee plans to give more money to the good little States which do restrict billboards.

The billboard lobby evidently has the Senators buffaloed. This situation contributes to a serious accident hazard. A survey by the United States Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with the Minnesota Highways Department indicates that "the greater the number of nonofficial signs at intersections, the higher were the accident rates."

At the last session of Congress, the subcommittee favorably reported an amended version of a bill by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat of Oregon, that would reward cooperative States rather than penalize the recalcitrant ones. The subcommittee now has two other bills which differ only slightly.

The Neuberger bill, at least, has a worthy purpose. The main provision would restrict signs to those "determined to be in the interest of the traveling public and which, by reason of their location, frequency, or character, do not impair the safety of travel or interfere with enjoyment of the natural beauty of the area through which the highway passes."

This seems to us a craven and probably ineffectual way to approach the matter of banishing unsightly billboards, but if it is the best Congress is willing to offer, we can only hope that Florida will take advantage of the chance to get the extra Federal road aid.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank my friend from California for yielding me time.

Mr. CLARK rose.

Mr. KUCHEL. How much time does the able junior Senator from Pennsylvania desire? I will yield him 5 minutes, and if he needs additional time I shall be glad to yield it to him.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, anyone who has listened to this debate about billboards for the past day or so might have thought that the Senate was considering a matter of great constitutional importance, involving the fundamental liberties of the people.

I hope that before the vote my colleagues will read the separate views opposing section 12 of the bill, which appear on pages 56 to 60 of the committee report. To my way of thinking those separate views in opposition to section 12 are the most eloquent arguments in support of the section which we have heard or seen in this debate.

Nothing could be further from the truth than the thought that this is a matter of great constitutional importance, or that high principle is involved in the opposition to section 12. All this modest little section 12 does is to help the States, if they decide that they wish help, to preserve a little scenery from being defiled by a mass of beer, liquor, and other similar kinds of advertisements. That is all it does.

Anyone who takes the dreary drive from Washington to New York over Route 1 or who drives over Route 30, or out west on Route 66, has only to drive over Twogate Pass from Jackson's Hole into Dubois, Wyo., to see the difference.

All this modest little bill does, as I have said, is to make it possible—not to require it, but to make it possible—for the States which desire to do so to prevent some 3 percent of the total mileage of roads with respect to which the Federal Government gives aid from being desecrated by billboard advertising, the way so many of our unprotected highways have already been desecrated.

It accomplishes this purpose through well tested and clearly constitutional methods, one of them being the well-known method of a Federal grant-in-aid. Perhaps the two parallels to the type of grant-in-aid which are most pertinent here are the program for aid to the blind and the program for aid to small cities in creating and constructing sewage disposal plants.

Just as we need to help the blind, so we need to help those who can see to see our scenery; and just as we need to dispose of our sewage by modern methods, so we need to get some of these billboards off the highways, where they obscure our scenery.

Let us consider for a moment who are for the bill. The supporters of the bill include automobile clubs, garden clubs, urban and national planners, the President of the United States, the titular head of the Democratic Party, every private citizen who wants to preserve some part of the beauty of our scenic highways, and the governors of at least two of our most populous States, namely, New York and Pennsylvania.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a telegram which I have received from Hon. George M. Leader, Governor of Pennsylvania, supporting my position with respect to billboard legislation.

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

HARRISBURG, PA., *March 24, 1958.*

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I strongly support your position as to billboard legislation along interstate routes.

GEORGE M. LEADER,
Governor of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. May I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Who is against the bill? The outdoor advertising industry, the operators of a few hotels and motels, and, somewhat halfheartedly and quite sheepishly, organized labor, which has been pressed by the Carpenters and Painters Unions.

What are the arguments against the bill? I urge my colleagues to read the minority report, in order to see how unsound the opposition arguments are. I suggest that for intemperate language, purple adjectives, irrelevant and immaterial assertions, supported by no proof and no logic, this report is indeed worth reading.

The opponents talk about States rights, but no State opposes this provision of the bill. The only State officials who appeared before the committee or submitted statements are in support of section 12.

I am a little weary of the dreary repetition of ancient and obsolete arguments in support of States rights which are being made in this case, with the knowledge that many a State legislature will not shake off the control of the billboard lobby until this bill is passed and some inducement is offered to take the step which the overwhelming majority of all the people of every State would like to see, and that is to preserve the scenic beauty of the country from desecration by the billboard lobby.

Yesterday the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] stated the issue in this case very clearly indeed, to my mind. In conclusion I should like to paraphrase what he said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. May I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senate of the United States believe that the American people want to use Federal funds to help protect the scenery through which the 41,000 miles of the Federal Interstate System is to be constructed? Or do we wish to stand idly by while the billboard lobby ruins much of that scenery and collects an additional enormous unearned profit from the windfall presented to it by the taxpayers when the Federal highway program was organized?

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will help those States that earnestly desire to call a halt to the further spread of billboarditis by defeating the pending amendment. I thank my friend from California for giving me the time to speak on the subject.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBLITZELL in the chair). The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. How much time is available now to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 37 minutes remaining, and the Senator from California has 45 minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. 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. KUCHEL. 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. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the section of the bill which contemplates the development of a program under which the Interstate Highway System will be protected from the deleterious influence of advertising boards and other devices which distract the attention of the motorist while traveling on the highways.

In Ohio we built a 241-mile turnpike. Ninety percent of the property lying contiguous to the turnpike has, by restrictive covenant, been prohibited from being used for advertising purposes. This morning I spoke with the officials of the turnpike commission. I asked them what difficulty they had encountered in acquiring the restrictive covenants. I was told that in the acquisition of covenants on property contiguous to the turnpike against use for billboard advertising, 90 percent were acquired with practically no difficulty.

The statement was made to me that inasmuch as the turnpike traversed virgin territory and billboards had not already been constructed, to buy the needed property rights created no unreasonable task.

I asked, further, whether the cost entailed in buying those rights was great. I was surprised to learn that a separate item of account was not carried showing what the cost was to buy the billboard rights. I asked why that was not done. The answer was, frankly, that the cost was so negligible that a separate item of expense for the acquisition of those restrictive rights was not developed.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, those easements were acquired simultaneously with the acquisition of the rights-of-way themselves, and from the same property owners.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. If the State of Ohio had deferred such acquisitions until the construction of the highway had brought into being an advertising utility, in which interests may have been vested, would not the cost, in the opinion of the Senator, have been much greater?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In that event, I think the cost practically would have become prohibitive. If these rights are to be acquired, they must be obtained at the time the land is bought from the person through whose property the highway runs. At that time the land is still virgin and free from values created by established billboards. It is for that reason that I believe that in the building of the Interstate System, which it is estimated eventually will cost $40 billion, the billboard problem must be solved at the very beginning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I asked further this morning, for information as to the experience of the Ohio Turnpike Commission from the standpoint of public acceptance. The answer was that on no feature of that public service did the compliments and approval exceed that expressed on the fact that the motorist was spared the plaguing and distracting sight of billboards.

I have already said that the length of the Ohio Turnpike is 241 miles. Along 90 percent of it there is not a billboard. The traveler who uses that highway expresses gratitude to those who had the vision to construct a highway free from the distracting billboards which today are to be seen upon so many highways.

I have listened to the debates about the supposed weaknesses of this section of agreement that the State governments will take these property rights by confiscation. They cannot do so. The Constitution of the United States specifically provides that whenever property rights are taken by condemnation, there must be compensation for those rights. I need not relate to my colleagues that even though we sought to do so, we could not, by statutory provision, arrogate or develop rights in State governments which were superior to or tended to contradict the rights of citizens provided by the Constitution of the United States.

I commend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for the vigor which they displayed in promoting and developing this section of the bill. My own hopes are deep that it will be adopted. The longer we delay the greater will be the cost. The longer we delay, the more probable will be the inability eventually to solve the problem. The time to act is now. If the bill shall be passed, it will, in my judgment, meet with the approval of the motorists, and will save us from increased costs when what is sought to be done now will have to be done at a later day, as I think will be inevitable.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Will the Senator from California yield a couple of extra minutes, so that I may make an observation concerning the remarks of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from California.

The Senator from Ohio has very eloquently and concisely expressed the views which I hold concerning the billboard issue. I compliment him upon the splendid presentation of his views. I associate myself completely with what he has said, and also I join in his commendation of Senators, particularly the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Tennessee, and the Senator from California, who have, so to speak, carried the flag in the committee in the effort to bring about billboard prohibition.

Like the Senator from Ohio, I come from a State which has had for 20 years a parkway without a billboard on it. That parkway has been a matter of pride and satisfaction not only to the people of my State, but it has likewise been equally a matter of satisfaction and pleasure to the hundreds of thousands of people who have traveled through Connecticut, which is the gateway to New England. One could not get the people of Connecticut to loosen up on the billboard prohibition if there were 10

referendums. Every one of them would result in increasing approval of the prohibition of billboards on that beautiful parkway.

One has only to drive from Washington to Baltimore to see the effect of billboard prohibition on the Baltimore-Washington Expressway.

Wherever the billboard prohibition has been put into effect, it has met with public approval, not only from the people within the State, but also from those who come from without the State and travel over the highways.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask the Senator from Connecticut whether by legislation those rights were acquired from the property owners?

Mr. BUSH. That was 20 years ago. I do not recall the details which were involved in the prohibition against billboards. I do not wish to go into that phase of the question now. I simply express my strong approval of the principle, because I believe the bill as the committee has reported it will afford a large measure of protection against the billboard on the Interstate Highway System. I sincerely hope that the committee's action in this respect will be sustained when the amendment comes to a vote.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for yielding to me.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have another minute?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield another minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think I ought to say that my mail has been overwhelmingly against this program. But obviously it comes from those who have a financial interest in perpetuating billboards along the highways. The mail was artificially generated. A sheaf of letters of the same composition and on the same type of paper, with no difference except the signatures, came to my office, as I suppose similar letters were received in the office of every other Senator. To those who have written the letters, I feel safe in saying that when this program shall have been put into effect, the benefits which will come to them because of the increased safety factors and the preservation of scenic beauty will be greater than whatever losses they might temporarily sustain because of the adoption of the program.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without having the time required for the quorum call charged to the time available to either side under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then, 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. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am opposed to section 12 of the bill in its present form because I believe it may unjustly deprive Massachusetts of the incentive payment of one-half of 1 percent, even though Massachusetts has a comprehensive, satisfactory, and effective system for regulating signs, billboards, and advertising devices along all the highways in the State.

Congress has declared the Federal interest in a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and is appropriating great sums of money to assist the States in carrying out this highway program. I share the views expressed by the majority of our Committee on Public Works in believing that there is a proper Federal interest in the development of roadside areas, as well as of the highway itself. I believe, too, that the regulation of the use of roadside areas for billboards, signs, and other advertising devices, as well as for restaurants, gas stations, and other facilities, should lie principally in the jurisdiction of the several States.

Massachusetts has long been in the forefront in discharging its responsibility for the condition of highway and adjacent roadside areas. We have had for 37 years statutes providing for regulation of the erection and maintenance of billboards, signs, and other advertising devices. The Massachusetts regulations have been effectively administered for many years, to the satisfaction of the public, including landowners, highway users, and commercial interests desiring to advertise products and services.

I hope laws for the regulation of advertising along public highways will be passed where there are none now. I am sympathetic with the idea that the Federal Government should help in this direction by creating some incentive for States to do so.

Such an effort is attempted by section 12 of this bill. In its present form, I do not feel that I can support this particular effort, sympathetic as I am to its purpose. The provisions of section 12 are not sufficiently specific. As I read them, and as they are read by the Outdoor Advertising Board of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works, I believe that there would be conflicts with the laws and regulations which Massachusetts has adopted to regulate advertising along our highways, and which have been administered satisfactorily. In some ways the provisions of section 12 may be more restrictive than Massachusetts law, and in some ways they may be less restrictive.

I believe that comprehensive and satisfactory State regulations should be held to satisfy the Federal interest in regulating roadside advertising, so that a State will not be penalized under, but may take advantage of, any cost sharing, incentive program established by the Federal Government.

I would like to support legislation which would provide for the preservation of the beauty of the natural landscape along our Federal-aid highways and for the safety of such highways, but I cannot conscientiously support section 12 as it stands. Accordingly, I strongly urge that whatever form of Federal standards Congress adopts for the control of roadside advertising along the Federal-aid highway system should make provision to honor, without interference, conflict, or penalty, any comprehensive program adopted by a State which has proven effective and satisfactory.

For the reasons which I have briefly stated, I intend to vote against the section, unless it is amended to read very differently from the way it now stands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California desire to yield any time to a Senator?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have no information that any other Senator desires now to avail himself of time in speaking against the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma for himself and other Senators.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes to me so that I may propound questions to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. As I understand the language of the provisions of section 12, all that is necessary for it to become effective is the signing of an agreement between the Secretary of Commerce and the appropriate highway official of an individual State. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Michigan is eminently correct. If he will turn to the bottom of page 21 of the bill, line 25, he will find the following language:

> Agreements. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to enter into agreements with State highway departments (including such supplementary agreements as may be necessary) to carry out the national policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section with respect to the Interstate System within the State.

Mr. POTTER. Assume that I am the highway commissioner of my State, and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is the Secretary of Commerce. We enter into an agreement. If, as the highway commissioner of my State, although I have all good intentions of complying with the agreement, I find I cannot do so, who is to enforce the agreement? What will happen?

Mr. KERR. If I understand the bill, it places the regulatory power in the Secretary of Commerce. Some proponents of section 12 say that it places the regulatory power in the State; but the reason why the Senator from Oklahoma has to repudiate that contention as untenable is that the States already have regulatory power. They do not need any contract with the Secretary of Commerce to give them, as States, power to regulate within their own borders. They now have that power. However,

the Secretary of Commerce does need permission to enable him to become effective in the matter of regulation. So the Senator from Oklahoma is compelled to the conclusion that the grant of right to regulate moves to the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. POTTER. And the Secretary of Commerce has no police powers to regulate, even if he so desires. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. He has none whatever.

Mr. POTTER. It seems to me a grave constitutional question could be raised as to whether, by an agreement entered into between the Secretary of Commerce and an official of a State government—in this case it would be the highway commissioner—something could be done which, under normal procedure, would be a proper matter for legislation.

Mr. KERR. The question raised by the Senator from Michigan has been in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma, namely, how can it be thought possible for the Secretary of Commerce, who admittedly has no power, to make a contract with a State highway department, which admittedly has no power to do so, and by reason of that contract be put into a position whereby acts could be done which neither of the two could properly do?

Mr. POTTER. If the Senator will allow me to propound another question, I refer to page 21 of the bill, under subsection (4), wherein it is stated:

Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

Let us assume that in a certain State there is in existence legislation permitting the erection of certain signs which may be of a larger size than allowed by subsection (3).

Mr. KERR. Which is 500 square inches.

Mr. POTTER. Yes. Is it the Senator's contention that the language contained in that section would prohibit the States from having such signs erected?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is compelled to the conclusion that the provision would prohibit the erection of the signs. If the Senator will read the language, he will see on line 6, page 21, it is stated:

It is hereby declared to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, or devices within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main-traveled way of all portions of the Interstate System should be regulated, consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary, which shall provide for:

One of the things which follows is——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

One of the things is:

Signs not larger than 500 square inches advertising activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located.

That being one of the things required, paragraph (4) must be read in the light of that knowledge, and it says:

Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section,

One of the standards is the required limitation that the signs shall not be larger than 500 square inches.

Mr. POTTER. I raise the question, because I believe in the debate yesterday the proponents of the provision claimed that subsection (4) superseded subsection (3), imposing a limitation of 500 square inches on the size of signs. The language of the bill, as I interpret it, is quite to the contrary. The limitation seems to be a part of the national policy which is set forth in the section.

Mr. KERR. Subsection (4) specifically says that the authorization by the States must be consistent with the limitations, one of which is in subsection (3).

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is the intention of the Senator from Nebraska to offer an amendment to clarify the meaning of subsection (4) to conform with the state interpretation of the authors of the bill. The amendment will consist of the insertion of words in the third line, so that the provision will read:

Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law, regardless of size, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

Then there will be no doubt about the meaning of the section.

Mr. POTTER. That language would remove the limitation.

Mr. HRUSKA. It would remove the limitation contained in the original subsection.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Oklahoma have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. KERR. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I shall take very little time.

If section 12 should become law a very damaging precedent, adversely affecting the States, might be established. A great number of my dearest and closest political friends in Pennsylvania have asked me to support legislation which will prevent billboards along the Interstate Highway System. I have not had any communications from those who favor billboards along the Interstate Highway System.

I am a strong believer in the Interstate Highway System. I presume that my great interest in it arose because of my military operations with troops. I took one assignment of 16,000 troops 1,600 miles overland, and that convinced me that what we need in our Nation is a system of interstate and defense highways.

When it comes to the police side of the matter, Mr. President, I think that is entirely a State function. Many States have already enacted laws regulating billboard advertising along the interstate highways and other highways. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania we do not have any signs along the original Pennsylvania Turnpike, and that situation has been entirely satisfactory. However, I think such regulation is a matter for Pennsylvania, and not for the Federal Government.

To follow the proper course it will be necessary to use police power to some extent. I do not want the Federal Government to invade Pennsylvania by the use of police power so far as the projected roads are concerned. I think that would be a bad precedent.

For that reason, Mr. President, I am opposing the billboard regulation section of the highway bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Pennsylvania an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, we are considering an emergency highway bill. The purpose of the bill is to help take care of unemployment in the Nation. It does not seem to me that anything should be put in the bill which does not refer to the construction of roads. To my mind, that is another reason for opposing the billboard regulation provision.

Mr. President, even if we were considering an original bill for highway construction, as in the case of the Interstate Highway System approved in 1956, I would have to oppose the billboard regulatory provision, because I think all the police power belongs to the various States. I hope that portion of the bill will be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 21 minutes remaining. The Senator from California has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. KERR. I understood the Senator from California desired to take additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The current time, which is running, is being charged equally to each side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. 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. KNOWLAND. 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. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California, and I assure him that I will not presume to use the entire 5 minutes he has so generously allotted to me.

I am certain that this issue has been fully discussed. I believe that most Members of the Senate know how they expect to vote on the question of whether or not to retain, in the new highway bill, the provision sponsored jointly by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and myself, to provide for cooperative agreements with the States to regulate signboards.

Before a vote is taken, I should like to pose a question to each Member of the Senate. The question is this: How does he think his own constituents, aside from those engaged in the outdoor advertising business, feel on the issue upon which the Senate is about to vote?

Consider the population of the State which any Senator happens to represent, whether it be California, Illinois, Florida, Oregon, or any of the other great States of the Union. What does that Senator think is the prevailing opinion of the men and women of the States who will travel along the 41,000 miles of interstate highways, and whose taxes will pay for the construction and maintenance of such roads?

If ever there has been an issue before the Senate on which the division in public opinion was very clear, I think it is this question.

I do not pose as a prophet, because it is said that only the seventh son of a seventh son can prophesy. But I believe that the overwhelming majority of the people of the country, who are also the motorists of the country, favor very strongly and emphatically this proposal to provide for cooperation with the States in regulating signboards and billboards along the interstate highways of the Nation.

I predict that if the Senate today votes to retain this provision in the bill, and then passes the bill—as I am certain the Senate will do—all over the country, in all 48 States, people who value the magnificent countryside will rejoice in what the Senate does.

I thank the Senator from California for yielding me time for this purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] or the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] desire to yield additional time?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma is willing to yield back the remainder of his time, if the Senator from California is willing to do likewise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). All remaining time for debate on the Kerr amendment has been yielded back.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to call up my perfecting amendment, identified as 3-25-58-B.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, at the end of line 24, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon, and then add the following:

Provided, however, That any such segment excluded from the application of such standards shall not be considered in computing the increase of the Federal share payable on account thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope it will not be necessary to use 30 minutes in discussing the amendment. So far as I know, there is no objection to it. It is intended as a clarifying amendment, to make sure that if a portion of the Interstate System is excluded by the agreement referred to in the language on page 22 of the bill, the portion so excluded from the application of the standards should not be eligible to earn an additional one-half percent of credit in the payment of the cost of the Interstate System. Certainly I do not believe that anyone wishes to pay a bonus for the segment which is excluded from the application of the standards.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, the amendment merely states what is the reasonable interpretation of the provisions now before the Senate. I regard the amendment as unnecessary, but I see no harm flowing from it, because it but specifies the intent and the meaning of the provisions. Since doubt has been expressed by some—although I do not share it—I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma desire to speak on the amendment?

Mr. KERR. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma. How much times does he wish to have yielded to him?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma such time as he may desire to use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, have I been recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma has been trying to digest the clarifying amendment.

I must say that I have trouble understanding the statement of the Senator from Tennessee, that all the amendment does is to put in the bill what was the meaning of the authors of the bill when it was before the committee. That may well be the case. However, inasmuch as the Senator from Oklahoma is not able to fully understand what the amendment does, he is having a little difficulty in deciding whether the reference of the Senator from Tennessee was to the meaning in his mind or in the minds of the authors of the amendment, and he would therefore like to ask the Senator from South Dakota just what the amendment proposes to do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator will yield to me, I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yesterday, during the discussion of the meaning of the language relating to the agreements referred to in the bill, particularly that portion of the bill providing for the exclusion of certain segments of the Interstate System which traverse incorporated municipalities, one Senator brought out the fact that in his State a great deal of the Interstate System would pass through municipalities, which were subject to local regulation. If they are subject to local regulation, and they are excluded from the application of the standards herein proposed——

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator mean standards of highway construction or standards for the regulation of billboards?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Standards for the regulation of billboards. The amendment is tied specifically to the sentence which deals with standards for billboards.

Mr. KERR. I understand. The Senator from South Dakota does not believe that the addition of the amendment would change the discretionary power of the Secretary of Commerce to include or exclude, but would merely provide that, in the event of an exclusion, the area so excluded would not be counted or be effective with respect to what the State would receive under the 5 percent provision or the one-half of 1 percent provision. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. The best answer, perhaps, is to read the language. It ties right on to the sentence which deals with the exclusion by the Secretary of Commerce, by adding the words:

Provided, however, That any such segment excluded from the application of such standards shall not be considered in computing the increase of the Federal share payable on account thereof.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment, in the light of that explanation. I am impressed with two things, however. First, it shows the general inadvisability of the entire composition of section 12 being added to the emergency highway bill. This is but another bit of the mass of accumulated evidence showing that section 12 is in great need of additional language to make it conform even to the ideas of the sponsors.

The Senator from Oklahoma feels that this illustrates the worthiness of the amendment which he and others are sponsoring, to strike section 12 from the bill, the effect of which would be to permit us to go along with an emergency highway construction program and leave billboard regulatory legislation to come up in a separate bill after members of

the committee and sponsors of the bill have had the time which it is more and more evident will be needed in order to get either understandable language or language which the sponsors themselves desire to have in it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I welcome the support of the Senator from Oklahoma, as a constructive legislator, in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I know of no opposition to the adoption of the amendment suggested by the Senator from South Dakota. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to lines 4, 5, 6, and 7 on page 23 of the bill, which read:

> The Federal share payable on account of any project on the Interstate System within that State provided for by funds authorized under the provisions of section 108 of this act, to which the national policy and the agreement apply, shall be increased by one-half of 1 percent of the total cost thereof.

As the able Senator from South Dakota has said, one Member of the Senate raised some question about the matter. The amendment he proposes will set at rest any doubt as to the meaning of the language.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, and ask for a vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "3-21-58-B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, line 11, after the words "Interstate System" it is proposed to insert: "constructed upon any part of right-of-way, the entire width of which is acquired subsequent to July 1, 1956."

On page 22, line 23, change the comma to a period and strike out all after the period down to and including the period in line 24.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. This is a very simple amendment. It can be very quickly explained, and I doubt that much time need be taken for its consideration.

The amendment would limit the restriction and the regulation of advertising on the Interstate System to those parts of the Interstate System of Highways which are completely new.

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

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator again state the number of the amendment which he has called up?

Mr. COTTON. It is designated "3-21-58-B."

The bill in its present form provides that the restrictions shall apply to those portions of the Interstate System which are completely new highways, or as to which any part of the right-of-way has been acquired since July 1, 1956.

If the amendment shall be adopted, the provisions of the bill will apply only to new, virgin interstate highways which are constructed where no highways existed previously. These are the reasons for the amendment.

First, a person who had been advertising on any highway before the Interstate System started would not be deprived of his present privileges. We would avoid all the distress, entanglements, difficulties, and complications which would be entailed by requiring the tearing down of the present advertising.

A person who was operating a motor court or a gasoline station, or who had any other form of business being advertised on presently existing highways, would not be affected by the amendment. The amendment would apply only to those parts of the new Interstate System which were entirely new and were located where no highways existed before.

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

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has just said that his amendment would limit the application of this section to the segments of the new Interstate System which would be located in entirely new areas; in other words, in areas and on ground not now a part of a highway.

Mr. COTTON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. To clarify my understanding of the Senator's amendment, I understand it proposes to strike out, on the bottom of page 22, lines 23 and 24, the words "or which are built on rights-of-way wholly acquired before July 1, 1956."

Mr. COTTON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Before discussing the amendment which the Senator from New Hampshire proposes, let me ask, Is it not true that the words at the bottom of page 22 which the Senator proposes to strike out by his amendment relate to the discretion granted to the Secretary of Commerce in reaching agreements with the States to exclude from the agreements those segments of the Interstate Highway on which the rights-of-way were wholly acquired before July 1, 1956?

Mr. COTTON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Then the Senator proposes to insert, does he not, on page 21, line 11, after the word "System", the words "constructed upon any part of right-of-way, the entire width of which is acquired subsequent to July 1, 1956."

Mr. COTTON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has said that this language would limit the application of this section to those parts of the Interstate System which will be located in entirely new areas. As the Senator knows, that will constitute about 75 percent of the system.

Mr. COTTON. I do not quite agree with that statement. It is my understanding that about 72 percent of the system includes areas where there have been highways, but where new rights-of-way have been added to widen the roads so as to bring them into the Interstate System. So the figure would be somewhat less than 75 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COTTON. I yield myself 5 more minutes.

Seventy-five percent of the system would be affected if the amendment were adopted. If the amendment should be adopted, let there be no misunderstanding, those portions of the interstate highway located upon existing rights-of-way, but on which the roads have been widened, where the rights-of-way have not wholly been acquired, but a part of them has been acquired, would not be subject to this provision of the bill.

Mr. GORE. The question I wish to raise is whether the Senator from New Hampshire has taken into consideration the extent to which his amendment would apply to a highway passing through a municipality, although it is not located on a Federal highway right-of-way, but traverses a street.

As I understand the amendment, it is so restrictive that it would exclude the operation of the section proposing to accomplish the regulation of outdoor advertising on the Interstate System to the extent that, if as much as 1 foot of an entire project had previously been a right-of-way for a street or a road, county, State, or Federal, the provision could not operate. Am I misinterpreting the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. COTTON. No; I think the Senator from Tennessee is exactly correct. I shall be glad, after he has completed his statement, to give my reasons for framing the amendment as it reads. But I think the Senator is perfectly correct. I think it would except from the billboard provision any part of the interstate highway that follows the course of a road which previously existed, no matter how small that road might be. It would also except from the provision highways which had only been widened somewhat.

Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes, because I want to go into this subject carefully.

In some States, including New Hampshire, toll highways already built and in operation before the passage of the 1956 act have been taken over. In most of the States, the policy concerning those highways has been determined. Some States control advertising; others, I believe, do not. But on the highways taken over, the amendment would not attempt to impose a new system or attempt to change the existing condition. On the parts of the Interstate Highway System which follow State roads, and which previously existed, where people already have their establishments and their advertising, the billboard provision would not take effect.

While I was unable to determine from the Bureau of Public Roads exactly the proportion of the Interstate System which would be affected if the bill be passed, it would not be 72 or 75 percent; it would be less than that. An educated guess is that 65 percent of the Interstate System would still be covered. Certainly

it would cover the portions of the Interstate System which traverse rural areas and are completely new. It is also true that it might leave, to be operated on by the statute, certain parts of new highways within municipalities. But they would still have operative upon them the restrictions already in the bill.

I call attention to four prime reasons for the amendment.

First, it would not necessitate destruction of already existing advertising.

Second, it would provide an opportunity, under the provisions of the act, to control advertising where it is most necessary that it be controlled, namely, where the Federal Government has invested many millions of dollars in building new highways.

Third, it would reduce the cost of operation of the act, because it would reduce the number of miles of highway covered; and it also would restrict the application of the act more to the sections of the Interstate System in connection with which the cost of obtaining the advertising rights would be less.

Fourth, it carries this principle, which I submit is a very vital one: It would make the bill applicable, in general, only to the parts of the Interstate Highway System where the advertising values would be created entirely by the building of the highway system, and where there were no advertising values before. Therefore, if the new highway were built where no highway had existed before, the owners of the abutting land would not have any valuable advertising rights until the Federal Government had paid 90 percent and the State had paid 10 percent of the cost of constructing the highway which, when put into use, would create the advertising rights.

So, Mr. President, I assert that this amendment will make the operations of the act much simpler. It will minimize the possible hardships which could be created. It will be less costly. It will be in keeping with the principle we really wish to have applied, so the new nationwide system of interstate highways will be controlled. Furthermore, I believe the amendment will strengthen the bill and will make it more readily administered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who has been on his feet for some time. Thereafter I shall yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I may be incorrect, but it seems to me that this amendment would create in the billboard amendment a loophole so big that it would almost be large enough for a diesel locomotive to be driven through it.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire several questions, if I may.

In the crowded industrial, metropolitan States of the East, is it really possible to obtain a new highway right-of-way without locating it in many instances on previously existing country roads or lanes or other roads?

I agree that in some of the great, wide-open spaces of the Far West—such as Wyoming, Idaho, Oregon, and many parts of California—it would be possible to build a road across the countryside where no right-of-way had previously existed. Certainly that would be possible in remote or primitive areas.

But in the great industrial States of the eastern seaboard, which are crisscrossed with county lanes, country roads, and other roads of various kinds, would not the amendment virtually remove those States from the application of the act?

Mr. COTTON. I do not think so, and I do not think the apprehensions of the Senator from Oregon are very well justified.

It is true that in the very thickly settled areas of the Eastern States, the Interstate System might well follow, very largely, previously existing highways. But that portion of the Interstate Highway System would, as a matter of policy, be excluded from the application of the provisions the Senator from Oregon is supporting.

I live in an eastern State, part of which is fairly heavily populated. I find that a large portion of the Interstate System in my State runs through new territory. I also find that in many of the Eastern States, if the Interstate System were constructed on presently existing roads, the Interstate System would be so crooked that a snake could not follow it, because the existing roads are extremely winding.

It is true that in the environs of Boston, Springfield, New Haven, Newark, and other great cities——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from New Hampshire has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 3 more minutes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as I was saying, it is true that as regards the environs of various large cities, the Senator from Oregon may be correct.

But it is not my understanding—and I have supported the billboard amendment from the very start—that it is the proclaimed purpose of those who support this provision to try to control advertising in the industrial areas, because the industrial areas are to be specifically excluded at the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I may be incorrect in my understanding of this matter, and I have not consulted either the able Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] or the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] about it. However, it seems to me that this amendment could create a major breach in the regulation here proposed.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I must interrupt the Senator from Oregon for a moment, to inquire about the time situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A moment ago the Senator from New Hampshire yielded to himself an additional 3 minutes. When they have expired, the Senator from New Hampshire will have used 18 minutes, and he then will have 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield again, but briefly, to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the case of a portion of the Interstate Highway System which happened to fall on an existing country lane or road, there could be advertising, whereas if in a nearby section the Interstate System did not follow an existing road, there could not be any advertising at all. Would not that lead to a perfectly absurd situation?

Mr. COTTON. I doubt that there would be many serious problems of that kind. It should be borne in mind that the States will not be compelled to control advertising, and it is very unlikely that either the State highway department or the Secretary of Commerce would think it worth while to control advertising on a small section of a road, when there already was advertising on each side of it.

I believe the amendment would result in having advertising controlled along the portions of the Interstate System in the scenic areas of the country—which, as I understand, is the purpose we have in mind.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield briefly to me?

Mr. COTTON. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, it seems to me that there is much to be said for the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire. In dealing with old rights-of-way, where there already are billboards, certainly the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire has much to commend it. It avoids the charge of retroactivity and the charge that we would be seeking to confiscate advertising rights already established. The amendment would reduce the probable cost of operation of the bill, I may say, because the advertising rights along a new highway and a new right-of-way would not be regarded as being as valuable as those along a highway where the right had long been recognized and where the advertising was already in existence.

It seems to me that there would be no harm at all in accepting this amendment and taking it to conference. If, in the deliberations which always occur in a conference committee, the instances cited by representatives of the Bureau of Public Roads or by the conferees on the part of the House or by the conferees on the part of the Senate were sufficient to indicate that a further modification should be made, or that there should be included a provision for the application of a new policy with respect to existing roads, certainly that could be worked out in the conference.

However, it seems to me that at this stage of the proceeding it is highly desirable to accept the amendment the Senator from New Hampshire has proposed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; if I may do so.

Mr. CARLSON. It seems to me that the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire has much merit in its practical application. We have a toll road in Kansas two-thirds or three-fourths of which has been taken over as a part of the Interstate System. On some portions there are billboards. The highway right-of-way was secured before 1956. If the proposed legislation shall be enacted without the Cotton amendment, the billboards on two-thirds or three-fourths of the highway will have to be removed. It seems to me the proposal has much merit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from New Hampshire has 9 minutes remaining. The Senator from Oklahoma has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. COTTON. I would rather reserve a little time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator, and I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Can the Senator imagine a 20-mile project being found within the Interstate Highway System in his State, or in any State adjoining his State, which would not at some point within the 20 miles traverse, or at least encompass, at least 1 foot of a lane, a country road, a highway, a street, or some form of thoroughfare the right of which was publicly owned?

Mr. COTTON. I shall answer that frank question with equal candor. The Senator from New Hampshire cannot imagine in his State 20 miles of a highway on the Interstate System where that would not be true. It might not be true in the northern part of the State, but, by and large, in the southern part of his State the Senator from New Hampshire cannot imagine 20 miles of an interstate highway which would not at some point cross or run for a distance on another highway.

The Senator from New Hampshire would like to respond to the Senator from Tennessee by saying it is not the understanding of the Senator from New Hampshire that it is the intention of the proponents of the bill to put a ban on advertising. It is the understanding of the Senator from New Hampshire that the purpose is to put reasonable controls and limitations on advertising, with emphasis on a restriction of advertising on new parts of highways to be built throughout the country. What would be the harm or serious danger if for 5 miles, or 3 miles, or even 8 miles, of a 20-mile stretch an interstate highway in the State of New Hampshire, for example, should run along a present highway, and the present signs should remain? The new part of the road would be in virgin territory, and should be clean as a whistle, and should be regulated. What is the harm in that? We are making a great deal of it, are we not?

Mr. GORE. Frankly, since the Senator has asked me, I think the adoption of the amendment he proposes would nullify the entire provision, except perhaps in the Western States, where projects would be located which would not encompass any part of any right-of-way of any kind of thoroughfare whatsoever. I cannot imagine that the Senator could find a 10-mile stretch in any eastern State, unless it be in the northern woods of Maine, to which, perhaps the Interstate Highway System will not extend, which would not cross or encompass at least 1 foot of a public right-of-way. In that event the Senator has just stated his amendment would exclude most of his own State.

Mr. COTTON. Oh, no, I have not said that. The Senator misunderstood me. I would be very glad to invite the Senator from Tennessee to my State and show him where the major portion of the highways of the Interstate System would be built. The major portion would be covered by the pending bill. I do not think there would be any ruination resulting if occasionally an interstate road followed along, for a time, a State highway where signs already existed. I do not agree with the Senator that it would defeat the purpose of the provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further, so that we may clarify the question?

Mr. COTTON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. In entering into an agreement with a State by the Secretary of Commerce the agreement would apply to projects or segments of a highway. Is that true?

Mr. COTTON. I think there is one element of sharp misunderstanding on the part of the Senator from Tennessee which has just come to my mind. Does the Senator from Tennessee take the position that if Road A crosses an interstate highway at a point, or even crosses it diagonally, so that it runs along it for 200 or 300 yards, and half a mile thereafter Road B crosses the Interstate System, or runs along with it for 200 or 300 yards, advertising would be permitted between those crossings if my amendment were adopted?

Mr. GORE. It would not have to be for 200 or 300 yards; it could be for only 1 foot. Let me read a sentence of the bill as it would be if the Senator's amendment were adopted. I read beginning on line 6, on page 21, of the bill:

> It is hereby declared to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, or devices within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main-traveled way of all portions of the Interstate System—

Now reading the Senator's amendment—

> constructed upon any part of right-of-way, the entire width of which is acquired subsequent to July 1, 1956.

Reading that language in its entirety, it seems to me the conclusion is inescapable that it is required that the entire width be acquired subsequent to July 1, 1956, to make it subject to this regulation; but if the State owned 1 foot, 1 mile, 1 yard, of the right-of-way before July 1, 1956, then the project could not be subject to this regulation.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is completely missing my point. He has read at some length, when the time for discussion is limited, the wording of my amendment, with which I am thoroughly familiar. If a road is built along an existing highway, then it is true that even if it overlaps only 1 foot or 2 feet the display of signs is not to be controlled, under my amendment. The Senator talks about intersecting highways. Highways could not be built in the States, except in the great West, where there would not be crossing or bisecting of other highways. If a road crossed a highway, for just a few feet, it would be exempt from control.

Mr. GORE. In other words, the Senator interprets his amendment to mean that if there is a 20-mile segment of a highway, and a half mile here and a half mile there is on a right-of-way previously owned, control can be exercised with respect to all segments of that section except the half mile here and the half mile there?

Mr. COTTON. I certainly do. Under the Cotton amendment, all portions of the Interstate System constructed as entirely new highway would be subject to the provisions of the section. I do not see how anyone could possibly read anything else into the language.

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

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, the dangerous area, the area in which it is most desirable and necessary to obtain regulation, is the area of turnoffs and intersections. If the Interstate System is constructed across a State highway, where there is to be a cloverleaf interconnecting with an existing highway, then would it not be true that the entire area of the intersection would be excluded from regulation, for the reason that the right-of-way for the existing road was owned before July 1, 1956?

Mr. COTTON. It is quite possibly true that the portion of the highway which actually crossed the other right-of-way would not be covered if the amendment were adopted.

Let me remind the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that the purpose of the amendment, boiled down to the least common denominator and phrased in plain English, is that every new portion of the interstate highway shall be subject to the provisions of the bill, and that all the old highway, whether it be the entire width or not, where rights already have been created and signs are existing, shall remain unaffected. That is the common-sense approach. Actually, I could take the Senator to the State of New Hampshire and to many other eastern seaboard States and show him miles and miles of the proposed Interstate System which would fall under the control of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Let me see if I can state the proposition in understandable English. Suppose there are three segments of an interstate highway, A, B, and C. Let us assume that A had been completed prior to July 1956; that B was in existence prior to 1956, but required additional rights-of-way to bring it up to the standard prescribed by the Congress and the Bureau of Public Roads; and that C represented brandnew rights-of-way across areas to be developed.

Under the provision which is presently in the bill we do not propose to touch A. In other words, that part of the 41,000-mile system which was in existence prior to July 1956, requires no new right-of-way. Perhaps there are billboards along each side of it now. We turn our backs on that.

We seek, however, to have the Senate approve a national policy on the two remaining types of highways; those where new rights-of-way are required in part, and those where new rights-of-way are required in toto.

From a percentage standpoint, about 75 percent of the 41,000 miles will be brandnew rights-of-way. Those will be completely new. Of the remaining 25 percent, the opinion expressed by the Bureau of Public Roads is that approximately 5 or 7 percent represent highways to which no additions are required, and somewhere between 18 and 20 percent require new rights-of-way.

If we adopt the proposal of the Senator from New Hampshire, even if a State wants to make billboard regulations for such sections of the highway where new rights-of-way are required, the State cannot do so. We would thereby deprive the State of the opportunity to participate in the incentive payment the bill provides.

If we pass it in its present form, the bill says that any State can acquire advertising easements, if that is the way it desires to proceed, and the State will participate in the payment for such easements. Why do we give them an incentive with one hand and take from them with the other hand the right to exercise a policy which would bring them the incentive? I say this sincerely to my friend from New Hampshire. The Senator has helped to have the bill reported to the Senate. We joined together in a majority. I say to the Senator from New Hampshire in complete good faith, I wish he would withdraw his amendment, because I believe the problem can be solved by each State endeavoring for itself to determine whether it will live up to the policy.

Mr. COTTON. If the Senator from California will yield, did he intend to say if my amendment were adopted it would deprive the States of the right to control the other segments of highway? The amendment would take nothing from the States whatsoever.

Mr. KUCHEL. I said that in my opinion, if the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire were adopted, it would deprive the States of participating in a Federal incentive payment, to the extent of applying the national policy over that part of the Interstate Highway System where new rights-of-way were required.

Mr. COTTON. The States would get payment for those portions of the highway which were controlled, exactly as they would under the bill as now written. It would save the States from getting their noses into a lot of trouble.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will some Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to ask the author of the amendment if he does not feel the State, in the situation described by the Senator from California, might still be eligible to get help on the purchase of rights, if the State decided to seek to purchase rights where the advertising is in existence?

Mr. COTTON. I think that participating in the purchase of rights would not be affected by the limitation any more than it would be affected by the limitations already in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My reading of the language leads me to believe it is only applicable with respect to the so-called incentive payment, but would not interfere with the State getting help on the purchase cost of easements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Does the Senator from Oklahoma desire to yield time?

Mr. KERR. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. President, I am going to accept the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. As I understand it, it would exclude from the provisions of section 12 any part of the right-of-way the entire width of which was acquired subsequent to July 1, 1956.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Who is in charge of the time on the respective sides? If I am not mistaken, I just heard the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma yield himself time to support the Cotton amendment. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has been yielding himself time to support the Cotton amendment. Who is in charge of the time for the opponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader; and the Chair understands that he had turned the responsibility over to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from Oregon desire some time?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am new at parliamentary law; but am I to understand that the time for both sides is controlled by the proponents of the Cotton amendment? I should like to ask for a ruling on that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time in support of the Cotton amendment is controlled by the sponsor of the amendment, the Senator from New Hampshire. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, time in opposition was to be controlled by the majority leader, should he be opposed to the amendment. If he were not opposed to the amendment, the time would be controlled by the minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that it has been the practice on both sides of the aisle to yield time without regard to whether a Senator supports or opposes an amendment, if the time in opposition is not demanded by an opponent of the amendment. We frequently ask unanimous consent to extend the time on an amendment. If the Senator from Oregon or any other Member of this body desires time, and no time is available, I am prepared to ask unanimous consent that it be made available.

I cannot sit at this desk all day long. Inasmuch as the subject matter was one in which the Senator from Oklahoma was interested, and which he was handling, and inasmuch as he was required to be present in the Chamber anyway, I asked him to handle the time.

This has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of the pending amendment. If the Senator from New Hampshire had some time available, and it should suit his purpose to yield time to the Senator from Oklahoma, he could do so.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I still do not understand. How can the Senator from Oklahoma support the Cotton amendment by yielding himself a portion of the time of the opponents of the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Frequently Senators opposed to an amendment use time belonging to the other side. That is not unusual. I think it happens in connection with almost every such unanimous-consent request.

If the Senator objects, we can yield back the time in opposition to the Cotton amendment, and then yield the Senator time on the bill. All we want to do is to give every Senator every reasonable opportunity to express his views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that in this situation the time should have been controlled by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], acting for the minority leader in opposition to the amendment. The Chair did not know the position of the majority leader or of the Senator from Oklahoma with respect to the pending amendment. The Chair erred in recognizing the majority leader and the Senator from Oklahoma, and the Chair regrets it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, may I be yielded time to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In the event there is any objection to yielding time, I ask the Senator from Oklahoma how much time he desires?

Mr. KERR. I should like 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for 3 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My parliamentary inquiry is based upon one clause in the unanimous-consent agreement:

Provided, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

If it is evident that the majority leader is in favor of the amendment, then it seems to the Senator from South Dakota that the time in opposition would be controlled by the minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is true; but we have never had a problem in that connection. The majority leader and the minority leader take whatever time we have and allocate it to Senators in accordance with their positions. But if there is any time available beyond that, we allot it to any Senator who wishes to be heard.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota was eminently correct. The Senator from Oklahoma was aware of the situation. He is not surprised at the confusion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. He does not expect him to understand either what the amendment is about, the effect of it, or who controls the time with reference to a discussion of it.

The fact of the matter is, as the Senator from South Dakota stated, that the minority leader is in control of the time in opposition to the Cotton amendment, for the simple reason that the majority leader favors the amendment. So the Senator from Oregon was entirely out of order as he attempted to silence the Senator from Oklahoma, who was speaking in time which he, acting in the position of the majority leader, had granted himself in which to say a word or two about the Cotton amendment.

In my judgment the Cotton amendment is salutary, but it would not cure the ills of section 12. While the Senator from Oklahoma is in favor of the Cotton amendment, he will be just as much opposed to section 12, if amended by the Cotton amendment, as he is opposed to it in its present form. However, the Senator from Oklahoma is supporting the Cotton amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCHEL. I understood that the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] desires some time.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I share the view of the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I understood that the Senator from Vermont said he had some views to express on this amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may address a question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I address this question to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and ask him to look at page 22, line 15 of the bill. I desire to ask his opinion about the meaning of the following language:

Any such agreement may, within the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, consistent with the national policy, provide for excluding from application of the national standards segments of the Interstate System which traverse incorporated municipalities wherein the use of real property adjacent to the Interstate System is subject to municipal regulation or control.

I ask the Senator whether that language would permit the Secretary of Commerce to recognize the authority of a municipality through which a segment of the Interstate System passes to have its own way on the question of billboard control. I should like to have that question clarified for the RECORD. Is that language designed to give the Secretary the privilege of exempting from the billboard control provisions property within a municipality through which the highway runs?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, may I have 2 minutes additional to clarify this point?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 minutes additional to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. GORE. It is my understanding of the language which the Senator has read that the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to exclude from application of the standards, in any agreement reached with a State, those segments of the Interstate System within incorporated municipalities. The question was raised yesterday that this was a matter in which the Secretary of Commerce could exercise discretion. That I concede. However, the terms of the agreement must be agreed to by the Secretary of Commerce and the State. After conferring with the authors of the committee amendment I have agreed to accept an amendment to be proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], to insert after the word "policy" on line 17—and I am reading from the Senator's amendment—these words: "and upon application of the State."

In other words, it would be clear from that language that if the State applied for the exclusion of such an area, the Secretary would be authorized, in his discretion, to exclude it from application of the standards.

Mr. BUSH. That applies to the billboard section of the bill as well as to the other sections of the bill; does it?

Mr. GORE. This is a part of the billboard section of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, while I recognize the good intentions connected with the Cotton amendment, I am rather apprehensive with respect to its application. I am thinking particularly in terms of my own section of the country. We were told that there would be access roads every 5 or 8 or 10 miles. Those intersections would be over land that was partly acquired prior to 1956.

However, that is not the main point. As the interstate highway progresses through the State, north and south, and east and west, it will cross an existing highway at least every mile or in a large part of the area at least every mile. Sometimes those crossroads are a quarter of a mile apart. Most of that land, having been acquired about 100 years ago, and certainly prior to 1956, would be available for the erection of billboards. The amendment would mean that over a good part of the State there would be a continuous forest of advertising signs. I must say in all fairness that at the present time my State does have a law which controls billboards very satisfactorily. In the event a future legislature should repeal that law, we would find ourselves very much surrounded by billboards in driving through the most attractive State in the Union, if I may say so.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 4 minutes remaining and the Senator from Oklahoma has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, upon listening to the statement of the junior Senator from New Hampshire as to his intent and as to his understanding of the meaning of the amendment, I reached the conclusion that it is not as far reaching as I had originally thought. It is still, however, a restrictive amendment. If I may have the attention of the junior Senator from New Hampshire, I should like to point out that any section of the highway, any part of which encompassed any part of a right-of-way which a State owned prior to July 1, 1956, could not be regulated under the terms of the agreement. The provision beginning at the bottom of page 23, line 24, which provides for reimbursement of a State for 90 percent of the cost of the acquisition of the right-of-way, could apply, because it can apply without the reaching of an agreement.

Therefore, the effect of the amendment, upon further consideration, would not be as far reaching as the junior Senator from Tennessee had originally thought. It would operate, it would seem to me, as a discrimination against the States. Suppose that the States wanted to exercise the regulation and desired to acquire the advertising easements and proceeded to do so. They could be reimbursed to the extent of 90 percent of the cost of acquiring the easements provided the cost did not exceed 5 percent of the right-of-way cost, but they would be denied the other financial incentive of one-half of 1 percent of the cost of the project.

Does the able Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. COTTON. If, under the existing act, without my amendment, the State controls its advertising, and does not control it in an industrial section, which is excepted in the bill, it does not lose the one-half of 1 percent, does it? It merely means that there is an additional amount of the highway for which the State does not receive the incentive money.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I welcome the statement of the Senator from Tennessee, because it coincides completely with the observation I made earlier, that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire does not deprive the State of its right to get a part of the cost of acquiring the rights.

The language at the bottom of page 23 says: "Whenever a State shall acquire."

It does not say whenever a State enters into an agreement. It says: "Whenever a State shall acquire by purchase or condemnation the right to advertise or regulate advertising" it shall be entitled, and so forth.

Mr. GORE. The Senator agrees with my interpretation of the amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is what I suggested earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes, in order to permit the Senator from South Dakota to finish his statement, and then I shall ask him a question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that this is the legislative process at its best. Here we are saying, with respect to existing rights, there will not be any confiscation or restrictive acquisition of such rights, but with respect to them, if a State wishes to purchase them, we will help the State purchase them; but with respect to new rights-of-way, we will say to the State, "If you will establish this policy with respect to new rights-of-way, then we give you an additional incentive."

Mr. COTTON. May I ask the Senator if there is anything in the amendment which would prevent the State from receiving its incentive amount if and when it acquired the right to control advertising in accordance with national standards?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If a State accepts the incentive payment and applies the policy with respect to new rights-of-way, it would also be entitled to receive a share of the cost of the acquisition. The incentive is for the purpose of establishing a policy with respect to the new rights-of-way. The sharing of the cost would apply to either old or new rights-of-way, but it would not be confiscatory in any sense. It seems to me there is another point that should be mentioned in that connection, and that is with respect to the existing rights-of-way. The cost of that would be somewhat different.

In the case of new rights-of-way, the cost-sharing should not be so great, because the value of the advertising rights on new rights-of-way is not comparable with that on the old rights-of-way.

Mr. COTTON. This amendment has four virtues. First, it would not confiscate or tear down existing billboards. Second, control would be exercised on that portion of the Interstate System where it was most necessary and deserving. Third, it would reduce the cost. Fourth, it would adhere to the principle that advertising should be controlled on the portions of the highway where no advertising value existed before.

The problem has arisen only because the Federal Government has assisted the States to build new roads.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has been consumed. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. KUCHEL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After all time has been yielded back, and in anticipation of a vote, a quorum call may be had without the time for the quorum call being charged to either side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, what is the purpose of the quorum call? Does the Senator from California desire to have a vote?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes; I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum prior to the vote. I do not have in mind asking for a yea and nay vote, but I have in mind letting the roll be called for a short time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire will state it.

Mr. COTTON. If there is a quorum call, do I have the right, after the quorum call, to ask for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly. A Senator always has that right.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the time for the quorum call will not be charged to either side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, am I within my right to request that a division be had on this vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. A division has been requested.

On a division, Mr. COTTON's amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer a perfecting amendment, on page 22, line 15, immediately after the word "significance", and the period to strike out "Any" and insert in lieu thereof "Upon application of the State any."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Ohio send his amendment to the desk?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is being typewritten. I will send it to the desk in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the present language can be construed to mean that the discretionary power of excluding from the mileage that is to be covered by the nonbillboard provision lies only with the Secretary of Commerce.

My amendment makes it clear that the discretionary power shall be exercised by the Secretary of Commerce only when application therefor is made by a State.

The language of the bill now reads:

> Any such agreement may, within the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, consistent with the national policy, provide for excluding from application of the national standards segments of the Interstate System.

This language is susceptible to the interpretation that the discretion lies solely with the Secretary of Commerce, and that the individual States will have nothing to say about it. My amendment contemplates that the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce shall be exercised only when it is applied for by a State.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is adopted, the Secretary of Commerce would not be granted the discretionary authority unless the State applied for its consideration and exercise.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is exactly what the amendment contemplates and achieves.

Mr. GORE. With the adoption of the Senator's amendment, where, then, is the argument that the Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to exercise his discretion in a manner prejudicial to the State?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is that argument I am trying to obviate by the amendment. The sum and substance of the amendment is that both parties would have to concur in the program excluding certain parts of the interstate highways from the billboard provision.

Mr. GORE. Both parties would, of necessity, concur under the provisions of the bill as it is, because an agreement cannot be reached except by at least two parties. But if the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio shall

be adopted, no such discretion can be exercised as is herein proposed, except upon the application of the States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Then I accept the amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have not even seen the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I do not know whether I have the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to address a question to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator from Ohio to restate his amendment?

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 22, line 15, after "significance," strike out "Any" and insert in lieu thereof "Upon application of the State any."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. Now I wish to ask him an additional question. I respect the constitutional knowledge of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I may say that it is negligible compared with the richness of the constitutional knowledge of the Senator who is now asking me a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now we are beginning to legislate. [Laughter.] Or, Mr. President, as is said in the vernacular, now we are beginning to cook on the front burner. [Laughter.]

I should like to direct the attention of the Senator from Ohio to page 21, beginning in line 6. I believe most sincerely that there is involved in this language a clearly unconstitutional delegation of Congressional power. I now read from that part of the committee amendment:

It is hereby declared to be a national policy—

In that connection, I emphasize the phrase "national policy"—

that the erection and maintenance of outdoor-advertising signs, displays, or devices within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main-traveled way of all portions of the Interstate System should be regulated, consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary.

Here is a clear declaration that it is a national policy that the erection, maintenance, and display of such advertising signs shall be regulated.

But then the committee amendment says—

Which shall provide for:

(1) Directional or other official signs or notices that are required or authorized by law.

(2) Signs advertising the sale or lease of the property upon which they are located.

(3) Signs not larger than 500 square inches advertising activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located.

(4) Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

Does not the Senator from Ohio agree with me that the effect of this provision is, first, to declare as a national policy that the placing of billboards and signs shall be regulated, but shall be regulated "consistent with national standards" which would be prepared, not by the Congress, but by the Secretary of Commerce; and that the standards so prepared and so promulgated shall provide for the 4 things thereafter specified; but the committee amendment does not say that the standards shall provide only for those 4 things. Therefore, that section of the committee amendment would be construed by any court—and, in that connection, I refer particularly to the words "which shall"—among others—"provide for" as meaning that the Secretary of Commerce could provide for any standards he might please to provide for.

The principle of constitutional law, as I understand it, is that in delegating Congressional power the Congress must itself set up the standards by which the person who is to exercise the power shall be controlled or limited.

But in this case that principle would be reversed; in this instance, the committee amendment would give the Secretary of Commerce the power to set up the standards, and the committee amendment merely specifies that a certain four shall be included.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I believe the case has been correctly stated by the Senator from Wyoming. My understanding is that the minimal requirements which are enumerated in the committee amendment as (1), (2), (3), and (4) are mandatory; they must be included by the Secretary of Commerce in the standards he will establish.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. But he may establish others.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; in addition, he may establish standards which are consistent with the policy declared in subsection (a), which states or declares the national policy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; and the national policy is that they should be regulated. But the committee amendment does not specify how they should be regulated. The "how" is to be determined by the Secretary of Commerce; he is to be given that power.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; I think subsection (a) directs the Secretary of Commerce mandatorily to include in the regulations the matters covered in the paragraphs marked (1), (2), (3), and (4).

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree completely as to that. But this part of the committee amendment will enable the Secretary of Commerce to go much further.

I have discussed this matter with the very able and distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]; and when it is proper for me to do so, I shall offer an amendment to strike out the words "provide for," in line 13, and to insert in lieu thereof "include the following four objectives, and none other." In that way there will be a definite limitation on the power which the Congress will have delegated to the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for yielding to me.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Oklahoma controlling the time in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KERR. I do not know. Has the majority leader stated his position?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Oklahoma is in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio or is opposed to it.

Mr. KERR. I do not know; I am trying to find out what the amendment would do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement, a Senator who is to control part of the available time must first determine whether he favors or opposes the amendment then pending.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have not yet determined that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in one place the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio would strike out the word "Any." But in another place, the amendment would restore the same word.

I wish to say that I still do not understand the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. However, I can see how it could add to the confusion already existing in the minds of the sponsors of section 12 and already existing by reason of section 12 and by reason of the so-called clarifying and perfecting amendments.

Mr. President, I shall not object to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, but I certainly am of the opinion that the amendment is far from a perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, let me say that the word "Any" was proposed to be stricken out by my amendment because the word commenced with a capital letter; and my amendment proposes that the word "any" be reinserted because it comes in the middle of the sentence and must be decapitalized.

Mr. KERR. But the copy of the amendment which has been handed to me has a capital letter both for the "A" in the case of the proposal to strike out the word "Any" and in the case of the letter "A" in the word which is proposed to be inserted by means of the amendment.

Will the Senator from Ohio examine the copy I have of the amendment, and then tell me whether I am in error?

You see, Mr. President, on yesterday the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] told me that the language of the committee amendment did not mean what it says.

Mr. GORE. Oh, Mr. President, just a moment. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. Now will the Senator from Ohio tell me whether the letter "A" in his amendment is or is not capitalized?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is capitalized.

Mr. KERR. And is the copy I hold in my hand a copy of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Certainly this copy does not show the word "Any" spelled with a small letter "a." [Laughter.]

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the amendment should show the letter "a" uncapitalized.

Let me say that those whom we pay and those whom the Senator from Oklahoma and I hire are responsible for the fact that the letter "a" is shown as a capital letter, instead of a small letter or noncapital letter "a." [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, those whom we hire—although I know not whom the Senator from Ohio and I hire as "we"—may be responsible for capitalizing the letter "A" on this piece of paper. But the Members of the United States Senate will be responsible for putting it into this bill, if it is put into it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, let me ask the unanimous consent of this august body that the capital letter "A", as typed into the amendment, be changed to a small letter "a."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has a right to modify or change his own amendment, and it will be modified accordingly.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I have at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 21, to strike out lines 21 through 24, after the numeral (4), and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

> Signs erected and maintained pursuant to permission or authorization under State law, regardless of size, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Earlier today a question was asked by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] as to whether subsection (4) on page 21 of the bill was modified by subsection (3) contained on that page.

Subsection (4) recites and states that "signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section" are among the national standards which will be included in the list of standards set by the Secretary of Commerce.

The preceding section, subsection (3), states: "Signs not larger than 500 square inches." That is about the size of the placard on the easel in the rear of the Chamber.

The question was asked, with regard to subsection (4), if signs would be limited to 500 square inches. The interpretation was stated that subsection (3) did not modify subsection (4).

The purpose of my amendment is to spell that understanding out in no uncertain terms; therefore, I propose insertion of the words "regardless of size" and the elimination of the words "and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section."

It is my hope the authors of the bill who contended for that interpretation will not interpose objection to my clarifying amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the able chairman of the subcommittee desire to speak on the amendment?

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from California in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Then I am in favor of it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 3 minutes to the able Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the proposed amendment incorporating the words "regardless of size" would, in effect, prevent the Secretary of Commerce from entering into an agreement providing for regulation of billboards in conformity with the policy herein stated, "to promote the safety, convenience, and enjoyment of public travel and the free flow of interstate commerce and to protect the public investment in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways."

If the Senate desires to adopt an amendment which would be inserted in that section of the bill designed to protect the right of local interests to reasonable advertising, and thus make it mandatory that the Secretary must include in the standards, a prohibition against regulation of billboards, regardless of size, then the Senate may as well face the issue; and I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. GORE. Yes; if I have time.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield myself five minutes for the purpose of asking a question. I should like to inquire whether the Senator from Tennessee, in his judgment, thinks subsection (4), as it now reads in printed form in the bill, contains any size limitation.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator restate his question?

Mr. HRUSKA. Does subsection (4) as it is printed in the bill, have inherent in it any limitation on the size of signs which can be displayed?

Mr. GORE. Specified by footage or square inches, no; but it would authorize provision signs of the type described within the criteria of reasonableness, and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section. What are the national policy and standards of this section? They are:

> To promote the safety, convenience, and enjoyment of public travel and the free flow of interstate commerce and to protect the public investment in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska would insert therein the words "regardless of size." It would in my opinion, nullify the whole provision.

Mr. HRUSKA. The standards also include the limitation of the size of signs to not more than 500 square inches. Why does the Senator disregard that particular part of the national policy spelled out in the standards? It was stated earlier that subsection (3), which sets some of the standards, limits the size of signs to not larger than 500 square inches. We were told by the author of the bill and the Senator from California that standard does not apply to subsection (4). We were told earlier there was no size limitation in subsection (4). Is that true or is it not?

Mr. GORE. There is no specific size limitation in subparagraph (4) on page 21, but there is this provision:

> Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section.

Mr. HRUSKA. And one of the standards is 500 square inches.

Mr. GORE. May I answer the Senator further?

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes.

Mr. GORE. To the junior Senator from Tennessee that means the standards must include the provisions spelled out or stated in subsection (4), that they shall be consistent with the national policy. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska would strike that provision and state the standards must provide for signs "regardless of size." The words "regardless of size" remove reasonableness. They remove discretion. They open the gate wide, and state that the Secretary must provide in his standards for the erection of signs "regardless of size." Those are the words of his amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is exactly the wording, except that the signs would have to be approved under authorization of State law and be permitted pursuant to State law. If a State legislature saw fit to act on the matter, I think it would be just a little bit closer to the people of the State than would the Secretary of Commerce, who is not an elected officer. If it is the position of the Senator from Tennessee that he would rather trust to the wisdom of the Secretary of Commerce than rely upon the elected members of the respective

legislative bodies, I should like to be informed on that point.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator from Nebraska is asking the junior Senator from Tennessee his preference, the junior Senator from Tennessee is glad to state that he seeks reasonable regulation of billboards along the Interstate System, in conformity with the policies and standards herein provided, in preference to the provisions of the Senator's amendment, which would require the Secretary, if he issued standards, to provide for signboards "regardless of size."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the Senator is seeking to achieve a desirable result. It occurs to me that the use of the words "regardless of size" does open the door, and suggests to the States, almost, that the sky is the limit.

Has the Senator considered as an alternative striking out the two words in line 23, "and standards"? I would be obliged, I think objectively, to agree that when the words "and standards" appear in the bill they embrace subsection (3), which prescribes the size and distance for certain signs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska did consider that possibility, but unfortunately if we leave in the words about national policy, the national policy as defined on page 21 includes subparagraph (3), which limits the size of the signs of 500 square inches.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota does not agree with that interpretation. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska is entitled to his opinion.

I believe the description of signs in terms of inches or feet and distances establishes a precise standard. I think that is a standard.

Mr. HRUSKA. Very well.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think, however, that a policy as described in the words above, where the reference is made to the policy, is different. The language is:

> That the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, or devices within—

A certain distance of the highway, and so forth—

> should be regulated.

I think that is the definition of policy. That is also true of the earlier language:

> To promote the safety, convenience, and enjoyment of public travel and the free flow of interstate commerce and to protect the public investment.

I think all such language is policy. I think the standards come in primarily in subparagraph (3).

It occurred to me that the purpose which the Senator seeks to achieve, which I believe has some merit, would be accomplished by striking out of subsection (4) the words "and standards," which would still maintain the policy and give some leeway or discretion.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. On page 21, line 6, it is stated as a declaration of national policy:

> It is hereby declared to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, or devices within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main-traveled way of all portions of the Interstate System should be regulated, consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary, which shall provide for.

Then there is listed, as one of the standards, as a part of our national policy, subsection (3), with which the Senator is concerned.

In other words, subsections (1), (2), (3), and (4) are part of our national policy.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. POTTER. Even if we eliminate the words "and standards" in subsection (4), subsection (3) remains as a part of the national policy.

Mr. HRUSKA. If the Senator does not mind, since I am on limited time, will the Senators please get time from the opponents of the amendment?

Mr. President, earlier today it was stated in the Chamber by the authors of the bill that subsection (4) does not embrace the proposition of the limitation on the size of signs. The amendment which I have proposed would place that in no uncertain terms, in very understandable English. I submit again it is a meritorious amendment, in view of the interpretation placed on the subsection by the authors of the bill, and it should be adopted.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Nebraska for offering the amendment, because a little while ago, when the junior Senator from Virginia was present in the Chamber, he specifically asked the sponsors of the proposed legislation if subsection (4) were limited by the provisions of subsection (3), and he received the answer that it was not.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. It was stated that the limitation of 500 square inches contained in subsection (3) did not limit the application of subsection (4), which exempted signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. As I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska, the only thing he seeks to accomplish is to make a reality of the interpretation which the sponsors themselves have claimed for the bill. The Senator's amendment would make it clear, so that if a sign is authorized or permitted by State law, it would be exempt from the regulation. That is in accord, as I understand, with the statement of the sponsors of the bill as to what subsection (4) was calculated to accomplish.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is my intention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield some time to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California desire to yield time?

Mr. KUCHEL. Before I do, I wonder if my friend from Nebraska would join in asking for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. I now yield 3 minutes to the able Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the point on which I wish to speak is whether subsection (3) is one of the standards. I think when the Senator from Michigan read the language on page 21, when he came to the words "consistent with national standards to be prepared" and so forth, it bothered him a little bit to continue reading. Perhaps I am unfair in suggesting that.

Let me read the sentence with the emphasis which I think is pertinent in the situation:

> It is hereby declared to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, or devices within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main-traveled way of all portions of the Interstate System should be regulated, consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary, which shall provide for.

Then follows the enumeration of the national standards, or at least 3 or 4 of them.

With all due deference to whoever said subsection (4) was not modified by subsection (3), I think subsection (4) is modified by subsection (3). I think when the words "and standards" appear in subsection (4) they refer back to the standards of subsections (1), (2), and (3), which are the standards which are to be provided by the Secretary by the very language of the bill. I think that subsection (3) is a standard.

If we delete the words "and standards" then we merely have a policy and not precise standards.

Mr. HRUSKA. Therefore, I assume the Senator from South Dakota is supporting my amendment?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What is that?

Mr. HRUSKA. Therefore I assume the Senator from South Dakota is supporting my amendment?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator would be supporting the amendment if the amendment were to strike out the words "and standards", but the Senator from South Dakota finds it impossible to support the amendment if the Senator wishes to state "regardless of size" because it seems to me the Senator from Nebraska would thereby open the door so wide that the whole provision might become rather meaningless.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am happy to yield.

Mr. POTTER. The controversy concerns whether the standards mentioned (1), (2), (3), and (4) are part of the national policy. The Senator suggests we could strike out "and standards" and by so doing we would eliminate the question which the Senator from Nebraska has raised. However, in the definition of the national policy there is one sentence, and a part of the national policy is "consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary, which shall provide for."

Then there are (1), (2), (3), and (4) subsections. I say that the standards which are listed are parts of the national policy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I think the policy is that signs within a certain distance of the highway should be regulated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Does the Senator from California desire to yield additional time?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to interrogate the Senator from Nebraska. I am a little puzzled by the amendment offered by the Senator, in this regard: Will or will not the amendment permit, under subsection (4), signs of any size whatever to be set up in accordance with State provisions, still allowing the one-half of 1 percent payment?

Mr. HRUSKA. Oh, yes. All the signs which are permitted by subsections (1), (2), (3), and (4) would be permitted, and the States would still qualify for the one-half of 1 percent. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. Even using the Senator's words, without any size limitation?

Mr. HRUSKA. So long as the signs are approved by the State legislatures, or authorized by State law, that would be true. That was the interpretation which was placed upon subsection (4) by the authors of the proposal earlier today. I did not conceive that idea. I would not like to have the authors of the bill get the advantage of subsection (3) not qualifying subsection (4), and at the same time have the courts construe the law the other way around. I do not think the authors should ride 2 horses at the same time, unless there are more than 2 of them involved.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the Senator that I am in the position of the one black crow listening to the other black crow play the tin flute, when he said, "Even if it was good, I wouldn't like it."

This amendment is evidently an entrance for signs of unlimited size, and it would still make the State eligible for the one-half of 1 percent allowance.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is the contention of the authors of the bill that subsection (4) is not limited with respect to size.

Mr. FLANDERS. "Even if it was good, I wouldn't like it."

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the Senator interpret his amendment to mean that subsection (3) is practically rendered valueless? In other words, the 500 square inches would be out of the picture if the legislature wanted to make it different.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct; but there would still be the 12-mile limitation. The sign would have to advertise activities within 12 miles of the location of the sign.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to see some standards. I favor reasonable regulation of billboards, but I believe that 500 square inches is not a reasonable-sized billboard under the circumstances. For example, in my State there is one highway, a defense interstate highway, which runs from the north end of Utah to the south end of Utah, a distance of nearly 400 miles. It runs near by many small communities. Those communities would have no opportunity whatsoever to tell what they had in the various communities, unless the size of the billboard were increased.

Mr. HRUSKA. And the increase in size of the billboard will be up to the State legislature. I venture to say that the State capitol of Utah is much closer than the office of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand that; but it seems to me that what is proposed is totally inconsistent with subsection (3). I do not agree with subsection (3) as now written, but I find difficulty in going along with what the Senator says, because his amendment would eliminate any standard with respect to size. I think there should be some standard with respect to size.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. How much time remains available to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 15 minutes remaining and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has 23 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. President, during the discussion of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, allusion has been made to the intention which was expressed by the authors of this amendment with respect to subsections (3) and (4).

Last night the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I believe by actual count, answered 17 times the question as to what the intention was with respect to subsections (3) and (4).

Mr. GORE. Eighteen times.

Mr. KUCHEL. It ought to be very simple. I ask Senators to read subsections (3) and (4) on page 21.

But aside from everything else, how ridiculous it would be now to say that States may legislate on the subject of signs regardless of size. What kind of regulation is that?

What we had in mind was that we would endeavor to indicate to the States that what they did in a reasonable manner would be acceptable to a reasonable Government of the United States. How, now, can anyone justify saying "regardless of size" and writing it into a Federal law which seeks to indicate the incentive basis for State legislation?

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If a Secretary of Commerce should be so unwise as to promulgate such standards and so unwise and inconsiderate as to enter into agreements with the States in conformity therewith, the United States Government would be obligated to pay 90 percent of the cost of acquiring such advertising easements, which provision would have no effect whatever, because the signs could be erected regardless of size.

Moreover, the Federal Government would be required to pay one-half of one percent of the cost of the interstate highways throughout the States.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. I join the Senator in asking, How ridiculous can we become?

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not the opinion of the Senator from California that if this particular amendment is adopted it will reduce nearly to a nullity the very mild regulation we are attempting to bring about in cooperation with the States?

Mr. KUCHEL. There is no question about it. If we attempt in Congress to legislate in this field by saying to the States, "Regardless of the size of signs which you determine are necessary, we will approve your determination," there will be no regulation whatever. No one should be fooled.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the Senator from California another question.

As is his inalienable right as a citizen and a Member of the Senate, the Senator from Nebraska, if I am not mistaken, all during the consideration of the bill has consistently opposed any regulation or control of signboards. Is not that true, according to the recollection of the Senator from California?

Mr. KUCHEL. I thought there was a time when the Senator from Nebraska was about to come over to our side.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The point I wish to make with respect to the proposal of our good friend from Nebraska is that the proposed amendment to our very mild billboard regulation measure comes from someone who, to my knowledge, has been very adamantly opposed to the entire proposal which has been added to the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not think there is any way of interpreting this amend-

ment, with the phrase "regardless of size" in it, except as an amendment which would completely destroy our intention.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would it not be possible, under this amendment, to have the most enormous kind of so-called 24-sheet signs near the interchange, saying "Blatz beer served at tavern around the corner," or "one-half mile away," or virtually any other kind of advertising?

Mr. KUCHEL. There is no question about it. If the Congress were to say "regardless of size," that could be the result. The Federal Government would have no right to sit in judgment as to what was reasonable. A billboard might be as large as the Capitol, and nothing could be done about it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It seems to me that such a proposal would render the bill a nullity.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HRUSKA. How much time remains to the proposer of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 15 minutes left.

Mr. REVERCOMB rose.

Mr. HRUSKA. I allow myself 3 minutes, and yield to the Senator from West Virginia for a question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say to my colleague from Nebraska and to other Members of the Senate that I heard with surprise the statement that certain Senators who have discussed the bill have said that there was no relation between subsection (3) and subsection (4). With the greatest deference to any opinion which may be held by them, I very definitely disagree.

I believe the four provisions, which are a statement, to some extent, of the policy spoken of in this section, are related and must be read together. It would seem to me, and it is my understanding of the provision of subsection (3), that there is a limitation of size of 500 square inches, and when subsection (4) is read along with it, the application of the limitation of the size has to be had in any part of the use of the subsections. I believe that to be the intent. If I read them together, that would be the conclusion that I must definitely reach. Therefore, if the amendment of the able Senator from Nebraska is adopted, using the words "regardless of size," it completely negates the limitation placed upon size in subsection (3).

Mr. HRUSKA. If the authors of the bill are willing to say that subsection (3) does qualify subsection (4), I am willing to withdraw my amendment forthwith. However, I would suggest to the Senate that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is here, and the Senator who answered his query is here. If they would like to repeat their statements, I shall ask the Senate to judge for itself whether my amendment does not put the interpretation of those two subsections together.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I stated to the able Senator from Virginia that this part of the bill—and I refer to page 21, subsections (1), (2), (3), and (4)—was drafted so that the wording of the separate subdivisions would constitute an unrelated provision for the regulations which the bill contemplates would be laid down by the Secretary of Commerce, and that each subsection would stand on its own feet and refer to the additional responsibility which the Secretary would have to discharge by enumerating the standards. Under that interpretation it was easy for me to tell the Senator from Virginia that when we read No. (4) it has no relation to No. (3), and that it was to be judged separately and apart. I said that. The able Senator from Oregon gave the same opinion. I believe a reading of the language, and the fact that each one of the subdivisions is separate in paragraph form, would add to that understanding.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia accepted that explanation of the sponsors of the amendment in the bill, and he feels that the pending amendment goes far beyond that. As pointed out by the Senator from Oregon, it takes off all limitations. It applies not only to the intersections, in which the Senator from Virginia was interested, but everywhere along the line. If the State, by permission or law, puts no limitation on it, there is no limitation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. KERR. First I wish to congratulate the Senator for presenting his amendment. All it does is to implement what the sponsors of section 12 said was inherent in it. All the Senator from Nebraska is seeking to do is to exempt from regulation signs which are authorized under State law. Is that correct?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct. There has been a great deal of lipservice rendered to the idea of States interesting themselves in the regulation of billboards. All the amendment does is to give them that opportunity, pursuant to the interpretation placed upon these sections by the authors of the bill.

Mr. KERR. I wish to congratulate the Senator on the amendment. I hope it will be adopted.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from California is willing to yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have in mind suggesting the absence of a quorum, and, for the benefit of absent Senators, reserving only 1 or 2 or 3 minutes, so that the opponents and proponents of the amendment may speak very briefly before a vote is had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from California suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to ask——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time will come out of the Senator's time.

Mr. KUCHEL. I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time will not come out of the time allotted to either side.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Nebraska to agree, if the Senator from California agreed, to yield back the remainder of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator yields back his time, no unanimous consent will be required for the time taken for the rollcall. Am I to understand that the Senator from Nebraska has not yielded back his time, if the Senator from California has not yielded back his time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. I have no objection.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KUCHEL. Has my unanimous-consent request been granted that the time be not charged to either side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. 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. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, before we vote on the amendment, which goes to the very heart of the bill, I wish to make a brief plea to the members of my own party. I have been a Democrat all my life. If I am not mistaken, I am the first Democratic Senator from my State in 40 years.

Our party has been a party of conservation. I urge my fellow Democrats not to let the brand of billboards be put on our political party. I have heard it said, in the name of States rights, that we must not pass the mildest kind of bill to provide for cooperative agreements with the States to regulate signboards. Yet ours is the party which favored, and favored strongly, only recently, a measure which tells every cotton and corn farmer how many acres he can plant on his own land. Still, we are told that it is "Russia" or "Hitler" to pass the mildest kind of bill to regulate signboards along highways for which the Federal Government puts up 90 percent of the cost.

In my opinion, this is an issue which the people across the broad face of the land understand, and understand fully. The women in the garden clubs understand the issue. So do the men in the outdoor clubs and wildlife groups and Audubon societies. So do the scoutmasters and all others who love the

countryside. They understand the issue, and they understand it fully.

In this country the boys and girls in the schools are taught to sing America the Beautiful. I hope that the Democratic Party, which has produced such great conservationists as Franklin D. Roosevelt, and many others in our tradition, will not now let itself become saddled with the harness of the billboard lobby.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee, I regard this as a test vote. If the amendment should be adopted, then the Senate will be in the unusual position of authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to enter into agreements with the States, by which the States will be entitled to incentive payments, while directing that the Secretary, if he issues standards to be incorporated in those agreements, must provide for the erection of billboards "regardless of size." That is a quotation from the amendment.

Does the Senate want to place itself in the anomolous position of holding out the possibility of States receiving one-half of 1 percent of the cost of the Interstate Highway System—for doing what? For purchasing advertising easements which would permit the erection of signs regardless of size.

Of what value would be the easement the States would purchase, if there is permitted the erection of signs regardless of size? Yet that is the position the Senate will take if it votes for the amendment. I call this vote a test of whether the Senate wants to bring about reasonable regulation of outdoor advertising on the new system of interstate and defense highways "to promote the safety, convenience, and enjoyment of public travel and the free flow of interstate commerce and to protect the public investment in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways."

Two years ago the Senate passed a bill which provided that in order for the States to qualify for 90 percent reimbursement of the cost of the new system of expressways, the States must limit access to those highways. That means that although a man lives beside the highway, although he owns a farm alongside which the highway passes, although he has a business adjacent to it, he is not permitted to enter upon the highway freely. He must proceed 1, 2, 3, or 5 miles to a cloverleaf, to a point of access, where he can enter the stream of traffic under regulated conditions, with safety to himself and the stream of traffic into which he will enter.

How does it happen that we can deny to a farmer who lives beside a public highway the right to use the highway except under regulated conditions, yet be asked to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in the promulgation of standards, to provide for the erection of billboards regardless of size?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. How does it happen that the Senate, which has, in the name of safety and national defense, passed a bill to provide a system of expressways of limited access which denies to a businessman the right to the full use of the highway, but instead requires him to enter the highway under regulated conditions, will not, if it votes for the amendment, require the outdoor advertising industry to be regulated also? Regulated for what? For safety, for the free and rapid flow of traffic, for the same reasons for which we denied the farmers, homeowners, and businessmen the right of free access to the highways.

Yes, I think the Senate should pause, think, and ask itself why it would impose a limitation of access on every person who uses the highways, except possibly the outdoor advertising industry. Is that the position the Senate wants to take? It is not the position which the junior Senator from Tennessee will take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I am greatly amused at the mental agony and physical pain of the sponsors of section 12, now that they are face to face with a provision that does no more than they themselves have said was inherent in the language of section 12.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] was offended and outraged that certain provisions were referred to as being on a par with the action of Hitler and Russia. I am the one who referred to them. I was referring to the proposal to have the Federal Government take from private citizens vested property rights without paying for them.

Mr. President, where else in the civilized world are parliamentary authorities seriously considering such a legislative enactment? One would have to go to Russia or someplace like that to find where the government would wish to take from the private citizens their property rights without paying for them.

Yet the sponsors of this proposed legislation have stated on the floor of the Senate that under this proposal there would be created a situation in which the Federal Government would pay money to the States, in return for action by the States to acquire these rights, either by the right of eminent domain or by means of the police power. I submit that such a procedure would be the procedure which one would find followed only in Russia or in some country like it.

The Senator said that 2 years ago the Senate voted for a bill to limit access roads. He said that measure took from the property owners along the right-of-way the right of access by their customers and prospective purchasers. That is true. Mr. President, do you know why that was done? It was done because under the lashing whip exercised by the great Senator George of Georgia, even the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], himself, fled in terror from sponsoring this very amendment. This billboard amendment was in that bill, 2 years ago. At that time the Senator from Georgia said, "You shall not do this to the people of my State and not pay them for it."

Here is what the Senator from Tennessee said at that time, 2 years ago:

> Mr. GORE. Few bills of the magnitude of S. 1048 have ever been before the Congress. It may be that the committee has erred in including a provision which is extraneous to highway legislation. The committee was undertaking to facilitate the acquisition of lands by the States.

At that time the proposal was to purchase those rights. But now it is proposed that they be taken from the owners by means of the police power.

Then the Senator from Tennessee said:

> As chairman of the subcommittee, I have conferred with members of the subcommittee, and we are unanimous in our feeling that such a small matter as this should not in any way endanger the bill.

On that occasion, 2 years ago, he was referring to the billboard amendment.

Then the Senator from Tennessee said:

> Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oregon, without losing his right to the floor, may yield to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] to propose an amendment which I believe will be agreed to without objection.

Mr. President, what was the amendment? It was the same one that the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Nebraska, and the Senator from North Carolina are sponsoring now, namely, to strike the billboard provisions from the highway construction bill.

So, 2 years ago, that language was stricken from the bill. After it was stricken from the bill, the bill was passed. That bill did not permit the property owners along the highway to have the right to have their customers have access to their places of business before they went to the cloverleaf; but the bill did not deprive the property owners of the right to put up signs there, to tell their customers how to reach the cloverleaf and then to reach their places of business.

So 2 years ago, these Senators took steps to provide that the customers would not be able to reach the places of business along the highway without going to the cloverleaf. But then the Senator fled in terror from an amendment which would have deprived the owner of the right to erect a sign to tell the customers how to go to the cloverleaf and then to reach the owner's place of business.

But now, in the name of esthetics, whatever it may be, and however it may be spelled——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nebraska to yield 1 more minute to me.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. KERR. So, Mr. President, now, in the name of culture and esthetics, these Senators are asking the Senate of the United States to adopt the amendment which they, themselves, asked the Senate to strike out, 2 years ago.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska provides only that if a billboard is permitted or authorized by State law, it shall not be subject to the police power, the pistol-toting power, and the regulatory power of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, I think the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska should be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me some time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, whenever an amendment is offered by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], my natural impulse is to favor it. Whenever I hear the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] wave the flag, I always seek an opportunity to get right behind him in the procession and to go down the road with him.

But in this instance I think the Senate should realize what the issue is. The pending amendment would not strike the billboard provision from the committee amendment. Senators who vote for the pending amendment will not be voting to strike the billboard provision from the committee amendment. The vote which soon will be taken will be on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, which proposes that certain language of the committee amendment be changed.

Let me read the language which would be changed by means of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. It is to be found on page 21, following the provisions about permitting the Secretary of Commerce to enter into agreements with the States. I read now from page 21, beginning with line 21:

(4) Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public—

Mr. President, under that provision the Secretary of Commerce would have to insure that the agreements would provide for signs "erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public."

The agreement would have to permit such signs. If the States qualified under this provision, they would be entitled to receive an additional one-half of 1 percent of the cost of the projects covered by the agreement.

The Senator from Nebraska proposes to strike out that language, and to insert in lieu thereof a requirement that the agreement with the States permits signs to be erected and maintained pursuant to permission or authorization under State law, regardless of the size of the signs, when designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

The pending amendment would strike out the requirement that the signs not be inconsistent with the national policy. The amendment would remove that provision; and, by means of the amendment, if a State passed a law which provided for signs, regardless of size, the State could still qualify for the proposed additional payment.

Mr. President, I am not interested in the partisan aspects of this matter, and I am sorry such aspects were raised.

But I am interested in protecting the Treasury of the United States and the so-called trust fund for the construction of highways.

Are States to be entitled to receive an additional one-half of 1 percent as a result of the signing of an agreement which will leave to the States the definition of the policy and will permit them to authorize the erection of signs, regardless of their size? Why should the States be paid anything at all, in that event? Why should there be imposed on the Federal Treasury the burden of paying an additional one-half of 1 percent under such circumstances?

The cost of the program has been estimated variously at from $100 million to $200 millon, or perhaps more. I do not know what the cost will be; in any event it could amount to millions of dollars.

However, if signs, regardless of their size, are to be permitted, why should the States be paid anything? Why should they be paid the one-half of 1 percent under those circumstances? Why should there be such a sharing of the cost of purchasing these rights, if the States are to be permitted to prescribe the standards and if there is not to be a requirement that they shall be consistent with the policy of regulating billboards?

Mr. President, if Senators do not want the billboard section included in the committee amendment, let Senators vote for the amendment which will be called up later on; I refer to the amendment to strike out that entire section of the committee amendment.

But Senators who favor striking from the committee amendment the entire billboard section should not vote for an amendment which provides that the States shall be paid an additional one-half of 1 percent of $37 million, or whatever the cost may be, but does not provide standards which the States must meet or comply with, and permits the States to pass laws permitting the erection of signs, regardless of their size.

Mr. President, why should Senators vote for an amendment which would require that the States be paid something for nothing?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. I should like to reiterate the reason for the amendment being proposed by the Senator from Nebraska is the construction placed on the bill by the authors thereof, as declared a little earlier today.

On page 21 of the bill, subsection (3) provides a limitation of 500 square inches on the size of signs.

It was said earlier today that the limitation of 500 square inches provided in subsection (3) does not apply to subsection (4), notwithstanding the use, in section (4), of the language, "Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section."

The effect of that interpretation of the language is that subsection (4) has no limitation as to the size of signs.

All I want to do is simply say that in so many words. I cannot understand all the agitation about the deep implications of the language I have proposed, when all I am trying to do is put in precise and clear language what the authors of the bill themselves say is provided by the bill now.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am prepared to yield back the time remaining to me, and I do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	Martin, Iowa
Allott	Fulbright	Martin, Pa.
Anderson	Goldwater	McClellan
Barrett	Gore	McNamara
Beall	Green	Morse
Bennett	Hayden	Morton
Bible	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neuberger
Butler	Hoblitzell	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Holland	Pastore
Carlson	Hruska	Payne
Carroll	Ives	Potter
Case, N. J.	Jackson	Proxmire
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Purtell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Revercomb
Church	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Clark	Kefauver	Russell
Cooper	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kerr	Schoeppel
Curtis	Knowland	Scott
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smathers
Douglas	Langer	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lausche	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ervin	Malone	Stennis
Flanders	Mansfield	Symington

Talmadge	Watkins	Yarborough
Thurmond	Wiley	Young
Thye	Williams	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent on official business attending the Interparliamentary Conference as a delegate to the conference from the Senate.

The Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG] are officially absent attending the burial services of the late Congressman George P. Long.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the role.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent on official business attending the Interparliamentary Conference as a delegate to the conference from the Senate.

The Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG] are officially absent attending the burial services of the late Congressman George P. Long.

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If present and voting the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—31

Bennett	Holland	Russell
Butler	Hruska	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Curtis	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kerr	Stennis
Eastland	Malone	Talmadge
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Thurmond
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Yarborough
Goldwater	McClellan	Young
Hickenlooper	Mundt	
Hill	Potter	

NAYS—58

Aiken	Fulbright	Murray
Allott	Gore	Neuberger
Anderson	Green	O'Mahoney
Barrett	Hayden	Pastore
Beall	Hennings	Payne
Bible	Hoblitzell	Proxmire
Bricker	Ives	Purtell
Bush	Jackson	Revercomb
Byrd	Javits	Robertson
Carlson	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Carroll	Kennedy	Smathers
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Church	Langer	Symington
Clark	Lausche	Thye
Cooper	Magnuson	Watkins
Cotton	Mansfield	Wiley
Douglas	McNamara	Williams
Dworshak	Morse	
Flanders	Morton	

NOT VOTING—7

Bridges	Humphrey	Monroney
Capehart	Jenner	
Ellender	Long	

So Mr. HRUSKA's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to lay on the table the motion of the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, line 13, it is proposed to strike out the words "provide for" and to insert the words "include only the following four types of signs and no signs advertising illegal activities."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized. How much time does the Senator allot himself?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall allot myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The purpose of the amendment is to eliminate a clearly unconstitutional provision of the bill.

It is recognized that when Congress delegates away its power to regulate any activity within its jurisdiction, Congress must set forth the standards which are to guide the person writing the regulations.

The amendment proposed by the committee conveys to the Secretary of Commerce the power to make regulations—the power and the discretion to provide what the regulations shall be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order, so that the Senator from Wyoming can be heard.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

The amendment as reported by the committee provides only four classes of standards which are mandatory upon the Secretary. Otherwise, there is no limitation upon what the Secretary may do. It is perfectly simple to realize this is true by reading the language.

Mr. President, it may not be important to Members of Congress whether we delegate our power, but I think it is important for Members of the Senate to give attention while a matter of such great importance is being presented. It is no wonder that Congress is losing its power, when Members do not take the time to pay attention to proposals which are being made.

This is a serious argument. Let me read to the Senate the language beginning in line 6 on page 21:

> It is hereby declared to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, or devices within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main-traveled way of all portions of the Interstate System should be regulated—

And so forth. Regulated how?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order? Will the Chair request those carrying on conversations and milling about please to retire?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Attachés who are at the rear and sides of the Chamber will please retire from the Chamber in order that Senators may hear the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that this time shall not be assessed against my 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time taken by the Chair will not be assessed against the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, here is language declaring that a national policy should be adopted for the regulation of billboard signs, but it does not say how that policy is to be formed, until we reach the next phrase, which reads as follows:

> Consistent with national standards—

That sounds good, and it is fine; but who is to determine those standards?—

> to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary—

Here is a plain, clear, lucid, delegation to the Secretary of Commerce of the Congressional power to regulate signs.

The sentence continues—

> to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary, which shall provide for—

Then follow four distinct categories. If this language had been prepared in such form as to say "which shall provide for only" the four categories, that would be

a limitation upon the discretion of the Secretary. But the word "only" is not there. The Secretary may allow any other kind of category which he deems it proper to allow.

The amendment which I propose is simply an amendment which would strike out "provide for" and insert in lieu thereof "include only the following four types of signs, and no signs advertising illegal activities".

Under the language which the committee has reported, it would be perfectly possible for the Secretary to authorize the use of signs advertising illegal businesses. There is no question whatever about it.

What I ask the Senator in charge of the bill to do is to accept this amendment, which merely declares the policy of Congress to regulate for itself, and to establish the fixed standards which must guide the Secretary.

I say to the Senator from Tennessee, without the slightest reservation, that if the committee amendment goes into the bill without some such change as I am proposing, the billboard advertisers whom it is desired to control will break it down in the first test case in the Federal courts.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator from Wyoming possesses far more knowledge of constitutional law than is in the possession of the junior Senator from Tennessee. Even so, I venture to suggest that the provision to which the Senator has addressed his remarks is on all fours with a provision of the Highway Act of 1956.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is now saying to me what he said in our private discussion this afternoon. He is citing the engineering standards which have been established. I think there is no real relationship between the two, and I say to the Senator in all sincerity, in all candor, and in all earnestness, that the wise thing for him to do now is to accept this amendment and take it to conference. I have no doubt that there will be available in the conference constitutional advice far better than my own, which will prevail upon the Senator to accept the amendment and write it into the law.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. GORE. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 provides, in subsection (i) of section 108:

> The geometric and construction standards to be adopted for the Interstate System shall be those approved by the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the State highway departments.

The pending provision would authorize the Secretary of Commerce not to regulate, but to enter into agreements with States, under which agreements the States themselves would undertake to regulate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, the Senator does not mean that. The language in the bill makes it clear that the State laws must be in accordance with the policy and the standards of this section.

Mr. GORE. For what purpose?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say again to the Senator that this is a question much bigger than billboards. This is the question of the right of Congress to write the laws of the Nation.

We complain about judge-made laws. We complain about the delegation of power to the Executive. The bill would vest in the Secretary of Commerce and the underlings appointed, under civil service or otherwise, power to take over the entire administration of the law.

We should not surrender our own power. If we pretend to be the leaders of the Free World, we should be striving to preserve government by the people; and when the people's representatives give up government by the people, when they undertake to delegate away their power without writing definite and complete standards which they themselves impose, there is no question as to what will happen.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. With great deference and respect for the ability, knowledge, and erudition of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, I submit that it is my opinion that the provision constitutes a reasonable delegation of power by Congressional enactment, with specific directions that the standards to be promulgated shall provide for—

> (1) Directional or other official signs or notices that are required or authorized by law.
>
> (2) Signs advertising the sale or lease of the property upon which they are located.

And the types of signs described in subparagraphs (3) and (4).

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is idle for the Senator from Tennessee and for the Senator from Wyoming to argue this matter back and forth now. Senators are not listening or paying attention to the discussion. The Senator from Tennessee and I are talking for our own enjoyment.

Mr. GORE. Several Senators are listening.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Several Senators may be listening, but I hear conversations going on all around us.

Mr. GORE. I believe some of the conversations may be the conversations of attachés of Senators, rather than of Senators.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What I am asking the Senator to do——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield myself 2 more minutes. What I am in all sincerity asking the Senator to do is to take the amendment to conference and give it consideration there, where it can be considered with the aid of constitutional lawyers.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I say in all candor that, so far as I am concerned, I would have no objection to the amendment. However, the subcommittee desired, as I understand the action of the subcommittee, to provide for standards to be promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce which would allow, under certain conditions consistent with the national policy herein outlined, certain outdoor advertising. The adoption of the Senator's amendment would make the bill somewhat more restrictive than it is at present. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming will agree that if his amendment is adopted, the standards——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is proving my argument. All he is saying is that the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce under the committee amendment is so broad that it is broader than he knows.

Mr. GORE. That is not exactly what the junior Senator from Tennessee is saying. If the Senator will permit me to proceed for a moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am happy to do so.

Mr. GORE. I was undertaking to say that the Senator's amendment would restrict the standards so as to limit signs to the types described in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) on page 21; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is a confession by the Senator from Tennessee that the standards have not been set forth to guide the Secretary. That is precisely what I am saying.

Mr. GORE. Whether it is a confession or not, is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course it is correct.

Mr. GORE. Then the adoption of the amendment would mean that the standards which are to be the subject of agreements could not provide for commercial advertisements other than of the types and under the conditions described in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4). If the Senate desires to take such action, I certainly shall not object, but I cannot, on behalf of the subcommittee, accept the amendment, because I believe it was the intent of the subcommittee that, wherever signs could be erected so as not to impair the safety of the traffic, or mar the beauty of the landscape, or obstruct the view of some historic point, and so as to be consistent with national policy, the standards should make provision for them, under appropriate regulations. Although I am not inclined sincerely and strenuously to resist the Senator's amendment from personal conviction, I nevertheless am not in a position to accept it as chairman of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, how much do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator has allotted to himself has again expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me merely to ask a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. I yield myself 5 minutes for that purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It seems to me that the Senator from Wyoming wishes sincerely to have a bill which will withstand constitutional challenge. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Which will stand up in court; yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee where, in the section dealing with billboards, is there a limitation upon the extent to which the Secretary of Commerce may go in prescribing the standards?

Mr. GORE. The Senator will find them on page 20, in lines 23, 24, and 25, and on page 21, in the first line. The objective of the standards must be "to promote the safety, convenience, and enjoyment of public travel and the free flow of interstate commerce and to protect the public investment in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways." That is the policy upon which the regulation of commercial advertising or outdoor advertising would be based.

The committee sought to make specific provision for directional signs, for official signs, for signs advertising the sale of property erected on the property for sale, and for the advertisement of business being conducted in the general area of the signs. I submit to the able Senator that in my opinion that is a reasonable delineation and description of the authority here sought to be delegated. The distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming disagrees with that point of view. He contends that it is not sufficiently delineated to meet the constitutional test of delegation of authority. It is my opinion that it does. However, I must say that it is with humility that I match my judgment against the wonderful ability, experience, and training of the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding that the position of the Senator from Tennessee is that the provisions in subparagraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4 must be mandatorily included within the standards.

Mr. GORE. The standards must provide for subsections 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Beyond that there is a discretionary power vested in the Secretary of Commerce to adopt such standards as he may deem proper, provided he stays within the limitation set forth in lines 23, 24, and 25 on page 20, and in line 1 on page 21. That limitation is that no standards shall be adopted unless they "promote the safety, convenience, and enjoyment of public travel and the free flow of interstate commerce and protect the public investment in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways."

Mr. GORE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator believes that that limitation is adequate to circumscribe the Secretary of Commerce and keep him within a ceiling and a floor, and thus comply with the constitutional inhibition against Congress delegating legislative power to the executive branch. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is my opinion; and I have cited the precedent of the Highway Act of 1956, which likewise delegates authority for the promulgation of standards with which the States must comply in order to qualify for Federal aid in the construction of the Interstate System.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator knows how deeply interested I am in the success of his efforts to retain section (12) in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

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

Mr. GORE. The time is controlled by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Tennessee has some time in opposition, I believe.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I hope it will be possible, on the floor, to make an arrangement which will satisfy the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Tennessee, even though that is not always a very satisfactory way to operate. I am concerned about the point raised by the Senator from Wyoming. I call this to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee—by asking him to look at page 21, lines 11 and 12—"should be regulated, consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary."

I fear, as does the Senator from Wyoming, that when we tell the Secretary of Commerce to prepare national standards, we are delegating power which may be unconstitutional. That phrase limits the national standards and gives the Secretary the right to prepare and promulgate the national standards.

While I cannot say I am entirely in accord with the language proposed by the Senator from Wyoming, because I have not had an opportunity to study it carefully, I think it might be the part of wisdom to accept the amendment and take it to conference, where the whole matter can be worked out better.

The amendment, in my opinion, strengthens the bill. I know the Senator wants to see the bill strengthened. So do I. I suggest that the Senator from Tennessee accept the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming in the interest of getting a bill which will not be subject to any constitutional objection whatever.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have listened with great interest to the colloquy. I agree with the comments the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has made. It seems to me that it would be in the interest of drafting a better bill to have the Senator from Tennessee and also the Senator from Oregon consider accepting the amendment, which, as I understand, restricts the promulgation of rules by the Secretary of Commerce to the four enumerated paragraphs which are set forth on page 21, plus a recognition of the proposal to eliminate signs which advertise illegal businesses. To that extent, I suggest that the Senator from Tennessee accept the amendment.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I may say finally, and then I shall desist, that there should also be an escape clause which would protect those of us who want to give all possible flexibility to the States. Nothing the Secretary of Commerce would do pursuant to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming could be effective unless the State agreed.

So we are not really providing a stiffer and more arbitrary power, but are prescribing the standards, because the States will have to agree to them; otherwise nothing will happen. That is a helpful escape clause, which may persuade the Senator from Tennessee of the desirability of accepting the amendment.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to ask the Senator from California, who is my cosponsor, and the chairman of the subcommittee a question about the amendment.

I know it is submitted in the best of faith by the able Senator from Wyoming, whom all of us recognize and respect as a great authority on the constitutional aspects of any legal question. I know that the Senator from Wyoming is most eager to assist in developing a bill which will stand any court test to which it might be subjected.

One question I wish to ask the Senator from California and the Senator from Tennessee is this——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 5 more minutes to the Senator from Tennessee, who I understand has yielded to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I regard the opinions of my colleagues in this respect—indeed, in all respects—as being far more authoritative than mine. Is it their opinion that the proposal might put the Secretary of Commerce in too much of a straitjacket regarding the rules which he promulgates, or do they think it still will leave sufficient latitude to him so that, within reasonable administrative limits he can set forth logical rules for the protection of the roadside? That is the main question in my mind. I want my cosponsor and the chairman of the subcommittee to answer the question, because I believe it is pertinent.

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit me to answer, I think, based on my own limited experience as a lawyer, that implicit in the bill as the Senator from Oregon and I drafted it is the theory that the Secretary of Commerce in promulgating rules and regulations must be guided by the rule of reason. His discharge of his responsibilities under the national policy which is set forth would have to be in a reasonable fashion.

To the extent, however, that the Senator from Wyoming, in his proposal, recognizes the four specific fields in which regulation must be made, and, recognizing them, ties the Secretary of Commerce down to regulation in those four fields exclusively, he has, if not fettered, at least restricted the Secretary's area for regulation.

But I must say that in enumerating the four sections, the Senator from Oregon and I endeavored, with the help of the Bureau of Public Roads, to indicate the four important fields in which regulation could be met.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the conferees believe there should be more than four categories, I will have no objection. All I want is to have Congress, not the Secretary, declare what the categories are.

Mr. GORE. As chairman of the subcommittee, I find myself in a somewhat anomalous position. The subcommittee has taken a position. I have been told that all members of the subcommittee who are readily available, including the chairman of the full committee, the ranking Democrat on the committee, the ranking minority member of the committee, and all other members of the subcommittee available on the floor, save one, approve of accepting the amendment. The two coauthors of the provision suggest the acceptance of the amendment.

I suppose under those terms, because one member of the committee objects, I am hardly at liberty to accept it. I suggest that the Senate vote.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I invite the Senator's attention to the great service rendered by the Senator from Wyoming by offering his amendment. By the wording of the bill itself, by the standards set forth on page 21, subsection (a), the committee itself may have placed a limitation by referring to four categories of signs. It may be considered advisable to extend or broaden the categories. I think they ought to be broadened. That is why I think a service has been rendered by the Senator from Wyoming.

If this bill goes to conference, I would not wish to be bound by it, because I think there is a more serious question involved than that sought to be covered by the amendment. I know the junior Senator from Oregon made a statement concerning it this morning concerning the broad purposes of this bill. The language on line 5, page 22, provides that any such agreement shall include provisions for the regulation and control of the four categories of signs. I think that provision should be broadened and not restricted but may be unintentionally restricted in the bill.

In line 9, the language reads, "may include, among other things, provisions for preservation of natural beauty, prevention of erosion, landscaping, reforestation," and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Colorado recommend that the amendment to be taken to conference?

Mr. CARROLL. I suggest that the Senator from Tennessee take the amendment to conference. The Senator from Wyoming, has rendered a splendid service, and we have the debate in the RECORD. I do not want to tie the hands of the committee. There may be difficulty in the conference with the House, but at least I think it is necessary to broaden the standards to protect what the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Oregon really want as standards in the bill. That is what I understand the Senator from Wyoming has been trying to do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield, in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from Wyoming?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Tennessee said that lines 23 to 25, on page 20, and line 1 on page 21 provide definite limitations on the discretionary power of the Secretary of Commerce to adopt and promulgate rules and regulations. Will the Senator from Wyoming state his opinion of that statement by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, one can interpret language only after reading it.

Beginning in line 23, on page 20, the committee amendment now reads as follows:

> (a) National policy: To promote the safety, convenience, and enjoyment of public travel and the free flow of interstate commerce and to protect the public investment in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, it is hereby declared to be in the public interest to encourage and assist the States to control the use of and to improve areas adjacent to the Interstate System by controlling the erection and mainenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices adjacent to that system.

That is merely a declaration that it is in the public interest to control the erection and maintenance of signs. Of course it is a limitation, but it is merely a declaration that it is in the interest of the public to promote safety, and so forth, by controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Wyoming has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then we find the following:

> It is hereby declared to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, or devices within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the maintraveled way of all portions of the Interstate System should be regulated.

That is merely a restatement of the first sentence.

Then, following the word "regulated," there is a comma; and then, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has already pointed out, there appears the word "consistent." Consistent with what, Mr. President? "Consistent with"—and now I read further from page 21—"national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary."

I say that under the Constitution the Congress must provide the standards.

So I ask that the amendment be accepted. Then let the House pass on it as it may please; and thereafter let the conference committee handle it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; indeed.

Mr. GORE. Still another member of the committee has indicated his willingness to accept the amendment. Under the circumstances, I believe I would be reasonably entitled to exercise the discretion of accepting the amendment and subsequently taking it to conference; and I shall do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the amendment must be voted on by the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee may be permitted to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I submit the following amendment:

On page 21, in line 18, strike out "500" and insert in lieu thereof "3,000."

As thus amended, paragraph (3), on page 21, would read as follows:

> (3) Signs not larger than 3,000 square inches advertising activities being conducted at a location within twelve miles of the point at which such signs are located.

Mr. President, I submit that amendment for the very practical reason——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Utah yield to himself?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, there is displayed in the rear of the Chamber a sample of a sign 500 square inches in size. It is apparent that the distance of that sample from the desks of Senators is nowhere near the distance that signs along the right-of-way would be located from passing motorists. Under the circumstances, a sign so small would constitute a definite traffic hazard, if motorists driving their automobiles at 60 miles an hour were to attempt to read a sign of that size. In fact, even at a speed of 30 miles an hour, it would be hazardous for a motorist to attempt to read a sign of that size. In short, such a sign would be both dangerous and useless. Even though a sign of that size might carry an advertisement to the effect that a motel was located a certain number of miles away, the average motorist would either be unable to read the sign, or else he would have to slow down so much, in order to be able to read it, that a traffic hazard would be created.

Mr. President, we must keep in mind that the Interstate Highway System will in many cases traverse territory made up of many small communities. In my State, United States Route 91, an interstate highway, traverses the full length of the State of Utah, from north to south, a distance of nearly 400 miles. There are only 2 or 3 cities of any size along that highway. All the people living in those towns would be bypassed by the Interstate System. They would like to be able to erect signboards of sufficient size to advertise the facilities located within the 12-mile zone, in order that those who travel on the road would be able to read the signs.

I believe there should be regulation of billboards along the highways; I do not favor unrestricted placing of billboards, and I do not believe that a reasonable restriction would take away the rights of the property owners without due process of law.

But in providing or imposing these limitations with respect to billboards, we are much in the same position as the one the cities and towns and country districts were in when they imposed zoning ordinances. However, those ordinances have been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

But if we are to be reasonable and practical, I believe this amendment should be adopted.

Those of us who have had experience in driving automobiles on such highways—and who has not had that experience?—know that we cannot rely, as has been stated, on having places for the erection of billboards provided at the interchanges. Even if such places were provided, parking spaces would be required in order that motorists might stop long enough to read the billboards. Thus, a great deal more land would be required or else the traffic at those points would be greatly slowed down and jammed up. In other words, such an arrangement would not be practical or workable.

But, Mr. President, this amendment will be practical and workable, and it will make for far better feeling by the people of the small towns.

I have talked to the people of my State. I know that some of them want an unrestricted right to erect and maintain billboards of any kind along these highways. I am not in accord with those views. Instead, I believe there should be regulations; but I believe the regulations should be reasonable and sensible.

I believe that this amendment will remove much of the objection that has been raised to the proposal of the subcommittee—in other words, if the requirement is changed from 500 square inches to 3,000 square inches. Three thousand square inches would permit the erection of a sign approximately 30 inches high and 100 inches long. That would not be very much of a billboard, but it would be definitely better than the one now displayed in the rear of the Senate Chamber. This amendment would not permit the erection or maintenance of the very large billboards which have been objected to so strongly by the proponents of the billboard provisions.

Mr. President, I hope the subcommittee will accept this amendment.

I wish to say that I desire to support the bill; but I am in the same position that a large number of the other Members of the Senate are in, namely, we are faced with the objection of citizens who do not wish to have any billboards at all erected along the highways. Yet in our States there are many citizens who want no restrictions imposed in regard to the erection and maintenance of billboards.

The committee claims that the committee amendment constitutes a mild bill to regulate the erection and maintenance of billboards.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Utah is aware that the chairman of a subcommittee——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Utah has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Utah is aware that the chairman of a subcommittee is in a very real sense the servant of the subcommittee. Unless a poll were taken of the members of the subcommittee, and unless the poll indicated their acceptance of the amendment, I would not be in a position to accept it.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me ask how the Senator from Tennessee personally feels about the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Frankly, I see no necessity either for the 500 figure, or for the 3,000 figure which the Senator from Utah now proposes.

It is my view that subparagraph (4) is sufficient to accomplish the purposes the able Senator from Utah has in mind.

I agree that the Senator from Oklahoma has demonstrated the futility and uselessness, at such distances, of signs of the size of the one now displayed in the rear of the Senate Chamber.

I am not sure a sign 4 feet by 6 feet would be very much better. It is my sincere belief that subparagraph (4) will permit local interests adequately to advertise their facilities, property, and wares, and that neither the 500-square-inch figure nor the 3,000-square-inch figure, which he suggests, is necessary.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator feel we ought to strike out subsection (3)? What is its purpose?

Mr. GORE. I voted against including that subsection in the bill. I think the Senator from Oklahoma has demonstrated its lack of utility. It has no utility. It has no utility for traffic going 75 miles an hour. When a sign is only 500 inches square and is 200 feet away, it is utterly indiscernible.

Mr. WATKINS. I agree that it is utterly indiscernible, but if the sign were six times larger—and that is what my proposal would mean in effect—one might possibly read it and the sign might be of some service. The way the language is now, it is useless. If the Senator is not going to accept the amendment, he ought to strike out subsection (3).

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

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I want to remind the Senator, as I am sure he knows, the Senator from California and the Senator from Oregon opposed subsection (3). I know the Senator from Utah is one of the most conscientious Members of this body. I would like to make an alternative proposal, although I am not authorized to do so by any of my colleagues. What would he think of authorizing signs up to 3,000 square inches, but cutting the distance down to 6 miles, which would at least greatly diminish the number of signs along the right-of-way of the highways?

Mr. WATKINS. I have had some experience with traveling on limited access highways. When one travels with his family, and is trying to decide where he will stop, if he is going 60 miles an hour, he does not have much time to make a decision. If the distance were cut down to 6 miles, it would not give anyone time to decide whether to stop at a certain town or the next one. I think the small communities are entitled to some consideration. I feel very strongly about it.

I generally support the policies of the bill. I want to see an accelerated program. I supported the Highway Act of 1956. I think it was a good act. I think we have to use a little common sense in connection with the provisions. Personally, I would like to see in the bill an amendment which would fix the standards somewhat, but not to the point where the signs would be absolutely useless. I feel the provision now in the bill is a useless one. I refer to the particular subsection relating to the size of billboards along the roadway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The able Senator from Utah has described his interest in sponsoring the amendment as one to help other reasonable and sensible regulatory legislation by the States.

Mr. WATKINS. We are prescribing standards. Language in the bill must mean something. There is a need for some limitation. At least it should be pointed out to the States what they have to do if they are to get the extra percentage of funds.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator opposed an amendment which was offered to subsection (4), which would have provided that States could have billboards erected along the roads regardless of size.

Mr. WATKINS. That amendment in effect would have left us without any regulation as to billboards.

Mr. KUCHEL. I agree with the Senator. The Senator from Utah having voted against that amendment, we still have subsection (4).

Mr. WATKINS. Which seems to be inconsistent with subsection (3).

Mr. KUCHEL. While I have told the Senator privately, and while I have said publicly, what the intention was on the part of the authors, I respect the Senator's apprehension. Is there anything the Senator can suggest as an amendment to subsection (4) which would, to his mind, unequivocally give to the States, on a reasonable basis, the right to authorize signs in the interest of the traveling public?

Mr. WATKINS. I do not see how that can be done without practically adopting the language proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and I voted against that amendment, because I want some regulation.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator believe that by specifically giving to the States the right to regulate, without regard to size, it is impossible for us to lay down a guideline which provides for smaller signs?

Mr. WATKINS. I remember the colloquy on the point very well. I think the point was well taken. The admission had been made earlier that subsection (4) was not limited in any way by subsection (3). Yet, when one reads the language, the colloquy that subsequently occurred demonstrated clearly to my mind that the provision was limited by subsection (3). If that is the fact, I think it is ridiculous.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is not the fact in my opinion, although it apparently is the fact in the opinion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I did not want to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery, but I am forced to come to that conclusion. My logic may not be very sound, but that is the way it occurs to me. I have had to use whatever thinking powers I have had to get along over the years. I think most persons would interpret that section as one that placed a limitation on State legislatures. If it can be construed in that way, we ought to change it, because it is nonsensical as it appears in the bill.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I know the Senator from Utah is concerned about roadside businesses that cater to the traveling public.

Mr. WATKINS. There are interchanges on the limited-access highways. One cannot go into towns on the side of the highways without first coming to an interchange. The interchanges are very limited. Before a tourist reaches an interchange, he would like to know what the town he is coming to has to offer, and perhaps he would like to have a line on what kind of motel or restaurant or other services are there—not merely a service station, but perhaps a garage where his car can be repaired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. Bertram Tallamy apparently is a very able highway administrator. He was appointed by President Eisenhower. I should like to remind my good friend from Utah that during the testimony last year on this general policy——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. May we have 1 more minute?

Mr. WATKINS. Can the Senator get some time from the other side? I should like to have a few minutes for rebuttal.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Will the Senator from California yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I was about to propound a parliamentary inquiry as to who had control of the time.

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall oppose this amendment, too.

Mr. KERR. Then the Senator from California has control of the time in opposition.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WATKINS. I think as the amendment is now worded it is utter nonsense. It is completely ridiculous. We have two interpretations of what subsection (4) means. With that kind of record before any court, or an official who had to write regulations, I think we would have trouble.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it not true that those who disagree with the language used by the authors agree at least with the intention?

Mr. WATKINS. When the language is brought to the attention of Senators, it seems to me they would try to make the language conform with the intention.

Mr. KUCHEL. It does.

Mr. WATKINS. It seems to be contradictory.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it not true that the Senator understands the intention of the junior Senator from California in the words uttered to describe what the authors of the bill intended? The Senator from Utah agrees with the intention, does he not?

Mr. WATKINS. I am in support of the intention, and that is exactly what I am trying to have made clear.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is where the difference of opinion takes place, since the authors say the language does accomplish the intention. The intention of all is the same.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me ask the Senator: Does subsection (3) place any restriction whatever on subsection (4)?

Mr. KUCHEL. No, sir. In my opinion, in the opinion of the Senator from Oregon, who coauthored it, and in the opinion of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, it does not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Simply to keep the record straight, I do not agree with that. I think subsection (4) is modified by subsection (3).

Mr. WATKINS. That is my judgment, after listening to the debate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. We are speaking on somebody else's time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The language which appears between lines 6 and 13 sets forth the policy that advertising should be regulated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield two more minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator.

The language reads, "should be regulated consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary, which shall provide for."

Then there are listed four items. Instead of the words "provide for" we might as well use the word "include." Then the language would read, "consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary, which shall include."

And then list the subsections (1), (2), and (3).

Therefore, in subsection (4), when there is a reference to standards, it would be a reference to the things preceding, which must be included in the agreement.

Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KERR, and Mr. KUCHEL addressed the Chair.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield first to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. The rule I have always followed is to take into consideration all the matters which have gone before.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the national standards are enumerated.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The Senator was present in the Chamber a while ago——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 2 more minutes.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from South Dakota was present when the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] offered an amendment which further fortified the position the Senator from Utah takes and the Senator from South Dakota takes. The language has now been amended to include the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to ask the Senator from South Dakota if, when he offered in the committee the amendment to provide an area of 500 square inches, he intended that provision to be applied to subsection (4)?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know that now I could go back and honestly say that I had subsection (4) in mind before offering the provision of subsection (3).

I believe, however, that a reasonable construction shows that subsection (3) is one of the standards which must be included.

Let me say further that personally I think 500 square inches is too small. I think there have been argumnts presented to indicate that the selection of 500 inches was arbitrary. Somebody suggested 300 square inches, and I thought that was too small an area. Five hundred square inches may not be the proper size. I personally think that 3,000 square inches is too large.

If some reasonable figure could be devised, I think it would be desirable to take the question to conference.

After all, subsection (3) deals only with businesses and activities conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point where the sign is located. We were seeking to make it possible for a small town, which might otherwise be bypassed, a small town where there was a motel or something else on the route, perhaps 5 or 6 or even 12 miles away, to be able to say somewhere along the interstate highway, "Here we are over this way. Don't forget us." Or, when a tourist traveled by one town, to have a sign say, "Here we are down the road 12 miles." That is what we tried to do.

Mr. KUCHEL. On the point of intention, I think we can make a record which will demonstrate to everyone what was intended, so that everyone can recognize the intention.

Did the Senator from South Dakota intend, in offering the amendment providing 500 square inches, to make it apply to subsections (1) or (2)?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was intended to apply in particular to the activities I have mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 2 more minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To the advertising activities which are conducted within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located. I was thinking primarily of those things, I believe.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure the Senator was, when he offered the amendment, and I am sure the committee adopted the amendment with no desire or intention to make the 500-square-inch restriction apply to subsections (1), (2), or (4).

Thus, regardless of what anyone might argue with respect to the verbiage, I think it can be contended pretty generally in any court in the land what the intention was when the Senate acted.

Mr. WATKINS. Why do we not make it so clear as to render it unnecessary to go to court for an interpretation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The practical thing seems to be to agree upon what space would allow a reasonable identification of the activities by those driving on the highway.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand the situation, it seems to be clear that at least the proponents of the amended bill did not have any intention to hold the size down to 500 square inches.

Mr. KUCHEL. If I may interrupt, I would say that is true with respect to the one subsection. Does the Senator disagree with that?

Mr. WATKINS. If that stands alone, what does it mean?

Mr. KUCHEL. It means what it says.

Mr. WATKINS. It must be interpreted in the light of the whole section and in the light of the whole bill, as a matter of fact. If we have something so indefinite as that, which can cause so much argument now among those who should understand the law—at least, they have been admitted to the practice of law—what will happen when it gets into the hands of someone who is not a lawyer who is trying to write a regulation? We ought to clear it up now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I was talking on somebody else's time. I yield myself 2 minutes more.

We ought to clear it up now, when we have the opportunity. Nobody has argued that the sign over at the side of the Chamber, of 500 square inches, is sufficient. One might as well have a sign the size of a postage stamp, as that.

Mr. NEUBERGER. May I make a suggestion to the distinguished Senator from Utah and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota? It seems to me there is something of a valid point in the fact that a sign of 500 square inches is extremely small for the purpose of being seen as one goes by in a modern automobile on a high-speed express highway. What I am afraid of, when we are considering the distance of 12 miles, is that in many States—particularly in the Eastern States, but even in some western States such as California and Washington—we will have a constant picket fence of signs, because the 12 miles between towns will overlap and overlap.

Mr. WATKINS. We will have many little pickets which will not mean anything. We will see a continuous string of them. The question will be asked, "Is that a picket fence or a bunch of billboards?"

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am not authorized to speak for anybody else, but what would my good friends think of a little larger sign with some limitation as to the number of signs?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For any single activity?

Mr. NEUBERGER. At least to a certain extent.

Mr. WATKINS. I would accept the amendment and take it to conference, and then let the conferees write a better provision.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me complete my thought. Somebody may have a motel or a restaurant or a wayside business. He may undertake to put up a whole "Burma Shave" row of signs to advertise his one place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Will the Senator yield me an additional minute or two?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I cannot speak for the able Senator from California or the able Senator from Tennessee. What would the Senator think of modifying the provision with respect to the size of the sign, but restricting the number of signs any one establishment could put up, so that some person would not undertake to have a "Burma Shave" row of pickets?

Mr. WATKINS. I would accept anything of that kind, but I think a sign should be large enough to convey some kind of a message, rather than to have a whole string of small signs for miles and miles in an effort to say something. Size will determine whether the advertiser is to have 1 sign to do the job, or a string of them—perhaps 50—to tell the story.

Mr. GORE. The sign would have an area of 3,000 square inches.

Mr. WATKINS. It would be less than 30 inches wide.

Mr. GORE. It could be a sign 2 feet wide and 10 feet long, advertising an activity being conducted within 12 miles of the sign. Would it not be possible, then, to have a sign 2 feet wide and 10 feet long, showing, in large letters, the name "Colgate," and, in smaller letters, "for sale 10 miles east"?

Mr. WATKINS. How about motels, restaurants, and garages, which would be of great interest to the traveler?

Mr. GORE. When the Senator talked with me I gave him my candid opinion that the entire subparagraph (3) ought to be out of the bill, because, in my opinion, subparagraph (4) would adequately take care of the privileges which the subcommittee wished to preserve for the local interest. I join the Senator thoroughly and wholeheartedly in wishing to preserve such privileges, but I doubt whether his amendment would do it, or whether subparagraph (3) would do it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Personally, I think "activities," properly interpreted, would mean something which is manufactured or produced, or an operation which is carried on within the prescribed distance. I do not think the "Colgate" illustration would be applica-

ble, unless Colgate had a plant within the 12 miles, which would be an activity. I believe that a drugstore or a motel would be an activity, but I do not believe general advertising of a product would be an activity.

I was about to suggest that possibly we could start the subsection with "not to exceed 4 signs," whatever the size might be, "advertising an activity being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located."

That might be something to work on.

Mr. WATKINS. Would the Senator not allow an advertiser to place the four signs together, but require him to string them out?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. He would not want to put them together. He would put 2 down the road east of him and 2 down the road west of him.

Mr. WATKINS. If the small sign does not tell the story, he would rather have it all in one sign which would tell something.

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator from Utah has offered his amendment, because it helps to point up the extremely fuzzy nature of this particular section of the bill.

I wish to speak very briefly as to what we are talking about. We are not talking about signs along the road itself, but signs off the right-of-way, and between the edge of the right-of-way and a point 660 feet farther back, away from the road. We are talking in all, about a strip of land a quarter of a mile wide, plus the width of the right-of-way.

It seems to me that, considering the 4 subsections to which reference has been made, only 1 of them is reasonably specific, and that is the second—

(2) Signs advertising the sale or lease of the property upon which they are located.

There is no effort to limit the size of such a sign. So far as this provision of the bill is concerned, the sign could be of any size whatever which the owner of the property wished to use. As to these signs, we are talking about signs on a strip of land one-eighth of a mile wide on each side of the highway.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The signs would not be together.

Mr. HOLLAND. We are talking, in all, about 2 strips of land which, together, comprise a width of 1,320 feet, or a quarter of a mile, plus the width of the right of way which lies between them.

The first subsection reads as follows:

1. Directional or other official signs or notices that are required or authorized by law.

I do not know what the law in other States is, but the law in my State with reference to directional signs has to do with signs placed at the side of the road, on the right-of-way, not 100 or 125 feet or more from the place where a motorist is driving.

I have just talked with the head of the road department staff in my State, and he tells me that the minimum width of the right-of-way for Interstate System projects is 250 feet outside of cities. We are not talking in this section about directional or other official signs or notices required by law to be shown outside the right-of-way. I do not know anything about any such signs. Under the law in my State, subsection 1 would mean absolutely nothing; and I suspect it would mean absolutely nothing under the laws of any other State.

The third category is:

3. Signs not larger than 500 square inches advertising activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located.

Such a sign would be just about the size of the top of a Senator's desk. These desks are about 20 by 25 inches. The Senator from Utah is exactly correct in stating that a person driving at a customary speed on an interstate highway, with the signs required to be back of the edge of the right-of-way 100 feet or more away from him, could not any more distinguish any useful message on a sign of that size than he could count fence posts as he traveled along at that distance. This provision points up to me the complete absurdity of this whole section of the bill.

The fourth category is even worse:

4. Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

I make two references to that language. First, what is the size limit? The Senate has just turned down a helpful amendment which would have placed a size limitation by adopting the meaning of the State law as to size. So there is in this bill no size limitation whatsoever under subsection (4), which means that, after all, we are delegating to someone, not the writers of the bill, the duty of saying what is to be the size of the signs which shall be permitted, unless, indeed, there is to be no limitation of size whatever.

The legislative record will show that we have turned down, by a record vote of the Senate, a provision which sought to regulate the sizes in accordance with established State laws.

I believe that the last point which I have to make shows up the most absurd provision in the entire section. The closing words of category No. 4 are:

Signs * * * designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

Who is to determine what signs are designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public? Who is to determine what the traveling public wishes to know? Who is to be the censor? Who is to determine what the traveling public shall be allowed to see?

It seems to me that all four of these subsections, except only No. 2, are just as fuzzy as it is possible to make legislative language.

And subsection (2), I believe, is completely unacceptable from the standpoint of the authors of the bill, if they have any desire to keep down the size of signs.

Subsection (2) provides that the owner of land, if he desires to sell or lease it, may erect a sign as large as he wishes on the land, indicating to the traveling public, in such a way that they cannot possibly miss it, that he wishes to sell or lease the land.

I think I know what my distinguished friends are trying to do by this bill. I participated in a successful effort to do the same thing on the State level under the laws of Florida in 1941, when I happened to be Governor of that State. A proposed law was carefully drafted in cooperation with the garden clubs of the State. It was passed by the legislature and approved by the Governor. That law is still operative. It has never been amended. It is a success. Unfortunately, its operation would be sadly impeded by the law proposed here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I find myself in exactly the same position as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who finds that, if we should enact the proposed legislation, we would be passing a law which would interfere with the operation of a law of his State which has existed for 37 years—a time-tested and thoroughly acceptable law of his own State in this field.

So far as I am concerned, I would certainly be doing that same thing with reference to a Florida law passed in 1941, and not amended since that time, which was worked out around a table with three very distinguished ladies from the garden clubs of our State representing their membership throughout the State. I cannot and will not participate in disrupting the useful operations under that law.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I wonder whether the Senator from Utah would consider this type of sentence as an amendment to subsection (3). I suggest for his consideration a new sentence at the end of subsection (3) as it is presently in the bill, the sentence to read like this:

The provision in this subsection respecting the size of signs shall not apply to the signs provided for in subsections (1), (2), or (4).

Mr. WATKINS. What is the purpose of having subsection (3) in the bill at all? The Senator's amendment would completely disregard the provisions of that subsection.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was the author of that amendment in committee. I opposed it. I was overridden. It is in the bill now. I am trying to get a bill passed. At least if the Senator would consider a sentence which would make it crystal clear that the 500-inch provision would not control the right of a State to

exercise any reasonable judgment under subsection (4), I believe it might satisfy some Senators.

Mr. WATKINS. It would allow any size sign. The limitation of the 500 square inches would not mean anything. I do not follow the logic of insisting in one breath that the subsection stay in the bill and then in the next breath say that the subsection be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, actually, the Senator from South Dakota was not promoting subsection (3). I believe that language was proposed in lieu of the description contained in the original billboard proposal. The proposal in the draft of the bill suggested by the Senator from California and the Senator from Oregon originally read as follows:

3. Signs advertising activities being conducted upon the property upon which such signs are located.

The junior Senator from South Dakota thought it was too limited and that it would do no good to the town or the motel which was being bypassed. I thought the sign would have to be immediately adjacent to the right-of-way to be of any benefit. The Senator from South Dakota was seeking to make it applicable to activities which were within 12 miles of where the sign was located, to take care of bypassed communities or motels.

Mr. WATKINS. I believe the Senator's objective was a worthy one. I disagree with the number of square inches allowed. I think it was wise to place some kind of limitation on the size of the signs which would bind State legislatures which wanted to take the extra money from the United States in the building of the highways. I think it is wise to prescribe some kind of limitation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason for entirely eliminating subsection (3) and leaving only subsection (4), I assume, would be to permit signs within a reasonable distance of the highway, only in the interest of the traveling public, and not necessarily in the interest of activities which had been bypassed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from Utah have additional time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has 5 minutes and the Senator from California has 15 minutes.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to reserve my time in order to answer some further questions later.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Will the Senator from California yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Utah is offering an amendment limiting the size to 3,000 square inches. That would be a sign of about 3 by 7 feet.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would be larger than that.

Mr. WATKINS. It would be 30 by 100 inches.

Mr. KERR. Thirty inches is less than 3 feet. I said about 3 by 7 feet.

Mr. WATKINS. We will not argue the arithmetic of it.

Mr. KERR. I wanted the Senator to realize how small 3,000 square inches would be.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to make it 5,000 square inches.

Mr. KERR. Three thousand square inches would allow for 14 letters, each one 12 inches high, and that is all.

Mr. WATKINS. I am not prepared to analyze the Senator's figures. I know that it is at least six times as large as the sign the Senator has displayed in the Chamber.

Mr. KERR. I believe the Senator is going in the right direction. I heard him speak about reducing it below 3,000 inches.

Mr. WATKINS. I am not in favor of that.

Mr. KERR. I merely wanted him to know that if it is 3,000 square inches in size, the sign would permit only 14 letters, each one of which would be 12 inches high.

Mr. WATKINS. A sign 30 inches wide and 100 inches high, or vice versa, would be of some use. I would not put up a sign like the one the Senator from Oklahoma has displayed in the Chamber.

Mr. KERR. I would not put one up like that either. I brought it to the Senate floor only to show the ridiculousness of the provision in subsection (3).

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator has rendered a service, because no one had objected to subsection (3). I believe there should be some limitation placed on the size of the signs. Let us make it a reasonable one. If 3,000 square inches is not a reasonable one, the conferees can work out a reasonable one.

I should like to see some limitation written into the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. WATKINS. I have only a few minutes remaining. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr President, I feel I must express myself on this subject. I favor some limitation on the size of the signs. I speak from practical experience. I have driven an average of between 30,000 and 35,000 miles a year for the past 15 years. As I look at the sign displayed in the Chamber, which is supposed to be a sign 500 square inches, I must say that to try to read such a sign while traveling at 60 miles an hour will create a very great traffic hazard. I support the proposal of the Senator from Utah, which I believe is wholly reasonable. I believe a sign of the size proposed by the Senator from Utah will cause far fewer traffic fatalities among people who try to read signs while driving along a highway. The sign displayed by the Senator from Oklahoma is too small to do any good.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has 5 minutes remaining. The Senator from California has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time may not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California object?

Mr. KUCHEL. No; I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WATKINS. 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. WATKINS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I have had some discussion with the committee members who are supporting the bill. I am willing to amend my amendment so as to make it read "signs not larger than 24 square feet," instead of "3,000 square inches."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. I am ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. WATKINS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment, unless it will be accepted. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. WATKINS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah. A division has been requested.

On a division, the amendment of Mr. WATKINS was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, line 18, it is proposed to strike out "not larger than 500 square inches."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I trust the amendment will be agreed to. It restores the language to the form in which it was offered in the committee by the Senator from California and the Senator

from Oregon. I have in my hand a mimeographed copy of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 30 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield myself 5 minutes. I had hoped that the Senators who were sponsoring the bill would have recognized the situation and would have accepted the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah. Now I ask them to accept the language which they offered in committee.

I propose to strike out of the language the size limitation, which was placed in the bill in committee, and I am reverting to the original language which the Senators offered in the committee. I hope they will accept it.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I suggest that the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, consider what the Senator from South Dakota has just suggested. It seems to me to be an excellent amendment. I urge him to accept it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The amendment will limit the signs to advertising activities being conducted within a distance of 12 miles, which is the language that was offered in committee by the sponsors of the original bill.

I am certain that it is not desired to discriminate against motels or communities which are a few miles away from a highway, and to limit the advertising only to those who are immediately on the new highway.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator read the language that will then appear in this bill, if it is so amended?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Subsection (3), page 21, line 18, would then read:

> Signs advertising activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located.

We did have a limitation on the size of the signs. But if the sponsors of the general section do not want a limitation on the size of the signs, let us return to the open-end matter as to size, which they proposed in the original language.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to ask the able Senator from South Dakota whether he interprets his amendment to mean that under the regulations which the Secretary of Commerce would adopt and in the agreement between the State and the Federal Government, the actual size of such signs under paragraph (3) would be pursuant to State law and in accordance with the agreement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would think so—and consistent with the policy and the standards declared.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when the Senator from South Dakota presented his amendment—perhaps I did not correctly understand what he said, because of the confusion which then existed on the floor—I understood him to say it was in the form in which the Senator from California and the Senator from Oregon originally presented it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I modified that by a subsequent statement. I pointed out that it was in the form in which those Senators presented it, insofar as the limitation on size was concerned, but that I would preserve the right of businesses which were bypassed and were off the right-of-way to have the same right as those which happened to be immediately on the right-of-way.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, the Senator from South Dakota would add a provision that businesses within a distance of 12 miles would have the privilege of having signs erected along the Interstate Highway System; is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, because I believe that when a motorist who travels on the Interstate System reaches one town, he should be able to determine what facilities are available in the next town, about 12 miles, or 10 minutes, away.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am not as familiar with road construction as is the Senator from South Dakota; I often marvel at his vast knowledge of the subject. But is it not true that on the Interstate System there are very few stretches where interchanges or cloverleafs or turnoffs are more than, let us say, 24 miles apart? I am thinking of the Interstate System which already has been constructed and the standards which have been established by the Bureau of Public Roads and by my own State. If my memory of the conditions in my own State is accurate, I know of very few stretches, if any, in Oregon—which is a State of vast distances—where the cloverleafs or interchanges are more than 24 miles apart, if they are actually that far apart.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think most of them are closer together than that.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Then this amendment would mean that any establishment located within 12 miles of the Interstate System would have that right; is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that if a motel or a community is bypassed, it should have the right to advertise, by means of a sign, that its location is "just over the hill" or "down the road" just a few miles, or something of that sort. That is what we are endeavoring to provide for.

I thought the Senator from Utah offered a reasonable amendment. But apparently those who are interested in having the bill enacted into law wanted to deprive the communities which are off the highways of an opportunity equal to that of those that happen to be located directly on the highways. The injustice occurs particularly when the route is changed, and when some are bypassed as a result of the selection of the new route.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Again, I certainly cannot speak for my cosponsor or for the Senator from Tennessee. But I believe this amendment opens a very large loophole for the construction of signs.

Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has just called my attention to something which the Senator from South Dakota and I have discussed earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from South Dakota something I was discussing a moment ago in private with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], namely, the possibility that this entire situation would open the way to very extensive brand advertising, although I recognize that the amendment reads, in part, "activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located."

Yet I also realize that an "activity" could be the sale of a certain kind or brand of beer, gasoline, toothpaste, or liquor at such a point; and I realize that, under those circumstances, the name of the brand might be advertised on the signs in letters very much larger—in fact, virtually unlimited in size—than the letters used to advertise or describe the location of the particular establishment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, first, let me say that the word "activities" did not originate with me; it was in the original language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes; and I intend to modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I modify my amendment, as follows:

On page 21, strike out lines 18, 19, and 20, as they appear in the committee amendment, and insert in lieu thereof:

> (3) Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State laws and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, advertising activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Then this amendment would preserve, for persons who engage in activities in the vicinity of the location of such signs the right to erect signs "not inconsistent with national policy and standards of this section," and "maintained pursuant to authorization in State law", would it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Dakota send the modified amendment to the desk?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the amendment; and I yield back the remainder of the time at my disposal.

Mr. KERR. Let me ask whether the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is in favor of the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I so understand.

Mr. KERR. Then I do not think the junior Senator from California can yield back the remainder of the time available to the opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] was controlling the time.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma wishes to have an opportunity to see the amendment before the vote is taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a request by the Senator from Oklahoma is in order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I hand to the clerk the amendment, in the following language:

Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization or permitted under State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, advertising activities being conducted at a location within 12 miles of the point at which such signs are located.

Mr. KERR. I yield back all time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to strike out section 12, beginning on line 19, page 20.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has all time on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On the bill itself.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. 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. KNOWLAND. On the bill itself.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not believe I shall take the entire 5 minutes which have been yielded to me, but I merely wish to state my position on the general motion of the Senator from Oklahoma to strike the section referring to billboards. I have no brief for or against billboards, but I have a brief for what I believe to be the responsibilities of the States in connection with these matters.

I have an objection to the Federal Government attempting to coerce the States into doing certain things on which they otherwise might exercise their own individual judgment.

With special reference to billboards, I advert to a statement which I think is contained in the printed hearings, a very distinguished professor at Iowa State College, a professor of psychology and director of the driving laboratory of the Industrial Science Research Institute of Iowa University, made an intensive study for the State of Iowa, some 2 or 3 years ago, of the psychological impact of billboards, and other things of that kind, along the highways of our State, and other places.

As a result of the study, which was impartial, the conclusion was reached that abstractions of one kind or another along the highway contributed to safety rather than to accidents.

I have a letter from Mr. Lauer under date of March 17, 1958, addressed to me, which I shall read for the information of Senators. He states:

DEAR SENATOR HICKENLOOPER: We are enclosing a short article on a subject in which many of your constituents have an interest.

The clearing of roadsides back 660 feet on each side would have a deleterious effect upon safe travel, besides being discriminatory.

We hope you will vote against section 122 of the control amendment. We do not feel this amendment is germane to the purpose of S. 3414.

Very sincerely yours,

A. R. LAUER,
Professor of Psychology,
Director, Driving Laboratory,
Industrial Science Research Institute.

In order to have the record complete, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article written by Dr. Lauer, entitled "A Favorable Case for Highway Advertising Signs" or "Helping Them To See Better," printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HELPING THEM TO SEE BETTER

(By A. R. Lauer, Ph. D., Iowa State College)

During the past year there has been an upswing in accidents which apparently are due to persons overdriving their manipulative and seeing ability. Every optometrist should try to warn patients that speeds are dangerous and we hope this short description may call attention to some things which they have probably overlooked.

SOME FALLACIOUS REASONING

Several years ago it was generally believed that the driver must fixate his eyes in the middle of the highway in order to drive safely. As more is known about seeing and driving behavior, it becomes obvious that the driver must scan the surroundings in order to pick up the danger spots around him. There is a decided difference between efficient use of the eyes and ordinary "rubber necking" as one moves along the highway.

Any student of reading realizes that the eyes must scan the page and pick out the phrases, with as few fixations as possible, as he goes along the page. No student of reading has ever proposed that the learner fixate his eyes in the middle of the page and attempt to read. Eye movements are necessary to normal alertness and a reasonable level of attention.

Every practitioner should call his patients' attention to the fact that it is not only necessary to have good vision but to use his eyes efficiently. It is possible that some good vision training might aid materially in helping motorists to scan the countryside, and to pick out the danger points as they come along. Some aspects of highway construction and side features are considered here which aid the motorist in seeing more efficiently and in staying out of accidents.

The myth that advertising signs cause accidents has been fairly well exploded. Several studies have been carried out, and none of them have shown any valid evidence against highway signs (see attached references). In fact, one study in Michigan, which was an outdoor study along route U. S. 24 and M. 58, showed that a slightly beneficial relationship existed between safe driving and the presence of highway signs. A laboratory study at Iowa State College has confirmed this. The two studies, of different nature, originated by different people and carried out under different auspices, were so remarkably coincident with respect to results that it is safe to say there is a slightly beneficial effect of signs along the highway, although the relationship was low. By proper choice of locations and placing of signs, they could be made a major safety factor in safe driving.

This beneficial effect could be greatly improved if certain practices were followed by cooperative arrangements between highway departments, turnpike commissions, and outdoor advertising agencies. Here are a few of the reasons why advertising signs along the highway are an advantage to drivers and are an aid to safe motoring.

THEY KEEP THE DRIVER AWAKE

It has been shown in a number of ways that an alert driver is more likely to stay out of trouble than the driver who is drowsy and bored by a simple performance, such as manipulating a motor vehicle under normal conditions. The ease of driving a modern automobile does not help the situation. When an emergency arises, there is such a radical change from the very simple type of operation to a very complex one, unless the driver is quite alert. Unless the driver is mentally active he may suffer from what

some have designated as highway hypnosis. It is really a state of semilethargy from which the operator is unable to rouse himself quickly enough. This must be considered in terms of split seconds at times in response to new situations which arise. If the level of alertness is kept high, the operator will be in much better shape to respond correctly and avoid an accident.

In some studies of night driving, it was shown by Roper and others, that one can respond to a dummy thrown on the highway twice as quickly if he has had some forewarning that the object would be presented during the trip. Anyone who has had charge of a musical group, such as a symphony orchestra, a band or a choir, knows there must be a warning signal, such as tapping on the music stand, to alert the group for the attack. Otherwise the entrances are slow and uncertain. A conductor uses his baton to indicate cues to the less alert performers in his organization during a performance. In a similar way, safe driving in traffic implies a high degree of alertness at all times. The use of the word attention by the military, in starting any formation activity, is traditional.

There is ample experimental evidence, on basic theoretical grounds, for the conclusion that the alert driver is more likely to do a better job and have fewer accidents than the driver who is less alert. Drunkenness, sleepiness, excessive fatigue, disturbances within the automobile, preoccupation, sudden diversion of the attention by moving objects, such as a deer jumping into the path of the car, are potentially dangerous.

WHAT DOES THE DRIVER SEE?

There is very little evidence that diversions caused by stationary objects, outside the automobile, increase hazards. In fact, there is evidence to the contrary.

It has been pointed out that there are more accidents in the Western States, where there are fewer things to see outside the car, than in the Eastern States, where there are numerous stimuli. Even scenic grandeur becomes monotonous after a time.

Accidents in the rural areas are increasing; whereas the accidents in the urban areas are being controlled to some extent. Accidents at night are much more frequent per mile of driving than accidents in daylight. It would be supposed that in daylight, when one could see more things, that the dangers would be greater if nonmoving visible objects outside the car are sources of hazard. The reverse is true.

CUES FOR MOTORISTS

Everyone remembers when it was customary, in certain parts of the United States, for certain advertisements to be placed on large signboards at the end of long stretches of road ending in a curve. This type of installation was good, and no one has ever registered a complaint, to the knowledge of the writer, on this practice. At least no one seems to have ever run into such a sign.

On the other hand, there are many places in the country today where curves are guarded at the end by a large sign. No hazards are introduced. Conversely, in one location to the writer's knowledge, there have been 22 persons killed in several different crashes at the end of a long curve where there was a tree poorly marked by a small arrow 1 foot long. No one has presented any evidence of a driver running directly into a large sign placed across the roadway so as to be seen at sufficient distance to warn of an approaching curve.

If reflectorized signs were used at the end of such curves, it would be much better than even the painted or poster sign at night. Reflectorization stands out brilliantly in the headlight beam, and it will warn a driver several thousand feet in advance of the curve coming up. Most accidents on curves occur because of insufficient warning. Thus speed is highly associated with accidents on curves. Studies have shown that curves at the end of long tangent sections are more dangerous.

WHERE SHOULD THE EYES BE DIRECTED?

It must be remembered that the motorist is bound to look around and scan the landscape adjacent to the highway. If he sees trees, wild animals, domestic animals, farmhouses, etc., those will occupy a certain proportion of his attention. If he keeps his eyes fixed in the middle of the road all the time, he will become drowsy, cannot stay awake, and will be less alert. He must scan the area ahead, as a radar beam scans the sky, for every plane or object that may require his further attention. Good vision aids in this respect.

These fundamental principles in the use of the eyes are so elementary that any parent or grandparent need only observe the small infants in his family to realize that it is not human nature to fixate the eyes for a long time on 1 object or in 1 direction.

This is one of the basic reasons why motion pictures and television have held such a long reign and have worked themselves into the very core of our entertainment world. One looks at the film but the scene is constanlty changing. A wide screen is better because the eyes have more latitude of movement. If the scene remains relatively inactive over 15 seconds the story will become boring, and the telecast, motion picture, play, or whatever the nature of entertainment, will be characterized as dull by the audience. Gone are the days of the magic lantern. Our eyes demand movement in keeping with the 20th century developments and activity.

SUMMARY

We must conclude, therefore, that the case for advertising signs along the highway is strongly favorable, and it could be made much more so by beautifying the designs and surroundings of the locations where such signs are placed. It is likely that some very novel and attractive modernistic creations will appear along our superhighways during the next decade. Close cooperation with highway departments is needed.

Signs well placed along the highway make driving on highways safer since they serve as objects of stimulation and cues to road characteristics. Reflectorized signs are particularly effective at night for guarding curves.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from page 2 of the Driving Laboratory News of Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, March 6, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

(c) An interesting set of installations close (within 15 degrees to the side) to the roadside to avoid remote landscape rubbernecking by motorists. This should include the expected manmade installations of business, residences, display and advertising signs, route markers, landscaping and planting along with the natural scenery indigenous to the locale. Novelty and change should be the keynote from the standpoint of driving safety. The passing motorist must have proper stimulation to keep him on the alert all the time.

(d) Proper design for sight distance and scientific banking to make curves safe.

(e) Large-lettered signs and advance warning signals.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask that immediately following there be printed in the RECORD an article written by William Bancroft Mellor, reprinted from the November 1954 issue of Pageant magazine, entitled "Posters May Be Lifesavers."

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

[From Pageant magazine of November 1954]

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN BEFORE YOU DAMN THOSE HIGHWAY BILLBOARDS

(By William Bancroft Mellor)

A midwestern psychology professor has just come up with some scientific findings about safe driving that are pretty sure to annoy just about everybody—with the possible exception of the people who make roadside billboards and those who use them for advertising.

For the results of his long and carefully controlled tests fly right in the face of the widely held popular belief that billboard signs lining our highways not only are unsightly blots on our natural scenic beauties but also are safety hazards.

The study, made at Iowa State College, shows that highway advertising signs actually result in more efficient and safer operation of automobiles. The test was conducted by Dr. A. R. Lauer, psychology professor and director of the driving laboratory in the Industrial Science Research Institute.

Using scientific testing devices, he and his associates sent 480 motorists over a stiff driving course during a period of 10 months. Here are their findings:

By keeping motorists' eyes constantly on the move, roadside stimuli help to prevent the highway hypnosis which is becoming an increasingly important factor in motor vehicle accidents.

The test drivers, most of whom were male students of Iowa State, were more alert, got into fewer accident situations, and made faster time on highways lined with billboards than on unadorned ones.

The drivers on the highways with billboards saw just about as much of the landscape as those on roads with no distractions.

"Every motorist who has used one of our new high speed turnpikes," Dr. Lauer claims, "has at one time or another found himself becoming drowsy—lulled to sleep by the very features which were intended to promote safety; the long, straight stretches of road, the lack of opposing streams of traffic, and the vast reaches of monotonous landscape, unbroken by any familiar, manmade stimuli.

"With nothing to draw his gaze from the highway, he concentrates on that long ribbon of concrete or macadam until he has literally hypnotized himself. There you have an accident in the making. Give him something to draw his attention away from the road from time to time, however, and he remains alert. He is a better driver."

Dr. Lauer conducted his billboard tests with a gadget called a "drivometer," a device similar to those used by state highway departments and automobile clubs for determining drivers' reactions under simulated driving conditions.

"It wouldn't have been practical," he said, "to send our 'guinea pigs' out on actual highways, for in real life an accident situation presents itself only about once in each 3,000 hours of driving, on the average. By using the drivometer, with its simulated highways, we were able to compress into months driving experience which would have taken years of actual travel."

The drivometer consisted of an automobile driver's seat equipped with full-sized operating controls. In front of it was a box containing an endless belt—the simulated highway—flanked by scale models of houses, churches, schools, animals, shrubs, trees, and other objects normally seen along a country road. A miniature automobile, running along this "highway," was controlled by the steering wheel.

The test drivers were required to keep the miniature car on the right side of the road, comply with all traffic signals as in ordinary driving, and complete the trip in the shortest possible time. Their efficiency was recorded by an electric counter.

Thirty of the drivers were used as a control group, and drove only over a highway plastered with billboards. Other drivers were rotated over three different types of highways: one with no billboards, one with advertising signs placed on both sides of the road at angles varying from 0° to 30° from the line of vision straight ahead, and a third with signs placed at angles of 15° to 45°.

Their composite mean scores for the three types of highway were: 71.98 on roads with no billboards; 78.70 on those with signs at angles from 15° to 45°, and 80.00 on highways with signs varying in angle from 0° to 30°.

The Lauer study inevitably will have two results: it will draw fire from the groups of nature lovers who have been arguing for years that billboards are safety menaces, and it will be carefully scrutinized, in the light of our annual toll of 38,000 motor vehicle fatalities, by highway officials and safety experts. You may hate billboards from an esthetic viewpoint, but you may owe your life to one.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as I say, I hold no special brief for any particular medium of advertising, but I do have objection to what I believe to be congressional coercion in connection with inducements to States to do certain things they otherwise might or might not do.

Therefore, I support the proposition that the bill is for the purpose of building highways, not for controlling the esthetics of the situation which should be left to the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With the inclusion of these articles I have mentioned in the RECORD, and the expression of my reasons for voting as I do, I yield the floor.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma and other Senators to eliminate and strike out the so-called billboard incentive amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct.

The yea and nay vote will proceed.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has a pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—41

Barrett	Hill	Murray
Bennett	Holland	Potter
Bible	Hruska	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Scott
Curtis	Langer	Sparkman
Dirksen	Malone	Stennis
Dworshak	Mansfield	Talmadge
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Thurmond
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Frear	McClellan	Yarborough
Goldwater	McNamara	Young
Hickenlooper	Mundt	

NAYS—47

Aiken	Gore	Neuberger
Allott	Green	O'Mahoney
Anderson	Hayden	Pastore
Beall	Hennings	Payne
Bricker	Hoblitzell	Proxmire
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Byrd	Jackson	Revercomb
Carroll	Javits	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Church	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Clark	Kuchel	Symington
Cooper	Lausche	Thye
Cotton	Magnuson	Watkins
Douglas	Morse	Wiley
Fulbright	Morton	

NOT VOTING—8

Bridges	Flanders	Long
Capehart	Humphrey	Monroney
Ellender	Jenner	

So Mr. KERR's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Kerr amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the so-called utility section. The amendment is technical.

It is amendment No. 3 on the mimeographed sheet of amendments which I have distributed to all Senators. So far as I know, there is no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, at the end of line 14, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and the following: *"Provided further,* That Federal funds shall not be reimbursed to any State under this section when the payment to the utility violates the law of the State or violates a legal contract between the utility and the State";

On page 20, lines 16 and 17, strike out the words: "covered by formal project agreements executed by the Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof: "for which Federal funds are obligated"; and on line 18, after the word Act and before the period, insert: "for work including relocation of utility facilities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have his amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield myself 5 minutes. I hope I may have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee. The amendments are really technical amendments, and were suggested by the counsel for the Bureau of Public Roads. The purpose is to make the language in the bill conform to existing law with respect to payments where State laws or State contracts might be violated. The main provision is in the present law.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I asked my staff to get in touch with the Bureau of Roads for their legal and technical advice with respect to the amendment. It is as the able Senator from South Dakota has stated; the amendments are technical, but make the provision administratively more feasible. I accept the amendments.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WATKINS. I notice that the bill provides:

Whenever a State under State law is required to pay for all or any part of the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on any of the Federal-aid highway systems, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such cost in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on

the projects, not to exceed 70 percent of such cost which the State is obligated to pay.

Does the amendment change the 70 percent provision?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It does not. The amendment does not go to the 70 percent. It does not go to the merits of the utility section at all. At the end of the paragraph the amendment would provide that Federal funds shall not be reimbursed to any State when the payment to the utility violates the law of the State or violates a legal contract between the utility and the State.

That provision is contained in the present law. It should have been included in the language of the bill when it was written. I do not know why it was not included. Counsel for the Bureau of Roads believes it ought to be included. I cannot see how anyone would wish a payment to be made to a State if it violated a law of the State or if it violated a contract between a utility and the State.

Mr. WATKINS. The principal objection in my State to the 70 percent provision is that our State law requires it to pay it all. If the State pays for it all, it can be reimbursed for only 70 percent of the Federal contribution the State might receive under the law as it now is.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator's objection would go to the paragraph in the bill as a whole, not to the amendment. The Senator may be opposed to the provision in the bill, but so far as my perfecting amendment is concerned, I cannot see that he would have any objection to it.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator know whether another amendment will take care of this matter?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, there will be an amendment offered, I believe, to strike out the entire section, and that is when the Senator would wish to speak, I believe, and probably support the amendment to strike that section of the bill. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], I believe, is prepared to offer such an amendment, which would strike the entire section from the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. I would not object to the section in the bill, provided it would make the payment on the same basis that the Federal Government now contributes to the States under the regular highway provision.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator is talking against the entire paragraph, not against the perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, in lines 11 through 13, it is proposed to strike out "the sum of $36,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961," and insert in lieu thereof "the additional sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the sum of $36,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961."

On page 12, lines 14 through 16, it is proposed to strike out "the sum of $34,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961," and insert in lieu thereof "the additional sum of $13,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the sum of $34,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961."

On page 13, line 4, after "years ending" it is proposed to insert "June 30, 1959."

On page 13, lines 9 through 11, it is proposed to strike out *"Provided further,* That the apportionment heretofore made by the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, is hereby approved."

On page 16, lines 7 through 9, it is proposed to strike out "the sum of $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961," and insert in lieu thereof "the additional sum of $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the sum of $4,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 30 minutes. Does he desire that his amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself as much time, within the limitation, as I may need.

Mr. President, I have offered the amendments to S. 3414 on behalf of myself and Senators ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BARRETT, BENNETT, DWORSHAK, GOLDWATER, MORSE, MURRAY, JACKSON, NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, CHURCH, O'MAHONEY, WATKINS, LANGER, THYE, CARROLL. The amendments would authorize additional funds for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, and public land highways for fiscal year 1959.

One of the prime objectives of S. 3414 is to make available additional funds in 1959. We are completely in accord with this purpose, and the bill as reported by the Senate Public Works Committee provides for the authorization of additional appropriations for these 3 types of roads for fiscal years 1960 and 1961, but not for 1959. Our amendment corrects this oversight.

We have purposefully omitted from our amendment park roads and Indian roads because we were advised that there are substantial funds—$20 million for park roads and $10 million for Indian roads—which are available and unobligated. This is not the case for forest highways, forest development roads, and public land roads. There is a small balance in the forest development road fund, but it could readily be obligated in the next few months.

The amendment will make available sufficient funds in the next year to get started many road projects which many States would not be able to start under normal circumstances. These road programs will provide employment where it is so badly needed.

FOREST HIGHWAY FUNDS

The Bureau of Public Roads has a $1.3 billion backlog of work on forest highways. It is apparent that the additional $10 million proposed in this amendment can be readily spent.

About 80 percent of the forest highways are a part of the Federal-aid primary and secondary system. The proposed legislation now being considered by the Senate proposes a 31-percent speedup for the ABC roads for 1959 by adding $400 million. The amendment proposes a 30-percent increase for forest highways in order that they can keep pace with the accelerated ABC program.

About 85 percent of the national forest system is in the 20 Western States and Alaska. About 85 percent of the funds are allocated to these States. Unless we add the forest highway money, the Western States will lag behind in the forest highway program.

FOREST HIGHWAY FORMULA

We also propose in our amendment to revert to the language adopted by the Subcommittee on Roads. This language assumes that pending the completion of a detailed study called for in section 3 (b) of S. 3414, the same percentage of the total authorization will be distributed to the several States as has been distributed for the last 30 years. As the bill was reported from the committee, it applies the 30-year formula to 1960 and 1961 but excepts 1959. We respectfully point out that 20 of the 42 States that receive forest highway funds will face a cutback in 1959.

Of the 12 Western States, 8 will suffer substantial reductions, while 4 will gain. However, the gains of the 4 States largely offset the losses of the 8. The States which are the most vitally affected all face critical problems of unemployment. In my own State, officials have advised me that Montana will be hard pressed to match funds under the ABC and interstate programs. We believe that equity requires the consistent application of the time-honored percentage for the distribution of funds pending the receipt of the further recommendations of the Secretary of Commerce as called for in S. 3414.

FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

The Forest Service needs about 400,000 miles of forest roads ultimately to develop the 180 million acres in the national forests for full public use and enjoyment. Most of these roads are unsurfaced or gravel, with heavy-duty bridges and culverts to accommodate heavy log trucks and recreational use. The Forest Service has a tremendous amount of roadwork surveyed and planned. There is no doubt in my mind that the additional funds proposed in the amendment can be put to immediate and effective use.

I am sure that I need point out the great value of this program to the economic welfare of the lumber industry in the Northwest, which at present is suffering from a severe recession.

We must have adequate and sufficient forest roads and trails to meet heavy demands for timber and to allow the orderly marketing of it.

Among all the various types of road projects, the forest roads assure the highest ratio of employment to money expended. In addition, they constitute about the only road program which is really geared to get into the timber areas to relieve the critical unemployment that exists. The $13 million increase will enable progress in this direction.

PUBLIC LAND HIGHWAYS

This amendment also proposes an increase of $2 million in the funds for public land highways. As the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] pointed out to the Senate Committee on Public Works during his testimony, there are 180 million acres of public domain lands in the Western States. In certain instances roads are needed which cannot, for one reason or another, be provided under any of the other regular programs. The proposed $2 million increase will provide that the level of funds authorized for 1959 will be the same as those authorized for fiscal years 1960 and 1961.

Mr. President, some States will have difficulty in taking immediate advantage of an accelerated interstate and ABC programs, but all of them can take better and more immediate advantage of the forest highway and public land highway programs. I urge that the amendment be adopted as submitted.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Both the junior Senator from Montana and the senior Senator from Colorado are to be commended for offering the amendment. The amendment affects a number of States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Is it not true that the new formula, established without consultation with State authorities or with Congress, caused a serious setback in the fiscal 1959 appropriations of a great many States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. I think it is important to state some of the figures.

For example, California lost $194,000; Arizona, $148,000; Colorado, $313,000; Idaho, $172,000; Montana, $143,000; Wyoming, $158,000. I have rounded the figures.

I ask the Senator from Montana if the purpose of the amendment is not only to reestablish for 1960 and 1961 the formula previously used, but also to enable those States which suffered from the new formula to continue to build highways.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct.

I now yield the remainder of my time to the senior Senator from Colorado, who is a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this amendment to provide additional funds for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, and public land highways for fiscal year 1959. The adoption of this amendment will provide substantial additional amounts for these roads during the summer of 1958 when construction can be undertaken.

For some time I have been giving thought to some of the tangible ways we might dedicate legislative efforts to commemorate appropriately the 100th anniversary of the birth of Teddy Roosevelt. This, I believe, is one way we can fulfill that obligation. Teddy Roosevelt was a man of action. Any honors we propose for him should be in the spirit of his great role in American history. If I could name this amendment to the Highway Act—supposing it could be given a popular title—I would suggest calling it the Teddy Roosevelt amendment.

As those of us from the West know so well, it was President Theodore Roosevelt, aided by Gifford Pinchot, who transformed the forest reserves into national forests. Wise use based upon the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number was the cornerstone of Teddy Roosevelt's conservation philosophy. The foresight and wisdom of Roosevelt insured that this great 180-million-acre Federal domain would serve all of our people for generations to come. The soil, water, timber, grass, and scenery would assure Americans a full measure of the economic and spiritual benefits needed to promote a healthy Nation. Certainly roads are a basic and integral part of our forest development, essential to the people's use and enjoyment. What better way can we honor this great man than to continue the work he began in our national forests.

The forest highway system, which extends through the 40 States with national forests, has needs which total more than $1 billion. Road development is required equally for timber access and recreational use. The Forest Service needs 400,000 miles of road to develop ultimately the resources of our national forests.

I may say that in some places these roads actually are identical with the Interstate Highway System.

We are suggesting a very modest amendment in relation to these staggering needs. We would make $10 million more available for forest highways and $13 million available for forest development roads and trails for 1959, so that each program would stand at $40 million for this year. We would also add $2 million for public land highways, raising this program to $4 million.

There is no denying that our economy nationally is sagging at the present time. This increase is one positive and meaningful action to counteract that tendency. These three programs are unique in that practically no funds are held in budget reserves, as is the case with park and Indian roads. Under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, the money can be carried forward if the sum of the efforts being undertaken government-wide is sufficient to change the economic outlook. Therefore, I view this proposal as providing the President with another antirecession device; and I believe that we in the Congress should do no less than this.

Mr. President, I close my remarks with this observation: The Public Works Committee has moved rapidly to bring before us a bill which has strong bipartisan support. It has worked hard to achieve two goals. The bill will insure that the long-range program will go forward while we deal with the immediate questions before us. When we reflect on the complexities of the highway problems confronting the Nation, the general excellence of the bill warrants our warmest congratulations to this committee.

We who have advanced this amendment have done so in order to assist in providing a well-rounded bill.

Senate bill 3414 will provide $400 million additional for the ABC roads. The increases we suggest are in keeping with the objective, and will insure that our forest roads will go forward at the same rate as our primary road systems.

We can achieve these great immediate purposes, and at the same time can continue to build a practical monument to the wisdom and foresight of Teddy Roosevelt, who was such a paramount figure in the development of our mighty national forest system.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in my State a number of roads in the national forests were built by the CCC camps, during the depression. Of course, they were only dirt roads; none of them was hard surfaced. Furthermore, they were rather narrow roads, and in some cases were rather dangerous for use by automobiles.

Since that time, people still have tried to use those roads; but for quite a number of miles the roads should be made wider, in order to be safer for use by the people who travel in the forests.

Does the Senator from Colorado have such roads in his own State?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes; there are many in Colorado; and I think the condition the Senator from Utah has described is common to many of the areas of the West, where the great bulk of the public are kept from large areas of the national forests because of the state of disrepair of the roads the Senator from Utah has described.

Mr. WATKINS. I assume that in all the Rocky Mountain States—certainly it is true of Utah, and I assume it is also true of Colorado, and to some extent of Idaho—there are many areas where timber which in the past was not considered marketable, now is in demand, and it is necessary to build roads in order to permit the timber to be reached. Is that true generally in the Western States?

Mr. ALLOTT. It is true in Colorado, at least. I cannot speak for the other Western States. However, to judge from the statements which were made by other Senators in the committee, I believe that condition is general throughout the Western States.

Mr. WATKINS. Furthermore, in northeastern Utah, in the area of the Flaming Gorge reclamation dam, there is a vast forest through which the people of Utah have to travel in order to reach the Flaming Gorge area. Of course it is necessary to have additional forest roads built there, in order to permit that timber to be reached, and to permit the area of the dam to be reached, and in the future to permit the people to pass through that forest into Colorado and Wyoming.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah for his statement, and I am very happy that he has seen fit to join in sponsoring the amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of the amendment, which I believe is important to the public-lands States.

I also believe we should recognize the sympathetic understanding which has been displayed by the distinguished chairman of the Roads Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Roads, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. He has indicated that he understands the problems of the public-lands States, where there are approximately 180 million acres of public domain and another 180 million acres of forest lands that are owned by the Federal Government.

With the greatly accelerated program of highway construction provided by this bill, it would be a discrimination against the public-land States if additional funds were not made available to enable those States to maintain the same relative increased construction of highways which will be initiated throughout the entire country.

I think the additional funds made available for the forest highways and for the forest development roads and trails will return a great profit to the Federal Government, by virtue of making accessible those overripe stands of timber, which can be salvaged and utilized and marketed by the Government.

I feel confident that under the circumstances which we face in connection with this accelerated program, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads will accept this amendment, because it will overcome the lag of 1 year—the fiscal year 1959. Although I think the Roads Subcommittee gave very liberal and generous consideration to the authorization of additional funds for the forest highways and the highways on the public lands in fiscal years 1960 and 1961, at the same time, through an oversight, the fiscal year 1959 was not included as one for which additional funds would be authorized.

The pending amendment corrects that discrimination, and makes some additional funds available now, instead of in the fiscal years 1960 and 1961.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of this amendment I desire to join my colleagues in commending the committee, and particularly the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], for bringing in this splendid provision for forest highways. To my way of thinking the construction of forest highways will help materially in relieving unemployment and at the same time will provide a much needed public improvement.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Our forest highways are an integral part of our complex highways system and in nearly all cases the forest highways are connecting links in our Federal-aid system. The forest highways are the forgotten roads of our entire system and in fact are bottlenecks in the western road system. Throughout the West we find that the primary system has been improved and is in first-class condition. But when we come to the forest reserves of the West, we find that the forest highways are antiquated and outmoded and generally speaking in a dangerous condition.

I appreciate the fact that the committee acceded to our request to increase funds for forest highways for the years 1960 and 1961 and I hope that the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment which has been proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], to increase by $10 million the funds authorized for this fiscal year. I am glad to be a cosponsor of such amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I have only a very brief statement to make in support of the pending amendment.

No one need emphasize the importance of forest-highway roads or public-lands roads to the States of the West in which so large a percentage of the land is owned and controlled by the Government.

I desire to state here, tonight, that I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this amendment, because it provides for the same kind of proportionate treatment for the fiscal year 1959 that the pending bill now provides for the Interstate Highway System and for the ABC roads. In the interest of that fair treatment, we ought not to overlook accelerating the program for construction of forest access roads and public lands roads. We ask for no special treatment in this amendment. We ask only that these roads, which are so important to the economy of the West, be given the same treatment for accelerated construction work as the bill gives to the ABC roads and the interstate roads. This, therefore, seems to be a good amendment. I am happy to join as a cosponsor of it with my distinguished colleague from Idaho and other Senators from Western States, whose States are so directly affected.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I have already mentioned forest roads in the Intermountain States which need additional money spent on them. I desire to address my attention to roads on public lands which are for the most part controlled by the Interior Department. In my State more than 70 percent of the land is owned by or is under the control of the United States Government. It places a heavy burden on us if we also have to construct highways for State use across lands entirely owned by the Government, unless we get a large contribution in addition to what we ordinarily would get.

A number of years ago a law was enacted providing for Government participation of 100 percent for the construction of interstate highways which cross Government lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. May I have an additional minute?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I am particularly calling attention to that situation because the building of the Glen Canyon dam has required a very costly highway to be built over public land. We have had some help, for which we are grateful, but we would like to have additional help in order to complete the construction of the road.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I prepared explaining the forest-road aspects of the bill as it came from the committee.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

The committee has given full and fair consideration to a relatively small but important section of the road program—the part affecting public lands. Two classes of roads are of particular significance in my State and I want to discuss them for just a moment. The 1950 act provided $17,500,000 for forest-development roads and trails. In the 1952 act, the Senate proposed to raise the authorization to $22,500,000 and the House agreed. In 1954 the Senate proposed to increase the authorization to $25 million

and it was compromised at $24 million. In 1956 the House raised the authorization to $27 million and bipartisan floor action in the Senate provided a like amount, so no conference was necessary. This year the House has raised the authorization to $28,500,000 while the Senate has provided $34 million a year for 1960 and 1961.

The forest-highway program has proceeded in much the same way. In the 1952 act the House would have set the authorization at $22 million while the Senate suggested $25 million. The authorization was set at $22,500,000, very near the House figure. In the 1954 act, the authorization stayed at the House figure of $22,500,000, although the Senate suggested $25 million. In the 1956 act the House set their figure at $25 million while the Senate, as a result of bipartisan floor action, set the figure at $33,750,000. This was compromised at $30 million.

This year the House has not suggested an increase, while the Senate has before it a bill which will provide $36 million. The action over the year on the part of the Congress is most significant, because each year the executive branch has not recommended increases, despite the growing need for these highways. It has consistently opposed increased authorizations, while with bipartisan unanimity the Congress has suggested and provided increases.

This year the Budget Bureau recommended that authorizations not even be made and that the Congress turn over to it the responsibility for setting program levels. The Public Works Committees of both Houses have declined to turn this authority over to the executive branch.

In December of 1957 the Senate Public Works Committee, under the able leadership of the chairman of the Road Subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], held extensive field hearings on forest roads throughout the West. Six hundred and twenty pages of testimony were taken on forest-road problems. These hearings showed tremendous interest in providing an adequate system of service roads to develop our national forest resources.

Forest development roads are badly needed. On 193 of the national forest working circles, less than 70 percent of the allowable cut is being marketed, while on another 64 between 70 and 90 percent of the cut is being sold. On 50 working circles, lack of roads is the major cause of this situation. In each and every national forest area a complete system of service roads is needed in order to realize the full benefits for the public. A few years ago the allowable cut for the national forests was 9 billion board-feet. Today it is set at 10 billion board-feet. The Forest Service estimates that by the year 2000 it will be 20 billion feet. This can only be realized if we provide all the tools for effective management.

The record of cutting on the Forest Service lands justifies our doing this. In 1935, only 1 billion board feet of timber was cut which was valued at $2,200,000. By 1945 the cut had climbed to 3.3 billion board feet valued at $13 million. In 1953 the 5 billion mark was passed and revenue rose to $70 million, and in 1956 the 7 billion board foot mark was reached with revenues at $100 million. While price rises and inflation have been factors, there has been a 7-fold increase in timber cut since 1935.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-five was not a peak year in national lumber production. Only 20 billion board feet, about 60 percent of the production of the twenties, was obtained due to the effect of the depression. However, while national lumber production has slowly climbed back to the 37 billion board-foot level, national forest timber cuts have constantly climbed so that it now represents one-fifth of the timber we use annually.

In addition to providing substantial funds to accelerate construction of timber access roads, the committee has called upon the Department of Agriculture to speed completion of its long-range road program in order to present it to the Congress.

The bill before us also provides for a study by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the States covering the forest highway program. Last November the Secretary of Commerce, without consulting the States, revised a 35-year-old formula for the distribution of forest highway funds. The committee bill proposes to accept the 1959 apportionment as a "fait accompli," while requiring for 1960 and 1961 that the Secretary of Commerce apportion the funds using the same percentage for each State that was used in fiscal year 1958. The Congress will then consider the recommendations for a new formula to be made by the Secretary of Commerce by 1960.

I am particularly pleased that the committee unanimously decided to emphasize to the Department of Commerce that we expect there to be full and complete cooperation with the States on this program.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads is owed a great debt by every single Member of the Senate, as well as the residents of the public-lands States from the Continental Divide westward.

There have been few instances in recent times that I know of when a Senator from a State on the Atlantic seaboard has come to the western part of the country, during the Christmas season, away from his family and closest friends, in order to hold hearings in some of the great centers of the West and Northwest, so he could build a record to familiarize himself and members of his committee with problems which are immediately germane and local to our States, with respect to road construction in national forests and the public domain.

I am certain I speak for all my colleagues from the 11 Western States when I say to the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee we are deeply and profoundly grateful to him. I am proud to have been his companion during our Pacific Northwest hearings. Beneficial legislation has resulted.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am very pleased to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon, in taking this opportunity to pay tribute to our distinguished and hard-working colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. We both know that he came to our part of the country and held hearings in Idaho and Montana, specifically at Lewiston, Idaho, and Missoula, Mont. He knows as much as anyone outside our area, with the possible exception of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, about the Lewis and Clark Highway, the Lolo Pass, and the difficulties which we faced in establishing a transcontinental highway through that area. On behalf of the people of the State of Montana I desire to say that we are indebted to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the great support and the tremendous strength he has exhibited in our behalf, and he will never be forgotten by the people of the Northwest who have benefited so greatly because of his personal interest and his understanding, and his great breadth of vision.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Montana for his observation. Before I yield to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I should like to add to the list of geographic areas where hearings were held, I believe the able Senator from Tennessee presided over hearings at Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Portland, Oreg.; and Seattle, Wash.; to show how universally he covered our Western States.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Montana. The bill is of vital importance to Colorado, and we are grateful to the junior Senator from Tennessee not only because of this particular amendment, but because of the wonderful work he performed in behalf of our State by his efforts in furtherance of an adequate Federal road program. For years the State of Colorado and the State of Utah have sought to participate in an East-West transmountain link in the Interstate Road System. Although Colorado and Utah received the transmountain mileage designation of 547 miles last fall, that mileage was not scheduled to have funds apportioned to it until the rest of the Interstate Road System was completed years in the future. This bill now, for the first time, permits the new Colorado-Utah link to qualify for funds. This is due largely to the work of the junior Senator from Oregon, the masterful leadership of the junior Senator from Tennessee, and to the work of the other members of the Public Works Committee.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Particularly the junior Senator from Tennessee, because I am only a relatively new Member of the Senate. It is my opinion that a Senator rarely deserves great credit for work he does for his own State or in his own State. That is the bread and butter of American politics, and we all know it. But when a Senator goes 3,000 miles across the country, shows a genuine interest in the problems of that area, spends the Christmas season there, expends a lot of time and energy there, when the weather is not so good, and devotes himself to problems of other States, that is showing a genuine interest, and we appreciate it.

Mr. CARROLL. I may say that is one of the reasons why the people of Colorado, the West, and the Rocky Mountain region will be glad to have the junior Senator from Tennessee come and visit with them and speak to them on March 29, this coming Saturday, will be not only to tell them about the issues before us here in Washington, but about their interstate and ABC road systems.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The people of Colorado could not listen to a better speaker than the junior Senator from Tennessee.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I was delighted that it was possible for the junior Senator from Tennessee to go to Oregon, because I wanted someone who did not live in New Mexico, Arizona, or California to go there. I was only too glad to insist that the Public Works Committee request the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads to go to the State of Oregon and see the beautiful forests in that State.

Mr. NEUBERGER. None of this would have been possible without the leadership of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As one of the cosponsors of the amendment, I am delighted at the prospect of its adoption. I only regret it does not provide funds for the construction of roads to mines. There are many mines containing valuable strategic minerals which it is impossible to reach unless roads are built to them over public lands.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I may say to my friend from North Dakota the bill which was reported by the able Senator from Tennessee, as amended by the proposal of the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Colorado, and cosponsored by others of us, will provide access to mines, sawmills, logging camps, and all activities on the public lands which belong to the United States.

Mr. LANGER. I am delighted that the bill is to be amended.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor and has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota to give me 2 or 3 minutes of time. Then I shall yield the floor and the Senator can make remarks in his own right, if that is agreeable.

Mr. THYE. I believe the time on the other side is exhausted.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is my understanding.

Mr. THYE. I will yield 2 minutes of time from this side to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield to the Senator who is responsible for all this. Perhaps we can get additional time, after the Senator has made his remarks.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am very, very grateful to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the able and fine senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] for their very generous and kind remarks.

Knowledge is power. The true purpose of committee hearings is the acquisition of knowledge upon which to act. Knowledge of problems creates the power to value them. The power to accomplish good is available to a man in very few places equal to the floor of the United States Senate. If I have been a part of some good accomplishment for the great western part of the United States then I have been a part of making America stronger. When America is made stronger my own native State and the people therein are helped.

I have great difficulty delineating between what is good for America and what is good for Tennessee. It seems to me that what is good for the Northwest in bringing about development, conservation, and progress, which makes America stronger and more prosperous, is good for Tennessee.

In that connection, the amendment presented by the able junior Senator from Montana and those who have cosponsored the amendment seeks to do for the roads relating to forests the same thing which the committee has recommended that the Congress do for the primary, secondary, and urban highways.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. GORE. The committee may have been remiss in not recommending a step-up in fiscal year 1959 funds for the forest roads, the same as we recommended for the primary, secondary, and urban roads. The amendment proposes to do no more and no less than that. I think it has added appeal from the fact that the States in the Northwest are in an area of the highest unemployment in the Nation. Is that not true?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Unfortunately, it is true.

Mr. GORE. In view of those facts, Mr. President, there is no basic and logical reason on which I can oppose the amendment. I am not authorized by the committee to accept it. I suggest the Senate vote on it, and vote for it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CHURCH. I wish to associate myself very, very briefly with the remarks made with reference to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I would only add, since the Senator from Tennessee has spoken, he has given added evidence of the fact that he is not only a very great Senator from the State of Tennessee, but he is a great Senator of the United States of whom all of us can be proud.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of that fact there has never been any doubt, and I am glad to have the Senator from Idaho enunciate it.

Mr. President, I was going to make an additional statement about the bearing of the amendment on the forest roads and the forest access roads in my own State. In view of the fact that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has accepted the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Colorado, and cosponsored by others of us, it seems to me further talk would be redundant, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER, AS COSPONSOR OF MANSFIELD-ALLOTT AMENDMENT

S. 3414 provides a $400 million increase for ABC roads for 1959, about a 40 percent increase, but no 1959 increase for forest highways or forest development roads and trails. This amendment would provide $10 million additional for forest highways (25-percent increase) and $13 million for forest development roads and trails (33-percent increase).

It would apply the 1958 formula to all the forest highway funds for 1959. If adopted Oregon would get $5,510,000 in 1959, compared to $4,306,115 at the $30 million level with the new formula. If the new formula was applied to $40 million, Oregon would get $5,740,000.

Despite the fact that 35 percent of all the timber cut from the national forests (2.8 billion feet) comes from the Northwest, only 42 miles of new timber access roads costing $1.7 million were constructed in the Pacific Northwest last year. One thousand one hundred and forty miles were constructed by timber purchasers at a cost of $20.3 million.

The supervisor of the Umpqua National Forest reports that the slump in the lumber market has and will reduce road construction by timber purchasers.

Oregon is one of the highest States in unemployment. Unless we counteract the cut in economic activities with Government construction of timber access roads, the aggravated unemployment in the lumber industry will be worsened.

The construction of forest roads gets the construction into areas hard hit by unemployment. In the Pacific Northwest alone, 8,205 miles of timber access roads are needed at an estimated cost of $133 million for just the next 5 years.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some remarks I was going to make relative to forest highways, as well as tables indicating the amounts for each State and Alaska under the present funds, and the schedule under the amendment, if adopted.

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

FOREST HIGHWAYS

In order to advise the Senate of the effect this amendment would have on the apportionment already made I had a computation prepared which covers the 20 States and Alaska which receive 95 percent of the forest highway funds.

Each State listed would receive an increase over the funds they are now scheduled to receive. This amendment would enable the forest highway program to proceed in accord with the speedup in the primary and secondary advance scheduled in S. 3414.

	Present funds at $30,000,000 authorization	Schedule under amendment at $40,000,000 authorization
Arizona	$1,540,000	$2,251,000
Arkansas	483,000	543,000
California	4,102,000	5,728,000
Colorado	1,842,000	2,872,000
Florida	188,000	232,000
Idaho	2,883,000	4,072,000
Michigan	370,000	429,000
Minnesota	380,000	553,000
Missouri	185,000	204,000
Montana	2,248,000	3,188,000
Nevada	649,000	717,000
New Mexico	145,000	1,602,000
North Carolina	195,000	246,000
Oregon	4,306,000	5,510,000
South Dakota	168,000	313,000
Utah	1,027,000	1,328,000
Virginia	214,000	260,000
Washington	2,498,000	2,780,000
Wisconsin	212,000	223,000
Wyoming	1,121,000	1,706,000
Alaska	2,652,000	3,486,000
Total	28,408,000	38,243,000

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of the amendment and I have always been in favor of forest highways. They serve many useful purposes.

First, of course, forest highways give added protection against fire. They permit access to the area very readily by vehicles.

Another good feature of the forest highways is the access they provide to persons who cut timber, since the Government lets contracts for the cutting of timber. The access roads make it possible for small bidders to participate and make bids. That is an advantage.

Reforestation and proper management of the forests become more possible with proper access to the forest areas.

For those reasons, among others, I join as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I know of no Senator on this side who wishes to speak on the amendment. Therefore, I yield back the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up an amendment at the desk, pertaining to section 11, identified as 3-24-58-C, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and by me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20 it is proposed to strike out lines 3 through 14, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(a) Availability of Federal funds for reimbursement to States: Subject to the conditions contained in this section, whenever a State shall pay for the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal-aid primary or secondary systems or on the Interstate System, including extensions thereof within urban areas, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such cost in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project, but not to exceed 80 percent of the cost of the relocation: *Provided*, That Federal funds shall not be apportioned to the States under this section when the payment to the utility violates the law of the State or violates a legal contract between the utility and the State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 30 minutes. How much times does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield myself 10 minutes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

Let there be order in the Chamber.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the amendment proposes to strike section 11 of the bill, pertaining to the reimbursement for cost of relocating of utility facilities in the construction of Federal-aid highways.

I should like to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the section which presently obtains is found on page 46 in column 1 of the committee report. The substitute language in the bill, which consists of section 11a, is found in the second column.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of both sections be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PUBLIC LAW 627, 84TH CONGRESS

SEC. 111. Relocation of utility facilities.

(a) Availability of Federal funds for reimbursement to States: Subject to the conditions contained in this section, whenever a State shall pay for the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal-aid primary or secondary systems or on the Interstate System, including extensions thereof within urban areas, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such cost in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project: *Provided*, That Federal funds shall not be apportioned to the States under this section when the payment to the utility violates the law of the State or violates a legal contract between the utility and the State.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE IN BILL AS REPORTED

SECTION 11A

"(a) Availability of Federal funds for reimbursement to States. Whenever a State under State law is required to pay for all or any part of the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on any of the Federal-aid highway systems, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such cost in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project not to exceed 70 percent of such cost which the State is obligated to pay: *Provided*, That such reimbursement shall be made only after evidence satisfactory to him shall have been presented to the Secretary substantiating the fact that the State has paid such cost from its own funds."

(b) This section shall apply only with respect to Federal-aid highway projects covered by formal project agreements executed by the Secretary subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. HRUSKA. Under the terms of the statute as it now exists, whenever the State shall pay for the cost of relocating utility facilities there is reimbursement in the same proportion as the reimbursement for the entire project. The principal change in section 11 of the bill is that the State must be required under a State law to pay for that relocation before such reimbursement is in order.

Mr. President, it is my information and understanding that in the present situation, if section 11 of the bill is made effective, the reimbursability of costs for relocating utilities will be destroyed insofar as most of the States are concerned. For that reason it is considered that a good deal of hardship will be visited upon the various communities where such reimbursement is called for.

Section 111 of the present Federal Highway Act was adopted after a great deal of consideration. In the separate views opposing section 11, beginning on page 52 of the report, is detailed the well-processed and well-seasoned legislative activity that was undertaken, and which transpired before the present section was adopted.

There were hearings as far back as 1952. There were additional hearings in the 83d Congress. There was a study by the Department of Commerce, which was directed by the 83d Congress, and which is the subject of a House report, House Document No. 127 of the first session of the 84th Congress.

There were further hearings in the 84th Congress before section 111 was adopted. It was the clear intent not only of the drafters of the legislation, but also of the conference committee, that the reimbursement should be made in accordance by the same procedures that were in effect pursuant to the practices and procedures of the Bureau of Public Roads. Section 111, as it is now effective, simply put into statutory form what the practice of the Bureau of Public Roads was prior to that time.

The principal difference between the two sections at issue is a substantial one. The fact is that in many of the States reimbursement for the cost of relocating utilities had grown up as a matter of practice. There were negotiations between the State highway departments and the utilities which resulted in arriving at a figure which was considered satisfactory to both sides. After such an agreement had been reached, it was the practice of the Bureau of Public Roads to look into the situation, check it, and allow reimbursement for the costs involved.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska how the committee distinguished be-

tween States in which the highway commissions are required by law to pay for the relocation of utilities and States in which the highway commission decides, as a matter of fairness and equity, to pay for the relocation.

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not know that the majority of the committee distinguished on that basis.

The reason assigned by the majority of the committee for proposing the amendment which is found in section 11 is briefly this: Since 1956, when the present Highway Act was passed, approximately 17 or 18 States changed their laws so that they could qualify for reimbursement for the cost of relocating utilities. It was said by the majority of the committee that the costs involved in such reimbursement reached a much higher figure than the committee originally contemplated; and because of the amount of such costs, and not because of any lack of equity, it was said that the arrangement should be changed so as to limit the number of States which would be eligible to receive reimbursement. That is the tenor of the argument, but there was no distinction in the committee on the basis of States which voluntarily reimbursed such costs and those which did not.

Mr. BARRETT. The committee recommends an amendment to the bill which would require so much to be paid out of Federal funds in instances in which the State law requires reimbursement for relocation.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct. Under the committee amendment there must be a law affirmatively obligating the State to pay. That is not true in a number of States where, as I explained a little while ago, a practice has grown up under which, if the construction of a highway interferes with utilities, equitable claims of utilities occupying the right-of-way, are recognized. The principal difference lies in that basis.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HRUSKA. By way of illustrating how this provision would affect particular localities, I invite the attention of Senators to the situation in Omaha, Nebr., my home city. We have there a metropolitan utilities district, which is a municipal corporation. It owns, and has owned since approximately 1913, the water and gas systems. We also have the Omaha Power District, a publicly owned municipal corporation. It is estimated—and I have here the breakdown of the estimates—that the relocation of the water and gas mains there will cost approximately $1.5 million. The costs of relocating the public power facilities will approximate $1,100,000.

It is submitted that if section 11 is enacted into law, under present legislation, those utilities will not qualify for reimbursement, which would involve an injustice and an inequity, because the cost of relocation of the utilities is as much a part of the cost of the project as is the cost of cement, steel rods, and the right-of-way.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not a fact that the agencies, both Federal and State, which regulate utilities allow them a fixed return on their invested capital after their necessary expenditures?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And, if we arbitrarily impose a new burden on them to relocate their facilities, all they have to do is to charge it to their operating expenses and pass it on to their customers, because they can get their 6 percent, or whatever the local regulatory body allows. We cannot force them to assume a new burden which would put them below their authorized return. So the assumption that we can change 10 percent to 30 percent is quite fallacious, because we cannot make the utilities assume the cost. They may pay it originally, but they can add it to the cost of doing business, and pass the cost on to their customers.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct, because the cost is borne by the users of the utilities.

The situation which will result if this section is enacted is this: In those communities which are traversed by the Interstate System, the users of the utilities will pay the bill for relocation. In cities which do not have the Interstate System passing through their communities, the users of the utilities escape scot free; yet they are close enough to the Interstate System to get the full benefit of it. That is not fair.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Virginia originally changed her law, so that now the proposed change in the 90–10 ratio will throw a new burden on the State of Virginia with respect to relocating utilities. The Senator from Virginia has an amendment at the desk, which he will offer as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia merely strikes out section 11. If that were done, we would revert to the law we have had for many years, providing the 90–10 percent ratio. The House of Representatives has just passed a highway bill. The bill passed by the House does not contain such a provision as is contained in the pending Senate bill. There is no necessity for our jumping in at this time and changing a formula which has been in use for a long time, and which, after much discussion, was included in the Interstate Highway Act of 1956.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I shall yield in a moment. I can save the Senator from Virginia the trouble of offering his amendment by modifying my amendment to conform to what he would like to accomplish. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking, on page 2, in line 1, the last two words and the words in line 2 up to the colon. The words to be stricken out would be "but not to exceed 80 per centum of the cost of the relocation:". The effect of that would be to restore to its full effect the present section 11, without impairment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When the Senator from Virginia is recognized, he will offer the amendment he has at the desk. It will be a complete substitute for the amendment now offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Very well.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It will strike out section 11, and revert to the present law, with the 90–10 ratio.

Mr. HRUSKA. That would be the effect of my amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska modify his amendment accordingly?

Mr. HRUSKA. I do.

Mr. WATKINS and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield? If so, to whom does he yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield first to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. What is the situation with respect to States where the Federal contribution on primary and secondary highways is on the basis of 74–26 percent?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The section that would be left in the bill would merely restore the provisions of the present law that applies in any State.

Mr. WATKINS. I could go along with that, but I wanted to be sure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is what it does. All that it is necessary to do is to strike out section 11. That eliminates the change the bill proposes to make and leaves the present law as it is.

Mr. HRUSKA. In answer to the Senator from Utah, I should like to say that the language in the present section provides that Federal funds may be used to reimburse States for such cost in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I want to know. The first sentence in the bill at page 26, line 3, reads:

> Whenever a State under State law is required to pay for all or any part of the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on any Federal-aid highway systems, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such cost in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project.

Would not that language take care of it?

Mr. HRUSKA. No; it would not.

Mr. WATKINS. Why not?

Mr. HRUSKA. Because, if the Senator is reading from the bill, the language provides "whenever a State under State law is required to pay."

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator would include States which are not required to pay. Is that correct?

Mr. HRUSKA. States which are not required by affirmative statutory and mandatory action to pay. That is the distinction. It is quite an important distinction, because there are several States which will not qualify under section 11 as proposed in the bill, but who do qualify under the present statute.

Mr. WATKINS. It would take care of States in which the law requires that

they pay all the cost, or which pay something, although not required to do so by law.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to my amendment on this subject, which, so far as city-owned or publicly owned utilities and cooperatively owned utilities are concerned, would reenact the 1956 law. It was brought out in committee hearings that the Federal Government is being milked as a result of the 1956 law. As a result of the 1956 law, measures were introduced in 40 State legislatures to permit the uncontrolled reimbursement of utilities for the cost of moving their lines. Sixteen States passed such law. It was one of the biggest giveaways that I know of.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that if the utility owns land and the land is taken for highway purposes, the land is condemned, and the utility is paid 100 cents on the dollar, even in the absence of any law. We are dealing, in this amendment, with the cost of moving the utility's pipes, and poles, and lines, if they are out on the State highways, not the cost of their land or their poles. If any of the property is taken, which includes lines, and poles, or pipes, or anything else, the utility is reimbursed 100 percent. My amendment has been printed.

Mr. HRUSKA. I would prefer it if the Senator would submit his amendment on his own time, instead of debating it on my time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for giving me the opportunity to call the attention of the Senate to my amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. I should like to address myself to the points raised by the Senator from Texas, but I shall do so after I have yielded to the Senator from Minnesota, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator why the committee has proposed the change set forth in section 11. Why does the committee propose to change the present law?

Mr. HRUSKA. I suppose I should defer to the majority of the committee to speak for themselves, but the way I understand it is that a number of States amended their laws in order to avail themselves of the statutory form found in the present section calling for a reimbursement of the cost of relocating utilities.

The committee said, "We are paying much more for the cost of reimbursement for relocating of utilities than we anticipated when we put that section in the statute back in 1956." Therefore, in order to stem that tide, it decided to adopt an amendment which will cut down the amount that is being paid out for that purpose. That is about the sum and substance of it as I see it.

Mr. THYE. Minnesota, of course, through its legislature, complies with the 10-percent contribution. In other words the Federal Government pays 90 percent and the State pays 10 percent. If the proposed change is made in the act then the State will not be qualified to enjoy its authorized 10-percent participation.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes.

Mr. THYE. That poses a problem for the State of Minnesota, and I am sure it poses the same kind of problem for other States. Therefore, the States should be forewarned before we enact such a change, because the States would not have sufficient funds, nor would they have the right legally under existing laws, to comply with the revision which would be made in the law if we amend that section now.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes; it would cause some delay, I am sure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I call up my substitute for the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A substitute is not in order at this time. It is not in order until all time for debate on the pending amendment has either been consumed or yielded back. Three hours of debate have been allowed on the pending amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Can any change be made in the pending amendment?

Mr. HRUSKA. The change has already been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the time allowed on the pending amendment has been yielded back or consumed, an amendment to the pending amendment, or a substitute for it, may be offered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia gives notice that he will offer a substitute to strike out section 11, so as to return us to the present law. It is a very simple proposal.

Mr. HRUSKA. If the Senator will withhold his request, that is the exact effect of my amendment as already changed. I have changed the proposed amendment so as to strike out the words which make it different from the present section 111. Therefore, if my amendment shall prevail, it will mean that section 111 will be reinstated intact, just as it is.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am interested in the objective, not in the way it is reached, so I shall gladly support the changed amendment. I do not object to the change.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am sorry I had to do it in the involved way in which I did, but I have a cosponsor of the amendment. The cosponsor was not present when I considered the deletion of the 80 percent clause. He later appeared and consented to the change made.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia has one other suggestion to make. As the situation now stands, the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska can be adopted, and I suggest that we have a vote.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is perfectly agreeable to me. I yield the floor for the time being.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to ask him some questions.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have received from municipalities in Kentucky a number of communications on this question. Simply for enlightenment, I wish to address some questions to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. First, let us assume that it becomes necessary for a State to take the property of a utility company by condemnation proceedings or by contract. Suppose it becomes necessary, if not in fee, to condemn, acquire, and compensate for an easement which the company may have. The State would pay that cost, would it not?

Mr. HRUSKA. It would.

Mr. COOPER. The original Highway Act of 1956 provided that the State would be reimbursed, in such a case, to the extent of 90 percent of the cost it was required to pay.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. The proposed change would reduce that amount to 70 percent.

Mr. HRUSKA. No, not under the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. COOPER. Not under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. HRUSKA. Under the bill.

Mr. COOPER. The committee amendment would reduce the reimbursement from 90 percent to 70 percent?

Mr. HRUSKA. In that particular type of proceeding, yes.

Mr. COOPER. Are there any other cases? What other types of cases could be considered?

Mr. HRUSKA. The proceeding which the Senator from Kentucky described, as I understood it, was a condemnation proceeding in order to establish the cost. The condemnation proceeding was pursuant to a statute of the State of Kentucky, the effect of which was to obligate the State to pay the amount involved.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. Whether by condemnation or by purchase in fee, it is the duty of the State to acquire the property and to compensate for the easement, in order to fulfill the purposes of the act.

Mr. HRUSKA. The circumstances which the Senator described would qualify the State to receive reimbursement under either the committee amendment or the present statute. The State would be qualified under either method.

Mr. COOPER. What would the Senator's amendment do?

Mr. HRUSKA. My amendment would strike out what is proposed in the bill and would permit the present statute to remain as it is now.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. Will the Senator yield sufficient time for me to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two communications I have received on this subject?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a telegram and a resolution I have received concerning this matter.

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

LOUISVILLE, KY., *March 21, 1958.*

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It has been reported to this organization that the Public Works Committee of the Senate will send to the Senate, an amendment to section 11 of S. 3414. This amendment will seriously invalidate the comprehensive studies made over a period of 5 years resulting in the Highway Act of 1956. It would make inoperative many existing enabling acts now functioning in many States. It would also place utility reimbursement in a different category than other construction expenses which would inevitably reflect in subscriber rates. The Kentucky Telephone Association is composed of telephone companies and REA affiliates in the State of Kentucky, and each and all of us respectfully solicit your opposition to this amendment.

P. H. MCCRORY,
Vice President,
Kentucky Telephone Association.

Commissioners' Resolution R-69-58

Resolution opposing Senate bill 3414 in the Congress of the United States of America and directing that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the proceedings of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Covington, Ky., and directing that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States and among certain Members of the United States Congress

Whereas the problem of payment of the cost of public utility relocations incident to highway improvements has become increasingly serious to municipalities in recent years because of the accelerated highway improvement programs of the State and Federal Governments; and

Whereas there is currently reimbursement by the Federal Government to public utilities of 90 percent of the cost of such relocations made at the direction of the highway commissions; and

Whereas Senate bill 3414 has been introduced in the United States Senate which provides for a reduction of reimbursement to public utilities to 70 percent of the cost of public utility relocations; and

Whereas the passage of said bill in the Congress of the United States would work a serious financial hardship upon the city of Covington, a municipal corporation of the second class of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in the operation of its waterworks department, and upon other municipalities throughout the Nation similarly situated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Covington, Kenton County, Ky.—

SECTION 1

That all Members of the Senate and all Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States be, and they hereby are, solicited and urged to oppose and defeat Senate bill S. 3414 now pending in the Senate of the United States Congress.

SECTION 2

That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the proceedings of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Covington, Ky., and that copies be made with the signature of the mayor affixed thereto and the seal of the city imprinted thereon, and that said copies be sent to: Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Hon. Richard Nixon, Vice President of the United States; Hon. John Sherman Cooper, United States Senate; Hon. Thruston B. Morton, United States Senate; Hon. Noble J. Gregory, United States House of Representatives; Hon. J. M. Robinson, Jr., United States House of Representatives; Hon. Frank L. Chelf, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Brent Spence, United States House of Representatives; Hon. John C. Watts, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Carl D. Perkins, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Eugene Siler, United States House of Representatives; Hon. William H. Natcher, United States House of Representatives.

SECTION 3

This resolution shall be in full force and effect when passed, published, and recorded according to law.

HARRY W. SCHNEIDER,
Mayor.

Attest:

FRANK A. GILLESPIE,
City Clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Under the provision in the committee amendment, there must be a State law requiring that the cost of the relocation of the utilities, necessitated by the construction of a project, be paid by the State.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. That is not required under the 1956 act, is it?

Mr. HRUSKA. No; it is not.

Mr. BARRETT. Consequently, as the bill now stands, unless a State has a statute requiring payment, the State will not be reimbursed under the committee amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. But it will be reimbursed under the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand the amendment provides that States which have laws requiring reimbursement will be taken care of.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. The States which operate under contract, or otherwise, but which do not have laws requiring them to pay in full, but which do actually pay, will be taken care of.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes. It has been a practice of many years' standing in some States, whenever there has been a relocation of utilities by reason of construction, to negotiate or contract to pay the cost of relocation, making due allowance for depreciation, betterments, and so on. It has been a matter of negotiation and agreement. It is done by negotiation under equitable principles and on an equitable basis. That is the basis that has been recognized by the Bureau of Public Roads for years. It has been done for years under Federal matching funds for Federal highway construction.

Mr. WATKINS. There cannot be any doubt in the State of Utah, where the law requires the State to compensate fully for the relocation of the utilities on the highways, that, if the Senator's amendment is adopted and the provision in the bill is not adopted, the State will be compensated for the moneys it pays out for the relocation of utilities on the same basis as the contribution it now makes under the 1956 Highway Act with respect to interstate and national defense highways and all the other highways as to which the United States makes a contribution.

Mr. HRUSKA. There can be no doubt whatsoever.

Mr. WATKINS. That is the full intent of the amendment?

Mr. HRUSKA. Heretofore the State of Utah has been reimbursed consistently, has it not?

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. Under the law as it now stands, the State would be reimbursed if the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska has proposed should be adopted.

Mr. WATKINS. But if the bill as drawn with section 111 included becomes effective, Utah will get only 70 percent of the contributions it usually gets from the Federal Government.

Mr. HRUSKA. Instead of 90 percent, or 95 percent in the case of public lands roads.

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct. Also, on primary and secondary highways, the State gets 74 percent. Under the bill, they would get 74 percent of the contributions they have to make for the payment of the relocation of utilities.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to make that clear because I am in favor of the Senator's amendment to strike out the whole provision and leave the law as it is.

Mr. HRUSKA. That would be the effect of the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the Senator's amendment require the Federal Government to pay even in cases where the State is not required to pay?

Mr. HRUSKA. Oh, yes. Under the present law, reimbursement is had where the State shall pay. Under the proposed amendment, there would have to be a law affirmatively requiring the State to pay. There is a difference, because under the practice of many States—and it has been in effect for years——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It has not been a law; it has been a practice?

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes. Some States make adjustments on equitable principles, as they are supposed to do, when they interfere with the property rights of anyone in the construction of a road.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the Senator from Nebraska object to adding to the amendment the language of the proviso in the text of the bill as reported, which is:

Provided, That such reimbursement shall be made only after evidence satisfactory to him shall have been presented to the Secretary substantiating the fact that the State has paid such costs from its own funds.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes, I would object, because it would interfere with and upset the language of the present statute, which, as I explained, was carefully

drawn. All of these showings were made. The present provision has been in effect and is now in its third year. There would seem to be no necessity for the language proposed by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason for the language is that it was suggested to the committee that in some States the utilities were saying to the State highway commission, "If you get 90 cents of the dollar from the Federal Government, we will see that you do not have to pay the other 10 percent."

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes; I am familiar with that argument; but there is nothing in the record which indicates that that transpired in any State. If there is, it has escaped my attention.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was stated to the members of the committee by representatives of the Bureau of Public Roads that that is the fact.

In order to explain the background of this matter, I do not wish to use the time available to the Senator from Nebraska.

However, I do not believe it is correct to say that this situation developed just because of the cost involved. In 1956, I took the lead in having placed in the act a utility-repayment provision. But it is my feeling that that provision is now being abused, and that it is being applied differently from the way intended when the Senate passed the bill in 1955.

In 1955, the Senate passed the bill which was incorporated into the 1956 act. However, the language finally incorporated into the act was not the language which was approved by the Senate. The language presently in the law is that which was proposed by the House committee, and which in conference was accepted, after the conferees found trouble in applying the 2 percent overall cost limitation which was provided by the original Senate language.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President——

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that a State would be guilty of bad faith and dishonesty if it obtained from the United States Government money with which to repay the State for money it was supposed to have paid, if it had not actually paid such money?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I have never known of a case in which a State had been guilty of fraud in connection with the program.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. President, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska will state it.

Mr. HRUSKA. How much of the time under my control has been consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has consumed 35 minutes of the time under his control.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, for the time being, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] controls the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the background of this provision of the bill, as reported to the Senate, is as follows: The Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads brought to the attention of the committee the situation which developed following enactment of the 1956 act.

The provisions reported in the bill, follow the recommendations of the Bureau of Public Roads and the recommendations of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks, and the recommendations of Mr. Tallamy, the Administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads.

In order to be specific on this point, I shall read the testimony given by Mr. Weeks to the committee. I read now from the hearings, beginning in the middle of page 5:

> In connection with the general subject of utilities, I would like to briefly discuss the use of Federal funds for reimbursement of the States for the cost of relocating utility facilities. Under the Constitutions of the United States and the States, when private property is taken for a public use, just compensation must be paid to the owner. Many utilities are located upon real property owned by the utilities, and in which the public has no right or title. When such property is taken for highway or other public purposes the utilities should and must be justly compensated. Federal-aid funds are available for participation in the cost of highway rights-of-way, and when it becomes necessary to acquire property for this purpose from utilities, Federal-aid funds participate to the same extent as if the property were owned by a private individual. In cases where the cost of relocating utility facilities is found to be a proper measure of just compensation for property rights taken for the right-of-way of a Federal-aid highway, Federal-aid funds can and should participate in such costs.
>
> I do not believe, however, that Federal-aid funds should participate in the cost of relocating utility facilities where no vested property right is taken, and the utility is not entitled to compensation under constitutional provisions. A great many utility facilities occupy the rights-of-way of public highways by permission of the States.

At this point I wish to say that, personally, I do not follow the Secretary wholly on that point. Certainly it is true that in many instances utilities municipally owned, privately owned, or owned by cooperatives such as the REA's, occupy highway rights-of-way by sufference, or perhaps in some instances by invitation. In any event, they are there.

The rerouting of a highway or the changing of a highway may in some instances create very burdensome costs, costs beyond the ability of a small utility to finance, if it had to pay for them; and in the case of Electric Administration cooperatives, perhaps it would create a cost burden which they could neither finance nor pass on to their customers without impairing the feasibility of the projects on which they had received loans from the REA's.

So I felt that something should be done for them. That was why, in 1955 and 1956, I supported the idea of writing into law a provision which would permit some reimbursement to be made to them.

But at the time we felt that there should be some automatic check on the matter, so the Federal Government would not be called upon to pay exorbitant costs which the State themselves did not recognize or were not willing to share in paying. We felt that if the States were to share in the payment of the reimbursement costs, that would automatically police or check against abuse.

However, we have found that some abuses have developed.

There is this difference between the language which was in the bill as passed by the Senate and the language of the conference report of 2 years ago——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield additional time to me?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. Will 5 minutes suffice the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Perhaps the Senator from North Carolina will yield an additional 10 minutes to me.

Mr. ERVIN. Perhaps the Senator from South Dakota will be willing to have me yield 5 minutes to him at this time, as the first installment. [Laughter.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Very well.

Mr. ERVIN. Then, Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, when the bill was passed by the Senate, there were two limitations: first, a percentage limitation—1 or 2 percent—on the project. In the conference it was said it would be difficult to determine how the 2-percent limitation would apply; in other words, the construction of a project might require more than 1 year. The Bureau of Public Roads representatives said it would be difficult to administer such a ceiling.

Consequently, we next talked about a 50-percent limitation.

Thereafter, in the conference, without examining carefully the House provision on this matter, it was said—as such things sometimes occur in conference; and the conference was a long one; it lasted for several days—"Well, we will yield to the House." But, in yielding to the House language, that was done only with the idea that the States would say, "We will do this on the Interstate System, where Uncle Sam will be liable for 90 percent and we shall be liable for only 10 percent; but we will not do it when the States have to pay 50 percent."

Now I resume reading the testimony given before the committee by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks:

Ordinarily, the utilities contributed nothing to the cost of acquiring the rights-of-way, paid nothing for the privilege of installing and maintaining their facilities thereon, and acquired no vested property interest in the rights-of-way. The occupancy of highway rights-of-way by public utilities is usually subject to the condition that the facilities do not interfere with public travel, and prior to the enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, the great majority of States required the utilities to bear the cost of relocating their facilities when such relocation was necessary to permit improvement of the highway.

That is to say, Mr. President, the great majority of the States have said, "You are occupying a public right-of-way. We provide a service here. You can occupy the right-of-way; that is a concession to you. But if we have to change the road, you will pay your relocation costs."

But after the 1956 act was passed, a change came about; and that is described in the next part of the testimony given by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks, before the committee. I now read it, as follows:

Since the enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which increased the Federal share of the cost of constructing the Interstate System to 90 percent, and up to 95 percent in public lands States, and expressly authorized the use of Federal-aid funds for reimbursement of the cost of relocating utility facilities, a significant reaction has occurred in many State legislatures. During 1956 and 1957, legislation which would provide for payment by the State of the cost of relocating public utility facilities was considered by the legislative assemblies of 40 States. Such legislation was given favorable consideration in 22 States, but was vetoed in 6 States, so that the legislation became law in 16 States. Under these 16 enactments, only 1 State will pay the cost of relocating utility facilities on all State-maintained highways. Five of the enactments relate to all Federal-aid projects and 10 relate to the projects on the Interstate System only, where the Federal share of the cost is at least 90 percent.

In other words, the experience was that although the legislatures of 40 States considered it, the legislatures of only 16 States passed legislation which was approved and became law; and out of those 16, the legislatures of only 10 States applied it to the Interstate System.

They said, "If Uncle Sam will pay 90 cents on the dollar, this is a good idea, this is a good principle, but we do not see any justice in a proposal that requires us to take care of the utilities on the primary system of roads. We do not see any justice in it in the case of the secondary roads, because there the States will have to pay 50 percent. But we see justice and equity in it only if Uncle Sam is willing to pay maybe 90 or 95 cents on the dollar. It is okay if Uncle Sam will pay the bill for 90 or 95 cents on the dollar. We are not taking action on the secondary roads."

I thought some of the greatest justice would be done in dealing with secondary roads, which, in many cases, affect municipalities or electrification co-ops, where small businesses would have to bear increased costs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield 6 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the distinguished Senator will state for the RECORD that this program applies only in cases where public utilities have no legal right to reimbursement. Where public utilities have such rights, a State has always had to pay them as a condition to make the change which was involved.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. In the first part of the Secretary's statement he pointed out that when utilities had a right or a title, the States, or the persons, whichever was paying for the road, had the obligation to reimburse.

Mr. HOLLAND. The States interested in this matter decided that, whatever Federal action was taken, so far as they were concerned they did not feel it was necessary for them to pay, out of their gasoline tax funds or road construction funds, for expenses incurred by utilities which were not legally chargeable against the States. Therefore, there was some justice and reason to the contention of the States that they should not go further than to meet the terms of the Interstate System contribution to which the Senator has referred, that being the only change in the system that was enacted by the 1956 law. Is that not correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should think it was contemplated, I certainly contemplated, and so stated during the hearings that if the States recognized the equity of taking care of one utility, they would have to take care of a utility whether it happened to be on the Interstate System or on the secondary system.

I should like to read the concluding paragraph of the Secretary's statement, wherein he said:

This drastic change in existing practices was not contemplated when the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 was enacted. The amount of funds authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 was not determined upon the basis of assuming the general obligation to pay the cost of relocating utility facilities within the highway rights-of-way. If Federal-aid funds continue to be available to reimburse the States for the cost of relocating utility facilities, Federal expenditures for that purpose will increase substantially, with the result that correspondingly less will be available for the construction of highways. We also are now considering the preparation of draft legislation on this subject.

I asked Mr. Tallamy at one point to furnish us with some estimate of what the additional cost would be for the Federal Government under the way the States were handling it. We did not get a figure on that alone. He said it was estimated 3 percent would be added to the cost of the system by reason of this, plus a requirement in the 1956 act that local needs should be considered in the development of the Interstate System. That has been interpreted to mean service roads. So the cost on the utility system alone was not segregated.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Is the Senator saying that the substitute language in the bill as reported meets the views expressed in the testimony of Secretary Weeks?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It moves in that direction. I think we would have to say the Secretary's recommendation would probably have been more in favor of a 50-percent limitation, or at least the requirement that there should be some showing that the States actually paid their share of it out of their own funds. I consider that the proviso which I read to the Senator from Nebraska embodies the Secretary's recommendation—that is, the testimony of the Secretary and the representative of the Bureau of Public Roads that it should not be possible for a utility to go to a State and say, "Do not worry about 10 percent. Go ahead and nick Uncle Sam for 90 percent, and we want either cash or a check, or we will bill you for the other 10 percent."

There was a feeling in the committee that there should be a showing that the State had paid its proportionate share of the cost of relocating utilities. That was important, because it would be evidence of the fact that the State was watching the operation and was not agreeing to an exorbitant bill for the relocation of utilities.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator read the proposal again?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The proposal I should like to see added to the language——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from North Carolina is becoming very liberal. I hope I will not use that much time.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from South Dakota has an amendment to the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska to modify the language of his amendment?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The language which the Senator from South Dakota is seeking to defend is the language contained in the bill. The Senator from Nebraska has offered an amendment which would, in effect, nullify the language in the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I correctly understand from the able Senator's presentation that the cost contemplated might approximate 3 percent?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is more than it would actually cost,

because 3 percent was the figure Mr. Tallamy gave as embracing the utility relocation costs, and also other costs, principally the building of service roads along the Interstate System. But that the cost would run into millions of dollars was equally evident.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator's amendment protect rural electric and telephone co-ops? I am especially concerned with protecting the small rural co-ops.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The rural co-ops I think would be largely taken care of by the provision that if a State was required to pay, the cost for it would apply to the right-of-way which affect the co-ops, because they are largely on the secondary roads or on the primary roads. Very few co-op lines are found on the so-called Interstate System of highways.

Mr. CARROLL. For example, I have had several calls from small rural electric co-ops in Colorado which bear out conclusively the presentation made by the Senator from South Dakota. They have advised me that they have neither the working capital nor the financial base to sustain a violent change in their programs such as is brought about by radical relocation of their facilities. I want to be sure that these co-ops are given adequate protection under this bill and are not placed in a position where they could be financially ruined by an order to extensively relocate their power-lines.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The two principal changes which are effected by the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska are these:

First, the language reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works in the bill places a ceiling of 70 percent on the share of the cost which would fall on the Federal Government. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska would lift that 70-percent ceiling and permit the Federal Government to pay 90 percent, or up to 95 percent, of the cost in the public-lands States.

Mr. CARROLL. Which is similar to the old law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Similar to the present law, which has been in operation.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is identical. If the Senator will yield, my amendment will simply let the present statute stay as it is.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. I am trying to make clear the two differences between the amendment and the language of the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First, the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska would permit the Federal Government to be charged with 90 to 95 percent of the cost of utilities' relocation, whereas the language reported by the committee would place a ceiling of 70 percent upon that.

The second thing is that the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska does not make any requirement that the State shall have shown that it was paying the other part of the cost itself. The proviso which is in the bill reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works reads:

Provided, That such reimbursement shall be made only after evidence satisfactory to him shall have been presented to the Secretary substantiating the fact that the State has paid such cost from its own funds.

Mr. CARROLL and Mr. THYE addressed the Chair.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will yield in a moment. I should like to make a connected statement.

My objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska is based as much on the latter point as on the first. I wish I could feel that we had a guaranty the State was checking the cost on the utility relocations and not getting exorbitant bills or unfair bills. I should like to feel that the State was not entering into some sort of an agreement whereby the State could say to the utility, "We will pass a law agreeing to recognize this, if the load can be thrown upon the Federal Government."

I should like to see in the law some provision which will insure that the State shall keep an eagle eye upon the expenditures, which comes only when the State, out of the State's own funds, pays the other share of the cost. There is no such guaranty under the present situation.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In a moment.

The members of the committee were told that at least in a couple of States the suggestion was made to the State highway commission, "Go ahead and bill the Federal Government for it. We will forget the 10 percent."

The very fact that 40 States considered such proposed legislation, that only 22 States passed it, and that in 6 of those 22 States the bill was vetoed, would indicate that in 24 States they looked at this matter and said, "We do not want to make it a legal responsibility of the States to pay a portion of the cost, nor do we want to accept the responsibility of policing the operation to be sure that this is a sound program, that the costs are reasonable, and that the proper costs will be assessed against utility relocations."

Mr. President, I feel that is a defect in the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska. I think I can say that with good grace, because the original utility repayment provision in the act of 1956 was one which I proposed in the committee. I felt that something ought to be done, so that the burden of utility-relocation costs should not fall upon municipalities, should not fall upon small utilities, and should not fall upon the REA co-ops which did not have a proper base on which to distribute the unusual burden of large amounts.

I think we ought to provide in the law some safeguard so that Uncle Sam will not be made a "sucker" in connection with the operation of the law.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Is that safeguard in the bill which is now pending before this body?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is in the bill in the proviso which I have read, and is as follows:

Provided, That such reimbursement shall be made only after evidence satisfactory to him shall have been presented to the Secretary substantiating the fact that the State has paid such cost from its own funds.

Mr. CARROLL. To what extent must the State pay? What percentage is involved?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Whatever would be applicable within the 70-percent ceiling. It would be in the same proportion that the funds are used on the project, with a ceiling of 70 percent.

If the Senator from Nebraska would add to his amendment the proviso I have suggested, then the proportion would be in the same proportion paid on all the systems, even to the 90 percent, but at least we would have the policeman clause, the requirement that the State pay its share out of its own funds, not handling it through some sort of an extrajurisdictional device.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Can the Senator think of any valid reason why we should change the provision the committee has recommended in the bill now before us?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not with respect to the proviso. I think the argument with respect to whether the ceiling should be 70 percent or 90 percent is a matter of policy for the Congress to determine. If one wants to take the position that the share should be paid in the same proportion that the costs are paid for building a particular highway, that is a matter for determination. I think a checkrein is needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, may the Senator from South Dakota have 1 or 2 minutes more, so that I may ask a question or two?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield further time?

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator wish to propound an interrogatory to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Colorado wishes to propound such an interrogatory.

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota 4 minutes for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

In effect, then, the committee has set up a standard, by saying to the State that a greater safeguard is provided if

we permit a percentage of 70 percent rather than 90 or 95 percent. Is that not the substance of it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The 70 percent does provide a limitation. However, within the 70 percent the primary roads, secondary roads and urban roads could all be taken care of. The relocations could all be taken care of, because they are, generally speaking, on a 50–50 basis, except in the public land States, and in the public land States most of them would be taken care of. I think there are a few public-land States which get a little better split than the 70–30, but the provision would take care of most of the public-land States.

Mr. CARROLL. I am indebeted to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his very clear presentation. My next question is: Do we have any idea what will be the cost if we should restore the language of the present statute? What will be the cost of the program if we permit the various giant private utilities to move, in a sense, scot free to relocate their facilities?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish I could answer that question. I cannot. One reason I cannot is that although I posed the question to the representative of the Bureau of Public Roads I was told the Bureau could not give a firm answer because until the exact location of the Interstate System was determined they could not be definite as to the road relocations, so it would be difficult to give a figure.

For instance, suppose the Interstate System should go through a city or the suburban part of a city. Whether the interstate highway goes on street A or on street B may make a great deal of difference as to the cost of the utility relocation. One reason I think the police clause should be in the law is that if there is no police authority involved and if the States can largely escape any sharing in the cost then they may take the interstate highway on a route through the city where the greatest relocation cost will occur. The highway might go down street A, where the cost might be $3 million, whereas if it went down street B the cost might be only $1 million. But if the Federal Government is to put up practically all the money, they may take street A, with the $3 million cost, rather than street B, which they would be inclined to choose if they had to put up a part of the cost.

Mr. CARROLL. I was impressed by the Senator's statement with respect to the possible cost of 3 percent. We spent many hours debating a cost of one-half of 1 percent of the total interstate road costs with respect to billboards. Now we are debating 3 percent of what?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Three percent of the estimated cost of the Interstate System. Under the estimate submitted by the Bureau of Public Roads last year, the estimated cost was $37 billion. I think that is too high, because contracts are being let for something less than that. I think the Senator could use a figure of more than $30 billion as the cost of the Interstate System, and be conservative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. ERVIN. I will yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I appreciate the indulgence of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

I have tried to make a quick calculation as to what 3 percent of $30 billion would be. I have become lost in the maze of these large sums. It would be almost $1 billion. That is what we are talking about in connection with the pending amendment. A little while ago we spent hours debating a percentage of one-half of 1 percent, which would be a sixth of a billion dollars.

Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. CARROLL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Hruska amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I know that Senators have been receiving requests from the small cities of the country for some method of reimbursement. Many of them say frankly that they will be unable to meet the cost of being on this great Interstate Highway System unless they are reimbursed for the cost of moving municipally owned public utility systems.

It will not be necessray to vote for the pending amendment and give away millions of dollars to those not entitled to it in order to afford the cities such reimbursement. I have an amendment, which has been on the table since last evening, by which we would grant to the municipalities and cooperatively owned utilities the same rate of payment that was granted all utilities under the 1956 act, and retain in section (b) the same grant that the committee has reported with respect to those States which are required to pay for the movement of facilities of privately owned corporations.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for the fine work they have done on this highway bill. A little later I shall offer an amendment by which the cities and cooperatives can be given the privilege of full reimbursement, without the private utilities of the country reaching their hands into the pockets of the taxpayers.

On Friday last, this august body turned down an appeal to raise the personal income tax exemption by $200, from $600 a person a year to $800 per person per year. A little later it voted to give $124 million to the richest insurance companies in the land.

In the midst of the recession we are voting money for those who need it least, and we are denying aid to the people who need it worst. The private utilities are not going broke. They have governmental status. They can charge a rate under which they can exist. If they are fortunate enough to be where the great Interstate Highway System is going, there will be an increase in population, in industry, and wealth, so that they will more than make back the cost of the moving of their pipes and lines.

We are not dealing with land taken away from utility companies. We are talking about the cost of moving their facilities off a State-owned, nationally owned, or county-owned highway, where they have their utilities on public land. Where there is a State highway 100 feet wide and a super highway 300 feet wide comes along, if the utility companies own land outside the 100-foot right-of-way, the State right-of-way, the utilities will be paid in full for it. Under the condemnation laws, if the value of their lands includes the cost of moving poles, lines, and pipes they will be reimbursed in full the cost of movement, because the condemnation laws provide they will be reimbursed in full if their land is taken, including the cost of moving facilities, and they will be reimbursed fully, without changing the bill as it now stands. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska pays fully for movement off of State lands.

I appeal to the Senate to let us have an opportunity to vote for the cities and the cooperatives. Let us retain the fine work which the committee has done with respect to private utilities.

The committee has found that since the 1956 act was passed, in 40 States private utilities have come forward with bills, which have been passed in a number of instances. They turn the States into transmission agencies to reach into the Federal Treasury, for what? Not for the States, but for the private utilities. Thank God, a large number of American States in which such proposals were made turned them down. They were turned down by a majority of the States. The States of New York and Washington considered the proposals and adopted laws which limited reimbursement to municipally owned utilities. The States of Washington and New York have adopted the very provisions which we propose in section (a) of the amendment which will come up later.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I oppose this 1958 highway bill (S. 3414) for three principal reasons, as follows:

First. It would destroy the pay-as-you-go policy for Federal highway aid, established by the Highway Act of 1956, which set up the road trust fund to assure that special taxes on highway users would be used for highway construction.

Second. In Virginia, and I presume in many other States, it would destroy the flexibility of State highway programs, and deprive primary, secondary, and

county systems which are certainly no less important then the so-called Federal Interstate System, which in Virginia is only 2 percent of the total road mileage.

Third. Over the 4-fiscal-year period 1959–62 this bill would reduce the ratio of highway construction to Federal funds for the ABC regular Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban systems.

This statement to this point clearly states my position as an advocate of continuing construction of good roads under sound programs.

This has been my position for more than 30 years. It has been the Virginia policy for nearly that long. The Virginia system of highways is indisputable evidence of the wisdom in this policy.

My first principal objection to this bill is that it would destroy the solvency of the Federal highway trust fund which 2 years ago was established as one of the most forward steps in the history of Federal participation in highway system development.

When Congress enacted the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, it did three things, among others:

It increased taxes on highway users to pay for roads.

It segregated the revenue from highway user taxes into a highway trust fund to be used exclusively for Federal-State highway construction.

It limited the amount to be apportioned among the States to the sum estimated to be available in the trust fund for the fiscal year in question.

The purpose of these three actions was to establish a Federal pay-as-you-build highway construction system. This policy was advocated and urged by the present administration through former Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and Secretary of Commerce Weeks.

From years of experience I knew this was a sound proposal—one that would get the best system of highways, keep it abreast of the needs, and accomplish the objective at minimum expense to users and to State and Federal Governments.

At the personal invitation of Secretary Weeks and Secretary Humphrey, I joined sponsorship of this Federal policy. Now, 2 years later, Secretary Humphrey has left the Cabinet, and Secretary Weeks and the administration have reversed their position.

But, my position is unchanged. I am still opposed to crash spending highway programs. Those who know highway construction best, know the utter waste they entail.

The teeth of the trust fund were in section 209 (g) of the 1956 act. Section 9 of pending bill suspends that 1956 provision and knocks the teeth out of the trust fund for fiscal years 1959 and 1960.

The effect will be deficit financing of Federal highway construction. The deficit in the coming fiscal year 1959 is undetermined. Bureau of Public Roads officials have estimated it from zero to more than $300 million. But they definitely estimate a deficit in fiscal year 1960 of $1.5 billion, and say it may run as high as $1.7 billion under this bill.

Under provisions remaining in the 1956 act, deficits must be repaid from the trust fund.

Under these conditions it is obvious that at the end of 2 years the trust fund will be approaching insolvency, insofar as sound financing of future highway construction is concerned.

This bill dooms the vital provisions of the highway trust fund under the guise of a 2-year suspension.

The second principal reason why I oppose this bill is the undue emphasis on the so-called Federal Interstate System, at the expense of our State primary, secondary, urban, and county road programs.

The official position of the State of Virginia, as stated by the Honorable F. A. Davis, State highway commissioner, is that we prefer the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to those embodied in S. 3414. The destructiveness of the overemphasis on the Federal Interstate System is documented in the official communication from Mr. Davis, which is being made a part of this RECORD.

It suffices for me to say that under this bill, Virginia would be required to spend 13.3 percent of its State highway revenue on less than 2 percent of the highway mileage in its system.

Without detracting from the desirability of the Interstate System, I submit this would be an unreasonable distortion of its importance.

Virginia, and other States, will be indeed fortunate if Federal highway legislation does not force them to increase their State taxes to match Federal funds financed through deficit spending in Washington.

My third principal reason for opposing this bill is that over the period of fiscal years 1959–62 it would reduce the ratio of highway construction to Federal dollars spent on the regular Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems.

This develops through a complicated procedure in the bill, but by the combination of reductions in the matching formula for 1959 and reduced program in 1961 and 1962, the loss in highway construction totals $459 million.

If there is any doubt about this calculation, it may be said for the record it was checked Tuesday, March 25, by Mr. F. C. Turner, Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabular presentation of how the loss occurs.

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

ABC HIGHWAY PROGRAM UNDER S. 3414

Federal highway trust fund expenditure authorizations and State matching requirements for primary, secondary, and urban systems (ABC program), fiscal years 1958–62 (projected)

[In millions]

	ABC program under existing law, fiscal year 1958	ABC program under existing law and S. 3414 proposals, fiscal year 1959	ABC program under proposals in S. 3414		ABC program projected at 1960–61 level for fiscal year 1962	Total, ABC program, fiscal years 1958 to 1962, inclusive	Loss to ABC highway construction program under provisions of sec. 2 of S. 3414
			Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961			
1. Sec. 1 of the bill would authorize expenditures for the regular ABC program for fiscal years 1960 and 1961. The bill would continue matching requirements for the States on the basis of the existing formula of 50 percent Federal and 50 percent State funds. Figures in the opposite columns represent actual ABC program funds for fiscal years 1958 and 1959, proposals under S. 3414 for fiscal years 1960 and 1961, and fiscal year 1962 projection:							
Federal	$850	$875	$900	$900.0	$900.0	$4,425	
State	850	875	900	900.0	900.0	4,425	
Total	1,700	1,750	1,800	1,800.0	1,800.0	8,850	
2. Sec. 2 (a) of the bill would provide additional appropriation from the highway trust fund of $400,000,000 for fiscal year 1959. The bill would further provide in sec. 2 (d) that the Federal share of the program financed under this new authority would be 70 percent and the State share 30 percent (instead of the existing 50–50 formula). The figures in the opposite columns represent the level of the regular ABC program together with the program expansion proposed under this $400,000,000 additional 1959 authority:							
Federal	850	1,275	900	900.0	900.0	4,825	
State	850	1,046	900	900.0	900.0	4,596	$229
Total	1,700	2,321	1,800	1,800.0	1,800.0	9,421	229

ABC HIGHWAY PROGRAM UNDER S. 3414

Federal highway trust fund expenditure authorizations and State matching requirements for primary, secondary, and urban systems (ABC program), fiscal years 1958–62 (projected)—Continued

[In millions]

	ABC program under existing law, fiscal year 1958	ABC program under existing law and S. 3414 proposals, fiscal year 1959	ABC program under proposals in S. 3414		ABC program projected at 1960–61 level for fiscal year 1962	Total, ABC program, fiscal years 1958 to 1962, inclusive	Loss to ABC highway construction program under provisions of sec. 2 of S. 3414
			Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961			
3. Sec. 2 (e) of the bill would provide further that expenditure of $115,000,000 be authorized in fiscal year 1959 from the Federal highway trust fund in the form of advances to the States to meet their 30-percent matching requirement for the allocations under the proposed $400,000,000 additional 1959 authorization. Federal advances may equal ⅔ of the 30-percent State matching requirement, having the effect of increasing the Federal share to a maximum of 90 percent. Provision would be made in sec. 2 (f) for "reimbursement" of such advances from State allocations of Federal funds in fiscal years 1961 and 1962. The figures in the opposite columns represent the levels of the regular ABC program together with the effect of the Federal advances in fiscal year 1959 and their "reimbursement" in 1961 and 1962:							
Federal	$850	$1,390	$900	$842.5	$842.5	$4,825	
State	850	931	900	842.5	842.5	4,366	$459
Total	1,700	2,321	1,800	1,685.0	1,685.0	9,191	459

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there are numerous other objectionable features in this bill but, in summary, those I have mentioned would:

First, destroy the solvency of the pay-as-you-build highway trust fund method of assuring use of highway taxes for road construction;

Second, work hardships on my own State, and I suspect others, by impeding the discharge of its responsibilities to its own citizens, requiring disproportionate expenditures on the Federal Interstate System and perhaps leading to increased State taxes;

And third, reduce the ratio of highway construction to expenditure of Federal road funds.

These three provisions, separately or collectively, are sufficient in my judgment to make this a bad bill. I want this record to show the reasons why I am against it, and for these reasons I shall vote against it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Nebraska prepared to yield back the remainder of his time, and is the Senator from North Carolina also prepared to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Case, N. J.	Fulbright
Allott	Case, S. Dak.	Goldwater
Anderson	Church	Gore
Barrett	Clark	Green
Beall	Cooper	Hayden
Bennett	Cotton	Hennings
Bible	Curtis	Hickenlooper
Bricker	Douglas	Hill
Bush	Dworshak	Hoblitzell
Butler	Eastland	Holland
Byrd	Ervin	Hruska
Carlson	Flanders	Ives
Carroll	Frear	Jackson
Javits	McNamara	Scott
Johnson, Tex.	Morse	Smathers
Johnston, S. C.	Morton	Smith, Maine
Kefauver	Mundt	Sparkman
Kennedy	Murray	Stennis
Kerr	Neuberger	Symington
Knowland	Pastore	Talmadge
Kuchel	Payne	Thurmond
Langer	Potter	Thye
Lausche	Proxmire	Watkins
Magnuson	Purtell	Wiley
Malone	Revercomb	Williams
Mansfield	Robertson	Yarborough
Martin, Iowa	Russell	Young
Martin, Pa.	Saltonstall	
McClellan	Schoeppel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, has all time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, Senators may not want to have a yea-and-nay vote on this issue; but the action on this particular amendment probably will draw more attention than any other vote we have had, except the vote on the billboard amendment.

The American Automobile Association, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Administrator of Public Roads all say that some change should be made in the present law.

The debate is too long to review here, but the two issues are these:

The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska would revert to the language of the present act, which lets the Federal Government in for paying the share of the utility costs in relocating up to 90 or 95 percent. The language proposed by the Committee on Public Works places a ceiling of 70 percent on that amount. So the question can be answered simply as a matter of dollars and cents.

But in my estimation the most important provision of the language proposed by the committee was a proviso which would require evidence to be presented to the Secretary of Commerce that the State was paying its share of the cost out of its own funds.

If there is not some check rein like that, the evidence suggests that the relocations are more expensive, because a utility can say to a State highway commission, "Go ahead and put the new road where the utility relocation will require a new distribution system. Uncle Sam will pay 90 percent of the cost. So what difference will it make? We will either forget the 10 percent or will not cash your check, or whatever it may be."

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has just indicated to me that he will be willing to include that proviso in his amendment. In that case, I have nothing further to say.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. As the offerer of the amendment, I am willing to accept the proviso as an amendment to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has a right to modify his amendment.

The question now comes on the amendment, as modified. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. CARROLL. I shoud like to know the status of the amendment before the Senate. As I understand it, the original amendment was offered by the Senator from Nebraska. Then it was proposed to be amended by the Senator from South Dakota. I should like to know the status of the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment at present consists of a return, in substance, to the act of 1956, with the proviso which was included in

the bill reported by the committee, and which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Provided, That such reimbursement shall be made only after evidence satisfactory to him shall have been presented to the Secretary substantiating the fact that the State has paid such cost from its own funds.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. CARROLL. Only a few Senators were on the floor during the recent discussion of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska. In the very crucial argument made by the Senator from South Dakota, it was estimated that the cost of the amendment to the program would approximate 3 percent, and that a very quick estimate of the amount would be approximately $1 billion.

The Senate has spent many hours yesterday and today discussing the billboard amendment which involved one-half of 1 percent.

Now I ask this question of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who made so brilliant a presentation: By virtue of the acceptance of his amendment as a modification of the pending amendment, how much of a reduction would be made in the possible cost under this measure?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First of all, possibly I did not make myself clear when I discussed the 3 percent. I thought I said that the 3 percent cost estimate by Mr. Tallamy embraced not only the utility-relocation costs, but also the added costs by virtue of the 1956 act which required that consideration be given to the local needs and requirements, which would include the so-called service roads alongside the interstate roads, and that a substantial portion of the 3 percent should not be charged to the utility item, but should be charged to the service roads.

Mr. Tallamy was not able to give us a firm figure for the utility-relocation costs, because, first of all, they do not know just where the roads will go in suburban areas, where the utility-relocation costs would be the greatest.

But by this means there would be a check on such costs, so that the States would not agree to a relocation which would throw the greatest cost on the Federal Government, if the States themselves had to pay their proportionate share of the cost.

I thought that matter was even more important than the percentage figure which might be used for the ceiling.

Mr. CARROLL. Would the Senator from South Dakota not say that even with his amendment or the modification which provides for that safeguard, that the pending amendment would cost the highway program hundreds of millions of dollars?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, I do not know that I would say that. Of course, I think the cost will be greater if there is a 90-percent ceiling, instead of a 70-percent ceiling. Of course the cost will be higher if the Federal Government pays 90 precent in some instances, rather than 70 percent. But I am not able to say what the difference in dollars would be. However, it would cost more.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the colloquy between the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] and the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has obviated the necessity which I felt to make some remarks.

It was agreed that the junior Senator from South Dakota would wage the fight and would represent the committee on this issue. I support him fully. He has done a brilliant job. I congratulate both him and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for having come closer to agreement on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, had this proviso not remained in the bill, there would have been permitted a continuation of a practice by certain States that has bordered upon a sharp practice, by means of which an arrangement between the States and the utilities has operated in such a way that the State funds were not paid out, yet the Federal Government was forced so to pay.

The bill as reported by the committee recommends and provides that, as a prerequisite for the reimbursement of a State by the Federal Government, there shall be a certification that the State has lawfully made the payment, and thereby is entitled to the reimbursement.

That is now provided for in the amendment; and I see no serious objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the Hruska-Kerr amendment, as modified. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me 1 minute on the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee just what proportion of the Federal funds will be expended for this purpose, under the pending amendment, as modified.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Georgia inquire as to what percentage of Federal funds?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The bill as reported by the committee provided that 70 percent would be paid by the Federal Government. As I understand the pending amendment, as modified, provides that 90 percent shall be paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. GORE. The amendment proposed that the percentage be increased from 70 to 80 percent. If the amendment has been modified in this respect, I am not so advised.

Well, Mr. President, I have just been advised that while I was out of the Chamber, the amendment was modified so as to provide for the arrangement under the present law, namely, 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State, on the Interstate System. In other words, the pending amendment, as now modified, provides for the present law, with the addition of the requirement that before a State shall be entitled to reimbursement it must certify to the Federal Government that it, the State, has actually made the expenditure, thereby entitling it to the reimbursement.

Mr. RUSSELL. But does the Senator from Tennessee not think that the amount a State would have to pay would have quite a good deal to do with the certification? Why is the Senator from Tennessee abandoning the provision approved by the committee, namely, that 70 percent of the cost is sufficient to be paid from Federal sources?

Mr. GORE. The committee submitted a similar provision to the Senate 2 years ago, after long and diligent study.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have had some little experience with this program since the long and diligent study, to which the Senator has referred, was made by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I repeat my question.

Mr. GORE. I agree that we have had considerable experience with the program since then.

This amendment, as modified, is not a happy solution; it is a compromise arrangement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not see that a compromise is provided for if a return is made to the 90 percent. It seems to me that it would be well to have the figure remain at 70 percent, and certainly not 80 percent or 90 percent, so that the States would have an equitable interest in getting a settlement of these costs.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. If I have time in which to yield, I yield. I am speaking by sufferance.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Georgia has put his finger on the nub of the question. It has been said that the question is now one of State certification. What certification, Mr. President? The certification of 90 percent, not 70 percent.

There was a debate on this matter when the Senator was not on the floor. At that time we discussed and debated

the cost. The cost was estimated to be almost $1 billion.

The committee brought forward, in its wisdom, the 70-percent figure.

Now, however, an effort is being made to disregard the committee's recommendation and to revert to the old law.

I agree completely with the Senator from Georgia that the 70 percent should be preserved.

Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the amendment as now modified, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

The yeas and nays have been requested on the question of agreeing to the Hruska-Kerr amendment, as modified. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Mundt
Allott	Hayden	Murray
Anderson	Hennings	Neuberger
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Beall	Hill	Payne
Bennett	Hoblitzell	Potter
Bible	Holland	Proxmire
Bricker	Hruska	Purtell
Bush	Ives	Revercomb
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Javits	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smathers
Church	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Clark	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Langer	Symington
Curtis	Lausche	Talmadge
Douglas	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dworshak	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Watkins
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Frear	McClellan	Yarborough
Fulbright	McNamara	Young
Goldwater	Morse	
Gore	Morton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], cosponsored by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG] are absent on official business attending the funeral of the late Congressman George Long, of Louisiana.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent on official business attending the Interparliamentary Conference in Europe as a representative of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—47

Allott	Hayden	Mundt
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Murray
Barrett	Hoblitzell	Potter
Beall	Holland	Revercomb
Bennett	Hruska	Robertson
Bible	Ives	Saltonstall
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Byrd	Kerr	Smathers
Carlson	Knowland	Talmadge
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Thurmond
Curtis	Malone	Thye
Dworshak	Mansfield	Watkins
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Young
Goldwater	McClellan	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Green	Neuberger
Bush	Hennings	Pastore
Carroll	Hill	Payne
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Proxmire
Church	Javits	Purtell
Clark	Kefauver	Russell
Cooper	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lausche	Stennis
Eastland	Magnuson	Symington
Flanders	McNamara	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Yarborough
Gore	Morton	

NOT VOTING—11

Bridges	Ellender	Monroney
Capehart	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Long	

So the modified amendment, offered by Mr. HRUSKA for himself and Mr. KERR, was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment, as modified, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I call up my two amendments which are at the desk and I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. One of the amendments, Mr. President, deals with section 7. The other amendment deals with section 9. The two amendments together will cut about $2 billion from the bill affecting the provision for an accelerated program for the interstate highway. They are important amendments with separate purposes. I do not wish to discuss them very long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Virginia for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, beginning with line 13, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 21 on page 18.

On page 19, beginning with line 8, strike out all down to and including line 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the amendments are being considered en bloc. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during the administration of Governor Byrd of Virginia, Virginians adopted a pay-as-you-go plan to finance the State highways. I think I can say with all due modesty that Virginia now has a system of highways, encompassing 45,000 miles, which compares favorably with the highway system of any other State in the Union, and we do not owe 1 cent of bonded indebtedness on those roads.

Throughout my public career I have taken a great interest in highway construction and good roads. A good highway program was a major plank in my platform when I was elected to the State senate in 1915.

I was a sponsor of a resolution to create a State highway system. The senior Senator from Virginia and the junior Senator from Virginia both served on the commission to lay out a highway system in Virginia. We both sponsored a resolution to adopt the report. We both backed the bill to create a highway department. We both fought a proposal to burden the highway department with bond issues. We finally secured, when the senior Senator from Virginia was governor, the enactment of legislation to finance the highway program by a gasoline tax.

Based upon that experience over the years, the senior Senator from Virginia in 1956—anticipating that some people might be impatient with regard to the 41,000-mile, superduper, 6-lane highway system, might consider that it was not proceeding fast enough, and might feel that the Treasury should be called upon to issue bonds, and thus borrow a vast sum of money—offered an amendment providing that the program should be adopted on a pay-as-you-go basis, and that provision was written into the law.

We now have before us a bill which says, "For 2 years let us borrow $2 billion and speed up the program. Let us rush into it, although we are not prepared."

I will be frank about it. Virginia cannot meet the requirements of the program. Some 12 States have said they can. How many of the 48 States cannot meet the requirements of the program I do not know, but Virginia is not the poorest State. We have no bonded indebtedness. We have not gone overboard and committed our revenues for

interest on bonds. However, we cannot meet the requirements of the program, and I am sure some other States cannot do so.

I feel, Mr. President, that it would be prudent, it would be more efficient, and it would be better for the highway system in the long run, to follow the course I have suggested. Why should we rush to appropriate an extra $2 billion for the program now, and then make the appropriation that much less 2 years later? What are we going to accomplish by that? In 2 years all the States will be more organized to push the program. The States are not yet equipped for it.

Is this type of program going to afford relief? Of course not. Not a State could let a contract before next year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have read the amendments offered by the Senator. If the amendments are adopted, will they not really cut out the whole acceleration program?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In that event, we might as well pass no bill at all.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, the Senator has not read the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have read the Senator's amendments.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The bill contains all of the regular highway aid. The forest roads are covered. The park roads are in the bill. The bill now contains the "sugar plum" that our western friends put in it a while ago. My amendments would not touch any of those items.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. We have for consideration all that was in the House bill. Does the Senator think the House did not pass a highway bill? The House passed a bill, but the House did not put any of this program in. The House did not put in the super-duper $2 billion program. The House bill is in the Senate now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Will the Senator please suspend. Let the Senate be in order.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, the Senator's two amendments are joined and are considered as one. Do the amendments delete not only the speed-up money for the interstate highways, but also the money for what we call the ABC roads? Do the amendments affect the $400 million for the ABC roads?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The amendments do not touch the $400 million. That sum is for other highways. The amendments do not touch the new 70–30 formula. The amendments only seek to delete from the bill the accelerated financing for the interstate roads.

There is $800 million eliminated from section 7, and the allocation in section 9 is also eliminated. The two together, I believe the Senator from Tennessee will agree, will total approximately $1.8 billion, or about $900 million a year. The committee report in one place says $1.7 billion, but I believe the Senator from Tennessee stated he thought it would be about $1.8 billion for 2 years, or about $900 million a year.

So I say that at least $1,800,000,000 is what would be eliminated from the bill.

This is a simple matter. It involves a great deal of money, but the proposal is very simple. If we wish to continue with a program at a level which the States can meet, we should do so. This is not a program to relieve automobile workers and steelworkers in the next few months, because it will be next year before the program is under contract. We can vote for these two amendments and we shall be back on the pay-as-you-go plan, as contemplated in 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, provided the Senator from Virginia will do likewise.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. (Putting the question.) The Chair is in doubt, and requests a division.

On a division Mr. ROBERTSON's amendments were rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am about to yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for the purpose of offering an amendment, and then I shall ask the Senate to remain in session for the purpose of hearing any Senators who may desire to express their views, and who cannot be present tomorrow. Then I shall move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. I express the hope that tomorrow we may consider the various amendments which have been proposed, and have a yea-and-nay vote on final passage some time late tomorrow. I want all Senators to be on notice as to the schedule.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, between lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 13. Temporary moratorium on matching requirements.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act or any other law, no State matching funds shall be required with respect to—

(1) Not in excess of $20 million granted to any State under the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, for projects on the Interstate System, or

(2) Not in excess of $15 million granted to any State under the provisions of such acts for projects on the primary and secondary Federal-aid systems and extensions of such systems within urban areas.

for which formal agreements are entered into with the Secretary of Commerce within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have grave reservations regarding S. 3414, the proposed Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, which is now before the Senate.

Considered as a whole, the bill carries the threat of contributing to a dangerous runaway inflation which the Nation may face next year and in succeeding years.

In our zeal to combat the current recession and the unemployment it has caused, with which we are all so greatly concerned, this Congress, in my judgment, is moving too fast and too far. We will regret it in the not-too-distant future.

Consider the outlook for the coming fiscal year. We already face the prospect of a Federal cash deficit of $5 billion. Proposals have been made for a tax cut which would increase the deficit by at least $5 billion more. We must increase defense spending over the levels of the past year by at least $1 billion, perhaps more. Other proposed increases in Federal spending could amount to an additional $4 or 5 billion. Before we know it, we may face a deficit next year of more than $15 billion. The inflationary potential of such an enormous Federal deficit is frightening. It is a direct threat to the security of many millions of Americans—the beneficiaries of pension funds, the holders of life-insurance policies, those with savings accounts and United States savings bonds; and all others whose accumulated thrift is repayable in dollars.

This bill contains certain emergency provisions intended to accelerate highway construction in the current calendar year and thus combat the recession and unemployment.

I agree that in periods of recession accelerated spending on highways and other public works can contribute to an upturn in the economy. However, I doubt that the emergency provisions of the bill will create as many jobs as its sponsors claim for it, and that the jobs will be created in time to have much effect upon unemployment and business conditions in the months immediately ahead—the critical period in our anti-recession efforts.

Nevertheless, I would support certain emergency features of the bill, together with provisions to encourage State regulation of billboards on the 41,000-mile Interstate System, if they could be considered by themselves.

These provisions, however, are presented in a bill which goes far beyond the present emergency. It proposes to add about $1.3 billion to an already enormous highway program authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

In my judgment, it assigns a wrong priority to Federal spending in the years ahead, years in which we face increasing competition from the Soviet Union in education as well as in military power and science and technology.

I would prefer that a higher priority be given at this time to education, and, specifically, to school construction which represents a far more urgent national need than making bigger a highway program which already is the largest public works undertaking begun by any nation in history. In my judgment, funds spent on accelerating school construction programs through the Nation would have more effect in creating jobs and would serve a greater national interest than adding new Federal dollars to the highway program.

In these critical times, we should be spending as a Nation—at all levels of government—as much money for the character building which education can provide as we spend for road building.

Mr. President, we should not act hastily on a long-range highway program at this time. The legislation we are considering now should be limited to that necessary to assist in the creation of jobs which can be made available in the months immediately ahead. A comprehensive highway bill, which should include provisions for equitable reimbursement to States for toll and free highways contributed to the Interstate System, can be considered at a later date. When we know whether a tax cut is necessary as an antirecession measure, and when we know the volume of increased Federal spending on other programs, we will be able to act more intelligently in determining the future of the highway program.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I should like to go on record as opposing the bill as reported from the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention for 3 or 4 minutes of the very able chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

First I wish to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the chairman of the Roads Subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and each member of the committee on both sides of the aisle for the fine, forward-looking expanded highway program they have reported to the Senate.

The $400 million proposed to speed up the construction of ABC roads is a most commendable and proper step to fight the recession with a real weapon.

Regardless of what the economic situation may be at any given time, this is a needed program. Thousands of people are killed by our outmoded highways.

The foresight of the Senator from Tennessee, who sparked this drive for a vastly improved highway system, deserves recognition in the four corners of our Nation. His effort and the efforts of all members of the committee to keep the Interstate program on schedule and to step it up by $200 million is a second example of real leadership.

The committee has taken wise and considerate action with respect to roads on our public lands. Park roads, forest highways, timber access roads, Indian roads, and public land highways have all received well-deserved increases. I do not want to make a speech on timber access roads. I do not think this is necessary. The Senate has provided a substantial increase for 1959 as well as for 1960 and 1961, and, in my judgment, it shows that the counsel of the Senators from the Pacific Northwest has been heeded. I think that the presence of my colleagues, DICK NEUBERGER and FRANK CHURCH on the committee has been helpful in assuring that our great natural resources will be protected and developed.

TIMBER ACCESS ROADS

As one Senator from the State of Oregon, I wish to thank both my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] on behalf of the people of the Pacific Northwest for the great assistance they have rendered in the fight this year for appropriations for timber access roads. The committee has made public hearings on timber access roads permissive rather than mandatory.

I wish to ask a few questions of the Senator from Tennessee at this point. First I should like to have him know that all over the State of Oregon on many platforms, since he held his hearings last fall, when he brought his subcommittee to the State of Oregon and conducted his investigations into our highway programs, particularly our forest and timber access roads, I have expressed to the Senator from Tennessee the thanks of the people of Oregon for his statesmanship. Here on the floor of the Senate tonight I wish to say that I do not know of anything in recent years that has done more to clarify thinking in the State of Oregon and to impress upon the people of the State the importance to sound timber management of adequate forest and timber access roads than the hearings which the Senator from Tennessee conducted last fall. Although I have thanked him privately, I now wish publicly, on the floor of the Senate, to thank him not only in behalf of the people of my State, and the people of the Pacific Northwest, but, in essence, for the people of the whole country, for the work he did by the hearings he conducted last fall.

Mr. GORE. I thank my able friend for his exceedingly generous remarks. It was my privilege to conduct hearings in the State of Oregon and in other northwestern States. The result of the hearings was the building of a record and the acquisition of knowledge upon which the committee was able to act with benefit to the whole Nation.

Mr. MORSE. With the patience and indulgence of the Senator from Tennessee, I should like to ask him a few questions.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Tennessee that the Forest Service will hold appropriate hearings on its overall timber-sale program, including its access-road plans, and that, if anyone requests a hearing on a specific project, a hearing will be held?

Mr. GORE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Senator to know that I am asking these questions because I believe it is important that we make this legislative history tonight. There is always the possibility, and in a bill so broad as this one there is always the probability that subsequently on some matter there may be litigation. I believe that the courts are deserving of the cooperation I am seeking to extend to them on the floor of the Senate tonight by building this legislative record as to the Congressional intent.

Is it also the understanding of the Senator from Tennessee that substantial sums will be saved by this revision?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Is it also correct that manpower will be released from paper work so that more roads will be built for the taxpayer's dollar?

Mr. GORE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I also note in the committee report, on page 21, that the committee will call on the Department of Agriculture to submit a long-range timber access road program and a résumé of legislative needs as soon as possible.

Will the Senator from Tennessee say that, in view of the recession, it would be desirable to have that report within 60 days in order that we might proceed on a sound basis if the recession should call for more action?

Mr. GORE. It will be desirable to have the report as expeditiously as possible. As the able Senator from Oregon knows, the Northwestern States are suffering the highest rate of unemployment of any States in the Nation.

I hope that this fact alone, plus the need for economic stimulation nationally, will result in the expedition of the report.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is a very satisfactory answer. In my judgment, in view of the recession which confronts us, a period of 60 days should not be considered unreasonable or excessive.

Mr. GORE. I agree.

Mr. MORSE. Is it also the view of the Senator from Tennessee that the Secretary of Agriculture should make immediate and full use of the contract authority he has for forest development roads and trails?

Mr. GORE. To the extent that the contracts can be put under effectual and efficient expenditure, yes.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that the Senator from Tennessee means to make clear by his discussion of the matter that the Secretary of Agriculture will be requested to submit facts by a certain date?

Mr. GORE. I will direct the staff of the committee now to so communicate with the Secretary.

Mr. MORSE. The committee report requests the Department of Agriculture to use the right of eminent domain when it cannot get to timber which needs immediate harvesting in order to prevent loss. Does the Senator from Tennessee intend that the right of eminent domain shall be applied only to farmers and small landowners, or does he think it should be applied to everyone equally?

Mr. GORE. I think that question must answer itself. I should like to comment, however, that at our hearings there was some reluctance on the part of persons and companies who were beneficiaries of contractual relationships with the Government and beneficiaries of federally constructed roads to give rights-of-way to the Government.

I think eminent domain must be exercised if it becomes necessary, and that it should be no respecter of persons.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Tennessee share my view that when a large timber company does not want to let the Government cross its land to Government timber, the Government then, in behalf of the people of the country, who are the owners of the timber, should move with deliberate speed to make certain that access is obtained across the holdings of such large timber company?

Mr. GORE. The Government must have access to its property. It should not countenance any unreasonable and undue hindrance.

The Senator from Oregon would be the first to recognize, proclaim, and defend the principle that property cannot be taken from anyone without due process. But in the instance of a beneficiary of access paid for by the Government, I think there is a special moral obligation to grant over private property access to Government property.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator's answer is completely satisfactory. I have raised the question because, over the years, I have received a good many complaints from people in Oregon that some operators who have large tracts of land, behind which is located Government land, are very reluctant to negotiate any right-of-way agreements, and use every dilatory tactic they can in order to postpone the day when the Government will exercise its legal rights. Of course, the longer the Government land can be kept bottled up, the more it is to the advantage of the private owners, in some circumstances.

I wanted to raise this point tonight because of the excellent work which has been done on the highway bill. I think the machinery and procedures are now available to enable the Government to go ahead and do a better job, scientifically, of farming the forests belonging to all the people of the Nation.

But there is the problem sometimes of getting access to the forests over the holdings of large and powerful companies, and I wanted the record to show that it is recognized by the Senator from Tennessee that the Government does have, as the Senator has just put it, the moral obligation to make certain that Government interests are protected by eminent domain, if necessary, against the big fellows as well as against the little fellows.

Mr. GORE. If the Government shows a determination to exercise the power and right of eminent domain, it may not be necessary to use it.

Mr. MORSE. Usually when the Government makes it clear that it intends to do so, it can negotiate a right-of-way in most instances.

Does not the Senator from Tennessee feel that when the Government wants to put an access road across a farm or a ranch of 40 or 160 acres, it should be very considerate because of the effect the road might have on the small owner? Therefore, would the Senator say that where a large timber company is involved, a Government timber access road could not be said to depreciate or hurt the property, such as in the case of a small operator, but that in the case of a large holding, very often it would enhance the value of the large holding?

Mr. GORE. The question is a little difficult to answer. I am sure that in the vast expanse of territory, under various circumstances, there would be instances in which both the small and the large holdings might be helped by Government right-of-way construction. Generally speaking, the Government should exercise the greatest prudence and caution in the use of the power of eminent domain.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator made that statement. I share his view. I want the RECORD to be very clear concerning the position of the senior Senator from Oregon in the matter. I think that when the Government is dealing with small pieces of property, it should certainly exercise the right of eminent domain; but every effort should be made to locate the road so that it will do a minimum of damage, so far as devaluating the land of the small operator is concerned.

In the case of a large holder, I think, likewise, that the Government has a moral duty to locate the road so that it will do the least amount of damage to the operator, as well.

We should seek, however, under the policies which are established by the bill, to place the roads in positions where they will best serve the economic interests of the taxpayers as a whole, and will, at the same time, do the least amount of damage, commensurate with the public good, to the property of the landowners.

Mr. GORE. I agree thoroughly with the view of the Senator that in the exercise of governmental rights in this regard, as in others, not only must the Government proceed with a determination to preserve the rights of the Government itself, but must also deal justly with its citizens.

Mr. MORSE. I close my questioning of the Senator from Tennessee and also my comments with this observation: Once again I commend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for the great work he has done on the bill. It was not so long ago—a year or so ago—that I stood in the Senate and commended the Senator from Tennessee for another great job of legislation which he did in connection with the first Gore bill. I think he has duplicated his efforts in connection with the bill now before the Senate and has made a record that will redound to his great credit.

Furthermore, I think he has been very fair and very wise in his acceptance of various amendments offered from time to time with respect to forest roads, amendments which have served to strengthen the bill. The amendments also have served to organize great support behind the bill.

I compliment the Senator also because the bill is a partial recession-cure bill. I do not know of any piece of proposed legislation considered by the Committee on Public Works which will make itself felt more quickly as a recession check than will the road bill. I think, if for no other reason, the bill is worthy of the overwhelming support of the Senate.

I sincerely hope, and I now make a plea to the President, that President Eisenhower will make certain that he, too, will give support to the bill and will accept it as a measure which Congress thinks the emergency calls for by way of the accelerating provisions it contains.

I think this is an opportunity for the administration to demonstrate to the people of the Nation that the leaders of both parties can transcend partisanship when a question of an emergency confronts the national welfare. When people are hungry, out of work, and disturbed, legislation of this type is needed. I am appreciative that the Senate has such leadership as that given by the Senator from Tennessee in connection with a bill such as this. I join in the hope that the bill will receive expeditious consideration.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO NOON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNFAIR PRACTICES IN THE MEAT-PACKING INDUSTRY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, by unanimous consent, the Senate has referred S. 1356 to the Committees on Agriculture and Judiciary, with instructions that the bill be reported back with recommendations no later than Monday, April 21, 1958. I understand that Senator O'MAHONEY and Senator WATKINS, the sponsors of this bill which was reported from the Judiciary Committee, consented to this agreement in fairness to Members of the Senate who were not present but who wished to be heard on this bill, and also for the reason that the original Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 was reported out by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I feel confident that when the members of these two committees have had an opportunity to consider this measure in greater detail, the members of the Agriculture Committee will be satisfied that S. 1356 with the Young-Carroll amendment will restore effective antitrust enforcement to the meatpacking industry, and will not diminish but will broaden the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture over those transactions which it is best equipped to regulate.

I point out to the members of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee that the bill initially reported from the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, and which eventually was enacted into law as the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, entrusted the Federal Trade Commission and not the Department of Agriculture with responsibility for enforcement of the act. In subsequent action on the floor of the Senate and in conference, the lobbyists for the large meatpackers were successful in obtain-

ing provisions in the bill which transferred jurisdiction for the enforcement of the act to the Department of Agriculture. In 1921 the Agriculture Committee was willing to permit the Federal Trade Commission to have complete jurisdiction over all matters embraced in the Packers and Stockyards Act. This included transactions covered by title III of the act relating to purchase and sale of livestock at stockyards. S. 1356 with the Young-Carroll amendment does not propose to clothe the Federal Trade Commission with anything like this broad authority. It would simply charge the Federal Trade Commission with responsibility for proceeding against the unfair trade practices of meatpackers in their various merchandising activities. The bill would leave with the Secretary of Agriculture jurisdiction over the multifarious activities relating to transactions in livestock. Moreover, as noted, the Young-Carroll amendment would broaden the Department of Agriculture's jurisdiction.

Objection has been made to S. 1356 by various farm organizations on the ground that the interest of the grower is not understood by the Federal Trade Commission. They argue that the Federal Trade Commission is consumer oriented and that only the Department of Agriculture can deal properly with the problems of the farmer. In just this manner the meatpackers who opposed this bill have deliberately obscured the issues and have attempted to mislead the various farm groups concerning the meaning and the effect of this bill. The bill introduced by Senators O'MAHONEY and WATKINS, and as modified by the Young-Carroll amendment which has been accepted by the sponsors, now divides jurisdiction between Agriculture and FTC in a way which should meet the objections of all farm groups to this bill. The Department of Agriculture has demonstrated its awareness of the problems of the farmer and the rancher in getting their products to the market place. Recognizing the competence of the Department of Agriculture in this area, the Young-Carroll amendment makes clear that all transactions in the live animal will remain under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture. This amendment specifically charges the Department of Agriculture with all responsibility over livestock transactions at country buying points and at auction yards. Furthermore, it broadens the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act by extending his jurisdiction to all stockyards, irrespective of size. On the other hand, after the live animal has been slaughtered and enters into the various forms in which it moves into the market place for sale to the consumer, the responsibility for preventing restrictive and abusive trade practices would be upon the Federal Trade Commission. For over 40 years the Federal Trade Commission has proved that it is specially qualified to protect the public interest at the wholesaling and retailing level. The problems faced in the wholesaling and retailing of meat and meat food products are no different than those which exist in the vast variety of commodities over which the Commission is now effectively exercising supervision.

Senator O'MAHONEY and Senator WATKINS have already pointed out that the record of the hearings on this bill conclusively demonstrates the failure of the Agriculture Department in regulating merchandising activities of the meatpackers. The Department of Agriculture has neither the experience, the personnel, or the know-how to cope with the problems of discriminatory pricing, false and misleading advertising, market sharing, mergers and acquisitions, and other monopolistic practices.

In the enforcement of the Federal Trade Commission, the Clayton and Robinson-Patman Acts, the Commission has developed a well-defined method of proceeding, and from the complaints filed over the years has evolved a comprehensive body of meaningful law. All persons subject to the provisions of these laws have ample precedent to determine what their rights are in specific cases. On the other hand, the unfair trade-practice provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act are in very broad, vague, and uncertain language. Since Agriculture has not seen fit to enforce this act, there are no litigated cases which afford parties any aid in determining the meaning of the provisions of title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act. Persons subject to the act have no reliable definition of what is prohibited and what is permitted. They have no way to ascertain their rights. Nor has the enforcing agency any well-defined standards to aid it in instituting proceedings under the act.

The crucial issue in this bill is who shall have jurisdiction to police the merchandising activities of meatpackers. S. 1356 places this responsibility squarely upon the Federal Trade Commission and leaves not the slightest doubt as to the agency who shall enforce, the statutes which shall apply, the meaning of such statutes, and the persons and companies subject to such statutes. The amendment sponsored by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] adopts the position sponsored by the American Meat Institute, the lobbyist for the big meatpackers. While this amendment concedes certain obvious weaknesses in the Packers and Stockyards Act, and thereby acknowledges the failure of the Department of Agriculture over the years to enforce the act against meatpackers, this amendment perpetuates the basic mistake of permitting meatpackers to take refuge under the protective umbrella of Department of Agriculture nonenforcement.

The history of the regulated industries has shown that the industry being regulated has frequently taken over or dominated the regulating agencies. There are many reasons why these agencies have not been able to maintain their independence. In the case of the Department of Agriculture, it is particularly difficult if not impossible to achieve independence in regulating meatpackers because other operational functions of the Department are dependent upon the cooperation and assistance of meatpackers. For example, the Department is dependent upon accurate information from meatpackers which is incorporated in the market news service furnished daily by the Department to farmers and ranchers. In the animal disease eradication program of the Department, the experience developed in packer laboratories is often correlated with departmental work in ascertaining the existence and extent of contagious diseases of livestock.

A prosecuting function, more than any other, requires complete independence. The dilemma confronting the Department of Agriculture is obvious. On the one hand it must determine whether it shall publicly attack certain practices of the meatpackers, while at the same time it is earnestly imploring these same packers to furnish assistance for other departmental programs.

We can achieve this independence only by the enactment of S. 1356. This bill makes the Federal Trade Commission, an agency insulated from packer influence, the protector of the public against unfair and monopolistic trade practices in the meatpacking industry.

PENSIONS FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I WHO ARE OVER 65 YEARS OF AGE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution which I have received from the Centennial Legion of the Historic Military Commands, Inc., of the Thirteen Original States.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CENTENNIAL LEGION OF HISTORIC MILITARY COMMANDS OF THE THIRTEEN ORIGINAL STATES, THE 1ST DAY OF MARCH 1958, IN NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

Whereas there is now pending in Congress Senate bill 3153, introduced by Senator LANGER, and H. R. 9714, introduced by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts; and

Whereas the passage of this bill will eliminate the confusion, redtape, and cost of administration, of the present law and regulations by the Veterans' Administration as it pertains to World War I veterans who have reached their 65th birthday; and

Whereas this bill now before the Congress would grant pensions to veterans over 65 years of age who are unemployable and meet income and service requirements; and

Whereas as far as equity, justice, and previous Government policy regarding veterans of other wars are concerned, it must be remembered that World War I veterans were given no consideration when separated from service and faced two depressions at a time when they were attempting to establish themselves in civilian life; and

Whereas the plight of many of these World War I veterans today is very serious, and the passage of this act would guarantee to them the security that they preserved for their Nation in time of war; and

Whereas the passage of this legislation would entail no financial burden upon the increased economy of this Nation, and would render justice to those veterans who are in dire need: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Executive Committee of the Centennial Legion of Historic

Military Commands, Inc., of the Thirteen Original States, meeting on the 1st day of March 1958, in New York City, N. Y., That we vigorously support the passage of Senate bill 3153 and H. R. 9714; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Senate, to the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, and to the House of Representatives, to the Honorable Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts.

Submitted March 3, 1958.

ALBERT E. HERRMANN,
Colonel, OGP, Legislative Chairman and National Director, CLHMC.

Approved:

Capt. AUGUSTUS J. MIGELL,
National Commander, CLHMC.

THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD a resolution which I have received from the Land O' Lakes Creameries.

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

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

1. Whereas there are bills before the Congress to raise interest rates on loans to rural electrification cooperatives; and

2. Whereas the authority of the REA administrator has been limited in approving loans within the Department of Agriculture; and

3. Whereas many dairymen, members of Land O' Lakes, are served by REA-financed cooperatives,

It is resolved, therefore, That Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., at its annual meeting on March 14, 1958, requests that (a) the interest rates not be raised; (b) the REA Administrator be given full authority to approve loans, which authority was granted to him in the original REA Act of 1936: It is therefore

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators and Representatives of the States in which Land O' Lakes has members, and that a copy be sent to the REA Administrator, Mr. Hamil.

(This resolution was approved at the Land O' Lakes Creameries annual meeting, March 14, 1958.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which is composed of over 900 rural electric cooperatives, delivered a speech to the 16th annual meeting of the members of the association at Dallas, Tex., which I have read carefully and which I believe every Senator could read with a great deal of profit.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech and a letter from Mr. Ellis addressed to me be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: As we said in our February 14 NRECA statement for the press, we hope that rural America and all America will join the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in congratulating you for all the splendid work you are doing—particularly for introducing legislation designed to require the Internal Revenue Service and the Federal Power Commission to obey the law.

Isn't it fitting that the Internal Revenue Service decision was received at the close of the nationally observed Advertising Week, as proclaimed by the Advertising Federation of America, whose slogan, you know, is: "America is a better America, thanks to advertising."

Surely, we have always worked for a better America, and such progress as yours gives us new incentive to continue our fight. Now, we do see the end of the "propaganda racket," and the beginning of the end of the "big lie technique."

I am enclosing a copy of my speech for our 16th annual national meeting which set a record for NRECA, and even for Texas, with its 6,478 registrations—6,478 enthusiastic supporters of rural electrification and NRECA banded together for continued progress through collective action.

On behalf of NRECA I congratulate you, and send a most cordial invitation to visit our new headquarters at 2000 Florida Avenue; and, I send my thanks with kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington D. C., February 14, 1958.

RURAL ELECTRIC LEADER PREDICTS END IN SIGHT FOR BIG LIE TECHNIQUE

The beginning of the end of the "big lie technique" was predicted today by Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, commenting on yesterday's Internal Revenue Service decision which held that America's electric light and power companies cannot deduct as expenses before income taxes money used in propaganda advertising.

"Rural America and all America should congratulate the Congress of the United States upon the great victory which it has achieved in prevailing upon the Internal Revenue Department to put a brake on what a Federal court has called the big lie technique which threatens to destroy all American enterprise," Ellis said, when notified that the decision had been received by the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee chairman, ESTES KEFAUVER.

Accusing the "profit power companies" of pouring millions of dollars into propaganda advertising designed to destroy the rural electrification program and the Federal wholesale power program of the United States, Ellis said, "We have long believed that the law prohibits the power trust from charging such expenses as operating costs. But this law has been ignored and thus the rate payers have been forced to help pay the bill."

The rate payers, Ellis stated, include the rural electric cooperatives of the United States, more than half of which purchase their wholesale requirements from the power companies. "The rural electric cooperatives paid the power companies last year approximately $70 million for wholesale power," he said. "They therefore were required to help pay the cost of the big lie technique propaganda campaign against themselves."

A recent Federal court judgment held that certain railroads and an advertising firm had conspired to use what the court specifically called the "technique of the big lie" designed to destroy the goodwill of the trucking industry, force truck transportation costs up to the public and thus destroy the long-haul trucking business. Opinion, *Noer Motor Freight, Inc., et al.* v. *Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference, et al.* (U. S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania).

"We hope that rural America and all America will join the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in congratulating Senator KEFAUVER and his committee and the Chudoff committee of the House, for their studies and investigations of this propaganda racket," Ellis said. "We should also congratulate Senator WILLIAM LANGER of North Dakota, and Congressman LESTER JOHNSON, of Wisconsin, for introducing this year bills designed to require the Internal Revenue Service and the Federal Power Commission to obey the law. The Federal Power Commission has yet to be heard from."

INTRODUCTION TO OUTER SPACE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement issued at the White House today by the President of the United States in connection with the study of space science and technology, together with a document labeled "Introduction to Outer Space: An Explanatory Statement Prepared by the President's Science Advisory Committee."

This is a matter of interest not only to the Members of Congress but also to the American public as a whole.

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

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

In connection with a study of space science and technology made at my request, the President's Science Advisory Committee, of which Dr. James R. Killian is Chairman, has prepared a brief Introduction to Outer Space for the nontechnical reader. This is not science fiction. This is a sober, realistic presentation prepared by leading scientists.

I have found this statement so informative and interesting that I wish to share it with all the people of America and indeed with the people of the earth. I hope that it can be widely disseminated by all news mediums for it clarifies many aspects of space and space technology in a way which can be helpful to all people as the United States proceeds with its peaceful program in space science and exploration. Every person has the opportunity to share through understanding in the adventures which lie ahead.

This statement of the Science Advisory Committee makes clear the opportunities which a developing space technology can provide to extend man's knowledge of the earth, the solar system, and the universe. These opportunities reinforce my conviction that we and other nations have a great responsibility to promote the peaceful use of space and to utilize the new knowledge obtainable from space science and technology for the benefit of all minkind.

INTRODUCTION TO OUTER SPACE

(An explanatory statement prepared by the President's Science Advisory Committee)

What are the principal reasons for undertaking a national space program? What can we expect to gain from space science and exploration? What are the scientific laws and facts and the technological means which it would be helpful to know and understand in reaching sound policy decisions for a United States space program and its management by the Federal Government? This statement seeks to provide brief and introductory answers to these questions.

It is useful to distinguish among four factors which give importance, urgency, and inevitability to the advancement of space technology.

The first of these factors is the compelling urge of man to explore and to discover, the thrust of curiosity that leads men to try to go where no one has gone before. Most of the surface of the earth has now been explored and men now turn to the exploration of outer space as their next objective.

Second, there is the defense objective for the development of space technology. We wish to be sure that space is not used to endanger our security. If space is to be used for military purposes, we must be prepared to use space to defend ourselves.

Third, there is the factor of national prestige. To be strong and bold in space technology will enhance the prestige of the United States among the peoples of the world and create added confidence in our scientific, technological, industrial, and military strength.

Fourth, space technology affords new opportunities for scientific observation and experiment which will add to our knowledge and understanding of the earth, the solar system, and the universe.

The determination of what our space program should be must take into consideration all four of these objectives. While this statement deals mainly with the use of space for scientific inquiry, we fully recognize the importance of the other three objectives.

In fact it has been the military quest for ultra long-range rockets that has provided man with new machinery so powerful that it can readily put satellites in orbit, and, before long, send instruments out to explore the moon and nearby planets. In this way, what was at first a purely military enterprise has opened up an exciting era of exploration that few men, even a decade ago, dreamed would come in this century.

WHY SATELLITES STAY UP

The basic laws governing satellites and space flight are fascinating in their own right. And while they have been well known to scientists ever since Newton, they may still seem a little puzzling and unreal to many of us. Our children, however, will understand them quite well.

We all know that the harder you throw a stone the farther it will travel before falling to earth. If you could imagine your strength so fantastically multiplied that you could throw a stone at a speed of 15,000 miles per hour, it would travel a great distance. It would, in fact, easily cross the Atlantic Ocean before the earth's gravity pulled it down. Now imagine being able to throw the stone just a little faster, say about 18,000 miles per hour, what would happen then?

The stone would again cross the ocean, but this time it would travel much farther than it did before. It would travel so far that it would overshoot the earth, so to speak, and keep falling until it was back where it started. Since in this imaginary example there is no atmospheric resistance to slow the stone down, it would still be traveling at its original speed, 18,000 miles per hour, when it had got back to its starting point. So around the earth it goes again. From the stone's point of view, it is continuously falling, except that its very slight downward arc exactly matches the curvature of the earth, and so it stays aloft—or as the scientist would say, "in orbit"—indefinitely.

Since the earth has an atmosphere, of course, neither stones nor satellites can be sent whizzing around the earth at tree-top level. Satellites must first be lifted beyond the reach of atmospheric resistance. It is absence of atmospheric resistance plus speed that makes the satellite possible. It may seem odd that weight or mass has nothing to do with a satellite's orbit. If a feather were released from a 10-ton satellite, the two would stay together, following the same path in the airless void. There is, however, a slight vestige of atmosphere even a few hundred miles above the earth, and its resistance will cause the feather to spiral inward toward the earth sooner than the satellite. It is atmospheric resistance, however slight, that has set limits on the life of all satellites launched to date. Beyond a few hundred miles the remaining trace of atmosphere fades away so rapidly that tomorrow's satellites should stay aloft thousands of years, and, perhaps, indefinitely. The higher the satellite, incidentally, the less speed it needs to stay in orbit once it gets there (thus, the moon's speed is only a little more than 2,000 miles per hour), but to launch a satellite toward a more distant orbit requires a higher initial speed and greater expenditure of energy.

THE THRUST INTO SPACE

Rocket engineers rate rockets not in horsepower, but in thrust. Thrust is just another name for push, and it is expressed in pounds of force. The rocket gets its thrust or push by exhausting material backward. It is this thrust that lifts the rocket off the earth and accelerates it, making it move faster and faster.

As everyone knows, it is more difficult to accelerate an automobile than a baby carriage. To place satellites weighing 1,000 to 2,000 pounds in orbit requires a first-stage rocket, engine, or engines, having a thrust in the neighborhood of 200,000 to 400,000 pounds. Rocket engines able to supply this thrust have been under development for some time. For launching a satellite, or other space vehicle, the rocket engineer divides his rockets into 2, 3, or more stages, which can be dropped one after the other in flight, thus reducing the total weight that must be accelerated to the final velocity desired. (In other words, it is a great waste of energy to lift one huge fuel tank into orbit when the tank can be divided into smaller tanks—each packaged in its own stage with its own rocket motor—that can be left behind as they become empty.)

To launch some of the present satellites has required rockets weighing up to 1,000 times the weight of the satellite itself. But it will be possible to reduce takeoff weights until they are only 50 to 100 times that of the satellite. The rocket's high ratio of gross weight to payload follows from a fundamental limitation in the exhaust velocities that can be achieved by chemical propellants.

If we want to send up not a satellite but a device that will reach the moon, we need a larger rocket relative to its payload in order that the final stage can be accelerated to about 25,000 miles per hour. This speed, called the "escape velocity," is the speed with which a projectile must be thrown to escape altogether from the gravitational pull of the earth. If a rocket fired at the moon is to use as little fuel as possible, it must attain the escape velocity very near the beginning of its trip. After this peak speed is reached, the rocket will be gradually slowed down by the earth's pull, but it will still move fast enough to reach the moon in 2 or 3 days.

THE MOON AS A GOAL

Moon exploration will involve three distinct levels of difficulty. The first would be a simple shot at the moon, ending either in a "hard" landing or a circling of the moon. Next in difficulty would be a "soft" landing. And most difficult of all would be a "soft" landing followed by a safe return to earth.

The payload for a simple moon shot might be a small instrument carrier similar to a satellite. For the more difficult "soft" landing, the carrier would have to include, as part of its payload, a "retro-rocket" (a decelerating rocket) to provide braking action, since the moon has no atmosphere that could serve as a cushion.

To carry out the most difficult feat, a round trip to the moon, will require that the initial payload include not only "retro-rockets" but rockets to take off again from the moon. Equipment will also be required aboard to get the payload through the atmosphere and safely back to earth. To land a man on the moon and get him home safely again will require a very big rocket engine indeed—one with a thrust in the neighborhood of 1 or 2 million pounds. While nuclear power may prove superior to chemical fuels in engines of multi-million-pound thrust, even the atom will provide no shortcut to space exploration.

Sending a small instrument carrier to Mars, although not requiring much more initial propulsion than a simple moon shot, would take a much longer travel time (8 months or more), and the problems of navigation and final guidance are formidable.

A MESSAGE FROM MARS

Fortunately, the exploration of the moon and nearby planets need not be held up for lack of rocket engines big enough to send men and instrument carriers out into space and home again. Much that scientists wish to learn from satellites and space voyages into the solar system can be gathered by instruments and transmitted back to earth. This transmission, it turns out, is relatively easy with today's rugged and tiny electronic equipment.

For example, a transmitter with a power of just 1 or 2 watts can easily radio information from the moon to the earth. And messages from Mars, on the average some 50 million to 100 million miles away at the time the rocket would arrive, can be transmitted to earth with less power than that used by most commercial broadcasting stations. In some ways, indeed, it appears that it will be easier to send a clear radio message between Mars and earth than between New York and Tokyo.

This all leads up to an important point about space exploration. The cost of transporting men and material through space will be extremely high, but the cost and difficulty of sending information through space will be comparatively low.

WILL THE RESULTS JUSTIFY THE COSTS?

Since the rocket powerplants for space exploration are already in existence or being developed for military need, the cost of additional scientific research, using these rockets, need not be exorbitant. Still, the cost will not be small, either. This raises an important question that scientists and the general public (which will pay the bill) both must face: Since there are still so many unanswered scientific questions and problems all around us on earth, why should we start asking new questions and seeking out new problems in space? How can the results possibly justify the cost?

Scientific research, of course, has never been amenable to rigorous cost accounting in advance. Nor, for that matter, has exploration of any sort. But if we have learned one lesson, it is that research and exploration have a remarkable way of paying off—quite apart from the fact that they demonstrate that man is alive and insatiably curious. And we all feel richer for knowing what explorers and scientists have learned about the universe in which we live.

It is in these terms that we must measure the value of launching satellites and sending rockets into space. These ventures may have practical utility, some of which will be noted later. But the scientific questions come first.

THE VIEW FROM A SATELLITE

Here are some of the things that scientists say can be done with the new satellites and other space mechanisms. A satellite in orbit can do three things: (1) It can sample the strange new environment through which it moves; (2) it can look down and see the earth as it has never been seen before; and (3) it can look out into the universe and record information that can never reach the

earth's surface because of the intervening atmosphere.

The satellite's immediate environment at the edge of space is empty only by earthly standards. Actually, "empty" space is rich in energy, radiation, and fast-moving particles of great variety. Here we will be exploring the active medium, a kind of electrified plasma, dominated by the sun, through which our earth moves. Scientists have indirect evidence that there are vast systems of magnetic fields and electric currents that are connected somehow with the outward flow of charged material from the sun. These fields and currents the satellites will be able to measure for the first time. Also for the first time, the satellites will give us a detailed three-dimensional picture of the earth's gravity and its magnetic field.

Physicists are anxious to run one crucial and fairly simple gravity experiment as soon as possible. This experiment will test an important prediction made by Einstein's General Theory of Relativity, namely, that a clock will run faster as the gravitational field around it is reduced. If one of the fantastically accurate clocks, using atomic frequencies, were placed in a satellite and should run faster than its counterpart on earth, another of Einstein's great and daring predictions would be confirmed. (This is not the same as the prediction that any moving clock will appear to a stationary observer to lose time—a prediction that physicists already regard as well confirmed.)

There are also some special questions about cosmic rays which can be settled only by detecting the rays before they shatter themselves against the earth's atmosphere. And, of course, animals carried in satellites will begin to answer the question: What is the effect of weightlessness on physiological and psychological functions? (Gravity is not felt inside a satellite because the earth's pull is precisely balanced by centrifugal force. This is just another way of saying that bodies inside a satellite behave exactly as they would inside a freely falling elevator.)

The satellite that will turn its attention downward holds great promise for meteorology and the eventual improvement of weather forecasting. Present weather stations on land and sea can keep only about 10 percent of the atmosphere under surveillance. Two or three weather satellites could make a cloud inventory of the whole globe every few hours. From this inventory meteorologists believe they could spot large storms (including hurricanes) in their early stages and chart their direction of movement with much more accuracy than at present. Other instruments in the satellites will measure for the first time how much solar energy is falling upon the earth's atmosphere and how much is reflected and radiated back into space by clouds, oceans, the continents, and by the great polar icefields.

It is not generally appreciated that the earth has to send back into space, over the long run, exactly as much heat energy as it receives from the sun. If this were not so the earth would either heat up or cool off. But there is an excess of income over outgo in the tropical regions, and an excess of outgo over income in the polar regions. This imbalance has to be continuously rectified by the activity of the earth's atmosphere which we call weather.

By looking at the atmosphere from the outside, satellites will provide the first real accounting of the energy imbalances, and their consequent tensions, all around the globe. With the insight gained from such studies, meteorologists hope they may improve long-range forecasting of world weather trends.

Finally, there are the satellites that will look not just around or down, but out into space. Carrying ordinary telescopes as well as special instruments for recording X-rays, ultraviolet, and other radiations, these satellites cannot fail to reveal new sights forever hidden from observers who are bound to the earth. What these sights will be, no one can tell. But scientists know that a large part of all stellar radiation lies in the ultraviolet region of the spectrum, and this is totally blocked by the earth's atmosphere. Also blocked are other very long wavelengths of "light" of the kind usually referred to as radio waves. Some of these get through the so-called radio window in the atmosphere and can be detected by radio telescopes, but scientists would like a look at the still longer waves that cannot penetrate to earth.

Even those light signals that now reach the earth can be recorded with brilliant new clarity by satellite telescopes. All existing photographs of the moon and nearby planets are smeared by the same turbulence of the atmosphere that makes the stars twinkle. Up above the atmosphere the twinkling will stop and we should be able to see for the first time what Mars really looks like. And we shall want a really sharp view before launching the first rocket to Mars.

A CLOSEUP OF THE MOON

While these satellite observations are in progress, other rockets will be striking out for the moon with other kinds of instruments. Photographs of the back or hidden side of the moon may prove quite unexciting, or they may reveal some spectacular new feature now unguessed. Of greater scientific interest is the question whether or not the moon has a magnetic field. Since no one knows for sure why the earth has such a field, the presence or absence of one on the moon should throw some light on the mystery.

But what scientists would most like to learn from a close-up study of the moon is something of its origin and history. Was it originally molten? Does it now have a fluid core, similar to the earth's? And just what is the nature of the lunar surface? The answer to these and many other questions should shed light, directly or indirectly, on the origin and history of the earth and the surrounding solar system.

While the moon is believed to be devoid of life, even the simplest and most primitive, this cannot be taken for granted. Some scientists have suggested that small particles with the properties of life—germs or spores—could exist in space and could have drifted on to the moon. If we are to test this intriguing hypothesis we must be careful not to contaminate the moon's surface, in the biological sense, beforehand. There are strong scientific reasons, too, for avoiding radioactive contamination of the moon until its naturally acquired radioactivity can be measured.

AND ON TO MARS

The nearest planets to earth are Mars and Venus. We know quite enough about Mars to suspect that it may support some form of life. To land instrument carriers on Mars and Venus will be easier, in one respect, than achieving a "soft" landing on the moon. The reason is that both planets have atmospheres that can be used to cushion the final approach. These atmospheres might also be used to support balloons equipped to carry out both meteorological soundings and a general photo survey of surface features. The Venusian atmosphere, of course, consists of what appears to be a dense layer of clouds so that its surface has never been seen at all from earth.

Remotely controlled scientific expeditions to the moon and nearby planets could absorb the energies of scientists for many decades. Since man is such an adventurous creature, there will undoubtedly come a time when he can no longer resist going out and seeing for himself. It would be foolish to try to predict today just when this moment will arrive. It might not arrive in this century, or it might come within 1 or 2 decades. So much will depend on how rapidly we want to expand and accelerate our program. According to one rough estimate it might require a total investment of about a couple of billion dollars, spent over a number of years to equip ourselves to land a man on the moon and to return him safely to earth.

THE SATELLITE RADIO NETWORK

Meanwhile, back at earth, satellites will be entering into the everyday affairs of men. Not only will they be aiding the meteorologists, but they could surely—and rather quickly—be pressed into service for expanding worldwide communications, including intercontinental television.

At present all transoceanic communication is by cable (which is costly to install) or by shortwave radio (which is easily disrupted by solar storms). Television cannot practically be beamed more than a few hundred miles because the wavelengths needed to carry it will not bend around the earth and will not bounce off the region of the atmosphere known as the ionosphere. To solve this knotty problem, satellites may be the thing, for they can serve as high-flying radio relay stations. Several suitably equipped and properly spaced satellites would be able to receive TV signals from any point on the globe and to relay them directly—or perhaps via a second satellite—to any other point. Powered with solar batteries, these relay stations in space should be able to keep working for many years.

MILITARY APPLICATIONS OF SPACE TECHNOLOGY

The development of military rockets has provided the technological base for space exploration. It will probably continue to do so, because of the commanding military importance of the ballistic missile. The subject of ballistic missiles lies outside our present discussion. We ask instead, putting missiles aside, what other military applications of space technology can we see ahead?

There are important, foreseeable, military uses for space vehicles. These lie, broadly speaking, in the fields of communication and reconnaissance. To this we could add meteorology, for the possible advances in meteorological science which have already been described would have military implications. The use of satellites for radio relay links has also been described, and it does not take much imagination to foresee uses of such techniques in long-range military operations.

The reconnaissance capabilities of a satellite are due, of course, to its position high above the earth and the fact that its orbit carries it in a predictable way over much of the globe. Its disadvantage is its necessarily great distance, 200 miles or more, from the surface. A highly magnifying camera or telescope is needed to picture the earth's surface in even moderate detail. To the human eye, from 200 miles away, a football stadium would be a barely distinguishable speck. A telescopic camera can do a good deal better, depending on its size and complexity. It is certainly feasible to obtain reconnaissance information with a fairly elaborate instrument, information which could be relayed back to the earth by radio.

Much has been written about space as a future theater of war, raising such suggestions as satellite bombers, military bases on the moon, and so on. For the most part, even the more sober proposals do not hold up well on close examination or appear to be achievable at an early date. Granted that they will become technologically possible, most of these schemes, nevertheless, appear to be clumsy and ineffective ways of doing a job. Take one example, the satellite as a bomb carrier. A satellite cannot simply drop a bomb. An object released from a satellite doesn't fall. So there is no special advantage in being over the target. Indeed, the only way to drop a bomb directly down from a

satellite is to carry out aboard the satellite a rocket launching of the magnitude required for an intercontinental missile. A better scheme is to give the weapon to be launched from the satellite a small push, after which it will spiral in gradually. But that means launching it from a moving platform halfway around the world, with every disadvantage compared to a missile base on the ground. In short, the earth would appear to be, after all, the best weapons carrier.

This is only one example; each idea has to be judged on its own merits. There may well be important military applications for space vehicles which we cannot now foresee, and developments in space technology which open up quite novel possibilities. The history of science and technology reminds us sharply of the limitations of our vision. Our road to future strength is the achievement of scientific insight and technical skill by vigorous participation in these new explorations. In this setting, our appropriate military strength will grow naturally and surely.

A SPACE TIMETABLE

Thus we see that satellites and space vehicles can carry out a great variety of scientific missions, and a number of military ones as well.

Indeed, the scientific opportunities are so numerous and so inviting that scientists from many countries will certainly want to participate. Perhaps the International Geophysical Year will suggest a model for the international exploration of space in the years and decades to come.

The timetable on the following page suggests the approximate order in which some of the scientific and technical objectives mentioned in this review may be attained.

The timetable is not broken down into years, since there is yet too much uncertainty about the scale of the effort that will be made. The timetable simply lists various types of space investigations and goals under three broad headings: Early, Later, Still Later.

SCIENTIFIC OBJECTIVES

Early

1. Physics.
2. Geophysics.
3. Meteorology.
4. Minimal moon contact.
5. Experimental communications.
6. Space physiology.

Later

1. Astronomy.
2. Extensive communications.
3. Biology.
4. Scientific lunar investigation.
5. Minimal planetary contact.
6. Human flight in orbit.

Still later

1. Automated lunar exploration.
2. Automated planetary exploration.
3. Human lunar exploration and return.

And much later still

Human planetary exploration.

In conclusion, we venture two observations. Research in outer space affords new opportunities in science, but it does not diminish the importance of science on earth. Many of the secrets of the universe will be fathomed in laboratories on earth, and the progress of our science and technology and the welfare of the Nation require that our regular scientific programs go forward without loss of pace, in fact at an increased pace. It would not be in the national interest to exploit space science at the cost of weakening our efforts in other scientific endeavors. This need not happen if we plan our national program for space science and technology as part of a balanced national effort in all science and technology.

Our second observation is prompted by technical considerations. For the present, the rocketry and other equipment used in space technology must usually be employed at the very limit of its capacity. This means that failures of equipment and uncertainties of schedule are to be expected. It therefore appears wise to be cautious and modest in our predictions and pronouncements about future space activities—and quietly bold in our execution.

Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., Chairman; Dr. Robert F. Bacher; Dr. William O. Baker; Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner; Dr. Hans A. Bethe; Dr. Detlev W. Bronk; Dr. James H. Doolittle; Dr. James B. Fisk; Dr. Caryl P. Haskins; Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky; Dr. Edwin H. Land; Dr. Edward M. Purcell; Dr. Isidor I. Rabi; Dr. H. P. Robertson; Dr. Paul A. Weiss; Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner; Dr. Herbert York; Dr. Jerrold R. Zacharias.

VOTING RECORDS OF THE SENATORS FROM OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article published in the Oregonian of March 25, 1958, and a letter with an enclosure entitled "A Look at the Record," sent to me by Mr. C. Gerard Davidson, national committeeman, Democratic National Committee of Oregon, under date of March 15, 1958. This material deals with the voting records of the two Democratic Senators from Oregon since they have served together in the Senate.

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

NEUBERGER ATTEMPTS TO SEVER ALLIANCE WITH MORSE

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, midway through his first 6-year term in the United States Senate, is trying to make a sharp change in his political tactics.

NEUBERGER has concluded, in effect, that Oregon cannot afford to have two gadfly Senators. He is making a bold effort to draw away from the tactical alliance he had with Senator WAYNE MORSE the past 3 years.

When he and MORSE differ in their views or approach, NEUBERGER is more anxious to have this difference widely known in Oregon than to attempt a show of surface party unity. He wants no longer to be thought of in the public mind as the junior half of the "Morseberger" team.

As a political figure, NEUBERGER is seeking to become an independent personality, unlimited by associations with Senator MORSE, whose enemies and critics he does not wish always to share.

OLD FIRE EXPLORED

The old NEUBERGER was a Senator cast from the same mold that produced Richard L. Neuberger, nationally famous magazine writer and biting critic of the less-than-perfect in the political status quo. If he usually stuck his colorful adverbial barbs into the hide of the GOP elephant, he was not adverse to letting fly at the donkey of his own party when it nibbled outside the pastures of liberalism.

By virtue of experience as a writer and State senator, he was equipped from the day he took office in the United States Senate to draft and deliver pungent essays in the Senate Chamber on the manners, morals, and policies of those in command of the Washington political arena. His targets ranged far up and down the domestic scale, from alleged trapping of squirrels on the White House lawn (so they wouldn't dig up Ike's practice putting green), to policies on major questions of public concern.

The old NEUBERGER was first of all a critic, least of all a candidate for acceptance into the club-like United States Senate where freshmen are, by tradition, expected to respect their elders' judgment in silence.

The new NEUBERGER is a Senator determined to get things done for Oregon, to win friends and influence people in the right places in order to achieve legislative ends, to disavow partisanship when a more conciliatory attitude toward Republicans is apt to win votes for a cause he holds dear.

One could say that NEUBERGER is attempting to move from the ivory tower of the critic to the forge of political action where public laws are hammered out of compromises by men willing to give and take.

ARIZONA LETTER CITED

This shift began months ago but has become pronounced the last few weeks. It has, it appears, been fostered by a combination of circumstances: a growing discontent with some of MORSE's gadfly tactics; and the legislative problems, such as the Klamath Indian mess, which demand constructive solutions by Congress.

The Morse-Neuberger political honeymoon ended last summer when the two Senators fell to writing uncomplimentary letters to one another about their differences on the civil rights bill and MORSE's comparison of President Eisenhower with Dave Beck.

Two recent votes illustrate NEUBERGER's new approach. He was instrumental in the Senate's passage of the administration's postal rate increase bill, and he opposed the Democratic proposal for a hefty tax cut. MORSE was on the other side both times.

NEUBERGER said he thought he would be a hypocrite if he continued to advocate projects which require Federal spending, such as dams, highways, access roads, and school aid, and also voted for lower postal rates or cuts in tax revenue needed to finance Federal programs. MORSE replied by saying he had never heard a more absurd non sequitur in his 13 years in the Senate.

As evidence that his attitude may not be so absurd, NEUBERGER cites a letter he received from Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat of Arizona, dean of the Senate and chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Said HAYDEN:

"By voting to cut down the postal deficit, you were actively assisting me to provide more Federal funds for dams, locks, transmission lines, redredging, and other needed public works in the State of Oregon. Federal funds, first or last, have to come from the taxpayers of this country. When we must divert such funds to cover postal deficits, it means less money for public improvements in such regions as the Pacific Northwest. I want to thank you for your courage in not flinching from the question of a 5-cent postal rate."

NEUBERGER has had HAYDEN's letter mimeographed for distribution.

Probably the most crucial case in point of NEUBERGER's new tack is over the Klamath Indian problem. As sponsor of a bill for outright Federal purchase of the reservation, he expressed disappointment in January when the Interior Department came up with a bill to give private industry first call on the timber, as long as sustained-yield management was observed. But as the Klamath hearings he personally conducted droned on, it became apparent to NEUBERGER that it would be tough to get any bill enacted. So he decided to back the administration's bill in hopes of getting more GOP support. In his current newsletter, NEUBERGER sums it up:

"Candidly, I doubt if this measure is quite as good as my own bill for outright Federal purchase of the timber and marsh of the vast reservation. Yet I believe it will fulfill the mission of preventing a disastrous termination, which could have broken Oregon's lumber market wide apart by dumping 4 billion feet of choice pine timber into

sales channels during less than 2 years. Had I insisted upon my bill for a straight Federal taking of the reservation, there probably would have been a bitter partisan fight. * * * It seemed to me that I had to put aside pride of authorship and political partisanship, in order to prevent a result that could be ruinous to southeastern Oregon."

SOME STANDS FAVORED

NEUBERGER doesn't wish to persuade MORSE to depart from the role of the gadfly, only to draw apart from that role himself.

"Senator MORSE serves a very useful role in taking out after the administration for all its faults," observed NEUBERGER. "He doesn't need too much assistance from me in that."

As for himself, said NEUBERGER, "When the administration is willing to go halfway, I think I've got to go halfway—and in some cases, like the Klamath Indians, more than halfway."

NEUBERGER has already been criticized by some Oregon Democrats for his new approach of modernization toward Republicans, but he avers: "This is one of the things we have to do if we are going to get things done."

Some have asked why he doesn't go all the way and become a Republican. Asked if it's possible he might do a reverse-WAYNE MORSE, he replied:

FOUR GAINS CITED

"I've been a Democrat since I was 21. I think the Democratic Party is heading in the right direction because it has the interests of all the people at heart. I can't conceive of any circumstances that would change that. On the other hand, I don't think everything the Republicans propose is bad. This administration is going to be in office for another 3 years and within the limits of partisan differences I think I should try to work with it for the best interests of our State."

Under his new "get things done" approach, NEUBERGER tallies these things done:

1. Interior Committee approval of his Fort Clatsop national monument bill.

2. Public Works Committee approval of increased authorizations for forest highway and timber access roads, plus agreement to an antibillboard clause.

3. Indian subcommittee approval of the Klamath bill.

4. Approval in principle by National Institutes of Health of a $1,250,000 medical research grant for Oregon.

Probably because he was in such a minority as a Democrat in an overwhelmingly Republican State legislature, NEUBERGER as a State senator followed the gadfly technique. As a member of the majority party in Congress, NEUBERGER now bears a heavier responsibility for affecting legislative action. Yet so long as Republicans control the administration and nearly match the Democrats in Congressional strength, legislative action is hardly possible without some measure of GOP support.

Like most folks who seek to make a personal change in behavior, Senator NEUBERGER will likely find that the old man dies hard. But this new approach to lawmaking is his expressed aspiration as he heads into the homestretch of his senatorial term and a probable bid for reelection in 1960.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE OF OREGON,
Portland, Oreg., March 19, 1958.

DEAR COUNTY CHAIRMAN: Providing we do not fall victim to over-confidence, November 1958 will mark the greatest Democratic victory since 1936. This is the attitude of national committeemen and women representing every section of the United States. It is also the opinion of reporters and newsmen, long experienced in detecting political trends.

The Republicans are without issues, without decent voting records, without leadership; and, November will see them without office.

Because of their lack of issues, the Republican press has, across the Nation, attempted to foster fights and strife between fellow Democrats. The Oregonian's I'll-hold-your-coat-while-you-fight attitude toward Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER is typical. Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER have voted differently. They are honest men of conviction and we Democrats expect them to differ. But how often? The Oregonian would have you believe they are on opposite sides of every vote. What are the facts?

Look at the record. The only real record is that of the rollcall votes. On rollcall votes, on which they both answered, throughout the entire 84th Congress, Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER voted together 89.9 percent of the time.

With a voting record of 89.9 percent agreement, Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER are very near the top of the list of those voting in agreement.

Don't allow the Republican press to divide your coworkers. We have nationally recognized, competent, and able representation in Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER. They are statesmen. They stand united on fundamental issues and with our help they will lead a united Democratic Party to victory this fall.

Sincerely yours,

C. GIRARD DAVIDSON,
National Committeeman.

A LOOK AT THE RECORD

During the 84th Congress, on rollcall votes on which they both answered, Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER voted together 89.9 percent of the time.

In each Congress, hundreds of bills are acted upon. In many instances, conscientious and able Congressmen may agree completely on an objective, yet differ on procedure; might agree totally on the merits of a bill, yet differ on legal or constitutional approaches.

In spite of the opportunities for honest differences of opinion, our two Oregon Senators stood shoulder-to-shoulder on virtually every major issue. The following resumé is to provide an idea of the number of bills considered by the United States Senate and to show the opportunities for disagreement.

Of all these measures listed (representing a share of the most vital votes cast during 1957) Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER voted identically.

Fiscal deficiency appropriation bill, H. R. 4294.

Senate version of President's Mideast doctrine, Senate Joint Resolution 19.

United Nations emergency force amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 19.

Morse amendment to Mideast doctrine, Senate Joint Resolution 19.

Financial Institutions Act of 1957, S. 1451.

Amendment fiscal deficiency for strategic material, H. R. 4294.

Cumulative voting amendment to financial institutions, S. 1451.

Antimerger provision, financial institutions, S. 1451.

Extension of corporate income taxes, H. R. 4090.

Amendment to retain flood control, river and harbors, S. 497.

Passage of flood control, rivers and harbors bill, S. 497.

Confirmation of Brigadier General Zwicker.

Extension of Agriculture Trade Development Act, S. 1314.

Commercial corn acreage program, S. 1771.

Deficiency appropriation, House Joint Resolution 310.

Confirmation Scott McLeod as Ambassador to Ireland.

Protocol International Convention Northwest Atlantic Fisheries.

Passage Department of State and Justice appropriation, H. R. 6871.

Supplemental appropriation strategic minerals, H. R. 7221.

Passage third supplemental appropriations bill, H. R. 7221.

Gore amendment housing bill of 1957, H. R. 6659.

Bricker amendment housing bill of 1957, H. R. 6659.

Morse amendment to increase public housing, H. R. 6659.

Bush amendment re college housing bill, H. R. 6659.

Bennett slum clearance amendment housing bill, H. R. 6659.

Passage public housing bill of 1957, H. R. 6659.

Department of Commerce appropriation bill, H. R. 6700.

Sockeye Salmon Convention protocol.

Morse amendment to increase Washington, D. C., budget, H. R. 6500.

Morse amendment to increase funds for District of Columbia teachers, H. R. 6500.

Independent offices appropriations, H. R. 6070.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation, H. R. 6287.

Amendment to retain conservation reserves, H. R. 7441.

Passage agriculture appropriation bill, H. R. 7441.

Statute of International Atomic Energy Agency.

Ratification International Atomic Energy Treaty.

Hells Canyon Dam bill, S. 555.

Department of Interior appropriation bill, H. R. 5189.

Senate resolution recalling U. N. regarding Hungary, House Concurrent Resolution 204.

Ratification Austrian Bond Treaty.

Motion to consider civil rights bill, H. R. 6127.

Department of Defense appropriations bill.

Amendment to strike martial rights 1866 civil rights, H. R. 6127.

Amendment to modify part III civil rights bill, H. R. 6127.

Amendment to modify part III, 14th amendment civil rights bill, H. R. 6127.

Amendment providing jury trial civil rights bill, H. R. 6127.

Amendment to ease Senate rules regarding debate, H. R. 6127.

Treaty of Commerce and Friendship with Korea.

Convention promotion Inter-American Cultural Relations.

Resolution providing Taxation Convention with Austria.

Amendment of International Sugar Control Agreement.

Authorize TVA to finance new power facilities, S. 1869.

Establish payments on TVA capital, S. 1869.

TVA appropriations bill, S. 1869.

Public works appropriations Army Engineers, H. R. 8090.

Washington, D. C., Government proposal, H. R. 6517.

Retirement benefits for civil-service employees, H. R. 6517.

Passage civil service benefits bill, H. R. 6517.

Government guarantee private loans to air carriers, S. 2229.

Authorization FPC to license New York State Power Authority, H. R. 8643.

Nomination Jerome Kuykendall, FPC.

Nomination Don Paarlberg Assistant Secretary Agriculture.

AEC atomic energy for peaceful and military uses, S. 2674.

Hickenlooper amendment to reduce AEC appropriation, S. 2674.

Hickenlooper amendment to delete AEC rights, S. 2674.

Revision immigration and naturalization laws, S. 2792.

Ratification International Atomic Energy Agency.

Restrict use of FBI files, S. 2377.

Amendment to permit Government use of wire recordings, S. 2377.

Mutual security appropriation bill, H. R. 9302.

Postal pay increase bill, H. R. 2474.

Federal employees salary increase bill, H. R. 2462.

NOTE.—The A. F. of L.-CIO report on Congressional action shows Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER voted identically on 90 percent of the issues chosen by that organization as the most important coming before the 84th Congress.

A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR THE WORKING MEN AND WOMEN OF AMERICA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on January 23 I introduced proposed legislation which represents a bill of rights for the working men and women throughout the Nation, who, at the present time are or may become members of the Nation's unions.

The proposed legislation provides for the election of union officials by secret ballot with protection against illegally conducted elections; for the recall of union officials who misuse their positions of trust and responsibility; the control by union members over the conditions, terms and duration of strikes; restrictions against arbitrary use of trustees to control local unions; the regulation of welfare and pension programs, and the preventing of conspiracy between management and union officials, against the interest of the union member.

I am pleased to report that this bill, S. 3068, now pending in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, is receiving substantial support among rank and file members of organized unions. I am advised that the permanent subcommittee on labor legislation of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has commenced hearing this month on proposed legislation dealing with this subject matter including a number of other bills now pending before the committee.

Since the introduction of S. 3068, I have received a number of communications from interested citizens in California and elsewhere who have requested that an additional protection be included in this bill which will make it possible for all employees if they should so desire to become members of the union which represents them under law as their collective bargaining representative. After a careful study of this subject and an investigation into the membership restrictions of certain unions, it is my belief that the Nation's existing labor statutes are deficient in this important field of union membership.

In accordance with these views I am submitting an amendment to S. 3068 to prohibit existing discriminations against employees who desire to participate in union activities.

Mr. President, the American way of life, guided by our constitutional form of Government and court decisions relating thereto, is fundamentally opposed to discrimination among our citizens based on age, race, religion, sex or color.

The Labor-Management Relations Act, as amended, specifically provides that those unions approved by the majority of members in a unit for collective bargaining purposes have the exclusive privilege of representing all the employees. I believe that fundamental justice requires that the union organization in such cases should permit all employees it represents to become members of their organization if they should so desire.

The amendment which I have submitted specifically provides that under these conditions all employees of the collective bargaining unit shall be permitted to membership in the union organization on the same terms and conditions and with the same rights and privileges enjoyed by those already members of the union.

I have included a provision that nothing in the amendment shall prevent a labor organization from denying union membership to individuals who are members of the Communist Party or who believe in or teach the forceful or illegal overthrow of the United States Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the amendment which I have submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and, without objection, it will also be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. KNOWLAND is as follows: On page 22, between lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) Subsection (a) of section 9 of such act is amended by adding the following new sentences at the end thereof: "No labor organization which does not admit to membership all of the employees it seeks to represent in a unit appropriate for that purpose, on the same terms and conditions generally and uniformly applicable to and with the same rights and privileges generally and uniformly accorded to all the members thereof, shall be a representative of any employees in such unit for the purpose of collective bargaining within the meaning of this section. Nothing in the foregoing sentence shall be construed to prevent a labor organization from denying membership to any person on the ground that such person is a member of the Communist Party or that he believes in, or is a member of an organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

On page 22, line 8, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)."

On page 23, line 9, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)."

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia on the question of the investigation of the Forest Service. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas the counties of Rabun, Habersham, White, Union, Fannin, Gilmer, Dawson, Lumpkin, Towns, and Murray are located in the Chattahoochee National Forest which is under the control and supervision of the United States Forest Service, a unit of the United States Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas in said counties there are some of the largest lumber mills of this State, and in most of these counties such mills are the principal industry; said mills being dependent almost entirely on national forest timber; and

Whereas by reason of the quality of timber, marked for cutting, the unnecessary costly requirements of logging roads to be constructed by the mills, excessive K. V. charges, and the high prices of timber on the stump, all being determined and fixed by the said Forest Service, the lumber mills cannot afford to bid on such timber; and

Whereas the Forest Service has advertised small and large lots of timber in north Georgia during the past 12 months for which there were no bidders resulting in a waste of marking and advertising costs as well as a reduction in revenues to county school and road funds; and

Whereas because of such policies followed by the United States Forest Service, the established lumber industry in these north Georgia counties is forced to curtail operations and some are going out of business; and

Whereas in one county in this area, lumber mills operating national forest timber produced approximately $2,500,000 worth of lumber products out of 26 million feet of lumber during 1957, and the payroll of these mills amounted to approximately $1,600,000; and

Whereas if these policies of the United States Forest Service are not investigated and relief given to the lumber industry, the unemployment and loss of payrolls will make ghost communities throughout north Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to investigate the policies and actions of the United States Forest Service as described herein and obtain every possible relief for the lumber industry in this area; be it further

Resolved as aforesaid, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives from Georgia; Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; and Hon. Marvin Griffin, Governor of Georgia.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

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

Ray M. Gidney, of Ohio, to be Comptroller of the Currency.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. BUTLER, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 3567) to prohibit the transfer of machineguns to minors, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF CERTAIN INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3068) to regulate certain internal affairs of labor organizations by providing processes and procedures for insuring democratic control of such organizations by the rank-and-file membership thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3414) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act approved June 29, 1956, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3511) to remove the present $1,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the accidental release of a bomb from an Air Force aircraft on an authorized noncombat training mission over and near Mars Bluff, Florence County, S. C., on March 11, 1958, that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3511 relates to the removal of a $1,000 limitation on the amount of claims that may be settled by the Secretary of the Air Force on account of the unfortunate accidental release of a bomb from an aircraft over Florence County, S. C., earlier this month. The subject matter of the bill is one over which the Committee on the Judiciary has exercised jurisdiction, and I believe other similar bills are now receiving consideration there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand adjourned.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, March 27, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 26 (legislative day of March 17), 1958:

Edwin D. Steel, Jr., of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the district of Delaware vice Paul C. Leahy, retired.

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

William T. Plummer, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 3, district of Alaska, for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Harlington Wood, Jr., of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois, for a term of 4 years, vice John B. Stoddart, Jr., resigned.

Daniel H. Jenkins, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania, for a term of 4 years, vice J. Julius Levy, resigned.

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior assistant surgeons

Pindaros R. Vagelos
John C. Ballar III
Martha Vaughan
Edwin L. Child
George H. Longenbaugh
Melvin A. Nimer
Robert C. Colvin
Nathan J. Clifford
William E. Morton
William W. Lee
William J. Maier
Robert E. Streicher
George W. Gaffney
Walter E. Williamson, Jr.
James E. Wesley
Morton L. Kurland
Charles L. Donaldson
Gerhard H. Hoffman
Donald A. Nagel
James W. Ruddell
Ralph Ten Have
John P. McGowan
Marvin W. Rosenzweig
William L. Lages
Eugene Braunwald
James E. Darnell, Jr.
William F. Ossenfort, Jr.
Clarence G. Wheeler
Joseph L. Rauh
Edward J. Leonard
Frank J. Nuckols
George M. Northrup
John R. McDonough
Charles G. Lewallen
Paul J. Schmidt
Leonard Laster
Frederick A. Fox
Phillip E. Morgan
Peter J. T. Beeton
Robert I. Fraser
Stanley Graber
Franklin T. Evans
Bernard J. Collopy
Jean R. L. Herdt
Bernard W. Agranoff
Milton Alter
William P. Thompson
Johnny Fruge
Ned Feder
Paul H. Blachly
Hugo C. Pribor
Arnold L. Nielsen
George G. Glenner
Walter G. Dukstein
Daniel C. Beittel
Guy E. Faget
R. Gerald Suskind
Robert W. Weiger
James H. Shindel
Robert Collier
George G. Browning
Jack Cooper
Leo J. Castiglioni
Lewis R. Thompson, Jr.
Robert S. Turner
Roy D. Hoke
Floyd L. Templeton
Gero Diels

To be assistant surgeons

Paul P. Carbone
Donald C. Loos
Jack P. Clark
Richard L. Pentecost
Arthur B. Sundberg
James D. Bremner
Ray L. Zeigler
Marvin Rowe
Dean F. Tirador
Norbert L. Dugan, Jr.
Vernon O. Larson

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Thomas H. McQueen
William E. Willoughby
Charles W. Switzer
Ernest C. Leatherwood, Jr.
Robert A. Kennedy

To be assistant dental surgeons

Edward M. Campbell
John F. Dyar
Clement K. Schmitt

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

David G. Stephan
Hugh H. Connolly
Francis L. Nelson
Ian K. Burgess

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Donald J. Baumgartner
Richard Anderson
Paul A. Kenline

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Peter L. Bogarosh
Kenneth E. Hanson

To be senior assistant scientists

Harry T. Miles, Jr.
Norman A. Clarke
Antonio H. Romano
Maxwell J. Wilcomb, Jr.

To be assistant scientist

Norman Cliff

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Rudolph P. Zalesak
Elizabeth A. Zacha
Florence M. Seidler

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 26 (legislative day of March 17), 1958:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Robert Newbegin, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Honduras.

Horace H. Smith, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Sudan.

Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

I Corinthians 16: 13: *Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.*

O Thou God of all might and majesty, may we go through the hours of this day with a strong and steadfast faith in Thy guiding and gracious presence.

We confess penitently that our finite minds and hearts are tempted frequently to surrender to the spirit of discouragement and defeatism.

Grant that we may accept Thy divine leading with courage and confidence, assured that when we follow Thee we shall not walk in darkness but have the light of life.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who proclaimed himself to be the light of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF JONAH KUHIO KALANIANAOLE

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, today, March 26, is a legal holiday in Hawaii, commemorating the anniversary of the birth of Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole, prince of the realm in the days of the kingdom, political prisoner and exile in the time of the republic, Delegate from Hawaii to the Congress of the United States during 19 years of Hawaii's 57 as an integral part of the United States.

Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole is honored by the commemoration of his birth because he was an American whose dedi-

cation and devotion to the ideals and principles of our Founding Fathers are amply demonstrated by his continuing efforts to improve the political and economic institutions by which the people of his beloved Hawaii lived.

Delegate Kalanianaole was an honor and a credit to this House, to the people of Hawaii, and to the Polynesian who has made the major contribution in the development of the "man of the Pacific"—whose peculiar value to the United States is becoming increasingly apparent.

The people of Hawaii ask you to join them—by wearing the orchids provided — transportation, courtesy of United Airlines—in observing the anniversary of one of Hawaii's greatest sons who served with distinction for the best part of 10 terms in this House.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the RECORD show that had I been present I would have voted "yea" on the bill H. R. 11470.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE STORY OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we learned a lot of wisdom from the fables to which wise teachers directed our attention in childhood. More is the pity that so many of us easily forget the wisdom in some of these parables, and recall them only as fairy tales. In this day when so many seem convinced that government has the ability, and even the responsibility, to alter economic laws—to provide for our well-being—two such tales spring to mind.

It is hard to tell which holds for us, in our maturity, the most profound lesson.

Have any of us forgotten the story of the ridiculous rooster who became convinced that it was his loud crowing that commanded the sun to rise each morning?

Perhaps more pertinent to today's problems, and we might all relax and laugh with one another once again over it, is the fable of the monkey whose duty it was to divide the cheese between the cats. To balance the scales, if you remember, he nibbled, first from one cheese and then from the other until all the cheese had been eaten—and the cats had none. Can any government do better than that monkey?

THE IMPROVEMENT IN THE POSITION OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the farm situation is on the mend. It is climbing steadily out of the postwar depths into which it was plunged by extending emergency programs beyond their practical usefulness, and beyond the time when they were of real help to farmers.

Income per person on farms last year was the highest on record. It was up 2 percent over 1951, the previous high year and, if you recall, a war year; 1957 was a year of peace.

Farm assets as of January 1 stood at $188 billion. That was an alltime high.

Farmers have less than $11 in debts for each $100 of assets. Back in 1940, before we felt the effects of wartime inflation, the ratio was $19 for each $100.

Farm ownership is also at a record high. Only 1 in 3 farms has a mortgage.

Contrary to what you may have heard, the family farm continues to dominate agriculture. Ninety-six percent of our farms and ranches are family operations. That is about what it was 30 years ago, though now it takes more capital and in some cases more land to make up a family-style farm.

And this must not be overlooked when we consider the overall condition of the people of American agriculture—the level of living on farms is the highest in history.

Last year our Tennessee farmers received higher cash receipts from cattle, hogs, and corn. However, these increases only partly offset a substantial decline in cotton. I might remind you that cattle and hogs operate in a free market, without any kind of production restraints or marketing quotas. Cotton has had the full treatment of all these dubious benefits.

In Tennessee we are grateful to Secretary Benson for the wise and courageous leadership he has given to basically improve the position of agriculture.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11574) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11574, with Mr. IKARD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, although I was excused from attendance on the floor last week on account of necessarily going to Boston as a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I do wish to have the RECORD show how I would have voted on the five rollcalls that occurred last week during my necessary absence.

On rollcall 22, if I had been present, I would have voted "yea"; on rollcall 23, "yea"; on rollcall 25, "yea"; on rollcall 27, "nay"; and on rollcall 28, "yea."

I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to our colleagues that we on the Independent Offices Subcommittee are glad to come to you and submit this bill, which is the result of several long weeks of hard study on our part. We hope you will agree with us. We think we have a good bill.

As far as I am concerned, there are just no finer folks than we have on this subcommittee. We get along beautifully, and we work well together. Whatever difficulties we have we try to iron out before we get here.

This bill, I think by and large, is a good bill. May I point out that there are 2 or 3 things I want to call to your attention. One relates to the Veterans' Administration. We went $8,365,000 above the budget in regard to inpatient care.

In that regard, we have a new administrator, Mr. Sumner Whittier, a young gentleman from Massachusetts. We think he is going to be one of the best administrators the VA has ever had. We are all impressed with him. We wish him well. I believe he will cooperate with the Members here and give the veterans an outstanding job.

In another item we put in a little money above the budget for them to get busy and renovate some of the old buildings that should have been brought up

to date several years ago. It does not save any money to postpone repair and maintenance on these Federal buildings.

In another item, we put in around $177 million for 66 multipurpose buildings. We did it because we think these buildings ought to be built. For another reason, it is cheaper by almost three-quarters of a dollar for every dollar spent for their construction to do it by direct appropriation instead of lease-purchase. For the same building, the same square footage, it would otherwise cost you about $1.60 or $1.65.

We have had a lot of questions about buildings used exclusively for post offices. They are not included in this bill. We have been asked why not. It is because the Post Office Department handles that. But may I respectfully say that I do not think the Post Office Department ought to be in the construction business? They were set up to deliver the mails—period. It is a fine organization, regardless of what you may think of Mr. Summerfield or his politics. Whether you agree or do not agree, he certainly is an outstanding man. He works at the job. But I do not think he ought to be in the construction business. When you set up a duplicate construction agency you are adding cost upon cost. For over 100 years the Public Building Service has been doing the construction work for Federal office buildings and post offices, and it ought to be there. So, let us get rid of lease-purchase, and that is what we have done.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. In many jurisdictions throughout the United States the facilities for the judiciary are woefully lacking.

Mr. THOMAS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. We find judges with their chambers in office buildings at a great distance from the courts themselves, which, of course, causes inconvenience not only to the judges, but to the litigants who must go to them for orders and other court business. I wonder whether or not the gentleman's committee in its wisdom has given consideration to the additions to Federal court facilities.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to our beloved friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the legislative committee has the jurisdiction of approving such matters. Our committee does not attempt to write out the projects. That comes within the jurisdicion of the Committee on Public Works. But, may I say to the gentleman that in this bill there are a good many courthouse buildings.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman explain the criteria used by the committee in approving the sum of $177,255,000 for the construction of 66 Federal buildings as found on pages 3 and 4 of the report accompanying this bill?

As I understand the action of the committee, you have approved these 66 buildings in about 28 States under a 1926 authorization. The 66 buildings are a part of 146 projects approved under the now expired lease purchase law.

Now, if the committee uses the approval of projects under the expired law as a criterion for appropriations for construction, 80 buildings will have priority ahead of the needs of other communities where the need is very great.

I have in my district a town, Dublin, Texas, where the Federal Government has bought and owns lots for a post office building. By reason of the Government owning the lots and because the proposition of private capital not being attracted, no consideration under lease purchase has been given. Now it seems to me that this community will be penalized by reason of the Government owning the property in the town.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that official estimates indicate it requires $10 billion to build even the minimum buildings needed but it seems to me the committee has somewhat discriminated in selecting the projects herein provided. In addition, must those places where the need is so great, wait until these remaining 80 projects receive appropriation? It seems to me that these selections, by reason of having been approved under the so-called Lease Purchase Law, now expired, is not particularly logical or fair. It does not follow that the need is any greater or as great, in the locations of these projects, as many others but they simply happened to have been included in a plan which was never contemplated until the past few days as a qualification for providing construction funds.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my good friend and distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], or someone on his committee, will discuss this proposition in clear detail.

Let me say further Mr. Chairman, that I congratulate my colleagues who are fortunate enough to have one of these projects in their congressional district but I would like to have my day in court to present the needs which are near desperate in my district.

I urge that the criteria, which I understand is used in these selections, be broadened beyond those projects approved under the old lease-purchase plan, to give consideration to other pressing needs.

Mr. THOMAS. May I explain to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] that he and certainly no Member of this body or any other body should be penalized or be hurt in his home district for any reason with reference to this, and certainly not for reasons of not having a post office in this bill or bills to follow. I realize, and this subcommittee realizes, that we have not had a post office construction program or any Federal office building construction program in this country since 1938. The projects under the jurisdiction of this committee are those which we call multi-purpose buildings, and they have been authorized and approved before they get to our subcommittee. They must be authorized and approved by the House Committee on Public Works before they come to us. Mr. JONES, of Alabama, who heads that particular subcommittee is going to take some time and he is going into it. We do hope that committee authorizes under direct appropriation and not under lease-purchase, some post office buildings, and if they send them to the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, I give you my word we will get our subcommittee together real quick and my guess and hope is that they will put some money in a bill for your buildings.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yesterday the Committee on Rules granted the rule to bring House bill H. R. 607 to the floor. That is a bill which would provide a 10-percent increase in the annuity of retired civil-service employees. The other body has already passed Senate bill, S. 72. On page 4, there is a proviso in this bill which is coming up now beginning on line 12 and ending on line 23, the effect of which would be to nullify the proposed increase.

Mr. THOMAS. If I may interrupt my colleague, may I say "No, this does not nullify anything." That is not the intention and it will not do that. Whatever your distinguished committee brings to this House in the way of an increase in annuities, and I speak for this group now, you come to the Committee on Appropriations and we are going to give you the money.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. All this language does is this: It says that whenever a legislative committee increases annuities, before they go into effect we must supply the money. Is there anything wrong with that? Here is this committee saying that whenever you increase them, what ever it is, come to the committee and we are going to give you the money.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for that assurance.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentleman bespeak his respect for the legislative committees. I only wish he had not inserted legislation in this appropriation bill. If no one else does, I intend to offer an amendment to strike it out. Why did not the gentleman yesterday, when the military pay bill was before the House, which increased retirements, offer the same proposal to the military pay bill?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, that does not come out of this fund. If it came out of this fund, the chances are we would have.

The very able and distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee is supporting this provision. What else could we have done than to go to that committee and ask the chairman to support that legislation, and he did?

Does that answer my friend?

Mr. GROSS. No, it does not.

Mr. THOMAS. It answers it, but the gentleman is not satisfied.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly am not satisfied.

Mr. LOSER. Will the gentleman yield for a couple of questions?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. LOSER. I observe on page 12, lines 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, certain language. My question is: Does not the language on page 12 to which I have just referred keep in full force and effect the lease-purchase agreements with reference to post offices?

Mr. THOMAS. It does.

Mr. LOSER. Then may I ask the chairman if lease-purchase contracts cost three-quarters of a dollar more than direct appropriations, why would it not be the better part of judgment to strike out that language?

Mr. THOMAS. A fine question, and it deserves an answer. This subcommittee is not going to encroach on the jurisdiction of any other subcommittee. Another subcommittee put in the Post Office Department appropriation bill $3 million for lease purchase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was delighted to hear the chairman of the Appropriations Committee speak favorably of the new Administrator of the Veterans' Affairs. We are very proud of him. I know how anxious he is to do a job for the veterans.

Mr. THOMAS. And I think he is going to do a good job.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to express my appreciation for the opportunity of serving with the members of this subcommittee. It is quite an experience to serve on the committee under the leadership of the distinguished and able gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] who is in charge of the bill today. He is a past master of diplomacy, and presides over the committee with a very, very fine touch. He is a warm personal friend of mine, and I pay this tribute to him today because it is well deserved. The privilege of working with the other members of the majority side has been one that I have greatly enjoyed, and I should also say the same thing with respect to my colleagues on my own side of the aisle.

There is some language in the report which purports to speak for the committee, but for which the committee is not actually responsible. The committee never had any opportunity to consider or discuss the report before it was filed. All of the credit for the language and for the comments in the report should go to the chairman of our subcommittee. There are some things stated in the report with which I do not agree. I am not taking any exceptions to the language used, because I understand how majority control works; but I do want to disclaim any responsibility for it.

There is one program financed by this bill in which I have a direct interest and it is noncontroversial. I would like to take a few minutes of the time allotted me to report to the membership and for the record some of the accomplishments of the General Services Administration during the last 5 years in bringing under control the vast motor-vehicle fleet which is being operated by the United States Government.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment the gentleman for this area of activity in which he has been most effective. The gentleman is responsible for consolidating the motor pool activity. He has looked into the cost of the operation of vehicles in the Government and has made a very signal contribution in that regard.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman very much for his kind words. It is true I have been actively interested in this field for the last 5 years and that is the reason I am taking this time today to make a sort of report to the membership.

Public Law 766, 83d Congress, of which I had the privilege of being the author—authorized the Administrator of General Services Administration to establish and operate interagency motor pools. The vehicles in these pools are financed through the general supply fund on a reimbursable basis.

By the end of 1957, 22 motor pools were in operation. By the end of 1958, 18 additional pools will have been established, bringing up to 40 the number of major cities in the United States in which motor pools are operating. Sixteen additional pools are programed for 1959. If all goes according to plan, we will have, by the end of 1959, 56 motor pools operating in as many cities in the United States.

By this motor pool operation, GSA has, through 1957, removed 547 motor vehicles from the Government's motor fleet. An additional 781 vehicles have been eliminated from the 22 locations where motor pools are in operation. The motor vehicles inventory will be further reduced progressively as additional pools are established.

The opportunity to save money in a substantial amount through better management of the Government's motor fleet should be obvious by mere recital of the fact that the Federal Government today owns and operates 214,243 commercial vehicles, excluding military troop training and tactical vehicles. Of this total, 104,270 vehicles are operated by civilian agencies of the Government, 109,973 by the Department of Defense.

A breakdown of the 214,243 commercial vehicles discloses that 38,103 of them are automobiles; 14,039 are station wagons, ambulances, and buses; and 162,101 are trucks. It is interesting to note that in 1953 the comparable total was approximately 260,000 vehicles, so that during the last 5 years we have reduced the Government's motor vehicle fleet by some 46,000.

The cost of operating this great fleet of motor vehicles is breathtaking. Maintenance and operating costs alone for fiscal 1957 were $178 million.

This vast fleet of motor vehicles consumed 195,429,949 gallons of gasoline in 1957, at a cost of approximately $48 million.

The bill which I introduced in the 83d Congress, and which became law during the 2d session of that Congress, was designed to develop some economies in the management of this vast motor fleet. Results to date, as reported to our subcommittee by the Motor Vehicles Management Section of GSA, indicate that the operation has been successful from the standpoint of effecting savings. I would like to cite three areas in which these savings occur:

First. The reductions in our motor fleet inventory, to which reference has heretofore been made, result in substantial savings to the taxpayers. The following table indicates the extent of these savings at the end of each year indicated in fleet reductions only:

1955	$365,000
1956	590,000
1957	664,000
1958	914,000
1959	1,164,000

Second. Savings are also accomplished by the gradual reductions in cost per mile of vehicles operated. This is made possible by keeping the vehicles in use and not in storage. Where motor pools are not in operation, frequently vehicles are used only occasionally but have to be available, stored and ready for use when needed. But in cities where the pools function, one vehicle can be used by a number of different agencies, and this makes for a more efficient operation and reduces the total cost per mile of use.

The following table lists the savings that have been accomplished per year through reduction in cost per mile of motor vehicle use:

1955	$9,600
1956	226,000
1957	839,000
1958	1,800,000
1959	2,400,000

Third. The third area in which savings are accomplished is referred to by GSA as fringe benefits. These include reduction in number of force account repair shops whenever the work can be performed more cheaply by commercial shops, eliminating parts supply facilities and by developing improved and modern safety programs which result in better care of equipment and fewer accidents. The following table indicates the savings per year in this area:

1955	$146,400
1956	483,500
1957	497,000
1958	456,000
1959	436,000

The total of these three specific items of savings by the motor pool operation are summarized as follows:

1955	$521,000
1956	1,300,000
1957	2,000,000
1958	3,170,000
1959	4,000,000

The original goal of the legislation was to effect an annual savings to the taxpayers of at least $5 million per year. Based upon results obtained to date, it is apparent that this goal will be attained by 1960.

The cost of operating these pools is nominal in comparison with the substantial savings. Annual costs are less than $200,000 a year—$194,500 to be exact. The program is run by the total personnel of 18.

A $5 million annual savings is small in these days when we are forced to think in terms of billions. But, in my opinion, $5 million a year is well worth saving. If we could save $5 million a year here, there and yonder, the cumulative effect would ultimately be very beneficial to the hard-pressed American taxpayers. I should like to pay my compliments to the small group of men in GSA who are in charge of this program and are making it work at a substantial saving to the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I would like now to turn to another subject that I do not believe is controversial either but which I am sure will be of interest to the Members. We handle in this subcommittee the appropriation for the National Science Foundation, an agency created by the Congress in 1950. The initial appropriation was $450,000 and it is in this bill today for $115 million, which indicates the tremendous increase in the amount of Government support given to science and education through the National Science Foundation during the last few years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, approximately a year ago I called the attention of the House to the fact that the British had entered into a contract with the Russians to build in Russia the biggest tire factory outside of the United States. Now I learn that the Department of Commerce has agreed to export—apparently the British do not know all of the ins and outs of building the kind of a tire factory the Russians want—the Department of Commerce of the United States has agreed to permit the export of technical data and expert individuals to aid in the construction of this plant. In other words, it is agreed to supply United States know-how for the construction of a huge tire plant in Russia.

Nothing in my book is more strategic than rubber. Armies move today on rubber. They have to move on rubber. And here we find the United States Government today joining in the construction of a tire plant that will increase, I am told, tire production in Russia approximately 30 percent. I wonder who is doing what to whom and why?

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman. Now, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I wish to bring to your attention some very interesting and encouraging testimony given to our subcommittee by some of the eminent scientists who appeared in support of the budget request for the National Science Foundation. But first let us consider a little background material.

Last fall when Russia launched Sputnik No. 1, a wave of pessimism swept over our country. Politicians rushed to the microphones and to the mimeograph machines to vie with each other in lamenting the alleged deplorable quality of scientific knowledge and progress in this country. Many commentators, columnists, and editors joined in the chorus in an apparent effort to convince the American people that we were lagging far behind Russia in the field of science.

All of this dark and foreboding talk almost resulted in scaring the people to death. Scores of impracticable plans were proposed to help "backward" America catch up with "brilliant" Russia in science.

We do not hear much of that kind of talk today. Explorer and Vanguard of course had a great deal to do with the change of sentiment. But I also think that when the first embarrassment over sputnik wore off, and when the people had time to take a second and calmer look at the facts, they realized that we have not suddenly lost our scientific potential and that perhaps our educational system, with its traditional liberties and freedoms, should not be scrapped after all or supplanted by the regimented system education employed in the Soviet Union. I am not alarmed over the fact that Russia is turning out X number more scientists than the United States. They have more people than we; they have more territory; they have more of many things. But I do not believe they have better brains.

I do not personally believe it would be worth while for our country to get into a race with Russia to see who can turn out more of anything. I would like to see our emphasis placed on quality instead of quantity.

I am quite sure we can improve the quality of our educational system, and I am all for that, but I do not believe the answer to the problem of how to do it lies in converting our public school system, which has traditionally been recognized as a local and community responsibility, to a Russian-type educational system which is supported and controlled by the central government.

The decision in the subcommittee to recommend $115 million this year was unanimous. We are all interested in stimulating basic research and are also interested in improving the quality of our educational system from the elementary through the college and graduate school levels. I cannot speak for the other members of the committee but my own view is that we should be very careful not to let our enthusiasm for the support of science and education force or entice us into the position of allowing the Federal Government to dominate or control education in this country.

During our hearings on the National Science Foundation budget requests, the subcommittee had the privilege of hearing Dr. D. W. Bronk, chairman of the National Science Board, president of the National Academy of Sciences, and president of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. Dr. Bronk gave the subcommittee some very encouraging comments concerning the quality of scientific knowledge and ability in this country. For the benefit of the Members who may or may not have an opportunity to read all of the testimony produced in the hearings, and for the record, I should like to quote a few of the statements made by Dr. Bronk. These will be found beginning on page 228 of part I of the hearings, and from that page I quote the following statements of Dr. Bronk:

> I do not for a moment think that we are behind in all fields of science. I am sure that the Russians have people who are more competent than some of our scientists in some fields. That always has been so. Back in the twenties and thirties that was so in the field of neurophysiology and psychology. They had the great Pavlov. Every person looked up to him. There have been great mathematicians, but having said that I know perfectly well that we have a great many scientists in this country of great distinction.

And then after making some other comments along this same line, Dr. Bronk made this statement:

> I am not prepared to say we are in a terrible state.

I should like to call your attention to some testimony given by Dr. Donald H. McLaughlin, president of Homestake Mining Co. for the last 13 years but prior to that an eminent scientist and educator. His testimony will be found on page 232 of part I of the hearings, but I would like to quote the following brief excerpts from that testimony:

> In the mining industry our usual procedure when we have a great new property and a great new ore deposit is to build a pilot mill. We do not go in and spend millions lightly without putting up a small mill to know how it runs. * * * Since I have been out of science and have been trying to run a company, I am rather concerned, too, that when money is spent, that money will be spent most wisely. I think there is grave danger now in our present anxieties and concern and great desire to stimulate progress in science, that we may spend money unwisely. As serious a problem as the Russian sputnik is, inflation, and money spent unwisely, will increase the deficit and lead to inflation, which is just as great a danger to this country.

And Dr. A. A. Potter, dean emeritus of engineering, Purdue University, also a member of the National Science Board, gave the committee some encouraging testimony on the subject of our accomplishments in the world of science. He said that a few years ago he invited 100 mechanical engineers, 100 civil engineers, and 100 electrical engineers to compile a list of the 100 greatest inventions since 1776. He stated that he filled in the

name of the inventor, the country of his birth or citizenship, and prepared an article based upon that study which was published by the American Society of Chemical Engineers under the title "Pride of America." Dean Potter furnished the committee with a copy of his article and it will be found on page 233 of the hearings, and is followed on page 236 by a list of 75 major United States inventions between 1793 and 1930—inventions that revolutionized the world.

I cannot take the time to read the list of 75 inventions but I would like to read into the RECORD as a part of my remarks the opening paragraphs of Dr. Potter's article:

The industrial progress of this country and the high standards of living of our people have usually been attributed to the abundance of our natural resources. Few, however, realize that the Americans, to a greater degree than any other people in the world, are responsible for most of the epoch-making inventions of the past century. Has any person in any other country given as great an impetus to mechanized agriculture as did Cyrus Hall McCormick in 1833, when he invented the reaper? Have any contributions equaled the pioneer inventions in the field of communication which were made by four Americans, Samuel F. B. Morse (first practical telegraph, 1832), Cyrus W. Field (first transatlantic cable, 1858), Thomas A. Edison (first quadruplex telegraph, 1874), and Alexander Graham Bell (first practical telephone, 1876)? In radio the names of Fessenden, Lee de Forest, Alexanderson, Armstrong, and Jenkins are a credit to our land. From the invention of the *Clermont* of Fulton in 1811 to the patent for the airplane by Wright in 1903 Americans have been major contributors to the field of transportation. Among these are Vail (the electric locomotive, 1851), Westinghouse (the air brake, 1869), Sprague (the trolley car, 1882), Duryea and Haynes (the first practical automobiles, 1885), and Sperry (the gyrocompass, 1905). Among American inventions are also included many new manufacturing processes, such as vulcanizing rubber, cracking gasoline, welding, and the manufacture of calcium carbide, aluminum, and plastics. The sewing machine, typewriter, talking machine, camera for films and plates, adding machine, and many other devices which contribute to human comfort and effectiveness, are also the creations of American men of genius. The accompanying table lists 75 United States of America inventions between 1793 and 1930, an incomplete picture, but indicative of the contributions of American inventive genius during the past century.

Many of the great inventions by Americans were made by people between the ages of 21 and 40. Westinghouse invented the air brake when he was only 21, McCormick the harvester at the age of 22, Howe the sewing machine at 27, Colt the revolver at 28, Eli Whitney the cotton gin at 29, and Wilbur Wright the airplane at the age of 36. These youthful inventors of our young country and many others like them, whose creative genius has been responsible for converting our natural resources into great industries, are the true "pride of America."

INVENTIONS EXTEND GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT

Economic security for the people of this country was achieved in a large measure by inventions which have definitely extended gainful employment. Only 1 in 6 inventions has as its primary purpose the saving of labor; the other five-sixths of all inventions create employment, increase wages, increase wealth, decrease drudgery, improve working conditions, improve quality of product, and reduce the cost of goods. Even in 1940 14 million persons in this country were earning their livings in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of patented goods, and this number is much greater at present.

The testimony of Dr. Potter stimulated Dr. Roger Adams, research professor of the department of chemistry and chemical engineering at the University of Illinois, into compiling a list of important discoveries of science in our country in the last 10 years, which list he also furnished the subcommittee, and it appears on pages 237 and 238 of part I of the hearings. It is a most impressive list and completely demolishes any contention that we are slipping backward in the field of science. I commend that list to you.

I say with Dean Potter, and with the other scientists who testified before the committee, that we have every reason to be proud of the accomplishments of our citizens in the world of science. And I would point out that these accomplishments have been attained under our free-enterprise system, which has always rewarded initiative, ambition, resourcefulness, and foresight, and also under our traditional educational system which has been free from regimentation, control, and domination of the Central Government.

I know not how others may feel about it, but as for me I favor holding on to the things that have been found to be good. I favor adhering to the principles that have made this country great and will keep it great if we do not make the mistake of trading them off for a mess of pottage.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, once again the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee brings its bill to the floor. Ours is a bill which represents one of the most interesting and challenging assignments in Congress, because it covers such a broad variety of governmental activities.

When one considers the vast amount in appropriations requested; namely, $6 billion, and the number and difference in the kinds of agencies represented, the fact that there was almost complete unanimity in our committee is quite remarkable. We have all the regulatory agencies such as Federal Power Commission. We have the Civil Service Commission. We have the General Services Administration with its many tentacles. We have the Housing and Home Finance Agency, that ever-burgeoning organization. We have the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, that very vital group which is so essential today as we stand on the threshold of the space age. The Selective Service System, the Renegotiation Board, the Veterans' Administration. All of these, presenting a myriad of different duties and responsibilities come to us with their problems and with their requests for funds. With all this, the differences in opinion among the committee are relatively minor.

In great measure, I think this real lack of controversy is attributable to the splendid caliber of the other members of our subcommittee, with whom it has been a distinct pleasure to work. Certainly, there is no more able, charming, or engaging person in this House than the genial gentleman from Texas, ALBERT THOMAS. He combines with his fine personal, friendly traits a mind of the highest intellectual quality and a spirit of conscientiousness which drives him to spend hour upon hour, day and night, poring over and analyzing the very intricate and detailed charts, figures, and tables which comprise appropriation justifications. This bill is the product of his capable touch. None of the other members of our subcommittee begin to possess the skill, the experience, or the knowledge of the gentleman from Texas. He is in a class by himself.

It was a pleasure, too, to work with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], both thoroughly competent and conscientious Members whose wise counsel contributed greatly in fashioning the bill which is before you today.

On the minority side, our good friends CHARLES VURSELL, of Illinois; HAROLD OSTERTAG, of New York; and CHARLES JONAS, of North Carolina, worked hard, long, and capably during the many tiring hours of listening to witnesses and of committee deliberations. Theirs, too, was a vital part in assembling this measure.

It may be that there will be one major controversy over the decision of the committee to terminate the lease-purchase program which was passed some years ago by the Congress in a moment of weakness. It sounded good at the time. We are going to avoid direct appropriations and cut down the size of the budget, but the bill was a pig in a poke, for the taxpayers would have to pay twice as much for their properties under the lease-purchase program as they would under direct appropriation. If this program was an example of the administration's economy in government—of Republican fiscal responsibility— I want no part of it and I am sure the American people want no part of it.

The Chairman of our subcommittee asked the General Services Administration to hold up entering into contract pending further action by the Congress. Did it do so? It did not. It has already entered into two contracts and I noticed an item in this morning's paper that it proposes to enter into many more.

And let's take a look at one of the contracts it entered into. A communicable diseases building in Atlanta, Ga. Listen to the figures on that building and then decide for yourself whether you want to vote to continue the lease-purchase program or to sustain the committee in terminating the program and providing for construction under direct appropriation. This is a comparison of what the cost on the communicable diseases project would be under direct appropriation and under lease purchase as prepared by the General Accounting Offices.

SCHEDULE B.—*Estimated funds required for acquisition of communicable disease center project in Atlanta, Ga., under lease-purchase program and by direct appropriation*

	Project acquired by—		Additional funds required under lease-purchase program
	Direct appropriation	4.97 percent lease-purchase contract	
Construction costs:			
Amount of construction contract	$8,790,000	$8,790,000	
Provision for contingencies	439,500	439,500	
Estimated interest during construction		432,210	$432,210
Total estimated construction costs	9,229,500	9,661,710	432,210
Interest on purchase contract		7,267,265	7,267,265
Total payments under purchase contract		16,928,975	
Other costs payable by direct appropriation:			
Real estate taxes on buildings for 25 years		6,126,625	6,126,625
Design and other project costs	267,000	267,000	
Estimated funds required, exclusive of interest on appropriated funds	9,496,500	23,322,600	13,826,100
Interest at 3 percent on appropriated funds required to make foregoing payments	4,137,600	4,928,903	791,303
Total estimated funds required	13,634,100	28,251,503	14,617,403

I think the building should have been built under direct appropriations rather than under lease purchase. Let me show you why. Under the direct appropriation method, the construction cost for this project would have been $9,229,500. Under the lease-purchase arrangement, the construction cost would have been $9,661,710. But, then, when you add the funds for interest and you add the funds for taxes to this building, under the lease purchase, this is the comparison of cost: Whereas under direct appropriations you have costs of $9,496,500 for the direct appropriation method of construction, under lease purchase the cost of that building would be $23,322,600. The question comes to your mind, yes, but the Government will have to borrow money under direct appropriations and the cost of this borrowing should be added. That is true. Adding the cost of borrowing to the direct appropriation we add another $4,137,000. But, in addition, the Government has to borrow money under lease purchase also. It has to borrow money to pay the interest that it would have to pay under the lease-purchase form, and the interest cost under this contract would have been $4,928,000. So that actually the total amount of construction cost under direct appropriations for constructing this project in Atlanta, Ga., by direct appropriations would be $13,634,100 and under lease purchase it would be $28,251,503 or approximately $14,500,000 more than it would cost under direct appropriations.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. With respect to the last item of $4,948,903 which is included as an estimate for interest, that would only apply in the event that we engage in deficit financing for the next 25 years; is that not so?

Mr. YATES. I do not know why deficit financing enters into this. This is the amount of borrowing that the United States Government would have to undertake in order to pay the interest under the lease-purchase contract over the life of the lease-purchase contract.

Mr. JONAS. I understand, but approximately $5 million involved is included as an estimated amount that we will have to borrow over 25 years to pay the interest payments. If we do not have to borrow the money to do that, if we live within our means, within a balanced budget, that item would not have to be included.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman wants to delete the item under lease-purchase cost, then I think we should also eliminate the interest item under the direct appropriation form, which is approximately $4,100,000. If you eliminate one you must eliminate the other as well.

Mr. JONAS. I am not trying to eliminate anything. I am trying to see if we understand each other with respect to this item of $5 million.

Mr. YATES. With respect to this item of $5 million, I cannot see at this time why we should speak in terms of eliminating it, because it is an actual foreseeable cost. This schedule of accounts was not prepared by me nor by the committee. It was prepared by the General Accounting Office under what it believed to be a conservative presentation of a schedule of costs under both methods.

Mr. JONAS. But it would not have to be paid if we make the installment payments from year to year out of revenue.

Mr. YATES. If the action of the administration this year is any indication as to our future financing we will have to pay probably a greater sum in interest.

Mr. JONAS. This bill is certainly a help in that direction, because it is in excess of a half billion dollars over what the administration asked.

Mr. YATES. It is in excess, because the administration made its estimates of Government operations much too low. It knew it was presenting an unrealistic level and that its Congress would of necessity exceed its estimates.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I wanted to emphasize and to suggest that the figures which the gentleman gave are the figures of the General Accounting Office. And that the Comptroller General has indicated that the lease-purchase cost of these projects would be from 65 to 70 percent more than by direct appropriations.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

So much for the lease-purchase program. There will be more to say on it later, I am sure.

When the bill was in committee, I reserved on two appropriations because I thought that the agencies should have more funds. One was the National Science Foundation which is our bellwether in scientific advances in education and in basic research, received a cut of $25 million from its budgetary request.

I first thought I would confine myself to two items in this bill. One was the appropriation for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics and the other was the appropriation for the National Science Foundation. The National Science Foundation, which is our bellwether to scientific advance and basic research, had received a cut of $25 million from the amount which had been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. But this does not tell the whole story, because this agency received an additional $75 million over what it had received last year. It had received $107 million for extension of its old existing programs and approximately $8 million for undertaking new programs. I favor the expansion of the agency. I think it is one of the most important we have in the Government today. It has a fine governing board, it has a fine staff, and it has an excellent program. All the members of the committee have been satisfied with the work of this agency up to date.

Our committee had no intention of placing a halter on this agency's activities; $75 million is a significant increase in its activities, and we have the feeling that this was just about as much as this new infant agency—it is only 7 years old—just about as much as this growing agency could digest at this particular time. Perhaps the other body will take another look at it.

With respect to the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, I have no objection to what the subcommittee did. That was to limit the amount of new personnel to 500. I do not think we ought to place a limitation on the employment of scientific personnel by the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics. The feeling in our committee was to the effect that it has 8,000 people now, and that this is enough.

I do not see anything magic in the figure 8,000; as a matter of fact, I would vote more money. I believe many people would feel more secure if we had 16,000 qualified people handling the affairs of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, because this is the agency which goes hand in hand with the Air Force and the other branches of our Defense Department in maintaining our strength at this time.

A few months ago without one dissenting vote in this House we passed an appropriation for the Department of Defense of $1,300,000,000. Why we should think in terms of holding this agency back, this agency which is as important

as the Air Force in keeping us on the threshold of scientific advance, I do not know.

I hope the other body takes another look at this limitation.

The committee takes pride in its appropriation for the medical program of the Veterans' Administration. Once again we have the fine hand of the Bureau of the Budget trying to cut down on medical care for our veterans. Our committee refused to go along. We increased by $3,365,000 the appropriation for inpatient care and we added $5 million for the care of neuropsychiatric veterans. This was $8,365,000 more than the budget estimate. The committee also allowed the sum of $10,344,000 for medical research and $1 million for prosthetic appliances. These were the full budget requests.

The action of the Bureau of the Budget in eliminating the Veterans' Administration request for extra funds for neuropsychiatric patients is difficult to comprehend. It is a cold and heartless superimposition of budgetary requirements over human needs. I invite your attention to our hearings commencing on page 578, where I questioned Dr. Middleton, the Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, and asked him about the need for the funds. Dr. Middleton said:

> My medical opinion is that this rate—

Referring to the rate of recovery—

> would be accelerated appreciably.
>
> Mr. YATES. Appreciably?
>
> Dr. MIDDLETON. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. EVINS. The doctor referred to these boys in the back wards, the men in the forgotten wards. Do you think that those boys—those veterans—with more attention and money and care could be rehabilitated and restored to the community, or restored sooner?
>
> Dr. MIDDLETON. I know it.
>
> Mr. EVINS. You know it?
>
> Dr. MIDDLETON. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. EVINS. In other words, the Budget Bureau is becoming an expert on the care you give patients?
>
> Dr. MIDDLETON. No, they are not.
>
> Mr. YATES. Did you make the same representation to the Bureau of the Budget that you have just made to us?
>
> Dr. MIDDLETON. I did, emphatically.
>
> Mr. YATES. You did emphatically?
>
> Dr. MIDDLETON. I did emphatically.

Sixty percent of the Veterans' Administration patients are mental health patients. The committee hopes that with the appropriation of the additional funds, the rate of rehabilitation of many of the veterans will be increased and that many will be enabled to return to their loved ones much sooner.

Mr. Chairman, some mention should be made, too, of the way in which this administration takes care of its own. Take a look at pages 338 and 340 of the hearings and read about how Hanna Coal & Ore Corp. entered the nickel field with contracts for mining, smelting, and sales. Extracts of the contracts appear on page 340.

And then read the hearings following on page 341 about the Freeport Sulphur Contract and the fact that the Office of Defense Mobilization overruled the recommendation of Administrator Floete in entering into a contract with Bethlehem Steel Co., but established requirements under which Freeport Sulphur Co. became the only company that could qualify. Under the contract the Government committed itself 271 million pounds of nickel at a price of 74 cents a pound—in other words, to take all the nickel that Freeport could not sell on the open market, thereby assuring complete disposal of Freeport's production until 1965.

The only justification for such contracts in the past has been the pressure of war and the need for expansion. No such reasons were present at the time this contract was entered into; the Government met its long-term stockpile obectives for nickel.

Take a look at the hearings on page 31, where I stated to Administrator Floete:

> They—the Government—could have gotten that through a Government loan or Government guaranty without an incentive-type contract, which would have been cheaper for the Government, wouldn't it?

And Mr. Floete replied:

> We recommended it.

On page 12 Mr. Floete states that he thought the deal with Bethlehem was a good deal and he recommended it by letter to the Office of Defense Mobilization, but it was turned down on a policy basis:

> That the Government would not loan money for that purpose nor guarantee such a loan.

Again on page 13 I asked Mr. Floete: "So you entered into a contract which was more expensive to the Government, did you not?" to which Mr. Floete replied:

> We didn't like it as well as the other but we had only one person to deal with, Freeport.

And now the Government is committed to buy all of Freeport's output—271 million pounds for the next 6 years.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Before the gentleman goes too far in another subject, I wonder if he would mind returning for a moment to his comments about the National Science Foundation. I am sure the gentleman and all of us are in agreement that we need to increase activities in this field. Does the gentleman feel that the funds recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the funds contained in this appropriation will enable them to carry out the work of the National Science Foundation in the way we wish them to?

Mr. YATES. I do. When Dr. Waterman appeared before our committee he said there was included in his request $107 million to carry on existing programs and another $1 million for supplemental work. The National Science Foundation's request has been recommended in full and its programs will be carried on in an expanded way.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. There will be no curtailment of their program?

Mr. YATES. No.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlemen will yield, I think the gentleman from Connecticut will be interested in knowing that there has been an increase from $9 million last year to $30 million this year.

Mr. YATES. Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to talk about the Federal Power Commission and the Natural Gas Act. The Natural Gas Act of 1938 provided for regulation of the natural gas companies. This includes regulation of natural gas producers who sell their gas in interstate commerce at wholesale rates. The purpose of the act was to protect consumers from exorbitant charges, and the Federal Power Commission was given the duty to administer the act and to carry out the purpose of assuring just and reasonable rates for the natural gas companies.

Believing as I do in the necessity of the act and in its purposes in protecting the consumers against extortionist rates, certainly I would favor an adequate appropriation. Ordinarily I would object to the reduction of $385,000 in the budget estimate for the Commission; but, after listening to the testimony of the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, I will not try to restore the funds. Why? Because I believe the Federal Power Commission is opposed to enforcing the Natural Gas Act. It does not even try. Its efforts are not even half-hearted.

When I asked Mr. Kuykendall, Chairman of the Commission, whether he had enough money, he said:

> Even if you give us all the money we wanted, we couldn't hire enough qualified people.

I interrupted. I asked him how much money he needed to carry out the purposes of the act. On page 892, I said:

> If the Congress grants you this amount of money, the Commission will then have all the funds it needs to carry out its functions as well as it can?

And Mr. Kuykendall replied:

> Yes; I think so. Our work still won't be carried out satisfactorily. I mean I would like to get all caught up in the fiscal year, but we cannot do it. It is obvious.

And then I asked:

> Why can't you?

Mr. Kuykendall replied:

> Because we cannot get enough people competent to do the work.

Is this the attitude of a Commission anxious to carry out its legal responsibilities? Of course not. The Commission just does not want the responsibility. It favors passage of the Natural Gas Act which would relieve the Commission of having to regulate the natural gas industry.

It has been said that the present Natural Gas Act is unworkable for the regulation of the natural gas industry. Mr. Chairman, I submit that it has not been given a fair test. Only a Commission whose members are interested in seeking to carry out the purposes of the act can give it a fair test. This Commission does not want to regulate the natural gas industry. It wants to kill the Natural Gas Act. For that reason I will not try to restore the funds deleted by the committee from the Commission's budget request.

The fault clearly lies at the doorstep of this administration. It is about time that the consumers of the country realize that this administration, too, favors passage of the Harris-O'Hara bill, passage of which will destroy effective regulation of the natural gas industry. The actions of the Commission are merely a reflection of the administration's views and we shall not get a commission anxious to protect the public interest until we get a change of heart on the part of the administration or a change of administration.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks two important articles which deal with the work of the subcommittee, one from Aviation Week for February 3, 1958, entitled "NACA, The Logical Space Agency"; the other from the American Legion magazine for December 1957 dealing with the research program for the VA entitled "Medical Research on a Mammoth Scale":

[From Aviation Week of February 3, 1958]

NACA, THE LOGICAL SPACE AGENCY

(By Robert Hotz)

Too often in recent history, the solution to acute national problems has been sought in the creation of complex new organizations that add to the Federal payroll and bureaucracy but do little about the problems they were created to solve. Often, an economical and effective solution lies close at hand, but is so simple the top-level officials hesitate to even consider it. The current debate over how many and what kinds of organizations the Federal Government needs to organize and guide research and exploration of space appears to be a case in point.

There is no lack of complex plans to tackle our space-age problems. In the midst of this furor it is finally becoming clear that there is in existence an extremely competent organization capable of spearheading this work—the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics established by the President in 1915 with the directive to "supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view toward their practical solution."

Credit for first calling attention to this simple but effective solution, we believe, belongs to Gen. Orval Cook, president of the Aircraft Industries Association, who told the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences in Washington on January 14:

"One of the things that has most puzzled me during this furor and clamor for Government reorganization so that we can catch up with the Russians has been the fact that NACA has apparently been largely overlooked. Yet here is a Government agency reporting directly to the President which has as its basic charter 'the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view toward their practical solution.'

"For more than 40 years NACA has dedicated itself to this task with outstanding success. The NACA has some of the finest aeronautical laboratories in the world—its facilities alone being worth more than $300 million, and an operating staff of some 7,600 people of whom more than 2,000 have professional degrees.

"For more than 10 years it has been conducting research and studies in scientific fields leading to man's conquest of space. In fact early in 1952, months before the first manned flight at Mach 2, NACA studies were launched into the problem of manned flight beyond the atmosphere and their solution. By 1954, NACA research teams were able to propose construction of a research vehicle for this purpose and in December 1955, in cooperation with the Navy and Air Force, a contract for this craft (North American X-15) was let. This vehicle is expected to be test flown within the next 12 months or so.

"NACA also pioneered in research that will pay off in manned boost-glide rockets flying at fantastic speeds and with a new concept that will enable our ballistic missiles to withstand sun-hot temperatures during reentry into the atmosphere.

"At the same time these projects were under way, the NACA has been investigating almost every element in the propulsion spectrum. Research is being conducted in propulsion by ion jets, photon jets, plasma jets, by nuclear rockets, and by solar power. Much more than mere theory is involved—practical experimentation is being conducted and detailed performance parameters are being developed. All of this research is directed toward one goal—flight, manned and unmanned, at incredible speeds through and beyond the earth's atmosphere. All of this vital basic research information is being funneled to the military services and the aviation industry to assist them in development of vehicles to translate this research into reality.

"If, as so many people are advocating, we need a governmental agency to take the responsibility for accelerating our efforts in space travel, I suggest we look to an existing organization such as the NACA to provide this direction."

We heartily endorse General Cook's suggestion and strongly urge members of Congress concerned with this problem, Defense Secretary McElroy and the public—which will eventually have to pay the bills—to carefully consider this relatively simple but effective solution of a most acute national problem.

There are several additional considerations, in addition to those cited by General Cook, that make the NACA role as the spearhead of our national space research and development effort extremely attractive.

First, it has, through 40 years of experience, established an extremely effective working relationship with all of the other basic organizations concerned with this problem—the military services, the scientific fraternity and the industrial complexes. Through its main and subcommittee structure, it provides adequate voice for all of these elements in determining a national policy.

Second, the caliber of its leadership evokes universal respect from the other agencies through which it works. There is no better man in the Nation today than James Harold Doolittle, NACA chairman, to serve as a link between the military, scientific, and industrial communities because he has had outstandingly successful careers in all three areas. The scientific leadership of Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, director of NACA, is based on a combination of solid scientific achievement and quiet but effective administrative ability, all too rare in scientific circles.

Third, NACA has proven its ability in the past to contribute significantly to urgent national technical problems. It developed the laminar flow wing in time to permit the P-51 Mustang to escort heavy bombers to any German target at the critical phase of World War II. Its high speed research aircraft program was an outstanding postwar example of joint work with the military and industry to produce maximum progress in minimum time and launch our military aircraft into the supersonic age a significant jump ahead of all competitors. Its work in ballistic missiles has also solved key bottlenecks in time to be useful in operational weapons.

Fourth, NACA has shown extraordinary ingenuity in devising new research tools required for tackling the unknown. The transonic wind tunnel, rocket powered models, gas dynamic facilities and multistage research rockets are a few examples of this ability which is absolutely essential in probing new frontiers fruitfully.

It is a major technical fallacy to consider aeronautics as a field that extends to the limits of the earth's atmosphere and astronautics as something that begins where the atmosphere ends. Both are integral parts of the same overall scientific problem. Any successful efforts in making the useful plunge into outer space must be based on the foundation of knowledge already accumulated on flight through the atmosphere from sea level to its outer fringes. Any space vehicle must also successfully pass through the envelope of atmosphere both on its outward and return journeys.

There is a strong case to be made for charging NACA with the job of spearheading our national advance into space with a minimum of time and new money required to achieve the strong possibility of maximum progress. If NACA gets the job, our jump into space will be catapulted from a solid launching pad.

[From American Legion Magazine of December 1957]

MEDICAL RESEARCH ON A MAMMOTH SCALE

(By Tom Mahoney)

Forty rabbits are smoking a pack of cigarettes daily at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Dallas. What happens to them may add to our knowledge of the connection, if any, of smoking and cancer. In 41 hospitals, ranging from Brockton, Mass., to Los Angeles, physicians are making a cooperative study of the tranquilizing drugs, chlorpromazine and promazine, as compared to phenobarbital and placebos on 1,000 neuropsychiatric patients. Using a new total body radioactivity counter, the first in any hospital, Boston researchers study blood circulation, digestion and other bodily functions with the aid of radioisotopes.

These are just a few of the 5,251 projects now being pursued under the Veterans' Administration's $10 million a year medical research program. While designed primarily to meet the present and future medical needs of veterans, the result will benefit all Americans and, indirectly, mankind in general. This already has been demonstrated in the fields of tuberculosis, mental illness, and atomic medicine.

Seventy-four leading medical schools cooperate in the program, and it has attracted to the VA hospitals many research-minded physicians and surgeons of first rank because of the opportunities to pursue their special interests. The VA education and training program, which includes residencies and has included clinical investigators since last year, is an important factor in graduate training of physicians and has been especially successful in qualifying general practitioners as badly needed psychiatrists. Deans of the medical schools and other medical leaders serve on VA advisory committees.

Actually much more is involved in the program than the $10 million figure indicates. Except for a few administrators and trainees, the salaries of all 4,600 full-time medical doctors in the program are paid out of the regular hospital and outpatient budget of the Veterans' Administration. In addition, support for some projects is received from the National Cancer Institute, the American Cancer Society, Atomic Energy Commission, Damon Runyon Memorial Fund for Cancer Research, and other organizations. Pharmaceutical companies also help by furnishing free great quantities of new drugs, often specially packaged.

Still the amount involved is less than 2 percent of the whole VA medical and hospital budget and is not large in comparison with some other research budgets. The American Cyanamid Co. in 1956, for example, spent $22 million. Standard Oil of New Jersey spends $35 million. The Depart-

ment of Agriculture has spent comparable amounts researching farm pests.

But the program is the greatest in the world as far as the number and variety of patients, records, modern equipment, and general resources are concerned. While the average hospital has fleeting contact with a few thousand or maybe only a few hundred patients a year, the average daily number of VA patients is more than 112,000. They suffer from nearly every ailment known to man. There are dozens of cases of maladies so rare that doctors never see them in ordinary practice. The rolls even show a few cases of service-connected leprosy contracted during duty in the Philippines.

On most patients there are medical records dating back to enlistment. Moreover, for certain statistical studies researchers can draw on the records of the more than 22 million veterans now listed in the Government files. These include, for example, 22,000 pairs of identical twins, favorite subjects for genetic study today by many investigators.

When patients die in VA hospitals, their families usually consent to an autopsy in the hope that something may be learned that will help another veteran. The autopsy rate has increased since 1946, when it was 34 percent of all deaths in VA hospitals, to 72 percent during fiscal year 1957, when 22,156 autopsies were performed. At many VA hospitals the rate is 85 percent or higher. Autopsy findings benefit mankind in general, and medical men consider a hospital's percentage of autopsies an important clue to its standing as a research center.

The varied locations of the 173 VA hospitals—ranging from Seattle and Walla Walla, Wash., to Coral Gables, Fla., and San Juan, P. R.—make possible research on diseases peculiar to many regions and climates. The San Juan hospital, affiliated with the University of Puerto Rico, and the New Orleans hospital, associated with Tulane and Louisiana State, investigate tropical diseases. At San Juan, for example, Dr. R. Rodriguez-Molina and others are studying schistosomiasis, a serious snail-borne disease which certain immigrants are bringing to New York.

This vast program is the direct result of a chain of events started by the American Legion's famous resolution No. 528, calling for reorganization of VA medical service, adopted at the national convention in Milwaukee in 1941. At that time the VA research budget was $10,000 or less a year. There was a single researcher who produced statistical studies on subjects like the number of veterans gassed in World War I who developed tuberculosis. Many VA hospitals were located in out-of-the-way places, had no connections with medical schools, and civil-service limitations kept salaries of VA physicians low.

If the medical needs of the veterans of another war were to be met, Watson B. Miller, director of the Legion National Rehabilitation Commission 1923–41, and other Legion leaders recognized all this had to be changed.

Legion National Commander Lynn Stambaugh and later national commanders urged reforms both to Congress and the VA. The advantages of locating hospitals in medical centers, of affiliating them with medical schools, and of research were spelled out by a Legion medical advisory board headed originally by Dr. Leonard G. Rowntree, of Philadelphia, and including Drs. Charles W. Mayo and Waltman Walters, of the Mayo Clinic. In Washington T. O. Kraabel, who became director of the National Rehabilitation Commission in 1941, Dr. Hyman D. Shapiro, the senior medical consultant, and others of the permanent Legion staff pressed for these measures at countless hearings and conferences.

Most were achieved and the medical research program was born when President Truman appointed Gen. Omar N. Bradley VA Administrator in 1945 and he brought with him as the first VA Chief Medical Director, Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley, who had been chief surgeon in the European theater. General Bradley's successors, Carl Raymond Gray, Jr., and Harvey V. Higley, and General Hawley's successors, Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, / dm. Joel T. Boone, and Dr. William S. Middleton, all have enlarged the medical research program. Projects have increased from 100 to 5,251. Appropriations have grown from $1,393,697 in 1947, to $5,700,000 in 1956, and $10 million in 1957. VA researchers now contribute more than 900 articles every year to scientific journals.

Dr. Middleton, now Chief Medical Director, is "a doctor's doctor." He often makes the rounds of the wards at Mount Alto, the Washington VA hospital, and is a frequent contributor to medical journals. He was previously dean for 20 years of the University of Wisconsin Medical School. He served overseas in both wars and is a member of the William B. Cairns, Victory No. 57 Post of the American Legion in Madison.

Except during service as president of the American College of Physicians, Dr. Middleton has been connected with VA in some capacity ever since he became a consultant in 1922. He was a member of the consultant group named by General Hawley and was a member of the VA advisory committee on education when named Chief Medical Director in 1954. The first major increases in the VA research budget have come under him.

He believes the encouragement and motivation of patients is as important as treatment of their physical ills. "The life stream of VA medicine," he often says "is research and education." He considers research and education the only insurance against mediocre medicine.

Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research and Education is Dr. John D. Barnwell, who for its first decade headed VA's research in tuberculosis, a disease from which he suffered himself as a young man. He was for years a professor at the University of Michigan Medical School. Directly in charge of the VA education program, which has 2,500 doctors in graduate training, is Dr. John C. Nunemaker, formerly chief of medicine at a VA hospital, and a veteran of war service in the Middle East. Immediately in charge of the medical research program is Dr. Martin M. Cummings, who came to the central office from a research post at a VA hospital. He is coauthor of a book on diagnostic and experimental methods in tuberculosis.

Dr. W. Edward Chamberlain heads the atomic medicine program as special assistant to Dr. Middleton and also is Associate Director of the VA research service. Dr. Chamberlain was professor of radiology at Temple University and director of its hospital's department of radiology for 17 years until joining the VA this year as successor to Dr. George M. Lyon who launched the radioisotope study program in 1947.

Drs. Magnuson, Middleton and Barnwell were all students at the University of Pennsylvania and did their first research in the surgical laboratories of Dr. Ted Sweet. This won election to Sigma Xi for the first two and the local Mary Ellis Bell Medal for the last. Such is the influence of research teaching upon succeeding generations—a succession of purpose and know-how that Drs. Nunemaker, Cummings, and Chamberlain are trying to perpetuate throughout the VA.

In addition to heavy administrative duties, Dr. Cummings is personally interested in finding the cause of sarcoidosis, a mysterious disease which simulates tuberculosis. As maps on his office wall show all cases of it originating in pine tree areas, he believes something from these trees, possibly pine pollen, is responsible. Five VA hospitals in pine areas are studying it.

Study of the chemotherapy of tuberculosis is the oldest VA cooperative medical research project. A writer in the Journal of the American Medical Association has termed this outstanding * * * a noteworthy accomplishment unsurpassed the world over. Led by Dr. Barnwell, his successor, Dr. W. B. Tucker, and the late Dr. Arthur Walker, this has involved the testing of nine new drugs and combinations of them with 27,000 patients in 60 hospitals in probably the most extensive clinical field trials in the history of medical research. Army, Navy, and Air Force hospitals cooperated.

Initial studies in 1946–49 showed tubercle bacilli became resistant to streptomycin. Trials in 1949–51 showed streptomycin in combination with PAS (para-aminosalicylic acid) better than either drug alone. Beginning in 1952 isoniazid was tested in combination with streptomycin and PAS, the latter combination giving better results than any so far. Since 1954 viomycin, terramycin, pyrazinamide, cycloserine and streptovaricin have been tested with varying results.

The reasonable safety of all these drugs had been established before being given to VA patients. "The VA is not, and should not be, in a position to make the first clinical trial of a new drug," explains Dr. Barnwell. "Once a new drug has been tried, however, and has been shown to have some promise of effectiveness without undue toxicity, the VA is peculiarly, and perhaps uniquely, fitted to conduct a large-scale investigation of its effectiveness and the best regimen for its administration." In his book on tuberculosis, Dr. Saul Solomon says VA clinicians are "of the highest caliber."

Success of the program has speeded treatment, reduced the number of patients, and saved $38 million. The death rate after 8 months of treatment has dropped from 5 percent in 1946 to 1 percent at present. Results have been given to the world in the transactions of the annual conferences, coordinated by Dr. Edward Dunner, which are attended by authorities on tuberculosis from all over the world. Dr. Barnwell received the Trudeau Medal for 1950.

A recent study at the Baltimore VA hospital showed rabbits can be given tuberculosis by placing them in air circulated from the rooms of tuberculosis patients. When the contaminated air was sterilized by ultraviolet lamps, the rabbits did not develop the disease. Use of such lamps will reduce further the chances of VA employees contracting tuberculosis from patients. A similar study to determine whether ultraviolet light protects against the Asiatic influenza virus is under way at the Livermore, Calif., VA hospital.

Eight VA hospitals are studying effects of tranquilizing drugs on tuberculosis patients who also are psychotic. Studies of three fungus diseases which affect the lungs similarly to tuberculosis were started in several hospitals in 1957. These are histoplasmosis, coccidiodomycosis, and blastomycosis. They apparently are caused by inhaling fungi from contaminated soil, and the VA has more than 500 cases.

Isoniazid, the tuberculosis drug, at one time appeared promising in multiple sclerosis, but a cooperative study by several VA hospitals showed this to be sadly untrue. But this interested VA researchers in the baffling malady. They are studying the records of 2,000 veterans with it. As it is rare in the tropics, geography may be a factor.

The current total of 5,251 VA research projects is an increase of 1,200 over the previous fiscal year. Of the total, 1,533 are studies related to the problems of aging. In this classification are 300 studies of cancer, 429 studies of heart and blood-pressure problems, 573 studies of lung maladies, and

231 other geriatric studies. There are currently 1,068 projects in mental and nervous diseases, 1,995 studies of general medical and surgical problems, 560 studies using radioisotopes, and 95 dental-research projects.

As care of 60,833 neuropsychiatric patients in VA hospitals cost more than $238 million in 1957 and some 16,000 veterans with such disorders are awaiting admission, studies in this field have a high priority. The National Science Foundation reports more than half of all Government research projects in mental health is now entrusted to the VA. Dr. Jesse F. Casey is Director of its Phychiatry and Neurology Service. Dr. Ivan F. Bennett is chief of its research program which currently has a budget of $1,238,000.

The 41-hospital study of the tranquilizing drugs has been mentioned. All forms and combinations of therapy, however, are being studied. Already, a combination of drug and group therapy largely has replaced electric shock, insulin shock, and hydrotherapy in VA hospitals. The lobotomy operation, surgery of the brain, as a treatment for schizophrenia, is less used following a seven-hospital study.

Use of the new tranquilizing drugs in the treatment of neuropsychiatric patients has increased the discharge rate of these patients 40 percent in 3 years.

Development of a chemical test for schizophrenia is the goal of one of the most fascinating current research projects. Most promising is the ceruloplasmin test using a dye which changes color in the bloodstream of schizophrenics. It is an outgrowth of the work of Dr. Robert G. Heath, at Tulane, who found that taraxein, a protein substance extracted from the blood of schizophrenics, and injected into monkeys and convict volunteers caused them to develop symptoms of the condition.

This suggests that schizophrenia, the most serious of mental diseases, despite its variety, may be a single chemical-caused disease entity. Such a test would be of tremendous value not only in diagnosing the disease but in determining when a patient is cured of it. This work is in progress at VA hospitals in Bedford and Brockton, Mass.; Topeka, Kans.; Omaha, Nebr.; Coatesville and Pittsburgh, Pa.; Hines, Ill.; and Gulfport, Miss.

At the same time, VA research also pursues the psychiatric approach. A study of schizophrenic patients of two nationalities in New York by Dr. Marvin K. Opler, for example, was published recently by the Scientific American. He reported that "Each * * * bears the imprint of the underlying family experience and pattern of stress. This sort of research cannot fail to improve our understanding and treatment of schizophrenic disorders, particularly if it is supplemented by studies of the organic or physiological effects accompanying each type of personality imbalance."

Many projects have the aim of giving more freedom and a more normal life to psychiatric patients past the acute stage to speed their recovery and discharge. "In other words," says Dr. Casey, "we are trying to make the mental hospital a therapeutic community that will prepare recovering patients for the life they will lead outside the hospital."

A motivation unit, directed by Dr. W. R. Coutant, staff psychiatrist, is the heart of a pilot program in this direction under way at the VA hospital in St. Cloud, Minn. It involves a ward with 80 patients selected from the entire hospital, and a foster home program under which 55 patients live outside the hosiptal on a trial basis. Only about 10 percent of those in foster homes have had to return to the hospital, and in 2 years since the motivation unit was established the number of discharges has risen from less than 300 to 600 a year.

This is also true of several other VA hospitals. Dr. Earl P. Brannon, manager of the neuropsychiatric hospital at Coatesville, Pa., for example, reports that some patients who have spent more than 10 years in hospitals, fighting severe mental illness, now are back on their feet, again supporting families and doing well at their jobs.

One of the VA's greatest contributions to the country's medical resources is the now 5-year-old career residency program for recruiting general practitioners into psychiatry. This is another Legion-stimulated program. In effect, the VA makes up the difference in pay for an experienced practitioner while he is qualifying in this much-needed specialty. This allows a practitioner with 6 years' experience to earn $9,000 a year instead of around $3,600. In return, he agrees to serve a minimum of 2 years in a VA hospital where his services are most needed upon completion of his training.

"Thousands of mentally ill veterans are receiving high quality psychiatric care today because of this program," says Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness and author of Every Other Bed, a 1956 book which terms mental illness "America's No. 1 health problem."

So excellent is VA work in this field that its doctors frequently are offered higher paying posts in State and private institutions. Dr. Stewart T. Ginsberg, for example, resigned as chief of the VA central office psychiatry division last May to become commissioner of Mental Health for the State of Indiana.

This is a problem to some degree in many VA departments. While salaries of VA physicians now are much higher than before World War II, increases have not kept pace with the rising earnings of physicians in private practice. Nor can VA physicians earn by sparetime practice or teaching. In 1955 the average VA physician earned slightly more than $11,000, while figures of Medical Economics, a medical publication, showed average earnings of more than $18,000 for physicians in private practice. A Legion-backed effort to raise VA professional salaries failed in the last session of Congress.

The opportunities and variety of the research program, however, attract many high-caliber investigators to the hospitals. Merely to list in the most abbreviated form all of the current VA medical research projects requires a 946-page Government document. This is literally an order of battle against all the unknowns of medicine and surgery.

Five blind veterans regained their sight last year with corneal transplants from an eye bank at the Hines, Ill., VA hospital. Many projects are directed toward the future day when there may be banks of other parts of the human body which can be utilized as needed. At the Houston, Tex., VA hospital Dr. George L. Jordan, Jr., recently successfully transplanted four parathyroid glands of a stillborn baby to a 36-year-old veteran. In a rare operation at the Cleveland VA hospital a veteran's protid duct was changed to conduct saliva to his eye instead of his mouth to keep his eye from drying to blindness.

At the West Haven, Conn., VA hospital surgeons have successfully used synthetic materials such as nylon, dacron, and orlon for correcting defects in major blood vessels. They also are exploring the freezing of whole blood as a method of storage and have been able to transplant white blood cells from other animals to grow in animals previously unable to grow their own. At the Nashville, Tenn., VA hospital surgeons discovered a principle which is basic to heart-lung devices and, utilizing it, developed a simple pump-oxygenator which makes possible bloodless surgery on the heart by rapidly providing oxygen to blood of the entire body without action of either the heart or the lungs. They also have developed a simple plastic device for insertion into the heart to substitute for damaged or useless heart valves.

Ten hospitals are making a collective study of high blood pressure to determine which type of patient responds to drug therapy and which, under various circumstances, is the drug of choice. Sixteen hospitals are studying special diets and anticoagulant therapy in patients who have had heart attacks or strokes.

A minute instrument for measuring the blood pressure in the veins has been perfected at the Durham, N. C., VA hospital as an aid in the study of cardiovascular disorders. Investigators at this hospital are preserving large arteries in solution and have found them to remain viable for many months. Artery banks for use in the repair of damaged vessels are becoming an important reality.

At the VA hospital, Hines, Ill., an electrocardiograph using transistors has been devised which is as small as the usual instrument for measuring blood pressure and can be carried as conveniently. They also have developed a portable cardiac monitor which warns the surgeons when heart action becomes abnormal during an operation. At the New York VA hospital, Dr. John T. Farrar conceived a device of capsule size, since perfected by the Radio Corporation of America, which will broadcast the pressure changes in the intestinal tract electronically. It is the world's smallest FM radio broadcasting station; the signal travels 1 foot. This will enable physicians to localize lesions and identify disease processes without disturbing the patient.

At the VA hospital in Ann Arbor, Mich., surgeons have successfully used irradiated bone grafts taken from normal animals for the repair of defects in bone structure of other animals. This may make it possible to develop bone banks for clinical use in treating fractures and other diseases of the bone. VA researchers have transplanted teeth buds in animals.

A study of the psychology of suicide is being conducted by Drs. Edwin S. Shneidman and Norman L. Farberow, of the Los Angeles VA hospital. They are studying suicide notes, case histories, and other data on suicides and attempted suicides in the Los Angeles area for the last decade with the hope of evolving clues for the prevention of self-destruction. Some of their work has been published in a 1957 book, Clues to Suicide.

The VA naturally has a large part in the current national program to solve the mystery of cancer. Questionnaires on the subject of smoking were sent out to holders of United States Government Life Insurance. In cooperation with the National Cancer Institute, American Cancer Society, and other organizations, 29 VA hospitals are participating in cooperative studies of chemotherapy of selected types of cancer. Among chemicals being tested are thiotepa, TEM, nitrogen mustard, radiophosphorus, and radiogold. Under VA leadership the use of radioactive iodine for treatment of certain thyroid cancers has become routine.

At the Bronx, N. Y., VA hospital, Dr. Ludwik Gross may have achieved a significant breakthrough in cancer research by discovering that certain forms of leukemia and cancer in experimental animals are produced by a virus which is transmitted from parent to offspring. He also has demonstrated that leukemia can be produced experimentally by total body radiation, showing that the dormant virus causing the leukemia can be stimulated into activity by extensive exposure to X-ray. His work has been supported in part by the Damon Runyon memorial fund.

What about those cigarette-smoking rabbits in the Dallas VA hospitals? The United States Public Health Service is sharing part of the cost of this 5-year project which is in

charge of Dr. Robert H. Holland. He explains rabbits react to certain lung conditions more like humans than do rats, mice, or other laboratory animals. The rabbits are X-rayed every 6 months, and after death their lungs and respiratory tracts are examined and the findings filed.

The rabbits spend 3 out of each 24 hours in plastic "smoking boxes" designed by Dr. Holland and R. A. Huffhines, a Dallas electronics expert. When a rabbit is placed in a box, a lighted cigarette is set 2 centimeters from its nose. The animals gets fresh air at all times, but when electric timing devices and solenoid switches close an aperture the rabbits also get a puff of smoke. "Most of the rabbits," says Dr. Holland, "seem to enjoy smoking."

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] who serves with me as a minority member of the committee, in paying tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. I am sure that you are all aware of the great devotion our chairman gives to the work of this committee and I say without fear of contradiction that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is better informed as to the functions and operations of the agencies coming under the independent offices appropriation than anyone else in the Congress of the United States. He does a magnificent job of guiding the work of this committee and it is a pleasure to serve under him and with him. But I do want to take this opportunity to join with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] in disavowing any knowledge as to the language in the report; like others, I did not participate in writing it or the opportunity of reviewing it before being printed. I too, disagree with some of the language in this report, although I think it is fair to say by and large everything in the bill and the action of the committee was more or less unanimous with the exception of 2 or possibly 3 major items.

Much has been said about a number of activities covered under the independent offices appropriation bill. I should like to call your attention to the fact that this bill carries an appropriation of about $6½ billion and it covers the financing of some 16 independent agencies. I believe you should know that. This bill is about $1,159,000,000 more than a similar bill of last year and it is $627 million more than the budget request or the budget estimate.

May I call your attention to where the major increases appear in this bill. First, and foremost, there is included in this $589 million a contribution to the civil service retirement fund although not included in the budget request. I repeat, this $589 million was not requested or approved by the budget.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. I have here a report for 1956. I am very much interested in this matter. In that report I find that the interest has been going up all of the time, with the exception of 1955 when it was $234 million plus. In 1956 it was $211 million plus, notwithstanding the fact that the balance was almost $500 million more than in 1956. There was a substantial reduction in interest.

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I say to the gentleman that interest is being paid on the money borrowed from the fund by the Federal Government. That is paid out of appropriations for such purposes and I believe the interest figure for this year amounts to $214 million. This amount is paid directly to the fund.

Mr. WITHROW. I know, but I cannot understand why there should be less interest when there is $500 million more of a balance in the fund.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am not sure I understand the gentleman's point.

Mr. WITHROW. All right. For fiscal 1955 the fund earned $230 million plus. There was a balance at that time of $6,193,000,000. For fiscal 1956 it fell off to $211 million, notwithstanding the fact that there was a balance of $6,708,000,000, almost $500 million more.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I think I can say this to the gentleman, that whatever money is borrowed from the fund, the Government pays interest; in other words, interest is going into the fund each year. It would depend on how much the obligation is for interest that determines the amount to be paid.

Mr. WITHROW. Then the possible difference is due to the fact that all of this balance was not used by the Federal Government, or less of the balance, rather?

Mr. OSTERTAG. There is $7.5 billion in the fund right now.

May I point out that the substantial increase in this budget of $627 million is due principally to committee action in adding of $589 million for the Civil Service retirement fund, $177 million to finance construction of buildings by direct appropriations which is a transfer of the projects under the lease-purchase method, $25 million for repair of buildings. And, I might point out to you that there is no controversy over that question. I think we are all agreed that the added $25 million is a reasonable amount to maintain and repair and put into proper order the Government buildings throughout the country, $18 million additional funds was added for sites, and $8.3 million for inpatient care of veteran patients and $10 million more for VA hospital construction. In all, there are increases totaling some $825 million as made by the committee, while at the same time we reduced or cut the budget in major points such as this:

First, the general supply fund was reduced $15 million; strategic and critical materials under GSA was cut $70 million; National Science Foundation, $25 million; National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics $5.6 million; veterans' compensation was reduced some $32 million, veterans' readjustment benefit $17 million, or a total of about $165 million was cut or reduced from the budget request by the committee.

Now, what are some of these major items and what are some of the particular problems that we might discuss at this point? First of all, civil defense. The committee provided $38 million for civil defense, which is $1 million less than the amount appropriated in 1958, but it is also $3.5 million less than the budget request for this year. There is a reduction of $1 million in operating expenses. However, I would like to call your attention to the fact that $18 million was approved for emergency supplies which goes with the inventory of some $219 million worth of emergency supplies for civil defense, including $12 million for reworking stored blood plasma.

The disaster relief fund was not disturbed in any way. By that I mean no moneys have been added to the disaster relief fund and no request was made for additional funds. You might be interested to know that the disaster relief fund has a balance of about $18 million as we go into the next fiscal year.

Perhaps I should say a word in regard to the Veterans' Administration appropriation because, as you well know, that appropriation including veterans' benefits amounts to the bulk of this appropriation bill. As a matter of fact, the total appropriation for the Veterans' Administration amounts to $4.932 billion out of the total of $6.5 billion provided in this bill. And I should like to pause to pay tribute to the new Administrator. Sumner Whittier, of Massachusetts, was recently appointed by the Preseident as the Administrator of Veterans' Administration, and I am confident that he is going to do an outstanding job. He is well aware of the veterans' problems. He is a veteran himself. I am sure he is going to serve in this important post with distinction and credit to himself, to the veteran, and to the Federal Government.

In connection with the veterans' appropriation I might point out that this budget represents a $266 million increase over that in 1958. You might be interested to note that $715 million is appropriated for inpatient care which is $8 million over the budget request and $13½ million more than the appropriation made last year. This will provide, and I am sure we are all agreed it is desirable and necessary, additional beds for our veterans and more particularly improved care for mental patients.

With reference to veteran compensation and pensions, $3.2 billion is provided in this bill. Out of a total of $6½ billion for some 16 independent agencies over $3 billion is provided and made available for compensation and pensions. There is a reduction of $32 million in compensation and pensions from the budget request but I do want to point out that we must meet this obligation with funds no matter what the amount may be.

This is a statutory obligation and whatever the benefits amount to during the year we must pay them. It is just a matter of estimating the amount that will be spent.

Mr. Chairman, as we go into the next fiscal year it is estimated there will be somewhere between $15 million and $25 million in carryover funds. In readjustment benefits $700 million is appropriated with a reduction of $17.9 million.

As you know, this money is made available for the trainee program and because of the fact that there will be a drop in number from 540,000 to 460,000 in the number of Korean veterans eligible to this training, this cut in the budget seems to be a reasonable estimate. You will be interested to know that the committee has added $10 million for hospital construction. That means we are putting that much more into construction and repair even though there is $144 million in unobligated carryover funds.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand there is a cut in the amount for compensation and benefits in this bill. Every year they have not allowed enough for those benefits and have had to come back for more money.

Mr. OSTERTAG. As I explained, and I am sure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will remember, I pointed out that there is a reduction of $32 million. But there will be a carryover of from $15 million to $25 million plus the $3.2 billion in new money which is being made available in this bill.

So the $32 million is a small amount compared with the overall amount, and whatever is required will and must be made available. We must make that available by virtue of law. It is just a matter of estimating the amount the VA will actually use.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Almost every year the Veterans' Administration does not have enough money to pay its bills and compensation.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And always supplemental appropriations have made up the difference.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, but it is a very bad habit.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Now, referring to the question of the civil service retirement fund, I should like to call attention to this particular fact: First of all, there is $7½ billion in the retirement fund today. Not only this bill but every appropriation bill we pass carries with it direct contributions to the retirement fund for all of the employees covered within the specific appropriation bill, so that when all of the appropriation bills have been passed this year some $624 million will have been appropriated by the Federal Government as its share to meet the retirement benefits of those covered.

In addition, the employees themselves will have contributed about $624 million. The direct appropriation of $624 million plus the employees' contribution of $624 million, plus the $214 million which will be paid into the fund for interest, means that approximately $1,500,000,000 will be paid into the retirement fund this year.

In connection with that, it might well be asked how much will be drawn, how much in the form of benefits will be paid. According to the Civil Service Commission, and the figures I have at hand, approximately $802 million, will be drawn in benefits or in pensions. Consequently, if you reduce the contribution that is going into the fund this year of $1,500,000,000 by subtracting $802 million you will have a balance this year of $660 million. In other words, upward to $700 million more will be paid into the retirement fund than will be drawn out during this year. This amount would be over and above the $589 million provided in this bill.

The Civil Service Commission has also informed us that the fund will grow to more than $13 billion between now and 1972. At that point I think it is fair to say that disbursements will begin to exceed the income. So if we appropriate this $589 million we are just adding that much more to the fund to be borrowed again by the Government. By raising this budget $600 million for this purpose we are without a doubt throwing this budget out of balance. And bear in mind that this particular bill is making available over $600 million more than the budget requested.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. This amount you are proposing to put into the fund this year is what we have kept out of the fund in past years, and is due the fund because the Congress has not paid its share. Is that the reason?

Mr. OSTERTAG. You could put it that way, yes.

Mr. MASON. I want to know. That is the way I have been told, that that is the reason.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I would say this, that much more than the $589 million might be appropriated to the fund in order to make it actuarially sound and have the money in the till to meet all ultimate obligations. On the other hand, the fund is just as sound as the Federal Government itself.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

May I call attention of the House to page 5 of the committee report. There is an item there that the General Services Administration called about this morning. It called our attention to a typographical error they had made in preparing a list. The last item on that list is Dallas, Tex., and it has $15,137,000 in that column. It ought to be $22,040,000. We ask that the report be corrected in conformity with the figures of the General Services Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to our beloved friend from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the statements of the majority of the Committee on Appropriations which has urged you to accept the independent offices appropriations bill of 1959 as reported by the full Committee on Appropriations.

Let me begin by commending the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the able chairman of our Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, for the excellent statement he has made in presenting the committee's recommendations. I want also to commend our chairman for his very able leadership of our subcommittee in conducting hearings on this bill. He is, as we all realize—not only genial—but able and always eminently fair to everyone.

It has been a genuine pleasure to be associated with ALBERT THOMAS on this subcommittee. It has also been a pleasure to work with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], the ranking minority member, and all the other members of the subcommittee, my colleagues Congressmen YATES, BOLAND, OSTERTAG, and JONAS.

Our subcommittee has devoted many weeks to hearings on the fund needs of these agencies and given thorough consideration to the appropriation requests of the 17 agencies composing the category of our bureaus and commissions referred to as our independent agencies. The bill, as reported, represents the best judgment of the subcommittee, based on a very complete review of the recommendations submitted in the budget. The hearings comprise two volumes of some 1,335 pages of testimony and exhibits.

It reflects the committee's concern that these important agencies should have all the funds they need to discharge their duties efficiently; but it also reflects the realization that the taxpayers' money in these critical times must be employed in such a way that the most important problems and objectives of our Government are met first.

The bill, although one of our bigger appropriations bills, is nevertheless a good one.

The committee has made reductions in many items, and the total of such reductions is in excess of $200 million.

Appropriations recommended in the bill total $6,549,920,900, which is an increase over the budget estimates of $627,577,400. These increases are largely represented by increased contributions to the retirement fund of the Civil Service Commission, the Veterans' Administration, and to accelerate the post-office construction program of the General Services Administration.

I shall certainly not attempt to discuss many of the items in the pending bill—there are so many agencies involved and the various agencies have numerous programs. I believe there are some 18 boards, bureaus, commissions, and independent agencies that come before our subcommittee each year for their annual budget review and fund needs. Among these agencies are included the Civil Service Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Veterans' Administration, the General Accounting Office, and the General Services Administration, among others.

These agencies are all arms of the Congress and have vital and important roles to play in carrying out the mandates of the Congress and in serving the public interest.

During the limited time allowed to me, I want to direct my remarks to the

programs of three agencies, in which we are all particularly interested at this time.

First, the National Science Foundation.

We all recognize the importance of the National Science Foundation at this time. This agency is tremendously important in endeavoring to reawaken America in the rocket and missile age, the space age, age of science in which we live and in carrying forward various programs of scholarships, fellowships, grants, to colleges and universities for advancing basic science and scientific research generally. The fund needs of this agency have been increasing annually, and we will all recall that specifically the President in his state of the Union message this year, singled out the National Science Foundation and called for a doubling of the national budget for the National Science Foundation. The President rightly was reflecting the public concern for our lack in science, and particularly made apparent, following the launching of the Soviet satellites in October of last year. I wish that our system of Congressional review of budgets were such that all the Members of the House and all the Members of the Congress could have heard testimony before our committee this year from the various distinguished and outstanding scientists and educators who composed the Board of Directors of the National Science Foundation. The testimony was most enlightening, and in fact, awakening of our needs.

Mr. Chairman, I am, with the indulgence of the Members, going to attempt to review briefly some of the statements of a few of the educators and scientists who came before our committee.

Dr. Bronk, the principal official of the National Science Board called for acceleration of our efforts in the field of education and science and while pointing out that America has some great scientists and that we have made great advancements in science, nevertheless, he recognizes our need for acceleration and for a new self-analysis—for the setting of our own goals and for maturity rather than our Nation waiting to be driven and to be awakened by the activities and programs of other countries. Dr. Bronk testified:

> I do not for a moment think that we are behind in all fields of science; I am sure that the Russians have people who are more competent than some of our scientists in some fields. Back in the twenties and thirties that was so in the field of neurophysiology—they had the great Pavlov; every person looked up to him. They have had great mathematicians, but, having said that, I know perfectly well that we have a great many scientists in this country of great distinction.

Dr. Bronk pointed out the number of Nobel prizewinners awarded to America in the past 20 years as evidence of our significant advances in science. He points out that a number of these were Americans. Others have come to our country from other countries. They chose America instead of Russia. Dr. Bronk called for a tremendous improvement and for a continual need for improvement in science and education by individuals, educators, institutions, and our Nation. Certainly the Rockefeller Foundation and the National Research Council have made numerous grants and financial contributions to fellowships in the advancement of science, but the work of the National Science Foundation has stimulated American thinking and American action in the field of science. The Government's role of leadership is both important and significant.

Dr. Gould, another Board member, gave credit to the work of our colleges and private scientific research institutions, but also stressed the need for the Government to participate and for the Government to lead. One of the greatest students of American democracy has pointed out that the crucial test of our democracy will be in its recognition of the superior individual. Dr. Gould told the committee that we should educate all of our citizens to their capacity—whatever capacity an individual can stand. He pointed out that the percentage of our population who have the competence to become great physicists and mathematicians is relatively small. We have to do a better job of recognizing those people who do have competence and encouraging them, and this, he said, should begin in the secondary school level.

A brilliant young man might want to be a scientist but if he arrives at college and does not have a good background in physics and mathematics, it is frequently too late and time is wasted. Dr. Gould likewise pointed out while there is great need for urgency and acceleration, he stated that our problems will not be solved by crash programs. We have a long, tough road ahead of us, but he added, "I have the impression that the pendulum is swinging." I think we are taking a more realistic attitude toward education—we are beginning to focus upon the ends of education as important, one of which is discipline, something which has been left out and which is now needed. The educators and scientists stressed the importance of intensified training in the grade schools and high school level. We are told that we must improve our teacher-training programs in the elementary level and to improve these programs all the way through the higher level of education so that our students will be better educated and broadened when they start university work.

Dr. Adams, another Board member, in commenting upon the Russians' educational system, stated that there are 428,000 freshmen in colleges this year in the Soviet Union and that every one of these 428,000 spent more than 1 month in taking examinations in various subjects and were extensively screened before being admitted to college. After they are admitted to the universities, they seldom fail—they have very, very few drop-outs because they are carefully screened. Not only are the science and mathematic courses stressed but there are thousands of more Russians studying English than there are Americans studying the Russian language. Their training is intensive, 6 days a week, 60 to 65 hours.

Pointing out that a National Science Academy has been proposed for our country, it was the opinion of Dr. Adams and others that what is needed is not a new academy but intensive and concentration courses provided at our numerous colleges and universities throughout the country. We only have a limited number of science teachers and if an academy were to be established, the instructors and staff would, of necessity, have to be taken away from our present universities. In calling for full appropriations for the work of the Science Foundation, Dr. Adams and others pointed to the long road, the big job ahead, and said that not only in the field of physics and mathematics but in other areas of science we must take every step and do everything that we can do to intensify and accelerate our educational programs.

Another witness before our subcommittee testified:

> What we need is a new look because science has moved so fast in the last few years that the children need to know more when they get to college than ever before. We have to do something about new courses, new ways of teaching, new curriculums of every kind in elementary schools and high schools—that means an enormous amount of experimentation, trying out new methods, what can the children learn more quickly, and are the methods we are using today the best. Can't these children who see so much television at home and know so much about science when they arrive at school go faster than our second, third, and fourth grades let them go? There is an awful lot of work to be done to see how each group of children can be brought along—that means somebody has to study new methods and the Foundation has a very strong program on that.

Dr. McLaughlin, a noted American scientist, commended the National Science Foundation as an excellent pilot mill. He particularly stressed the importance of teacher-training programs and the teacher-training institutions fostered and sponsored by the Foundation.

Concerning fellowship and scholarship grants provided by the Foundation, I feel that it should be pointed out that the testimony discloses that at the present time only about 19 percent of the requests received can be accommodated. The budget of the Foundation for this year, the present fiscal year, permits the agency to support only 19 percent of their request in this field. The bill before the committee would supply funds for only about 40 percent of their request. The goal of the NSF is to be able to supply 75 percent of this request for scholarships and fellowships.

The long-range objective of the Foundation is to help our country get ahead in this very important field of developing scientists and in broadening and increasing education in our own country. I feel that the increase in funds provided at this time is adequate and as much as the Foundation can reasonably and efficiently use at present.

Mr. Chairman, the overall budget for the Veterans' Administration for next year is $5,922,343,500. This is a large sum of money, but we all recognize that the Veterans' Administration is one of the largest service agencies of our Government. It should also be pointed out

that the budget for the VA has been cut and reduced from year to year for the past several years. The budget for all VA programs, immediately after the war, was in excess of $9 billion. It has been cut from 9 to 8, 7, 6, 5 and now to a level of about $5 billion.

There are two items of particular interest in the VA budget which has been previously mentioned. First, the item for inpatient care. For 1958 the VA had $79 million for providing medical care and service to the disabled veterans in our numerous veterans hospitals. For next year, 1959, the VA requested of the Bureau of the Budget $87,298,000, and this item was cut by $15,700,000. In other words, they had $79 million in 1958, for 1959 they ask $87,298,000 and the Bureau of the Budget cut $15,700,000 from their request for inpatient care for veteran needs. The testimony on this item before the committee is very voluminous. A number of hospitals or beds would have to be eliminated should the budget cuts stand. We were told that the VA needs an additional $5 million for inpatient care of veterans in general medical and surgical and tuberculosis hospitals, and an additional $6½ million to care for NP or mental patients. The committee in its wisdom has restored these funds. I am sure the Members of the Congress and the country do not wish the Veterans' Administration to provide second class medical care for the veterans of this Nation.

Dr. Middleton, chief medical officer, under questioning admitted that the cutbacks in the VA budget were directed by the Bureau of the Budget. I asked Dr. Middleton whether or not in his opinion it would be fair to say that there has been a slowdown in the inpatient care program and his answer was "Yes." He called for a higher level of financial support for our mentally disabled veterans, veterans in our NP hospitals equal to that of our general medical and surgical hospitals.

There is a direct relation between the amount of money spent for the care of these patients and the rate of recovery and their return to society as rehabilitated citizens. I quote from page 572 of the hearings, giving Dr. Middleton's testimony:

> The time has arrived when, if we were going forward instead of backward, we would have to have staffing that would bring patients from the back wards, that is forgotten patients who were in some of the wards, the burned out patients. This term "burned out," gentlemen, is anathema to many. I think in modern days when a physician says there is no longer hope for a mental patient, he is losing sight of the advances that have been made. The number of patients who have made satisfactory improvement for return to society, resocialized, rehabilitated, is advancing steadily.

At another point Dr. Middleton pointed out that we have 16,000 veterans on the waiting list for admission to NP hospitals. While it is true that the number of TB patients are declining, the number of NP patients are increasing.

At page 578 the following testimony appears:

> Mr. EVINS. Doctor, you referred to those patients in the back wards—the men in the forgotten wards. Do you think those veterans with more attention, care and money could be rehabilitated or restored to society? or restored sooner?
>
> Dr. MIDDLETON. I know it.
>
> Mr. EVINS. You know it?
>
> Dr. MIDDLETON. Yes, sir.

I am sure that the Budget Bureau is not a expert on the type and kind of medical care that should be provided the veterans of this Nation. I prefer to take the testimony and expert knowledge of our medical officers of the VA and I am sure that the Congress wants to do everything possible to see that these medically disabled veterans are given the proper care and attention and rehabilitated and restored to society.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that members of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars who appeared before our Committee best expressed the sentiments of the Congress and the people of this country when they strongly protested against what these men term the "dollar worshiping" concept of the Budget Bureau as contrasted with the "humanitarian" concept of veterans medical care authorized by the Congress.

I trust that any amendment offered to reduce this item for medical care will be resoundingly defeated.

The second item in the VA budget which was drastically cut by the Budget Bureau was the item for hospital construction and the hospital modernization program.

Last year the Congress appropriated $44,500,000 for this purpose. For 1959, the VA requested of the Bureau of the Budget $44,528,000. However, the Budget Bureau cut this item by $35,383,000 or an 80 percent cut. The Budget Bureau recommended only $9,145,000 for some construction and modernization of a $2 billion investment in the veterans hospitals of this country. Of course, it has been pointed out or will be pointed out that there was a carryover of some $50 million of funds of prior years; however, the VA feels, and I believe the country feels, that at this time the Nation should take a long step in the direction of building such hospital requirements as the Nation needs and also in improving and modernizing our hospitals, many of which are outmoded and in need of modernization and repair. The level of the construction program as approved by the Budget Bureau, even with the carryover, would be $15 million less than the amount available for construction in 1958.

I am sure that we are all aware that some of these veteran construction projects have been approved for too many years and postponed long enough. Instead of $9,045,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, its testimony indicates that the Veterans' Administration could use $192,121,000 to complete the approved projects.

The $10 million added to the bill above the budget is intended for the completion of the construction of two hospitals in the Veterans' Administration construction and renovation program; namely, hospitals in Nashville, Tenn., and Jackson, Miss. Funds have previously been appropriated for these projects, but increased costs due to materials, labor, and site location have necessitated an increased appropriation to complete these two hospitals.

As pointed out in the committee report, the committee will expect the VA to proceed with more speed and dispatch in its hospital construction and renovation program. I repeat, it seems that now is the correct time to take a long step forward in abating the frustrating delays the VA has encountered in carrying out its construction program.

I personally have deep resentment when the Bureau of the Budget can circumvent the will of Congress, not only with respect to items of medical care and hospitals for the veterans of this Nation, but other actions of Congress as well.

The committee is recommending $19,145,000 for funding additional hospital construction and repair in 1959. This is $10 million in excess of the budget estimates, but $23,355,000 less than the appropriation for this purpose for this year. This amount will not take care of all of the approved projects and all of the needs, but the amount carried in the bill certainly should be approved. It will help speed the hospital construction program—long delayed—and serve to provide better facilities for veteran needs—while at the same time provide employment and a stimulus to our economy at a time when our Nation can well afford to make these expenditures.

The third item—big item—in the bill on which I wish to speak briefly is the money carried in this bill for direct appropriation or construction of post offices or Federal buildings by the General Services Administration.

A great deal has already been said—or will be said about the inefficiency or lack of progress of the so-called lease-purchase program. I for one do not think that it has succeeded as the Congress intended. I believe that Administrator Floete of the General Services Administration, Public Buildings Commissioner McConihe, and members of their staffs have endeavored to do a good job and to render a real service in this field. However, as we all know, the GSA has been handicapped by a multiplicity of redtape with which this program has become involved. In addition, the Bureau of the Budget has failed to approve projects that are needed and have approved others that were not perhaps as meritorious as some that the Members of Congress might prefer.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman just made reference to construction of public building projects by direct appropriation. On page 2 of the report it is pointed out that $177,255,000 is to be used in the construction of 66 public buildings. Further along in the paragraph reference is made to 14 other authorized projects outside of the District of Columbia which the Administrator said cannot be placed under construction in 1959 even if funds were appropriated. On page 5 is a list of those 14 projects. My question has reference to one at Denver, Colo., involving a court-

house costing $17,390,000. Is it true that the Administrator of the General Services Administration will be given $18 million for the purchase of sites and to draw plans for that building?

Mr. EVINS. I may say to the gentleman it was the wish and intention of the committee that ample funds be provided in the bill for construction of all these projects. The $38 million appropriation to which the gentleman refers is for acquisition of sites and for plans for the 14 additional projects which the GSA said they were not prepared at present to start constructing. So the answer to the gentleman's question is "Yes."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. There is only one building built by the GSA under this lease-purchase program at Rock Island, Ill. There are three others under construction, one in Kansas City, Kans., one at Council Bluffs, Iowa, and one other construction. There are three under way in a period of some 4 or 5 years. I believe the Congress has felt this program has not been effective, therefore they did not renew the program or extend the legislation, but since the projects have advanced as they have the Committee on Appropriations approved the money for the completion of the 66 projects carried in this bill. I think that the Budget Bureau has been responsible for a crippling delay in its action and at this time when there is need for employment, when there is need for efficiency in Government, the program should go forward.

Although, as we know, the Lease-Purchase Act was not renewed by the Congress, I trust that these projects will be built under one of these plans promptly. There is some urgency to get these buildings constructed. There has been only one building constructed to date—only one post office and Federal building—built under the lease-purchase plan. There are three other projects approved and under construction, namely, Kansas City, Kans., Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Albuquerque, N. Mex.—besides the one that has been built and completed at Rock Island, Ill. As the plan has operated—cumbersome and with redtape, we have not actually leased any buildings, but only leased the money to build these very limited few buildings and the Government has been paying rent on that money which would increase the total cost of the building to the taxpayers from 65 to 70 percent.

Mr. Chairman, let me review how the present so-called lease-purchase program actually works. First, the Post Office Department and the General Services Administration do the entire job of planning the buildings. Secondly, when the Post Office Department approves construction of a specific post office and the GSA has the estimate of the cost, the GSA invites bids for financing the cost of the public building—I repeat, the bids are for financing the cost. Bids are received largely from insurance companies and the rates of interest proposed have been so high that many bids have been rejected. Until recent months, all interest rates have been in excess of 4¾ percent or more. The latest bids received in the past 2 weeks were about 4½ percent. The GSA then invites bids for construction and awards such bids as are acceptable. The GSA also supervises the construction and will be responsible for the construction. Mr. Chairman, the only thing the investor does is to loan the money. The Government, through the GSA, does everything else just exactly as it would do if the building were constructed with appropriated funds. There are two principal differences—under lease-purchase we have to pay at least a 1-percent point more for the money to build the building and, secondly, the Government must pay local taxes for a period of from 10 to 25 years. There is a fiction that the Government owns the building. The Government does not own the building or acquire the title to it until after a period of from 10 to 25 years—a 10-year period for amortization of small projects and 25 years for the amortization of higher cost public buildings. By direct appropriations, the money could be borrowed at the going rate of interest for Government bonds from 3 to 3½ percent—and possibly even less—thus, a saving of 25 percent in interest cost plus taxes. As the buildings would be Federal property, they would not be subject to Federal taxes—thus, representing a further savings.

Besides the increased cost under the lease-purchase, I think the Congress and the country are disappointed with the redtape and delays involved. Because of the delays and because of the inabilities for this program to move forward and to provide the modern and needed and essential post office facilities which are required, the committee has recommended in this bill a total of $177,225,000 for the construction of 66 public buildings by direct appropriations. These projects have been approved by the Public Works Committees of the Congress. At pages 1258–1259 and 1260, volume II of the hearings, will be found a statement of the Comptroller General and inclusive of the record of the full report of the analysis of the cost of the construction of these 96 projects under the lease-purchase plan and by direct appropriation. The GAO study relates to the 96 projects approved by GSA. However, as indicated the committee is recommending funds only for 66 projects. Projects in the District of Columbia have been deferred and other projects are not advanced far enough to proceed with construction at this time. However, the GAO study with respect to the 96 projects is applicable to all projects which have been approved to date—the same principal of increased cost applies to the 66 projects for which funds are recommended in this bill.

In brief, the total cost of the 96 projects, according to the GAO would be $1,772,555,000 at a 4½-percent interest rate and a total of $1,842,442,000 at a 5-percent interest rate charge. By contrast, by direct appropriation the total cost of the 96 projects will be reduced by $762,562,000 and it would be $692,675,000 under the 4½-percent interest rate contracts. In other words, it will cost the taxpayers 70 percent more to build these buildings under the lease-purchase plan. This includes the payments of taxes over the 10 to 25 year period which would represent a cost of $251,682,000.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the additional cost on a 5-percent interest charge would be $762 million plus. In other words, these 96 projects will cost the American taxpayer in excess of three-quarter billion dollars more if constructed under the lease-purchase plan than by direct appropriation.

The committee accordingly, very wisely and in the interest of economy, has directed that these approved projects be built by direct appropriation and the money is carried in this bill. I repeat, that these projects which have been long delayed and are much needed for efficiency of the Post Office Department should now go forward. This is the time when there is a recognized need for the providing of employment and the work will assist in our declining economy.

In conclusion, I want to ask the pardon of the committee for my trespassing upon so much of your time, but I felt that with this big bill there are three programs of special appeal and especial importance at this time; namely, the program of the National Science Foundation, Veterans' Administration, and the General Services Administration, worthy of some further detailed discussion.

Mr. Chairman this is a good bill—it is a well-considered bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, we in northern Ohio feel that there has been unpardonable delay in the construction of the two VA hospitals authorized by the Congress ten or more years ago.

May I call the attention of the House to a statement on page 16 of the committee's report on H. R. 11574:

> The committee cannot understand why it is taking so long to make any progress with the hospital renovation program. It certainly has not been due to lack of funds. The unobligated balance of construction funds at the present time is $144 million. It will be $105 million at the beginning of fiscal year 1959. The committee will expect an increased number of projects to proceed into construction without delay and will review the situation further next year.

There are two proposed VA hospitals in northern Ohio in which I have had a deep interest over a period of years. One is a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital to be constructed at Brecksville, Ohio; the other is an 800-bed general medical and surgical hospital at Wade Park in Cleveland.

The Brecksville neuropsychiatric hospital was authorized by Congress in the 1948 new hospital program and funds were appropriated in 1953. The Wade Park hospital was also authorized in 1948, but no money was forthcoming until 1956 when $1,056,786 was appropriated for plans, technical services, and so forth. Neither of these two hospitals have progressed very much. The VA recently informed me that plans for the neuropsychiatric hospital will not be completed until October and that bids for construction will not be let until some time after that. On the other hand, the VA does not plan to request construction money

for the Wade Park hospital until next year.

Cleveland has responsibility for 715,000 veterans in northern Ohio. Something over 1,900 veterans in that area are awaiting admittance to the neuropsychiatric hospital, and the Wade Park hospital is to replace a VA hospital which is old and the constant repairs costly.

I urge the committee to follow through and do everything possible to get these urgently needed hospitals under construction.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. I would like to join the gentlewoman in her remarks and to express likewise the thought that there should be steps taken by the Veterans' Administration to speed up this hospital construction program.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when we brought out this bill to the House a year ago, the independent offices appropriation bill, we were rather optimistic because we had defeated a piece of legislation that should never have been passed. It carried $50 million in that bill and ultimately would have cost the Government 10 times $50 million and put us into the indemnity insurance business with a sure loss probably running to $5 billion. The most optimistic report I can give you today is that the defeat was so sound there was no request for funds to implement the legislation in this budget. Today our report cannot be quite as optimistic as it was a year ago because a year ago we also came in with a substantial reduction of millions of dollars under the budget.

Our report today is not too optimistic. While in most of the hundreds of items we were able to make some reductions, which total $200,042,600, which is a considerable amount; however appropriations recommended in the bill as a whole show an increase over the budget request of $627,577,400, or $1,159,988,100 over 1958 appropriations.

The total recommended in the bill is $6,549,920,900. Several large items written into the bill are responsible for increasing the amount over the budget request.

The largest item is $589 million to the civil-service retirement fund. One new item is $177,255,000 to finance construction of 66 public building projects by direct appropriations rather than to continue them under the lease-purchase contract method.

Since some Members have placed great emphasis on the necessity of this bill providing for an increase to the civil-service retirement fund of $589 million, and have referred to the fund as in a bankrupt condition, I want to meet that charge with facts which I believe will prove to the Members of the House that such statements are not justified by the facts.

My first witness is the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and at this point may I read to you a statement which I received from Mr. Stans, the Director:

STATEMENT ON CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND RECEIVED FROM BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

This proposal to appropriate $589 million to the civil-service retirement fund would increase Federal budget expenditures unnecessarily in what appears to be an attempt to convert a perfectly good actuarial and cost-accounting estimate relating to one or two aspects of financing the retirement system into added appropriations which will either increase the public debt or add to the burden placed on today's taxpayers.

This proposed $589 million appropriation is unnecessary, because we are already appropriating funds for retirement purposes to the agencies, and as interest on the public debt, which funds find their way into the retirement fund. We are including about $650 million in 1959 appropriations to the agencies which will be paid over by them as their contributions to the retirement fund. And we are including about $214 million in the appropriation for interest on the public debt, as the amount to be paid upon the approximately $7.5 billion balance in the fund, and this amount will in turn become interest income to the retirement fund. Thus we are already appropriating about $864 million to the retirement fund over and above the approximately $650 million which the employees will pay, as their retirement deductions. Since it is estimated that disbursements from the fund in 1959 will be paid at the rate of about $802 million. This means that the fund in that year will receive income of about $722 million over its disbursements.

This condition of an excess of receipts over disbursements, will continue, it is estimated, until about 1972, 14 years, and by that time the fund will be about double what it is today, or about $13 billion.

It is obviously desirable that the Civil Service Commission keep accurate accounts, and report annually its estimates of income and expenditures, and of future requirements based on various assumptions. However, these abstract estimates should not be converted into added appropriations.

To imply that because it is not fully funded, the retirement fund is being somehow mismanaged and that it is bankrupt is to call into question the full faith and credit of the United States Government. The Retirement Act promises to make certain payments under specified conditions, and regardless of the size of the balance in the retirement fund at any particular time, these benefits will be paid because the promise to do so is backed by the full faith and credit of the Government. There are no conditions attached. It is a perfectly open and straightforward obligation.

While these are very strong reasons for full funding of private pension plans, these reasons do not apply in the case of the Civil Service Retirement System. The most important reason for full funding of private plans is to assure employees that they will receive the benefits they have earned even though the employer may go out of business. We have never thought it necessary to make provisions for the Federal Government going out of business.

FACTS ABOUT CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

Let me summarize this factual statement from the Bureau of the Budget, which summary will clearly show that the $589 million added to this bill is not necessary to the solvency of the fund; can only increase the Federal debt, and serve no worthy purpose.

For the fiscal year 1959 there are three automatic sources of income going into the fund without the additional appropriation of $589 million proposed, as follows: $650 million from the employees; $650 million from the agencies of the Government matching employees' funds; $214 million was appropriated in the Treasury bill to pay the interest on the $7,500,000,000 cash fund balance.

This makes a total of $1,514,000,000 income to the retirement fund in 1959, and makes unnecessary the additional $589 million proposed in the bill.

Disbursements from the fund in 1959 are estimated at $802 million which show that the fund will gain in 1959 over and above the amounts paid out—$712 million—again proving no necessity of adding another $589 million.

DO THESE FACTS INDICATE THE RETIREMENT FUND IS BANKRUPT?

The Members on both sides of the of the House are and should be concerned about the present day economic condition. Many Members are thinking of appropriating additional funds to expand public works construction or to reduce taxes—those things that will directly affect and benefit the citizens of this country.

This proposed appropriation of $589 million to the retirement fund will create an increase in the public debt. It is merely a bookkeeping transaction, and will not contribute 1 red cent toward relief to the present day economic condition.

This fund is not only sound actuarially for at least 14 years to come, but it has the full faith and credit of the Government as an assurance that all retirement benefits will be paid. Someone has said that the fund is bankrupt. Of course, that is a mistaken idea. This fund can only be bankrupted in the future by the Congress, managing the fiscal affairs of our Government in connection with the executive department in such a way that we will bankrupt the Government.

This extra appropriation with other billions and billions that might be unwisely appropriated could be the steps taken that would bankrupt the Government and thus bankrupt the fund.

We who are trying to stop the unnecessary increase of the national debt by asking the Congress not to put this unnecessary increase of over a half billion dollars on the national debt at this time, are, in fact, the ones who are trying to protect this fund for the future of those in Government interested in the retirement fund.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Some other substantial increases were for repairs and improvements of federally owned buildings—$10 million over the budget, which we thought were justified, and will save money in the long run.

Sites and expenses, public building projects—$18 million. By changing to direct appropriations rather than to continue lease-purchase construction of public buildings, and with increases we found necessary over the budget estimate, the total increase for General Services amounts to $121,517,900, notwithstanding a reduction in strategic and critical materials of $70 million, and other substantial reductions.

At this point may I say Mr. Floete deserves high praise for the leadership and energy he has demonstrated as Administrator of GSA. He and his staff have done an excellent job.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Since I shall direct some criticism with reference to some programs under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, whose Administrator is Albert Cole, known and highly respected by all the Members of Congress, I do want to say that I do not believe the President could have selected anyone for this difficult job who could have rendered a better service of administration than does Al Cole. Mr. Cole and the present administration inherited this giant arm of bureaucracy, which had been built up and had become a policy of the Federal Government for several years before Mr. Cole was named Administrator. I know and most of you know that Mr. Cole has greatly improved and tightened up this farflung organization.

His associates, including Mr. Slusser at the head of Public Housing, are doing the best they can, and have made great improvement in the administration of the act for which the Congress is solely responsible.

And I want to pay special tribute to Mr. Norman Mason for the excellent management he has given to FHA.

URBAN RENEWAL

In this rather large agency was carried an item of capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal of $50 million.

This appropriation finances two-thirds of the loss incurred by a local community in acquiring and clearing land for an urban renewal project.

The contract authorization at the present time for such grants, which will be given away to the large and smaller cities—$1,350,000,000, and legislation has been introduced to increase the authorization to $2,650,000,000 by fiscal year 1963. Thus, the total of $2,650,000,000 will be contracted for in the future and come before this committee and the Members of Congress for approval if the law is continued in effect, and I fear it will be.

These huge amounts are being spent and will continue to be spent to do a facelifting and slum-clearance job, building up such cities as New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and some smaller cities—all of this money to build up these cities at the expense of all of the taxpayers in the Nation—from every Congressional District in the United States.

I cannot bring myself to believe that all of our farmers, our little-business men, and our laboring men and women should be taxed as they are being taxed for these huge gifts in building up the urban and city districts. I cannot quite understand how the Members of this Congress can justify laying this tax on the citizens of their Districts who never derive any benefit whatsoever from it.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

There is another item in this bill for $107,500,000 for annual contributions, payments on 401,214 low-rent public-housing units. The bill also includes $11,800,000 for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, making a total of $119,300,000. This singularly large sum carried in this bill is only a pittance of the billions of dollars that over the years have been appropriated in the building of low-rent public-housing units—practically all of them in the large cities of the Nation.

These grants, gifts, or subsidies, whatever you want to call them, are first collected in taxes from the people of the entire Nation to build new and modern small housing units, mostly in great apartment buildings in the cities where the people who occupy them are charged a rental of about one-third less than normal rents, and this one-third rental is paid for them from the taxes of all the people throughout the United States.

Here are some startling figures which I feel should be called to the attention of the Members of Congress, taken from information I received from the Public Housing Section of the Housing and Home Finance Agency yesterday. This is the backlog or work ahead which has been contracted:

Ninety thousand units are under annual contributions, on which construction has not been started but will be built.

Fifteen thousand five hundred are under contract.

Sixty-seven thousand one hundred were authorized in 1956 to be placed under contract.

This makes a total of 172,600 that are authorized, with 15,500 under contract.

This does not include 376,000 which have been under management for several years, and it is fair to say that several thousand of the last lot were wartime units built several years ago.

I think it should startle you to learn that the Government, through its 40-year contract of subsidizing this public housing, to be occupied by people who pay only about two-thirds of the normal rental, when all of these units are completed will have a clear loss of over $5 billion of the taxpayers' money. When you combine this with a loss of $1,350,000,000, when the urban renewal contracts now entered into are finished, the total loss to the Government would be something over $6,350,000,000.

I bring this painful information to the attention of the Members of Congress in the hope that sometime, somehow we can stop the urban renewal and the public housing programs.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

I have a report today from the FHA section of the Housing Administration, which has been doing a wonderful job over the past number of years in promoting free enterprise housing, that the applications for insurance for smaller homes, from $10,000 to $13,000, are about 70 percent higher than this same time last year, and that is certainly good news.

Furthermore, it is the opinion of Mr. Norman Mason, the head of that section, as expressed to me, that there will be built 1,100,000 FHA financed homes this year, which far exceeds the new building last year.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

First, I want to pay my compliments and express my appreciation to Mr. Whittier of the Veterans' Administration, who I am sure has impressed all the members of the committee as an able and dedicated administrator in the interest of all of the veterans.

The committee recommended $4,932,210,000, which is $35,342,000 below the amount recommended last year for 1958; however, the committee increased several items above the amounts requested in the budget—for inpatient care, the committee provided $715,465,000 for eligible veterans in VA and other hospitals. That is $8,365,000 more than the budget estimate, and $13,465,000 more than the current year.

During the hearings it became evident that the budget estimate was inadequate for the number of beds that would be required, and also would not provide the type of care for neuropsychiatric patients the VA considered desirable. The committee has, therefore, added $5,000,000 over the budget estimate for improved medical care for mental patients, and $3,365,000 for care of additional patients.

The bill provides for treatment of 140,800 beneficiaries instead of 139,042 as proposed in the budget estimate.

OUTPATIENT CARE

The bill contains $75 million for this item, which is a reduction under the budget request of $798,000. The reduction is predicated on a smaller workload for next year.

COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS

The bill includes $3,200,000,000 for payment of compensation and benefits to veterans in 1959. The amount provided is a reduction of $32 million in the budget estimate, and is still $373,750,000 more than was appropriated in 1958.

The above reduction was made in view of the fact that a carryover of funds from 1958 currently estimated it from $15 million to $25 million.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

The bill provides $700 million for this item, which is $17,960,000 less than the budget estimate. More than $600 million of this appropriation is for training Korean conflict veterans, and the number of trainees is expected to drop from 540,000 to 460,000 next year.

I shall not go farther, because I have talked at great length; more than I feel I should, other than to say that we have done the best we could with this bill. We have taken care of the veterans in very good shape. There have been some things the committee has reported with which I do not fully agree, and there has been some language in criticism of some people, with which I do not agree. But, of course, those small things do not amount to much when you talk about the fine good that comes from a group of men working in the interest of our Government, such a group as we have on this particular committee.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. Briefly.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that the only way it can be said that this fund

is insolvent or bankrupt is in the event all the beneficiaries should apply at one time for payment and then there would not be enough money in the so-called trust fund to pay them?

Mr. VURSELL. That is true.

Mr. JONAS. But the fund itself is no more bankrupt than the Federal Government; is not that true?

Mr. VURSELL. I fear not nearly as bankrupt as the Federal Government.

Mr. JONAS. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government has used all of the money, and the trust fund merely has the I O U's of the Government as its only assets; is not that true?

Mr. VURSELL. That is quite correct.

Mr. JONAS. If we continue to pour money into the fund the Government will continue to spend that money and put additional I O U's in there. Eventually when paying time comes we will have to tax the people twice to take up the I O U's after having taxed them to provide the money to put into the fund, is not that true?

Mr. VURSELL. It would be a losing operation for the taxpayer and a greater expense.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VURSELL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The way things are going, the disbursements could not get up to the amount of money in the fund prior to 1972.

Mr. VURSELL. That is quite correct.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman recall the testimony of the Civil Service Commission before our committee——

Mr. VURSELL. I will anticipate the gentleman's question.

Mr. YATES. Let me ask the question.

Mr. VURSELL. I do not yield further. I know quite well the budget did not request these funds. It took a great deal of questioning to get them to say they were interested in any way whatever.

Mr. YATES. With respect to the point the gentleman made, the Civil Service Commission requested funds for the appropriation. On page 550 of the hearings Mr. Irons testified that if this contribution is not included in 1992 the Federal Government will have to make direct appropriations to meet the claims of the claimants of $1.5 to $2 billions per year.

Mr. VURSELL. I am perfectly willing to admit that. It took a good deal of urging to get Mr. Irons to make that statement, which is a factual statement. It is not 1992, however.

Mr. YATES. Nineteen hundred and ninety-two is the statement in the hearings.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Making direct appropriations is exactly the way we handle retirement funds for the military personnel, is that not true? We do not set up any trust fund out of which we pay retirees of the military service. We do that by direct appropriation each year.

Mr. VURSELL. And we take care of hundreds of millions and billions of dollars for the veterans. We are interested in the veterans. We are interested equally in those who expect to benefit from the civil service retirement fund.

Now I want to talk for a minute or two about the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and at this point may I compliment Mr. Cole on the ability and energy he has demonstrated as Administrator. He and his staff have done an excellent job.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. May I join my distinguished colleague from Illinois in his remarks about Mr. Cole. He is a fine man and a hard worker. He is a fine citizen and we think he is doing a good job.

Mr. VURSELL. And we think we have a fine chairman of this committee, a most gracious chairman, although we disagree occasionally as good citizens do. But we like to work with the chairman. We all know that he is rendering a great service to his country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] such time as he may require.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, like other members on the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman for the manner in which he has handled this committee; to the ranking minority member and to his two colleagues, the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from North Carolina, and my own colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Tennessee, for the efforts they have expended in bringing to this floor this appropriation bill.

One of the very pleasant tasks of this Congress is to serve on this committee. I know of no committee or subcommittee of the full Committee on Appropriations that enjoys its work as much or spends any more time on it than do the members who serve on this particular committee. When the chairman opened debate on this bill he indicated that other members of the committee knew as much about the various agencies as he does, but in saying this he is selling himself short. There are few members who work as hard, there is none who knows as much about the 17 agencies with which this bill deals, as does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

All of the agencies provided for by this subcommittee have their particular uses to the Government; all 17 are important, and all 17 have been treated very generously and very carefully by this subcommittee. One or more of the agencies provided for in this bill deal with the hopes, aspirations, and faith, I think, that the people have in this Nation of ours; and I believe one or two of them deal specifically with the future salvation and future security and stability of this Nation. One of those is the National Science Foundation.

Under the basic law the National Science Foundation is authorized and directed to develop and to encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences. I think the bill which this committee brings to this floor carries out that policy; as a matter of fact, as the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out in his opening, when the National Science Foundation came into being its first appropriation was $225,000. In this bill this year we make provision for the appropriation of $115 million. I think this indicates pretty clearly that the members of this committee, that the Bureau of the Budget, that the administration, that Members of Congress recognize the real race that we are in with some of our adversaries, and that by this appropriation we are attempting to take care of dealing effectively with an adequate science policy.

We are doing in our time what the founders of this Nation did in their time. Let me read a very interesting article which appeared in the New York Times of this morning entitled "Will We Do the Job in Science?"

The article reads as follows:

We Americans have been drawing comfort for years from a plausible proposition:

Freedom is the lifeblood of science. Therefore, as the largest free nation on earth we produced the most and the best in science.

Then Russia—which only yesterday was packing off to Siberia any scientist who upheld natural law against Lenin dogma—shot a missile through our complacency; she beat us into space by 4 months. She served notice that she was ahead of us in certain critical areas of rocket development. She unveiled an education system for scientists and engineers that turns them out much faster than we do.

On the threshold of a space age in which the side that is strongest in science will inherit the earth—or what is left of it—she sent us searching frantically for the proofs of a proposition we had taken for granted—in fact, for the answers to three questions:

Has our system failed us?

Have we failed our system?

In either case, what can we do?

We can thank sputnik for putting the question so plainly. For the challenge had been there all along.

With or without sputnik—with or without Russia—we would still have had to solve the giant problems raised by the massive eruptions of human forces and natural forces in our time.

We would still have had to find a way to harness the energies of the atom to the task of bringing technology, food, and freedom to the hungry three-quarters of the world's people—or been engulfed as these awakening millions reached out for the tools, or the weapons.

We would still have had to discover new sources of energy, in the world around us, in the sun or the stars, or see the conventional reservoirs of fuel dry up.

We would still have had to find the credentials of space-age scientific leadership for which we are searching now, or surrender that leadership.

Sputnik only added the exclamation point to the challenge, and set a deadline for decision.

It wasn't the system that failed us—the proofs are plentiful.

The founders of America did far more than establish a climate for the study of science. They set up the means by which the findings

of science could be put to practical use for the benefit of everyone.

They opened the way for whole industries to blossom from the seed of a single scientific discovery—and for those industries to reseed themselves and reseed science itself with profits plowed into research, into foundations and educational endowments. There's no reason now to doubt the resiliency of a system that could bring into being the miracles of aviation and automation and electronics that are the trademarks of modern America—and at the same time could produce more than half of the Nobel prize winners in physics, chemistry, medicine, and physiology between World War II and 1957.

A system that has pioneered the fission and fusion of atoms and at the same time conquered half a dozen of the world's deadliest plagues and plotted the final conquest of polio, malaria, cancer, arthritis, and heart disease, gives reasonable assurance of doing any job asked of it in the future.

But it's hardly necessary to labor that point—Khrushchev, himself, has driven it home. He has cut his physical scientists loose from the restraints of Communist dogma, and given them a degree of freedom that would have brought cries of treason from his predecessors. He did this by invoking an even more fundamental Communist axiom—that the end justifies the means, even if they are freedom's own means. He has borrowed another page from freedom's book in broadening the base of his scientific manpower through expanding education. An informed people has long been considered the nemesis of any dictatorship. Khrushchev is willing to take his chances.

We can stop worrying about whether freedom can do the job in science—and start asking ourselves in what respects we have begun to fail freedom. The answer is easy; the cure is not.

Until sputnik, we weren't facing up to the space age—we were backing into it.

Secure—as we imagined—behind our H-bombs and our unmatched industrial power, we ignored a fact that Russia grasped early and clearly:

Progress in weapons and progress in technology—basic requirements for survival in the age we have just entered—both depend upon the scientist in the laboratory, unlocking new secrets of nature.

Russia has not only emancipated her scientists—she has made them princes of the realm, enjoying salaries and status reserved for her top-rung aristocracy. And she has assured a satisfactory flow of reinforcements.

In America we have been going the other way.

As the original proprietors of the incentive system we devised incentives for just about every talent under the sun—from playing a good game of football to recalling Henry VIII's third wife's middle name. But an American scientist engaged in fundamental research has had to scratch to find any token of appreciation. (Nobel, after all, was a Swede.)

A recent study among high school students established an image of the American scientist as a combination of Svengali and the absent-minded professor. Another study among American adults developed that only 10 percent of those interviewed could call to mind the names of even two American scientists.

That we are still ahead in science—that we still have better facilities and greater aggregate scientific competence than Russia—is a tribute to the farsighted programs of the universities, industry and the foundations, and to the scientists themselves and their dedication to their own ideals.

But our margin of superiority is dwindling—and it will disappear unless we move swiftly to bring science into a condition to fulfill its mission in tomorrow's world.

The Federal Government has a responsibility here—to make sure that enough basic research is conducted to meet the minimum needs of national security. It is moving to meet this need, by stepping up the research, scholarship, and teaching-support programs of the National Science Foundation.

But the American people—not Government—control the incentives, the climate, and the training facilities that will finally determine whether we shall have enough science in time, or too little, too late.

They must know their own absolute dependency upon science in the space age—not that science, alone, can make freedom secure, but that the Free World cannot survive without that steady flow of scientific discovery that produces new weapons, new technology, new instruments and methods to wage peace.

If this life-and-death dependency upon science is understood, the American people will provide—readily and eagerly—the means for their scientists to do their job.

These are their needs:

Respect and status in keeping with their service. One measure of that status—though by no means the only one—is financial reward, and until now many scientists have had to leave the schools and university laboratories and go out into private industry to get it.

Freedom—to work alone in a laboratory, or to pool ideas and findings, and attack a complicated problem in worldwide concert, as was necessary to split the first atom. Military secrecy can never be thrown to the winds, but secrecy that forecloses a vital new weapon or a revolutionary instrument for peace is a costly self-indulgence in the space-age struggle.

An ample supply of new blood—which can come only by giving prospective young scientists the tough, challenging courses that will whet their minds, the laboratory equipment to train them, and the teachers to inspire them.

These are modest requests for a group of Americans who are prepared to provide, in return, the instruments for a better life for all of us, for security in the space age, and for accelerated progress toward the kind of peace we all seek. Our scientists are ready to prove—if the American people will join them in the effort—that the vigorous practice of freedom is the ultimate weapon.

What this bill before us does is to make sure that enough basic research is conducted to meet the minimum needs of national security and is moving to meet this need by stepping up the research scholarships, and teaching support programs of this National Science Foundation.

This committee provides for the three great programs of this foundation:

First, grants to universities for basic research.

Second, fellowships to continue predoctoral and postdoctoral studies.

Third, institutes for training science and mathematics teachers.

I think the $115 million we have provided in this bill, despite the fact that it is a $25 million reduction in the request, is sufficient to run this agency. This is an increase of $75 million. It seems almost inconceivable that this agency can use any more than this at this time. One of the other agencies under this bill is the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The work of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is to advance technology relating to aircraft, missiles, and in these days, of satellites and space craft itself. This is a tremendously wonderful and magnificent agency.

This is the agency that developed the area rule which enabled our planes to break the sound barrier by the simple process of revamping the fuselage on an airplane. This is the agency that developed the blunt nose cone that is able to break out into outer space and come back to the earth again without burning out. This is a great agency. This is the agency that ought to be put in charge of the entire space program, for this agency is composed both of civilian and military men. This is the agency that by its basic research will do more for the Nation in the space years that lie ahead.

What is this committee doing for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics? The first appropriation for this agency was back in 1949 and the total appropriation was around $38 million. In this bill today we make an appropriation for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics of $78 million, double the amount which was expended in 1949. So I say that the committee, the Bureau of the Budget and the administration are doing their part in making sure that this agency has sufficient money with which to operate and that our developments in space will be sufficient to keep up with any of our adversaries anywhere on earth.

One of the other agencies with which we deal and with which the committee is primarily concerned is the Veterans' Administration. I wish to express my best wishes to the new Administrator, Mr. Sumner G. Whittier, who is from my home State of Massachusetts. He was formerly a Member of the House of Representatives and was also a Member of the State senate, as well as having been Lieutenant Governor of the State. He has a tremendous job for it means that he supervises the expenditure of some $4,932,000,000. The expenditure of this kind of money requires a man with some intelligence and ability and faith in the veterans and faith in his Government. It also requires one who has a sense of humor. Mr. Whittier has it. So when the chairman of this committee, the ranking minority member and all of the other members of the committee join in wishing him well, I, too, join in that wish. I know that he can do a good job. I know he wants to do a good job, not only for the veterans but for the Nation itself.

In this bill here we added $5 million for medical research in medical institutions. The Veterans' Administration requested of the budget $6,500,000 and that request was denied. This committee, impressed with the manner in which Dr. Middleton is running the medical research program, put back $5 million. This will permit a modest advance in psychiatric treatment techniques by increasing the ratio of employees to patients. Improving treatment programs for the mentally ill is not an easy goal to achieve. It requires ceaseless effort, for no other area of medicine has such a historical lag to overcome. The effects of the tranquilizing drugs have created an urgent need for social stimulation of the patients and their families and application of treatment activities to large

groups. More can be done in this direction with more staff. Additional staff will also permit a broader use of other drugs. The addition of $5 million to the medical research program of the Veterans' Administration, the NP program, will do precisely this. I think it is a good expenditure of money, I think it will pay dividends in the future, and I trust, Mr. Chairman, that when the Committee comes to vote on this bill it will accept the recommendations of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for the fiscal year 1959.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss the items contained in the appropriation bill, I think it is necessary to make some brief observations of the history of the various building acts so that we will understand fully the proposition before the Committee today.

The first modern day authorization for the construction of Federal buildings was contained in the act of 1913. That envisioned a comprehensive construction program to take care of the housing needs of the various agencies of Government located throughout the 48 States and the Territories. Immediately after the passage of that act World War I came along and it was suspended; we did not have any building program in effect under that act. Again, in 1926, we revived the hope of a building program and the act of 1926 was passed, and all the construction that took place subsequent to that date was either by amendments to the 1926 act or in provisions contained in appropriation items during the thirties, for the construction of Federal buildings. In the latter part of the thirties we passed an act authorizing site acquisition for future construction of Federal buildings. World War II intervened, and we renewed the act in 1949. Later that program, by Executive order, was suspended due to the Korean war. Then in 1954 we passed the so-called Lease-Purchase Act which, we were hopeful, would fill the need of a construction program.

Now, today I am here in support of the proposition sponsored by the Committee on Appropriations which will definitely, for all time to come, I hope, get rid of the lease-purchase law and the authorization contained in that law. Last year the act expired, after almost 4 years of ineffective effort. Let me say that I have no complaint to lodge against Mr. Floete, who made an attempt to administer the Lease-Purchase Act, nor of the Post Office Department Facilities Chief, Mr. Kieb, and his administration. I think the failure of the act lies with the act itself, for it certainly has been a "Rube Goldberg" arrangement of the worst variety.

The reason I want to see the Lease-Purchase Act killed is, first, that from the time the act has been in effect it has proven conclusively that there would not or could not be any large scale building constructed under it. One hundred and forty-six buildings have been authorized for construction. But, Mr. Chairman, only one building has been completed since July of 1954, and that is at Rock Island, Ill. Now, if from 1954 to the present there has been no faulty administration and if there has been a conscientious desire on the part of the Administrators to carry out a building program, then this is ample evidence that the act will not work.

I do not know of any greater authority to rely upon than the Administrator himself, Mr. Floete, for in his testimony to be found on page 7 of the House Report No. 894 filed by the Committee on Public Works on July 29, 1957, accompanying the resolution for the continuation of a program of direct appropriations, we find this in the committee hearing in a colloquy between Mr. THOMAS and Mr. Floete, as follows:

> Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Administrator, did you ask for any direct appropriations on your public buildings program?
>
> Mr. FLOETE. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. THOMAS. How much?
>
> Mr. FLOETE. We asked for $335 million to finance the balance of 1957 and all of 1958 which would include all of these projects that have been approved.

Mr. Floete is directing his reply to the projects that had been approved under lease-purchase or Public Law 519 of the 83d Congress. Here is the next question:

> Mr. THOMAS. On what theory did you ask for money for a direct building program?
>
> Mr. FLOETE. Well, primarily because the present program was apparently not operating.
>
> Mr. THOMAS. It was just not workable; is that right? That is, when you were advised it might be well to hold all matters in abeyance, relative to your program?
>
> Mr. FLOETE. For the reasons I have stated.

This is an admission of the Administrator himself. The second reason we want to see an abatement of this program, is its overall cost. When we held hearings on the progress of Public Law 519 in the Committee on Public Works last year we asked the General Accounting Office to prepare an analysis of the estimated cost factors involved in the 146 projects that had been authorized since Public Law 519 was enacted. Let me read you part of their analysis.

Of the 146 projects, if direct appropriation was used the cost would be $714,616,000. Under the lease-purchase arrangement, on the assumption that the interest on the money for these projects would be at 4 percent, the amount would be $1,357,614,000. That is almost twice the entire cost of the direct appropriation.

Of the $1,357,614,000 under lease-purchase for 146 projects, $273,583,000 would be paid on taxes on Federal buildings constructed in various localities in this country. In other words, the Federal Government would assume all the obligations of the ad valorem tax and there would be an accumulation of such items throughout the country. For example, in the city of New York, on one project under lease-purchase whose construction cost would be $93,925,000 over 25 years the local taxes would add an additional $52,916,000 to the cost.

This is a departure from every known policy of the Federal Government in construction of projects for public use; to have the Federal Goverment pay local taxes for the purpose of servicing these people.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURLESON. As I understood the Chairman this morning, the committee has taken these 66 projects, with the exception of those in the District of Columbia, and has approved an appropriation of $177,255,000 for their construction, using as a criterion for their selection the fact that they had been approved under the so-called lease-purchase agreement. As I understand it further, their action is based on an authorization passed in 1926. Am I correct thus far?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Let me answer the question in the sequence in which it should properly be answered. The language in the bill is based upon the authorization of the 1926 act, which is the basic law for Federal building construction. The identities of the projects were taken from the 1954 act, Public Law 519, due to the fact that these were projects on which prospectuses had been approved by the Public Works Committee. The Appropriations Committee thus had sufficient information to make appropriations for specific sites throughout the country.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman has said there is a total of 146 projects approved under the lease-purchasing plan.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. BURLESON. The 66 projects included in this bill are taken from the 146; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The answer is "Yes." I want to say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that no man has devoted more time and effort toward working out a sound, economical building program than the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman has contributed his time and has made valuable observations to the Committee on Public Works on the projects in his own Congressional District as well as the needs in the entire country.

Mr. BURLESON. As to the remaining 80 of the 146, does that mean those projects will continue their priority, and that the committee will then appropriate money for the construction of those buildings?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I cannot answer that because I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BURLESON. Let me put it this way very briefly: Will these remaining projects hold the same status as the 66 projects?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I cannot speak for the Appropriations Committee. I know it would be the intention of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds to continue this status.

Let me point out one more item of interest before I conclude: There is not a single project that has been contracted for by the General Services Administration where the interest rate is less than 4.74. In other words, the basic

rate will be almost a 5-percent interest rate. Thus the total cost of these 146 projects will be approximately $1,465,000,000, or twice as much as the cost under direct appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, the lease-purchase scheme is the most indefensible waste of funds in the history of Government construction. If the program actually had resulted in the construction of the projects heretofore approved, it would have cost the taxpayers of the country hundreds of millions of dollars in excess of the amount that would have been necessary to construct the same buildings by direct appropriations.

This bill must pass. Lease-purchase must end.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I am most happy, although I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee, to follow my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], who is also a member of the Public Works Committee.

I first want to pay my respects to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] whom we all love, and who, as well as the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], on the Appropriations Committee, works hard to bring good legislation to the floor of the House. I recognize they have had a difficult job to do, and that it is impossible for them to satisfy everyone.

The gentleman from Alabama, my distinguished colleague on the Public Works Committee and who is chairman of the subcommittee, and his colleagues on his side of the aisle had a great deal to do with the defeat of the lease-purchase legislation. I am most happy to follow him and to give some replies to some questions I think he left not fully answered. I am sure he does not want to leave any erroneous statements in the RECORD, and I would submit to him the question of the rates of interest. I have them here for anyone to see, and I shall not take the time to read them all. They range from 4 percent and 4.38 percent clear on down the line. I can see one that is at 5 percent, and that is at Burlington, Iowa. There is the Rock Island at 4 percent, and Albuquerque, and all the rest of them down the line. I am sure he will correct his figures to concur with the RECORD. I want to discuss with you some facts about the lease-purchase bill. Those on the other side of the aisle must take the blame and they cannot deny it because it was a straight party line vote in the Committee on Public Works when they voted, and used proxies to do so, to let expire the Lease-Purchase Act which stopped public building construction which has been in effect for approximately 4 years. I have read with interest Mr. Floete's testimony, and I sometimes wonder if we need to look any further for the reason of nonactivity of the program than to the Administrator himself. I suggest that we carefully scrutinize the activities of the Administrator.

Now I would like to call attention to the requests for $177 million by direct appropriations. My distinguished colleague from Alabama would lead you to believe that it costs lots more money to build by lease-purchase than by direct authorizations. If we did not have to borrow any money—if we, the Federal Government, had more money than we knew what to do with—and if we did not have to borrow money and sell bonds, I would go along with a certain portion of the statement of the gentleman from Alabama. But, remember one thing. We have an indebtedness of $275 billion. The first thing we have to do in order to get the money to take care of this appropriation is to borrow money from the people who have money back in our respective districts. They forgot to add that interest to their costs of direct appropriations. Then, let us take a look at another consideration in this matter. Under the Lease-Purchase Act, whenever we entered into a contract in the area of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, that contract covered a period of 25 to 30 years. Did we pay taxes? We paid taxes to the local community until the expiration of that contract. What happens under the direct appropriation? The minute the contract is signed for the construction of the building, and we moved the first spadeful of dirt, no more taxes are paid to that local community. So, is it fair to charge off the taxes on one side and not to charge off the taxes on the other? My friends, you can take testimony and we will give you plenty of it that the actual difference between the lease-purchase method and direct appropriations is approximately 1.6 percent. If you are going to take into consideration the interest we have to pay on the borrowed money and the taxes we pay under the lease-purchase plan to the local communities, you will have a variance of 1.6 percent.

We have not constructed a Federal building outside the District of Columbia since 1938 under direct appropriation, and I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, that owing to the Korean war and to the administrator, Mr. Floete, and some others, that this program has been delayed because of the interest rate. I am sure my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, will admit that fact. Interest rate has had a lot of bearing on this matter. But, now what do we have? The distinguished Committee on Public Works decided to turn down the Senate bill, and the Senate bill was a continuation of the Lease-Purchase Act that had approximately 350 to 400 projects which were in the process of examination, survey, contracting, advertising and contract letting. Those were projects that were being considered by the various agencies. Take into consideration that there are approximately 400 projects. Go back 35 years and find out how many projects have been constructed under direct appropriations. None since 1938 and the record will so show. Some of my friends here in the committee are listening very attentively to the distinguished gentleman from Texas and to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. First, go back to the report of the Committee on Public Works, No. 894. If you have a project in your district, it is listed there. Go to those two gentlemen and ask them if your project is going to be included in their $177 million direct appropriation; if it is not, ask them why. It will be, if it is in the list under lease-purchase. Plans are drawn and contracts ready to let. That is the thing to ask them. Ask them if it is not in that list. If it is not, when will your project which we have O. K.'d be taken care of and who is going to determine whether or not it is in the list?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. If the gentleman is propounding a question to me as to whether or not these other projects will be constructed, I cannot answer him except to say that under public law they can be authorized in the future, and the only obligation to see that they are considered is to have the Post Office Department, General Services Administration, submit a prospectus to the Appropriations Committee setting out the need and the cost of the project.

Mr. McGREGOR. Then they come under a direct appropriation; is that not correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is absolutely true.

Mr. McGREGOR. Which law has not given us a single new project since 1938.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It has given us 66 under this bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is the bill before us for consideration, but it is unusual that they come in and ask reappropriation of a public works job. I am not an attorney, but I called this to the attention of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] one of the best attorneys in this House. I listened to him refer to a law of 1926 just a minute ago. He is going to give a direct appropriation for projects authorized by a law that is now nonexistent. I hope he will look that up and see whether or not he can bring in a direct appropriation for projects under a lease-purchase law that no longer exists.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes, I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would not only refer the gentleman to the decisions of the General Services Administration, Post Office Department, but to the statement of the gentleman from Ohio, which he made in July last year before this House under a special order. I just bring it forward now. The gentleman on July 19 in addressing the House had this to say:

> If the gentleman from Alabama or anyone else wants to introduce a bill to construct a post office in their community and the committee sees fit to authorize and the Congress sees fit to authorize and the Appropriations Committee sees fit to appropriate, that can become the law immediately, because the old basic law still exists.

Mr. McGREGOR. And that is a private law. That is a bill that you yourself are recommending for your own projects. I certainly will back that up, but it does not refer to general authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. McGREGOR. I will back that up because you are giving special authorization when this Congress passes that particular project, but here you are going along under direct appropriation and picking up 60 or 70 projects that have been authorized under a law that has now expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I cannot yield any further.

But please go to those men who ask $177 million, ask them why they did not want lease-purchase. Why they did not want private capital to come back into the local communities. There is a method on foot, where some men, a group, want to spend as much money as we possibly can spend by direct appropriation, with the result that we will again have to come before the Congress and ask for an increase in the debt limitation. You people who vote for this $177 million direct appropriation today, who vote for the direct appropriation for FNMA and for Civil Service, you will be over that $275 billion debt limit in a few days, and they will say, "We will have to increase the debt limitation." Here is a chance to cut $177 million and go back to the old law and let your local bankers at home take the contracts. Let your local community get their taxes. They will be glad to do that. Which is better, to give the local people their taxes back and get buildings constructed that are badly needed?

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is the gentleman aware of the efforts made under the lease-purchase program to get local bankers at home to finance the setup? My information is that they have not been able to get any; and I direct the gentleman's attention to the situation in Denver, Colo.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not know anything about the gentleman's district, but I do know of 2 projects last week that had 5 bidders on them; they were not in my district. I have no projects in my district, but I do know that some of you Members have very meritorious projects.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Contracts have already been executed on a large block of projects which I would read for the information of the committee if I had time. There are 16. Denver is not one of them. There are 20 more that are advertised and another 5 that will be advertised.

Mr. McGREGOR. In closing, may I just say one thing: Keep in mind that with lease-purchase contracts your local people get taxes and they provide some aid toward reducing unemployment where such a situation exists. If the buildings are to be built under direct appropriations it is going to be a long time before they are constructed. Records show not a single Federal building outside District of Columbia has been constructed by direct appropriation since 1938.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] for a moment. The gentleman states that those who are advocating this direct appropriation plan or to do away with the lease-purchase contracts advocate it and vote for it because they want to raise the debt limit. I would like to inform my colleague that that is not true. I intend to vote for the bill and I intend to vote for it for the reason that I would like to have a post-office building in my district, a building that is badly needed. This is the third time it has been authorized since 1940. In fact, funds were set aside for it in 1940. The present building is 63 years old, it is inadequate, it is obsolete, it is in bad condition, and the Post Office Department is leasing other space to accommodate their needs. It is located in the city of Martinsburg, W. Va.

I tell the gentleman that I am going to vote for this bill not because I want to increase the public debt but because I feel Martinsburg should have an adequate Federal building.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, what is the name of the place?

Mr. STAGGERS. Martinsburg, W. Va. It was authorized in 1940 and at that time funds were appropriated, but the Second World War broke out and the funds were set aside.

It was authorized again in 1949, but then the Korean war came along and again the funds were set aside.

It was authorized again in 1954 by the Public Works Committee of the House and it was supposed to be constructed under the Lease-Purchase Act, but here it is 1958 and the contract has not been let.

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say that the Committee on Public Works O. K.'d it.

Mr. STAGGERS. The committee O. K.'d it and I appreciate that, but I still say we need the post office building. Present facilities are woefully inadequate. Receipts at the Martinsburg post office are the fourth highest in the State of West Virginia, and for each of the last 5 or 6 years they have increased 100 percent.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. What is the gentleman's observation?

Mr. JONAS. I just wanted to say that there are a number of cities in West Virginia included on the GSA list as just about ready for construction.

Mr. STAGGERS. This is not one of them.

I would just like to say again that while I shall vote for the bill I shall vote for it not because I want to raise the public debt but because I want a post office. I believe the evidence is overwhelming that under the provisions of this bill, the buildings will be constructed more rapidly and at a great saving to the taxpayers. Talk of raising the debt limit is pure subterfuge in order to kill the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Appropriations Committee for replacing newfangled lease-purchase financing with time-tested direct appropriations.

This is one of the most sensible actions this Congress has taken in 2 years.

If this act becomes law, the Congress will save the American taxpayers at least $500 million on public buildings.

The new Federal building at Marshfield, Mo., can be built without excuses, delays, and redtape; and for $100,000 less cost.

By junking the lease-purchase financing theory, we are getting back to time-tested fundamentals—reasonable interest rates and contract construction by competitive bidding.

Lease-purchase financing works well for industry; but Government's experience with it has been a fruitless fiasco.

The General Services Administration has advertised for bids on many projects, but in 3½ years the financiers, contractors, and Government have reached agreement on the very complicated contracts of lease-purchase financing on only one project.

Many contractors have thrown up their hands in disgust at the redtape involved in lease-purchase financing.

Now, we can get on with necessary construction without all these unnecessary obstacles and wasteful complications.

We are going to build the buildings and pay for them, not on the installment plan at high interest rates but by direct appropriation.

This is what we have been fighting for. It has been a long, hard battle. If we pass this bill today it will be a great victory for common sense and fiscal soundness.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the appropriation bill now under consideration, and wish to address myself to the plans for including funds to construct 66 public buildings projects previously authorized under the lease-purchase program.

One of these building projects is planned for the town of Abingdon in the Ninth Congressional District of Virginia. The site is available to the Government, since the old building is to be demolished; architectural work and plans have been completed for several months; the occupants of the old building, including the western district of Virginia Federal court and the Post Office Department, have been relocated in temporary quarters since 1956; and the need for construction increases each day.

But despite repeated efforts of the General Services Administration to begin construction, the necessary con-

tracts have not yet been awarded under lease-purchase arrangements.

Efforts to secure the construction of the Abingdon building cover the terms of my two predecessors in Congress. When the lease-purchase program was approved in the 83d Congress, General Services Administration agreed to plan the structure as one of these projects. When I came to Congress in 1955, it appeared that the plans would fall through because of disagreements over the space, cost, and so forth. This was settled through conferences with GSA and many interested parties. I solicited the support of the House and Senate Public Works Committees in securing the final approval of the revised prospectus in mid-1955.

Architectural contracts were awarded in the fall of 1955, and the building's designs and plans announced early in 1956. Because of a controversy over the building's design—it did not harmonize with general architecture in the town of Abingdon—a delay resulted while the building's exterior was redesigned by the architects. This was again worked out with General Services Administration to the satisfaction of the local citizens.

The Government sought financing and construction bids on the project in late 1956. This bid invitation was not successful. The bids were rejected in early 1957, and soon after that suspension of the lease-purchase program was announced by GSA. It was not possible to secure private financing under the existing money market.

During the remainder of 1957, I periodically urged GSA to again seek financing and construction bids under the authority granted before the expiration of the Lease-Purchase Act.

In October of last year, the 4-percent interest limitation, which had been the real culprit in the lack of financing bids, was removed and bids sought under a new procedure. An acceptable bid was received and announced by GSA in January of this year.

Following the receipt of a financing bid, at a 4.78-percent interest rate, GSA called for construction bids. Four have been received and are under consideration today. I am informed by GSA that it is unlikely approval will be given for any of these bids because they exceed the reasonable increase in construction costs to be allowed, supposedly, for the authorized lease-purchase projects.

The situation in Abingdon has been very inconvenient since the old building was closed in 1956. The Post Office Department operates in temporary quarters, which are not adequate and which cost the Government considerable monthly rent. The western district Federal court has been forced to use local and State courtrooms in Abingdon and nearby towns, creating an additional burden on such facilities. It is not practical to renovate and reopen the old building.

Mr. Chairman, this is a brief history of one Federal building project under lease-purchase, which, as indicated in the subcommittee's report, is a most expensive way to secure this construction when compared with a direct appropriation.

My constituents in Abingdon have been patient. We have cooperated in every way to make this building a reality. The prospects for construction under lease-purchase are extremely doubtful, to say the least.

Because of the desperate need, we have not debated the merits of lease-purchase as compared with a direct appropriation; we have been interested in getting this building started under any reasonable program. However, I believe we have given lease-purchase a fair trial, and it has not succeeded. We should now provide these funds by direct appropriation so that contracts can be awarded and construction initiated.

Construction of the Abingdon building, in addition to giving the needed facilities for several Federal agencies, will serve as an impetus to the economy of the area.

I, therefore, recommend the passage of this bill providing funds for construction of the authorized lease-purchase projects, including $580,000 for the Abingdon Federal building.

I might say we tried the local banking interests and other financial interests located in the general area in which this was to be built.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a member of the committee, perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee, a question or two concerning this bill. Is there any money in the bill for the construction of a building in New York City for the United Nations?

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. GROSS. That went out?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say so. On page 2 of the bill $350,000 is provided for the screening of citizens employed by the United Nations. Is that a diminution of previous appropriations for this purpose?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know, I will say to the gentleman. It is hard to tell. It depends on the employment and we in the committee do not control the employment.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that.

Mr. THOMAS. I join in the gentleman's hope. I know what he has in mind.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Was there any evidence before the gentleman's committee, and I do not find anything in the hearings to that effect, indicating that there are any Communists from this country in the United Nations Organization?

Mr. THOMAS. They have been pretty good now since this program has been in effect. We think it has been worth the money on that basis. Incidentally, this appropriation is a little lower each year. You are right on that.

Mr. GROSS. Now that several additional countries have been taken into the United Nations, is there any chance that someday we might be reimbursed for this screening process?

Mr. THOMAS. I hope so, but my friend's guess on that is just as good as mine.

Mr. GROSS. On page 37 of the bill there is the following language: "Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Federal Facilities Corporation." That is a new one on me. Would the chairman of the subcommittee tell me what the Federal Facilities Corporation is?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to my friend from Iowa that it is not a new one. You know, we set up some rubber plants and a few other items, and that is the crowd that is liquidating them. It is called the Federal Facilities Corporation. It has been over in the Treasury, and they transferred it over to General Services Administration. It is gradually going down.

Mr. GROSS. I hope it goes out of existence before this administration decides to provide some more help to build tire plants in Communist Russia.

Mr. THOMAS. For my friend's information, I think we will put them out of business this year.

Mr. GROSS. On page 44 of the bill you apparently provide under "Corporation—General Provision," 1 personnel officer to each 135 employees; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. And most of them have lived within the limitation. For a while it was 1 to 115. We gradually got it down, and no one has complained about it.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that 1 personnel officer can handle more than 135 employees?

Mr. THOMAS. You know, we do not like to disagree with our friend from Iowa. You may have a point there. We thought we were doing pretty good when we got down to 135. Maybe you are right. Would you suggest we lower it next year?

Mr. GROSS. I would like to get it up so that each personnel manager would be handling a good many more than 135. That is my point. I think we should have fewer personnel people.

Mr. THOMAS. I do, too, and we are gradually hammering them down. I am speaking the other way around. We are up in the figure rather than lower.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. THOMAS. You are right. This has been in effect for 3 years, and they have not complained about it too much. The first year they complained bitterly, but the second year the complaint was less audible.

Mr. GROSS. Next year try to boost them up a little bit.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you recommend that figure be raised to 150?

Mr. GROSS. I think it could be made 200 without trouble. And do one thing more: help us put a stop to this business of hiring outside consultants to come in and handle personnel matters. We have got them falling all over themselves in Government.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman can rest assured we will do the best we can.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that an amendment will be offered later to change the language on page 9 of the bill. So as to avoid repetition and save the time of the House, I shall withhold my remarks until that time. If such an amendment is offered, I shall at that time attempt to explain the savings which the Congress can achieve by substituting construction by direct appropriation, as is proposed in the bill, for the relatively wasteful lease-purchase system.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, headed by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, for the work it has done on the bill we have before us.

As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have been particularly interested in that portion of the bill which relates to the Veterans' Administration. In my opinion, the entitlement to hospital and medical care is one of the most important benefits available to our war veterans, and I have been particularly concerned with that portion of the bill which deals with the Veterans' Administration's hospital and medical program.

I have noted that the subcommittee has restored the cut in the intended beneficiaries which was imposed by the the administration. As I understand the budget proposed to the Congress by the administration, it was based on an average of 139,042 beneficiaries. This represented quite a reduction from the beneficiary level in last year's budget. Last year, a budget was provided for an average of 140,630 beneficiaries. In reducing the number of intended beneficiaries, the administration cut from the Veterans' Administration budget $10½ million. The subcommittee has restored the average number of beneficiaries to 140,800, which is slightly higher than the level of last year. The subcommittee has also restored $3.6 million of the funds cut by the administration for inpatient care. An additional $5 million has been provided for improvement of care of mental patients. This additional $8.6 million restored by the subcommittee will help the Veterans' Administration to meet the expense of caring for the beneficiaries which have been added by the committee, but I am afraid that it is not sufficient. It appears to me that if 1,758 beneficiaries are to be added by the bill, that the full amount of funds necessary for their care, $10½ million, should be provided. I hope that this matter can receive further consideration in the Senate.

The Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs have worked together for several years in developing a long-range replacement, modernization, and repair program for the old Veterans' Administration hospitals. The program agreed on extends over a period of about 8 years and will require appropriations at a level of about $50 million each year. The Veterans' Administration requested $43,374,000 for this purpose and this was cut to $9,145,000. The committee has restored $10 million of the administration cut, which will help a good deal. I am afraid, however, that if more of the cut for replacement, modernization, and repair is not restored, that this vital program will lag. The Veterans' Administration hospital plant facilities are valued at $2½ billion and it is imperative that a proper maintenance program be carried on if this investment is to be protected. I am placing in the record a chart showing the details of the proposed replacement, modernization, and repair program, the cuts in the President's budget, and the amounts of the reduction involved:

	Original request	President's budget	Reduction
Replacement program:			
Jackson, Miss. (additional construction cost)	$3,647,000	0	$3,647,000
Nashville, Tenn. (additional construction cost)	5,362,000	0	3,362,000
Long Beach, Calif. (phase 2, technical services)	1,035,000	$1,035,000	0
Coral Gables, Fla. (site)	500,000	250,000	250,000
Coral Gables, Fla. (technical services)	1,335,000	1,335,000	0
Memphis, Tenn. (technical services)	2,270,000	2,270,000	0
Total	12,149,000	4,890,000	7,259,000
Modernization, improvements, and repairs:			
Major ($300,000 and over)	$27,585,000	$1,980,000	$25,605,000
Special project, Oteen, N. C. (technical services)	1,365,000	0	1,365,000
Minor	3,000,000	3,000,000	0
Total	31,950,000	4,980,000	26,970,000
Total program	44,099,000	9,870,000	34,229,000
Application of prior-year savings	−725,000	−725,000	0
Appropriation request	43,374,000	9,145,000	34,229,000

I would like to call attention to a matter which I consider to be the most serious problem confronting the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program. I have obtained a report from the Veterans' Administration which states that on December 31, 1957, there were 4,974 beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals not being used. These beds are designated as not required to meet current operating plans. As I understand it, these are beds which the Bureau of the Budget will not permit Veterans' Administration to operate. Since Veterans' Administration has no discretion in placing these beds in operation because of the administration's directive, there are no funds in the budget for reopening these beds. It seems to me that it is poor business indeed for the Federal Government to construct hospital facilities at costs exceeding $10,000 per bed and then remove these beds from use by veterans, when there are waiting lists all over the country of eligible veterans seeking admission to hospitals. I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the chart showing the number of vacant beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals and the various hospitals where such beds are located:

Unavailable beds in VA hospitals, as of Dec. 31, 1957

Reason for unavailable beds	Total	Type of bed				
		Tuberculosis	Psychiatric		Neurological	General medical and surgical
			Psychotic	Other		
1. Total unavailable beds	7,308	1,904	980	96	199	4,129
TB hospitals	1,356	1,356				
NP hospitals	666		477		76	113
G. M. & S. hospitals	5,286	548	503	96	123	4,016
2. Beds in process of activation	299	59	200			40
TB hospitals						
NP hospitals	85		85			
G. M. & S. hospitals	214	59	115			40
3. Construction or maintenance	1,018		155			863
TB hospitals						
NP hospitals	164		155			9
G.M. & S. hospitals	854					854
4. Difficult to recruit required personnel	752		391	96	147	118
TB hospitals						
NP hospitals	135		66		50	19
G.M. & S. hospitals	617		325	96	97	99
5. Type of bed not required to meet current operating plan	4,974	1,843	29		52	3,050
TB hospitals	1,354	1,354				
NP hospitals	101				26	75
G. M. & S. hospitals	3,519	489	29		26	2,975

Unavailable beds in VA hospitals, as of Dec. 31, 1957—Continued

Reason for unavailable beds	Total	Type of bed				
		Tuberculosis	Psychiatric		Neurological	General medical and surgical
			Psychotic	Other		
6. Other reasons [1]	265	2	205			58
TB hospitals	2	2				
NP hospitals	181		171			10
G. M. & S. hospitals	82		34			48

[1] Includes beds unavailable for patient care because (1) the space is required to quarter personnel (adequate housing is not available in the vicinity); (2) temporarily being used for research activities or special equipment for an individual patient's care; (3) substandard and not suitable for patient care; or (4) used to quarter member-employees.

Source: Controller, Department of Medicine and Surgery, Reports and Statistics Service, Veterans' Administration, Jan. 23, 1958.

Unavailable beds in VA hospitals as of Dec. 31, 1957

BEDS IN THE PROCESS OF ACTIVATION

TB hospitals	(1)
NP hospitals	85
Jefferson Bks., Mo	43
Salisbury, N. C	42
G. M. & S. hospitals	214
Houston, Tex	155
Lincoln, Nebr	30
Minneapolis, Minn	10
West Haven, Conn	19

CONSTRUCTION OR MAINTENANCE

TB hospitals	(1)
NP hospitals	164
Berry Point, Md	155
Tuskegee, Ala	9
G. M. & S. hospitals	854
Bronx, N. Y	68
Buffalo, N. Y	41
Dallas, Tex	388
Long Beach, Calif	220
Los Angeles, Calif	86
San Francisco, Calif	51

DIFFICULT TO RECRUIT REQUIRED PERSONNEL

TB hospitals	(1)
NP hospitals	135
Jefferson Bks, Mo	66
Montrose, N. Y	19
Salisbury, N. C	50
G. M. & S. hospitals	617
Ann Arbor, Mich	102
Cleveland, Ohio	56
Hines, Ill	107
Jackson, Miss	70
Kansas City, Mo	10
Memphis, Tenn	170
Minot, N. Dak	14
Muskogee, Okla	35
Pittsburgh, Pa	32
Poplar Bluff, Mo	21

Type of bed not required to meet current operating plan

TB hospitals	1,354
Batavia, N. Y	25
Brecksville, Ohio	46
Castle Point, N. Y	156
Excelsior Springs, Mo	26
Livermore, Calif	64
Madison, Wis	28
Memphis, Tenn	50
Oteen, N. C	933
Outwood, Ky	26

[1] None.

Type of bed not required to meet current operating plan—Continued

NP hospitals	101
Murfreesboro, Tenn	22
Topeka, Kans	79
G. M. & S. hospitals	3,519
Alexandria, La	435
Aspinwall, Pa	75
Bath, N. Y	20
Birmingham, Ala	29
Cincinnati, Ohio	14
Clarksburg, W. Va	16
Cleveland, Ohio	111
Columbia, S. C	10
Dayton, Ohio	269
Dearborn, Mich	33
Dublin, Ga	24
Erie, Pa	12
Fargo, N. Dak	28
Fayetteville, N. C	26
Fort Harrison, Mont	63
Hines, Ill	863
Jackson, Miss	126
McKinney, Tex	557
Memphis, Tenn	365
Minot, N. Dak	59
Omaha, Nebr	26
Richmond, Va	54
Shreveport, La	6
Vancouver, Wash	74
Wadsworth, Kans	136
West Haven, Conn	88

OTHER REASONS

TB hospitals: San Fernando, Calif	2
NP hospitals	181
Montrose, N. Y	171
Sepulveda, Calif	10
G. M. & S. hospitals	82
Bronx, N. Y	3
Fort Thomas, Ky	45
Kecoughtan, Va	34

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of every Member of the House the following facts regarding the budget under consideration for the Veterans' Administration for fiscal year 1959.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs held hearings on veterans' housing, and on March 12 officials from the Veterans Administration informed the committee that they had made no plans or request in the budget for additional personnel to handle an increase in activity in the veterans' home loan program if Congress took action to stimulate the veterans' housing program during fiscal year 1959. They further testified that the budget for the loan guaranty operations was based on the Veterans' Administration making only 55,000 guaranteed loans during fiscal year 1959. Personnel to handle this workload was estimated at 1,750 at a total cost of $11,039,642.

I requested the Veterans' Administration to furnish the committee with an estimate of the additional personnel that would be required in the event Congress passed legislation to stimulate veterans' housing. I feel confident that the President will favorably consider the emergency housing bill, S. 3418, and believe that the House must act now while their appropriation is under consideration to provide the Veterans' Administration with sufficient funds to handle an increase in the activities of the veterans' home loan program.

If no action is taken and the budget is approved based on only 55,000 loans, it will defeat the purpose of the emergency housing bill as builders, lenders, and veterans will be unable to have their applications processed through the Veterans' Administration due to the lack of personnel.

I have been informed by the Veterans' Administration that they have sufficient funds on hand to handle an increase in activities for the remaining part of fiscal year 1958.

In addition to the increase in the activities of the guaranteed loans, the emergency housing legislation extended the Veterans' Administration direct Loan program and appropriates $150 million for each of the 2 years of this extension. It is estimated that the Veterans' Administration will make 350,000 guaranteed or direct loans during fiscal year 1959, which will require an increase in personnel in the loan guaranty division from 1,750 to 2,645, or an additional 895 employees. The cost of the additional employees will be $5,643,870.

In view of the foregoing, I urge action at this time to increase the estimated Veterans' Administration budget for fiscal year 1959 in the amount of $5,643,870, this amount to be earmarked for loan guaranty operations.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, namely:

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

[Roll No. 31]

Albert	Barrett	Clark
Allen, Calif.	Bolton	Colmer
Andersen, H. Carl	Broomfield	Cooley
	Buckley	Davis, Tenn.
Barden	Burdick	Dies
Baring	Chiperfield	Diggs

Dorn, S. C.	Kitchin	St. George
Engle	Magnuson	Scott, Pa.
Gordon	Morrison	Sieminski
Grant	Moulder	Taylor
Gwinn	Passman	Teague, Tex.
Hébert	Powell	Thompson, La.
Holifield	Radwan	Willis
James	Rains	
Kean	Rivers	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. IKARD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill, H. R. 11574, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 391 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $350,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive order: *Provided further*, That members of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business away from their homes or regular places of business, including periods while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of appointment for part-time or intermittent service as a member of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Commission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated January 9, 1953, as amended.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I take this time to talk about the proposed neurosychiatric hospital for my home State of Florida to be located in Gainesville, Fla. Each year since I have been in Congress I have attempted, so far unsuccessfully, to get action on this proposed hospital. I should like to review the history of this fight in some detail because I think this proposed hospital is most deserving, and in fact, is in a category by itself.

Resolution 190, adopted by the Federal Board of Hospitalization on October 3, 1945, and approved by the President on October 16, 1945, included the first recommendation regarding the construction of a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Gainesville, Fla. This resolution stated that the authority permitted only tentative selection of a site but that the Veterans' Administration was to submit to the Federal Board of Hospitalization for consideration and recommendation to the President a request for authorization to proceed with acquisition of the present Gainesville site. This authorization was granted through Resolution 259, adopted by the Federal Board of Hospitalization on August 15, 1946, and approved by the President on August 26, 1946.

Funds were provided by Public Law 49, Public Law 269, Public Law 419, and Public Law 334, 79th Congress, for the construction of 76 new hospitals, and the Gainesville hospital was included in this group. A memorandum dated August 2, 1946, from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, to the President listed the 76 new hospitals for which the Veterans' Administration was authorized to initiate construction and to expend funds for the liquidation of the obligations in connection therewith. The proposed new hospital for Gainesville was included among the 23 new hospitals eliminated in the cutback authorized later by President Truman. Before the cutback had been authorized, however, the architectural and engineering firm of Bail, Horton & Associates, of Fort Myers, Fla., completed the design of a VA hospital in Gainesville, Fla., under the direction of the VA neuropsychiatric design section of the Jacksonville District Office, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and was about to invite construction bids and award a construction contract when President Truman suspended the construction of the 23 hospitals, including the one at Gainesville. It should be pointed out that total Federal and local expenditures before the cutback was authorized amounted to nearly a million dollars. The site was acquired, the sewage system was laid out, and as stated, the complete architectural designs had been drawn. There is thus an investment of $1 million that has been made and may I emphasize that this investment was made in good faith on the part of the community of Gainesville, Fla., which gladly in cooperation with Alachua County, carried out all of its obligations in connection with the acquisition of the land site and other details.

In June 1949, the Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Veterans' Affairs conducted hearings on each of the suspended hospitals and the committee unanimously included the Gainesville Hospital among 14 of the suspended projects on which immediate construction was recommended. Unfortunately, the pressure of other matters prevented this recommendation from coming before the House and Senate for action. Subsequent attempts to persuade President Truman to rescind the suspension of the Gainesville neuropsychiatric hospital were unsuccessful.

In the fall of 1952, the Florida delegation, under the coordination of Congressman BENNETT, who at that time represented the district which includes Gainesville, Fla., with interested citizens from Florida, appeared before General Gray to ask him as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to remove the Gainesville, Fla., neuropsychiatric hospital from his list of excess sites that he had declared surplus to the General Services Administration. General Gray agreed to do this.

On October 20, 1953, I appeared with many interested citizens from Florida and members of the Florida delegation before the Veterans Administration officials, and before representatives of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to ask that funds for building the hospital be included in the 1955 budget. Mr. Higley, at that time the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and Admiral Boone, the Chief Medical Director, were both present at this conference. This effort was unsuccessful.

In February 1954 the VA declared all of the former sites that were still remaining and which had been acquired under Resolution No. 190, adopted by the Federal Board of Hospitalization on October 3, 1945, to which I have previously referred, as excess to their needs. This included the Gainesville site, and it should be stressed that there were 16 altogether. The Florida delegation joined with me in a letter to Administrator Higley protesting the declaration of the Gainesville site as excess. Despite this protest, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs declared the Gainesville site and the other 15 sites throughout the country as excess.

On March 2, 1954, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Offices of the House, whose chairman was the Honorable John Phillips. It was my information that this particular subcommittee had suggested to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that he declare all of these hospital sites excess. The subcommittee gave me a good hearing, and seemed sympathetic with our problem in Florida, but no action was taken.

On March 3, 1954, I appeared before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and requested that committee to write both Mr. Higley, the VA Administrator, and to the Director of the General Services Administration, where the authority to dispose of the Gainesville site resided, to ask both Departments to do nothing at all about the disposition of the Gainesville, Fla., site until our Veterans' Affairs Committee had looked into the hospital program. Later the committee unanimously passed a resolution to that effect.

On March 15, 16, and 19, 1954, the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs held hearings concerning the disposition of all of the 16 hospital sites that had been declared surplus. Each hospital site was considered objectively. Some of the sites were in critical defense areas; others were no longer needed because of varying reasons. The hearings brought out the inescapable fact that the Gainesville, Fla., neuropsychiatric site was the only one of the 16 that presented a different problem from all of the others because of the big neuropsychiatric waiting list of non-service-connected veterans in Florida, because of the lim-

ited number of hospital beds for service-connected veterans in Florida, and the rapid increase of Florida's population.

On the recommendation of the Hospital Subcommittee, the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs on March 24, 1954, passed a resolution which specified, among other things—

Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be requested to reserve the hospital site at Gainesville, Fla., for 5 years from the date of approval of this resolution, and that no further action be taken by the Veterans' Administration to dispose of this site prior to the expiration of this 5-year period; and be it further

Resolved, That the Administrator of General Services Administration, be requested to return to the custody and control of the Veterans' Administration said site at Gainesville, Fla.; and be it further

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs interposes no objection to the disposal of the remaining 15 sites in accordance with existing law.

On April 10, 1954, the VA Administrator requested General Services Administration to return custody and control of the Gainesville, Fla., site to the Veterans' Administration.

On May 20, 1954, the General Services Administration, Surplus Real Property Branch, returned custody and control of the Veterans' Administration hospital site at Gainesville, Fla., to the Veterans' Administration.

On January 10, 1955, I reintroduced legislation in the 84th Congress to provide for a Veterans Administration neuropsychiatric hospital of 1,000 beds at Gainesville, Fla.—H. R. 1820. Both Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS of Florida, introduced identical bills in the Senate at that time.

On February 28, 1955, the Florida delegation at a luncheon meeting unanimously approved the proposed neuropsychiatric hospital for Gainesville.

On March 1, 1955, the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, gave me a lengthy hearing on my bill, H. R. 1820. On May 23, 1955, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, inspected the proposed neuropsychiatric site at Gainesville. On November 5, 1955, the late Honorable George S. Long, chairman of the Hospital Subcommittee of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and committee member, the Honorable JAMES A. HALEY, visited the proposed site of the neuropsychiatric hospital at Gainesville, and the University of Florida's health center, located nearby.

On April 18, 1956, the Hospital Subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported H. R. 1820, but no subsequent action was taken by the House.

On June 21, 1956, Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS, of Florida, along with myself and many citizens of Florida, the Honorable BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ranking majority member of that distinguished committee, met with Mr. Higley the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and other VA officials, and requested that they ask the Bureau of the Budget to build the neuropsychiatric hospital at Gainesville, Fla. We received a sympathetic hearing, but obviously the Bureau of the Budget did not include funds for the hospital in fiscal 1957.

On January 5, 1957, I introduced my bill, H. R. 1958, to provide for a Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospital of 1,000 beds at Gainesville, Fla. I have constantly talked with members of the great House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, members of the Appropriations Committee dealing with independent offices, and just several weeks ago I had a conference with the present Administrator of Veterans Affairs, the Honorable Sumner Whittier, about this project. Mr. Chairman, the great veterans' organizations of Florida, the Florida Congressional delegation, State, county, and local officials of Florida, have all enthusiastically recommended this needed neuropsychiatric hospital at Gainesville, Fla. I believe it is a moral obligation resting upon Congress to provide funds to go ahead to build this hospital. Florida is in a very unique position as far as geography is concerned. We are a great peninsula, bounded by water on three sides, and we find that due to the relatively few hospital beds in Florida, many of our veterans are travelling from 500 to 1,000 miles to secure hospitalization. The latest information that I have is that more than 1,000 of our veterans with service-connected mental disabilities are in hospitals outside of the State. My file is filled with letters from parents of these boys expressing the hope that Florida can have its own neuropsychiatric hospital because it is impossible for them on account of great distances to visit their sons. We, who are familiar with the problems of mental disease know that visits by loved ones are one of the most important elements in the recovery of a patient. Mr. Chairman, the total VA hospital beds in General Medical and Services in Florida as of 1957 were 1,320. The total neuropsychiatric beds were 107. This, for a veterans population well over 500,000. And mind you, this number is increasing very rapidly each year. In fact, in June of 1946 there were only 250,000 year-round veterans in Florida, and we had approximately the same number of hospital beds to care for them that we must now utilize in caring for over twice that number. In 1957 the ratio of veterans per bed in VA hospitals, as far as the national average is concerned, was 183 to 1, but in Florida it was 388 to 1. The ratio of veterans per neuropsychiatric beds in VA hospitals as far as the national average was concerned was 396 to 1, but in Florida it was 3,862 to 1. In other words, the neuropsychiatric veterans in Florida receive approximately one-tenth of the consideration that the veterans throughout the Nation recieve.

It is as fair and logical, Mr. Chairman, to ask a veteran suffering from a neuropsychiatric illness to go from Chicago to New York for treatment as it is to ask one of our veterans in the southern part of Florida to go from that distance to one of the hospitals in another State.

I want to quote from an address by the Honorable Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans Affairs, before the 39th Annual Convention of the American Legion, Atlantic City, N. J., September 17, 1957:

At present, all service-connected cases are cared for immediately, but we do have 22,000 nonservice-connected veterans on our waiting list, of whom 17,000 are suffering from mental illness. Congress has never said that the VA should hospitalize the nonservice-connected. Rather, it has said that if VA has a bed available, and if the veteran cannot pay for hospitalization elsewhere, then and only then is he to be hospitalized by the VA.

As a result, there are some who have concluded that since VA already is caring for all the service-connected, and since any new beds would be for the care of the nonservice-connected, no new hospitals should be built. Exempt from this thinking, however, are the two new 1,000-bed mental hospitals to be built under VA's post-World War II construction program, and the six 500-bed hospitals to be built under our replacement program.

So long as a definite policy is lacking, requests for new and additional beds will receive little if any consideration.

I suggested more than a year ago that we settle on a level of 125,000 beds * * * a plateau from which we could work upward or downward, as necessary. So far, I have had but little success in selling it.

Realistically, how would this plan work, in all probability?

Well, if our load of tuberculosis cases continues to decline, we perhaps can close down 3,906 TB beds during the next 3 years. These beds are not located where they could be used for the mentally ill or for general medical and surgical patients.

Just for argument's sake, if nonservice-connected veterans are to be cared for, I want to call your attention to most difficult situations developing in Florida, southern Texas, and southern California * * * because of tremendous increases in population.

For many reasons * * * including large waiting lists and increasingly heavy veterans population * * * we should plan a 1,000-bed mental hospital in Gainesville, Fla. We believe we could staff such a hospital in Florida, contrary to our situation elsewhere.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, wanted this hospital in September of 1957, and I have every reason to believe that our present Administrator, the Honorable Sumner Whittier, wants this hospital. Gainesville, Fla., where the proposed hospital would be built, is located near a great medical school. I can well understand the reasons why new Veterans Administration hospitals should be built near medical schools. One reason the medical school is located at Gainesville, Fla., is because the citizens were told that the location of the school there would enhance the possibilities of getting a VA hospital.

Mr. Chairman, it is my feeling that everyone wants this hospital about which I am talking but the Bureau of the Budget. I am going to urge the Bureau of the Budget again to include the money for building this hospital in the budget for fiscal 1959. I am going to plead with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to continue their efforts to help with this needed project—and I want at this time to pay tribute to the members of that great committee for their interest and for their help. I am going to

appear again before this great Subcommittee on Appropriations to ask for this money to build the Gainesville neuropsychiatric hospital.

Mr. Chairman, this is, it seems to me, a project—let me repeat again—in a class by itself. In the first place, it is the only one of the existing hospital sites authorized by President Truman, and later deleted from the list of needed projects. All of the other sites have been put to other uses. The proposed site for the hospital at Gainesville, Fla., is not in a sensitive defense area, and yet it is completely convenient for the major population areas of Florida. In fact, the hospital site is not far from the exact geographical center of the State of Florida. On the basis of objectivity, the Veterans Administration has stated that they want to build this hospital. The number of hospital beds in Florida is scandalously below the number of hospital beds provided for veterans in other States of the Union. I recognize that it is impossible to build a hospital in every locality, and yet from the standpoint of transportation and overall costs, surely it does not make sense to continue making the veterans of Florida, one of the most rapidly growing States in the Union, go a thousand miles or more for hospital treatment. The people of Florida, the veterans' organizations, want this hospital, and I intend to do everything in the world I can to continue fighting for this institution. I shall be most grateful for the cooperation of my colleagues as I continue this effort.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, my remarks are directed to page 11 of the bill and I wish to state my support of the appropriation of $177,255,000 which the committee has included for financing construction of 66 public-building projects by direct appropriation. All projects have been approved by the Public Works Committees and among these projects are six in West Virginia. The six West Virginia projects are located at Charleston, Huntington, Martinsburg, Parkersburg, Ronceverte, and Mount Hope.

I supported the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954, but it has been over 3½ years since that legislation was enacted and only one building has been built. I believe, therefore, that in order to expedite the construction of these needed buildings it is necessary that the Congress provide for such construction by the direct-appropriations method, and that is what H. R. 11574 does. The Charleston project is located in my Congressional District. A new Federal building is to be constructed in the State capital, and it is anticipated that this building will house the Federal family of agencies and, at the same time, provide suitable facilities for the functioning of the Federal court. The building which is presently being used is greatly outdated and many of the Federal agencies are scattered through the city in various rental areas. There has been a growing need for years for a Federal building to provide office space for a courtroom and the Federal agencies.

The merit claimed for the lease-purchase program was that it would channel private investments into the Federal building plans. The GSA Administrator, Franklin Floete, has admitted that private funds have not become available for the needed buildings. It seems clear that some other method must be adopted if buildings are to be erected in the near future to accommodate the growing needs for such buildings throughout the country. Moreover, had the plan proved to be a success, the buildings would have cost the taxpayers much more, and at a time when the taxpayers are yearning for economy in government. In fact, we are told in the committee report that the General Accounting Office prepared an analysis of the comparable costs of constructing buildings by direct appropriation and lease-purchase. The study indicates that it costs at least $1.64 under lease-purchase to buy the same amount of building as $1 does by direct appropriation. The lease purchase cost of the 66 projects would amount to $348,435,950, whereas the direct appropriation cost will be $177,255,000. The lease-purchase cost of the Charleston project alone would be $7,187,090, whereas the direct appropriation cost would be $3,670,000—a saving of $3,517,090. The total cost of the 6 West Virginia projects under the lease-purchase program would be $21,578,980, whereas the direct appropriations cost would be $11,897,000, a saving to the taxpayers of $9,681,980.

It is my understanding that the General Services Administration may yet proceed to let the contracts for the 6 West Virginia projects under the lease-purchase program until June 30 of this year. If, however, by July 1, no contracts have been let, the projects would be constructed by the appropriations included in the bill which we are now discussing.

Mr. Chairman, my main interest is to get the buildings built, whatever the method. The passage of this bill seems to insure the construction of these needed Federal buildings, if not by lease-purchase then certainly by direct appropriations.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing the liability of the United States, created by the act approved May 22, 1920, and acts amendatory thereof (5 U. S. C., ch. 30), $589 million, which amount shall be placed to the credit of the civil-service retirement and disability fund: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations herein made and no part of the moneys now or hereafter contained in the civil-service retirement and disability fund shall be applied toward the payment of any increase in annuity benefits or any new annuity benefits under the act approved May 22, 1920, and acts amendatory thereof (5 U. S. C., ch. 30) which may be authorized by amendment to said acts after the enactment of this act until and unless an appropriation is made to such fund in an amount estimated by the Civil Service Commission to be sufficient to prevent an immediate increase in the unfunded accrued liability of said fund.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 4, strike out line 6 and all that follows down to the word "no" in line 13 on page 4, and capitalize the letter "N" in the word "no."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to strike out an appropriation of $589 million which was not budgeted.

The situation is this: At the present time there is an annual intake of money into this retirement fund amounting to $605 million paid by the Government employees and another item of $605 million paid by the Government. In addition to that there is $214 million which is paid by the Government as interest upon $7.5 billion which is in the fund now and loaned to the Government.

Now, there has been a lot of talk about there being a shortage of funds.

This shows that they are taking in now twice as much as they are paying out. Frankly, I do not believe they are going to have a shortage when they get through. There have been a few times when a smaller sum than the regular contribution was appropriated. There has been a few times when there was more appropriated. Last year there was quite an item and on top of that in every single appropriation bill there is an item for this purpose. So it seems to me that with the present situation of the country we should not get into the idea of appropriating $589 million out of the Treasury for the purpose of putting more money into this fund. It is not bankrupt. It is guaranteed by the Government, and if the Government is good—and I believe it is—there is no shortage and there is no situation that requires this action. The trouble with it is that we have already run an enormous number of bills over the budget estimates and we are getting to the point where it is going to be necessary, if we have a few more items like this, to have another extension of the debt limit. I do not want to see another extension of the debt limit and I do not believe you want to see another extension of the debt limit before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is it not true that the interest that will be paid into the fund this year, plus the employees' contribution of $650 million plus the direct appropriation of $650 million that is being made will total about $1.5 billion as the amount to go into the fund this year; and that deducting the payments that will be made it will leave $700 million in the fund this year over and above the $802 million paid out in benefits?

Mr. TABER. In the neighborhood of $750 million.

Mr. OSTERTAG. And if you add the $589 million that is in the bill, that will amount to $1,200,000,000 that will go into the fund.

Mr. TABER. Almost $1.5 billion.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that this fund is no more bankrupt than the Government of the United States is bankrupt?

Mr. TABER. That is exactly correct.

Mr. JONAS. When they speak of it as being bankrupt they might just as well say that the Federal Government is bankrupt, because the full faith and credit of the Government is behind this obligation, just as it is behind the obligation to pay veterans' pensions and retirement pay for retired members of the military service.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has so ably said, we are confronted here today with voting on an appropriation which was added by the committee in the amount of $589 million. It was not requested by the budget and was not in the budget as it was submitted to the Congress. This means that we are adding $589 million to the budget this year, and I doubt that it is a good time to be raising the budget unnecessarily.

What does this appropriation do? It seems to me that in view of the fact each appropriation bill carries with it an appropriate amount to cover the Federal contribution which is in excess of $650 million, and that the employees of the Federal Government are likewise contributing over $650 million annually, coupled with the interest on the money borrowed by the Federal Government from the fund which amounts to over $214 million, over $1,500,000,000 will have been paid into the fund this next year.

It is interesting to note that this fund, which now totals $7.5 billion, will reach the total sum of $13 billion by 1972. It will not be until 1972 that the disbursements will exceed the income. Therefore there is no need at this time to add the $589 million to this bill. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

As the Members know, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I have the honor of being chairman, has charge of all retirement legislation in the House and I am intensely interested in the solvency of this retirement fund. For several years I have been deeply concerned about the condition of this fund. During the past 10 years the amount of the insolvency of this fund has risen over $10 billion. In 1953, the fund was insolvent to the tune of $9,912,000,000. In 1954, the fund was insolvent to the tune of $10,583,000,000. In 1955, the fund was insolvent to the tune of $11,971,000,000.

In 1956, the fund was insolvent to the tune of $13,838,000,000.

In 1957, last year, the insolvency had grown to $17,937,000,000.

The Board of Actuaries which has charge of this fund, of which Mr. George S. Buck is chairman, says that on June 30, 1958, this year, the insolvency of the fund will be $19,360,000,000. Why is this fund becoming more and more insolvent? It is because the Congress for the last several years has liberalized this fund four different times, increasing the benefits to the annuitants without making contributions to take care of the additional costs. The Board of Actuaries says it will take a 19.31-percent appropriation a year of the total payroll to take care of the costs. Right now the Government contributes 6½ percent and the employees contribute 6½ percent. There is 6.31 percent which is not taken care of each year, therefore, the insolvency continues to grow each year. It is not right or proper to continue this insolvency. Our former colleague Hon. Robert Ramspeck, when he was Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, appeared before our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on many occasions and told us how concerned he was about the condition of this fund. He said Congress should put this fund in order. I appeal to you to let us go ahead and appropriate this money. Let us get started toward wiping out the insolvency of this fund. It cannot be done unless the Congress appropriates the extra percentage which is 6.31 percent of the total payroll in addition to the contributions of the Government and the employees of 6½ percent each year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The employees during their employment in the Government have taken care of their share of the obligations; have they not?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And the fault is on the part of the Congress in its failure to make this contribution; and there is more to be done if the legislation is approved.

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And this $500 million, or whatever it is, is only a part of what the Congress owes the Government, that is the fund; is that not correct?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to understand the point that has just been made. Do I understand correctly that what the gentleman from Kansas has reference to is the action of the Congress in voting for proposals that bring about a heavier drain on the fund?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. But the gentleman did not mean to say that the Congress was voting for its own personal advantage; is that correct?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. I wanted to be sure about that. I would like to pose this question to the gentleman from Tennessee who is an able and conscientious legislator. May I say I am in support of this amendment. I dislike to find myself in disagreement with the gentleman, but it strikes me that if we indicate by this sort of action that instead of handling this fund the way we ought to that from time to time we will just vote funds out of the General Treasury to supplement the fund, then in truth and in fact the fund which should not exist.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would say to the gentleman that there is no invitation attached to it at all. It is just our failure now to carry on and to go ahead and make appropriations after we agreed to do it.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, I understand that, but let me ask the gentleman this question. Do you not break down the resistance that otherwise is found here if you indicate a willingness to go ahead year after year and put money into the fund out of the General Treasury?

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have broken that resistance a long time ago. This is just making it worse.

Mr. HALLECK. That may be.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Would not the gentleman from Tennessee agree with me that we ought to appropriate each year for the normal cost plus the interest on this fund?

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, let us get clear in our minds what this fund is. This is the fund to pay the retirement benefits of all Federal employees. It is important that its integrity be preserved. Let me read to the House the question and answer of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] and Mr. Irons. Mr. Irons is in charge of this fund for the Civil Service Commission. Before I do that I want to point out—take note—that the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Civil Service Committee, is opposed to this amendment. He is in favor of the appropriation. The gentleman from Kansas, the ranking member of the Committee on Civil Service, is opposed to this amendment. He is in favor of the appropriation. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is opposed to this amendment. He is in favor of this appropriation. They know how important this fund is. Let me read to you what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] asked and what the answer was. I read from page 547 of the hearings:

Mr. VURSELL. That was in 1956. Now there has been some argument, when it was before the committee previously, that it probably would not be a good economic move to continue to pay the $525 million that we once paid and skipped. I presume if there was

any argument now, we would go into the fact that the fund is paying off at the present time.

And this is what will happen if this amendment is adopted:

Now how long will it continue, if we don't pay anything into the fund, before the fund is insolvent to take care of the debt of the retirees and their dependents?

How long will it continue if we did not pay anything into the fund?

That is what will happen if this amendment is adopted.

How long will it continue before the fund is insolvent to take care of the retirees and their dependents?

And this is what Mr. Irons said:

The income to the fund from employees and from the agencies is more than adequate to take care of the disbursement from the fund for the calendar year. Our actuarial estimate is that if we keep on with our present method of taking 6½ percent from the employee's pay and matching 6½ percent from the Government, and adding to it the interest, at the rate our retirements are taking place, that this fund will grow from its present $7½ billion to a little over $13 billion, and ultimately—and by "ultimately," I mean about 1992 or 1993—the fund will be exhausted unless additional appropriations are made, unless the interest rate is raised, or unless the employees' contributions are increased, or unless fewer retirements than we expect take place.

This means that the fund will be exhausted by 1992, leaving a great many Federal employees to seek new retirement benefits from direct appropriations.

I asked Mr. Irons the vital question. I asked him, "What happens at the time the fund is exhausted? What will occur when the fund becomes exhausted in 1992? How do those who are under retirement get their benefits?"

He said, "We will have to get a direct appropriation at that time." I said, "How much will it be?" He said, "It will be between one-half and two billion dollars a year of annual appropriations."

Can you imagine the Congress at that time, faced with an exhausted fund and having to appropriate $2 billion annually to take care of the retirement benefits from this fund? Will the Congress do so? It is always reticent in appropriating such a large sum.

The only thing that this appropriation of $589 million does is to keep the fund current at the deficit level of $18 billion. It does not lessen the deficit. If you do not appropriate this money, the deficit goes up from $18 billion to $18½ billion. Is it fiscal responsibility to let this lay? If the argument of the gentleman from New York is sound, that this is an obligation of the United States, why is it necessary for Federal employees to make any contributions? Why not say the whole fund is the obligation of the United States and it is not necessary to make any contribution? Obviously, the argument is not sound.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, this is a very real and serious problem. I serve on the subcommittee handling retirement legislation on the legislative committee. We are faced with some very real and practical problems, as I see it. The other body has already passed legislation to increase the retirements for those who are presently on the rolls. We have coming before us next week legislation approved by our committee to do that very same thing. These are the simple facts: Those who are on the retirement rolls, including ourselves, are placed there on as nearly an actuarial basis as we possibly can be. However, the Congress has from time to time increased the annuities for those who have already retired, over and above that which they have actually earned during the time they have been serving the Government. As a matter of fact, we have today approximately 10,000 people on the retirement rolls who are drawing more money under retirement than they received in salary when they were working for the Federal Government.

In view of that fact it is apparent that something has to be done.

I say to you, that next week we are going to be faced with some amendments here that are going to be very serious. We have those on retirement rolls who have retired after a certain number of years in the Government who are working full time in other occupations, yet while they are working full time in other occupations their annuities are being increased. Some who have been retired from the rolls and worked full time now draw social security also.

I say to you that we have to be very cautious and any increase for retirees who are presently on the rolls should be on the basis of need. No responsible person I am sure would want any faithful servant of the United States Government to be in need. I certainly am in favor of the bill that is soon to be reported out of our committee, but if we increase the amount of the retirement for those who are presently on the retirement rolls over and above what they have actually earned we have to make some kind of provision some place to pay it, because if we do not we are going to be faced with a very serious problem in the future.

This amendment is one that is going to have to be decided either now or some years later and we must decide as to the propriety of facing it now or in future years. I just want to call your attention to the fact that this matter will be on the floor for consideration next week, and we had better take a hard look in a thoughtful way, certainly making no unwise decisions, so that we do not place the fund in jeopardy in future years. We are custodians of this fund. This fund does not belong to the citizens of the United States, it does not belong to the Members of Congress, it belongs to the employees, and we as trustees of the fund had better not look at it from the political point of view but as good custodians and trustees for over 2 million employees and 300,000 presently on the retirement rolls.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. Would it not be just as logical to eliminate payment by the employees into the fund as to eliminate the payment by the Government into the fund?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am not sure I follow the gentleman's reasoning, but I do not see how the fund can be solvent if we refuse to pay into the fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the trouble with this whole matter is irresponsibility. Four or five times in almost as many years you have played politics with these annuities; you have raised them, and raised them, and you want the Federal Government to be sure that the annuities are paid.

I have taken this matter up with the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Stans, and have a long statement here from him. I wish to read 1 or 2 paragraphs from his statement:

To imply that because it is not fully funded, the retirement fund is being somehow mismanaged and that it is bankrupt is to call into question the full faith and credit of the United States Government. The Retirement Act promises to make certain payments under specified conditions, and regardless of the size of the balance in the retirement fund at any particular time, these benefits will be paid because the promise to do so is backed by the full faith and credit of the Government. There are no conditions attached. It is a perfectly open and straightforward obligation.

While there are very strong reasons for full funding of private pension plans, these reasons do not apply in the case of the Civil Service Retirement System. The most important reason for full funding of private plans is to assure employees that they will receive the benefits they have earned even though the employer may go out of business. We have never thought it necessary to make provisions for the Federal Government going out of business.

There is no use letting your hearts bleed in this matter; it can be corrected in the legislation that is coming up; it can be corrected, and it should have been corrected prior to this time.

Here is the situation: You have $650 million going into this fund paid by the Federal Government for the fiscal year 1959; you have $650 million going into the fund paid by those who are working for the Government. You have $214 million going into the fund from the Treasury of the United States as interest on the $7.5 billion. In other words, we have $1,547 million going into this fund in 1959 and we pay out only $712 million.

Does that look like the fund is bankrupt? Is the fund as near bankrupt as the Federal Government that we are trying to make pay an extra $589 million in this particular bill?

Members on both sides of the aisle should be concerned about the present economic condition of the country. You talk about it but what are you going to do about it? Many Members are thinking of appropriating additional funds, billions of dollars, to make jobs for people. The Bureau of the Budget, yes, the Civil Service Commission, feels that this fund is perfectly safe in its present

condition notwithstanding what the gentleman from Illinois has said.

The facts are that they go to work and say that this would not reduce by 1 cent any benefits, but it would add additional cost to the Government to appropriate this $589 million.

Mr. Chairman, this fund is no sounder than the Government. If you want to bankrupt the Government you can bankrupt the Government, you can bankrupt the fund, but you cannot ever bankrupt the fund unless you bankrupt the Government. Adding this extra appropriation of $589 million is a step in the direction of bankrupting the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] he made a very intelligent and telling argument and I congratulate him.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to talk a little common horsesense with my colleagues for about 5 minutes. I want to talk about fiscal responsibility, and that is our job here. This fund is insolvent, and no one has denied it. We have had the best actuaries in the country we could get, and they testified that this fund now, not 3 years from now but now, is $19 billion insolvent. Every month each civil-service employee has 6½ percent taken out of his pay, yet the fund is $19 billion short. In the last 5 years this fund has increased its insolvency by $10 billion. That is in only 5 years. There is only $8.2 billion in the fund now.

We talk about the fact the fund will be exhausted in 12, 15, or 17 years from now. I am going to talk sense to you. We have depleted it by $10 billion in the last 5 years. There is nothing partisan about this thing; we are all in the same boat on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Not now. The gentleman does not question that statement, does he?

Mr. TABER. I would like to have the gentleman tell how it ever became that way.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not being partisan. Who knows but what in the next 5 or 6 years the fund may go into bankruptcy to the tune of another $10 billion? Then where will the civil-service employees be?

Mr. Chairman, are we not ducking our responsibility when we fail to put in this $589 million? That is not the committee's figure. The present Chairman of the Civil Service Commission was one of our colleagues, a very capable man and he served here in the House with us. I refer to Mr. Ellsworth.

He asked the Bureau of the Budget for this $589 million. Whom did he follow as Chairman of the Commission? Another fine man, Chairman Philip Young, who resigned about a year ago and is now our Ambassador to Luxembourg. He asked the Bureau of the Budget for about $541 million.

Now, the Bureau of the Budget in denying those funds is crippling the solvency of this fund, gentlemen, and we are denying that great principle of fiscal responsibility when we do not come up with this money. There cannot be much argument about it, gentlemen. If we put it in, that is not going to reduce that $19 billion deficit figure. Do not misunderstand me. No, it will not reduce it $589 million; it will just keep it from going up. This thing is going to skyrocket and skyrocket and we will wake up in another 10 or 12 years and there will not be a dime in the fund. We will then have to appropriate money by the billions if we do not appropriate for the fund now. Oh, what a temptation it will be then to say "Let us rub it out and start all over."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for speaking about fiscal responsibility. That is fine, but the thing bothering me is that if the Congress is ready to enact legislation taking money out of the general fund and putting it into this particular fund, then it is an open invitation to further bankruptcy.

Mr. THOMAS. How are you ever going to put it on an even keel without taking it out of the general fund? It cannot be done in any other way.

Mr. Chairman, we are only doing the right and honorable thing.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that half of it should be charged to the employees?

Mr. THOMAS. The Federal Government has not done its job. Let us do our job. Here is the time to do it now.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 47, noes 128.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HYDE: On page 4, line 12, after the word "fund" strike out the colon and strike out the remainder of line 12 and all of lines 13 through 23, and insert a period.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I fear that if the language which my amendment seeks to delete stays in the bill it will be rather like a Mickey Finn served at the supper table, the effect of which will be to knock out the participants before they have had a chance to sup.

The language which my amendment seeks to delete provides that no part of this particular money that you are now appropriating can be used to pay any increase in the retirement fund unless another appropriation is made in such an amount sufficient to prevent any increase in the unfunded accrued liability of the fund.

I know that this language was offered with good intent and I have no more desire than anyone else to see any increase in the unfunded liability of this fund. However, I am afraid the gentlemen who drafted this proviso have overlooked a possible effect. Bear in mind that the chairman of the committee said earlier today that we need have no fear of this; that when the retirement bill which is due to be heard next week is passed, their committee will be ready, willing, and able to appropriate enough money to meet that increase. But under the language of this proviso, should it happen that the unfunded accrued liability increases for any reason—for any reason at all; suppose there is more of a demand on the fund than has been anticipated—you are liable to cause an increase in that unfunded liability. So no matter how much the committee attempts to meet the obligation of this retirement bill which will be before us next week, the Treasury and the Civil Service Commission might well find themselves in the position of not being able to pay whatever increase in retirement is provided for in the bill next week.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the members of the committee whether or not next week you want to vote for a provisional increase; that is, an increase provided nothing happens in the future that will cause an increase in the unfunded accrued liability.

Mr. Chairman, you have just listened to a debate in which it is estimated that this unfunded accrued liability might increase—oh, up to billions of dollars in the next few years. If that occurs and you have this provision in the bill, you may not be able to pay any increase in retirement which you expect to pass next week. I am sure that you do not want to say to the thousands of retired Government employees, "Oh, we are going to give it to you with this hand, but if you reach for it we are going to slap it out." That is the effect of this proviso.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman for submitting this amendment to the House at this time. As I understand it, this proviso would sabotage the right of the present retired employees to receive any increase in their retirement annuities. It is evident from the action already taken by the other body and from the action already taken by the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service that we are moving toward such a bill to provide an increase, at least recognize the increase in the cost of living that these retired employees have already encountered. This proviso would just jeopardize their right to receive any additional compensation whatsoever.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I am afraid that that is so. I know it is not the intention of the committee. I know the committee intends to appropriate enough money to meet any increase in cost which we might vote next week.

However, the language of this proviso is such that it has a hidden trap in it

which may well prevent the payment of any increase in retirements made by this bill which we expect to act on next week.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, with 5 minutes reserved to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] and 5 minutes to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because I believe the language which is now contained in this appropriation bill is improper and unnecessary, and would be somewhat damaging to legislation pending to benefit retired Federal employees.

It is improper, of course, because it is legislation on an appropriation bill. If the Appropriations Committee has sufficient time and is better qualified to act on legislation affecting post office and civil service matters, then it would be in the interest of economy and efficiency to abandon the proper legislative committee.

It is not necessary because in pending legislation the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has provided language that would require that these funds be appropriated or the law itself would expire. Public Law 555 back in the 82d Congress provided for a temporary increase for annuitants, but if the Appropriations Committee did not provide the appropriations within a 1 year's period that legislation would expire.

In Public Law 854 in the 84th Congress passed in 1956 we provided that matching funds be placed in this retirement fund by the agencies every year, and that the Civil Service Commission submit an estimate to the Bureau of the Budget as to what the cost would be, if any, of keeping those funds actuarially sound.

I appreciate the concern which has been expressed about the actuarial soundness of the retirement funds, but that has already been pretty well debated. I do not think any of us is too much worried about those funds becoming bankrupt. If there is some deficiency, and there is some when you consider it on an actuarial basis, it is because Congress in the past did not comply with its obligation to put a fair amount of money into those funds.

Alarming headlines appear in the daily papers alleging that the United States civil service retirement and disability fund is in precarious condition. The press reports are based upon statements made by two Members of Congress before the House Rules Committee on March 24. As a matter of fact, the fund is a long, long way from being in a precarious condition. The fund has successfully operated for over 37 years. It started in 1920 from zero and today has a balance in excess of $7,800,000,000 invested in Government securities.

The statements indicating the fund is in a precarious condition are based upon an unrealistic technical actuarial assumption and computation showing an actuarial deficiency, or so-called unfunded liability, at the present time of $19 billion. This unfunded liability does not in itself establish that the fund is in a precarious condition. Many other factors must be taken into consideration, such as the assured future income of the fund. In 1921 the unfunded liability was 22 times the assets in the fund; in 1940 the ratio was 5 to 1 and today it is about 2½ to 1. Because of the efficient management of the fund by Congress, this decided financial improvement was accomplished. An extremely important action of Congress to improve the financial condition of the fund was the passage of Public Law 854 of the 84th Congress, increasing the salary deductions of employees from 6 to 6½ percent and making it mandatory that the Government annually match the contributions of the employees. This produced a fixed income to the fund of 13 percent of the payroll or about $1,300,000,000 per year. Additional assured annual income results from the interest on the balance of $7,800,000,000 invested in Government bonds. This income varies from year to year. In 1957 it amounted to $220 million.

That the income of the fund far exceeds the disbursements is established by the last annual report of the Civil Service Commission covering the fiscal year 1957, which shows income from contributions and interest amounting to $1,391,000,000. All disbursements for this period covering annuities to retired employees and their survivors plus refunds and death claims amounted to $594 million. The excess of receipts over disbursements of $797 million in that year increased the balance in the fund from $6,708,000,000 to $7,512,000,000. At the close of this fiscal year, June 30, 1958, the excess of receipts over disbursements will be about $800 million, and it will bring the new balance in the fund to about $8,300,000,000.

Does this big annual increase in the assets of the fund indicate a precarious condition at this time?

If it is not a precarious condition at present when will it be in such a condition?

To determine that answer we must estimate the future income and the future disbursements of the fund. As a basis of such an estimate, we have the financial statements for the past 37 years. It is not difficult to estimate the receipts and disbursements for the next 37 years based upon assured income and probable expenses. As no one can predict the increase or decrease in employees during the next 37 years it is fair to base such an estimate on the assumption that the present payroll will remain fairly constant, and that the fund will earn 3 percent interest on the yearly balance. On that basis the fund will steadily increase. The estimate indicates that it will grow during the next 37 years to about $15 billion.

The statement that the fund is in precarious condition is based upon the unrealistic assumption of actuaries that tomorrow or on a certain day all civil-service employees will either retire, die, or resign and withdraw from the fund their contributions. Of course, such a situation would develop only if our Government does not continue to exist. I prefer to believe that our Government will exist into perpetuity.

I challenge anyone to produce evidence that this fund will be unable to meet in full all of its obligations on the due date in all future years. I specify estimates based upon actual receipts and disbursements, not on technical actuarial assumptions based upon a dream that our Government will end tomorrow or at the end of this year, or on some other future date, and then have to pay all the obligations of the fund at once. Such a dream may be made by actuaries, but not by experienced businessmen who realize that when the annual receipts of a business exceed the annual disbursements that the business is sound. For 37 years the receipts of this fund have exceeded the disbursements, and guided by able Members of Congress they will continue to do so. For 37 years a fallacy has existed on the Hill and in the Government that this fund is not financially sound. It is time we killed that fallacy.

It is damaging to pending legislation because on Monday I believe we will be considering H. R. 607, to provide another increase for retired employees. One hundred and sixty Members of this body were interested enough and concerned enough about the plight of retired employees to introduce legislation providing for an increase. Here before we even have a chance to consider that legislation which is embraced in H. R. 607, which is coming up pretty shortly, we are prohibiting these employees from receiving the increase unless further action is taken by the Committee on Appropriations.

We do have in that legislation, in that pending legislation, language which would do almost what the language in the appropriation bill would do. It states in part:

> That such annuities and increases in annuities shall terminate for each fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 1960, for which an appropriation shall not have been made by the Congress to compensate such fund for the cost, as determined by the Civil Service Commission of such annuities or increases in annuities for such fiscal year.

That is the language embraced in the bill, H. R. 607, which we will be considering Monday. If this language in this appropriation bill is necessary, then let us offer that to the bill when it comes up Monday and at that time we will discuss the entire subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, this language is put into this bill only for the purpose of improving the soundness of the retirement fund. There is no effort on the part of any member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee to sabotage that or jeopardize the employees' rights, or any particular bill which might increase their annuities. The effort on the part of the members of this committee to preserve the soundness of that fund is the only reason why this proviso is in this bill. A week ago the other body

passed a bill for retired annuitants that will cost some $85 million. As to the bill which the House will consider next week, I do not know what the cost will be, but whatever it might be, I think there ought to be a willingness on the part of those who are anxious to increase the retirement of those annuitants who are on the retired rolls to stand up and have the guts and vote the amount for it. That is all we want. I am one of those who has introduced a bill increasing annuities for retired Federal civil-service workers. They deserve this increase and have waited a long time for it. When we do increase the annuities, I am sure and know that this committee will come back with a supplemental and we will give the money that is necessary to meet that obligation.

I repeat, this proviso is for the purpose of not sabotaging the retirement fund or of prejudicing those who might benefit hereafter from the fund. It is only for the purpose of preserving it. I think the membership here ought to realize that and those who are in favor of this amendment ought to realize it, too. This committee worked long and hard on this bill. It spent many hours considering the solvency and the insolvency of the retirement fund. This is the way to preserve and protect the fund; and this is the way to do it.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I respectfully direct the attention of the committee to the fact that on March 5 of this year during the debate on the bill, H. R. 8002, a very eloquent statement was made by a member of the Committee on Appropriations in defense of the prerogatives of the Committee on Appropriations. I recall to your attention the fact that at the time I raised the question as to whether there would be the same eloquence and the same earnestness in behalf of some other committee when the legislative prerogatives of that committee were being challenged on some subsequent occasion by the Committee on Appropriations. I think this is an appropriate time to call your attention to the fact that this is precisely what is transpiring here. There is a suggestion here in the statement of the gentleman who preceded me that there is an apparent lack—and I am quoting his words—of guts on the part of the House to match new obligations with the funds to meet those obligations. I again direct the attention of the committee to the provision in section 4 of the bill, H. R. 607, which is coming before the House shortly, which specifically provides, and this has been voted out of our legislative committee where this matter ought to originate and from which it ought to emanate:

Any annuities or increases in annuities provided by the preceding section in this act—

And that calls for increases—

shall be paid from the Civil Service retirement and disability fund and such annuities and increases in annuities shall terminate for each fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 1960, for which an appropriation shall not have been made by the Congress to compensate such fund for the cost.

The intent of the legislative committee is clear, as comprehended in this bill, H. R. 607. There will be an opportunity to act on the recommendation of the proper committee to take care of this provision.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not see how any Member of this body can complain about this provision which provides for the highest sense of fiscal responsibility. The language merely means that, before there is any further increase in annuity benefits, there must first be an appropriation made to the retirement fund to cover the increased cost of such benefits and to prevent an immediate increase in the unfunded accrued liability of the fund.

Why has the tremendous deficit in the retirement fund happened over the past 10 years? It is because the Congress has liberalized this fund four different times during that period. Those four different amendments to the retirement fund cost millions and millions of dollars, and yet the Congress made no provision for taking care of the additional cost provided by those amendments. It is high time that Congress displayed some sense of financial responsibility about this fund. Everybody will admit that the fund is in terrible condition. It is insolvent. Its insolvency is growing, and if you continue to liberalize the fund in the future and do not provide additional appropriations to take care of the new liberalized features, naturally the deficit in the fund will continue to grow. I do not see how you can object to this provision, which merely means that if Congress feels that this retirement system should be liberalized in the amount of $200 million in additional benefits, first Congress should vote an appropriation of $200 million to take care of this amount.

Mr. Chairman, it is high time that we get this fund in proper financial order or we are in real serious trouble.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, within the next few days this House will by an overwhelming vote agree to authorize the expenditure of somewhere between $60 and $100 million for additional retirement benefits for former employees in Government, and dependents of former employees. That money will be in addition to the amount they receive as contributors to the retirement fund.

The legislation provides that all people employed in Government and retired prior to October 1, 1956, will be entitled to additional payments as provided in the bill. The cost of the bill approved by the House committee, I am advised will cost approximately $60 million the first year. A companion bill approved by the other body will cost nearly $100 million the first year.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. HYDE. I have full sympathy for the purpose expressed by the gentleman from Kansas, also the gentleman from Tennessee. My fear is that when you say in this proviso that none of this increase can be paid unless the appropriation is made, to prevent an immediate increase in the unfunded accrued liability fund, should there be an increase in the accrued liability of such fund even if you appropriate the money, should that increase occur because of some miscalculation of the number of beneficiaries or for some other reason, then the Government may be in the position of not being able to pay the increase even though you have appropriated the money. That is my objection to this proviso. It contains language an interpretation of which may kill any increase in retirement benefits. I am in sympathy with keeping the fund solvent, but under this language if for any reason at all there is an increase in the accrued liability these payments cannot be made. We have been told here time and time again that it is going to increase untold millions of dollars. Should it increase, you are not going to be able to pay any more annuities.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is my contention the appropriation for the retirement fund in this bill is intended to apply on present and past obligation to the retirement fund.

I further contend this House should immediately appropriate the additional amount necessary to completely take care of the additional obligation created when the House votes to make additional payments to those who retired prior to October 1, 1936, and the survivors of those who are deceased.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have gotten ourselves into a controversy here and gotten our emotions stirred up a bit when there really is not any important problem. I was very pleased to hear the gentleman from Kansas say that he thought that next week or in the very near future we would be authorizing $60 million to $85 million for retired Federal employees. If there are any real victims of inflation who deserve this increase they are those people who will be covered in benefits.

We have gotten all excited about the fact that there is going to be some proviso in the law requiring an appropriation of money. I submit it is as easy as this: The bill S. 607 or H. R. 607, as the case may be, that will be before us, does, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN], said, provide that if the money is not forthcoming from the Appropriations Committee and the Congress that the benefits cannot be paid the following year. The gentleman from Massachusetts wondered if we had the guts to stand up and be counted. For

me it is the job of the House Civil Service Committee to pass the authorizing legislation; it is for the Appropriations Committee to bring before us the proper appropriation.

We all showed here on the last amendment, we who supported it, that we are seriously concerned about the solvency of the fund. The people who are opposed to this amendment are just as concerned as the people who would like to say that it does not matter what the will of the Congress is, that what matters is the will of the subcommittee on appropriations. I believe that in a contest between two jurisdictions, the legislative committee and the Congress, we should not allow any portion of the whole to build a trap both legally and otherwise which will withhold from deserving people, so labeled by the vote of Congress and the signature of the President, withhold from them the benefits we feel they are entitled to.

I believe this amendment should be passed without question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is legislation on an appropriation bill. That is the first argument in favor of the amendment and against the proposal in the bill. The Appropriations Committee has gone far out of its way to write legislation in this bill.

As one member of the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, I am jealous of the prerogatives of that committee. The House has just spoken, by a substantial margin, and said that the retirement fund should be contributed to annually by the Federal Government. That is, the annual payments, based on cost and interest, should be paid each and every year by the Federal Government.

There is no need for this legislation in this appropriation bill. The House has spoken and the House committee in reporting a bill to you next week will speak on that score again. Why do you not leave this matter to the proper legislative committee?

What you are inviting, I may say to the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, is language in the bill that will come to the House next week, and other bills from other committees, providing that, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act passed by the House of Representatives, that a certain procedure will be followed. We can take care of you in that fashion. I do not think you want it that way, I am sure I do not want it that way.

I appeal to you to stop bringing in legislation on appropriation bills and going to the Rules Committee and getting points of order waived on appropriation bills.

Mr. Chairman, I support the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, there is not the slightest intention on the part of any member of this subcommittee on either side of the aisle to circumvent the jurisdiction of the great legislative committee. We consulted its very able chairman and asked his permission. He went to the Rules Committee with us and advocated this rule. I am not jealous of anybody's prerogatives, and no one on this committee is; but, Mr. Chairman, we are jealous of this fund that is $19 billion in the red.

My very able and lovable friend from Iowa makes an argument that really is not in keeping with the great service he renders. In the last 5 or 6 years this fund has gone in the red by some $10 billion. By whose action? By his action, by my action, by your action. He serves on that great committee and that great committee has not done anything to protect this fund. It is the job of this subcommittee to handle the dollars and cents involved, and that is all we are doing.

My very good friend from Maryland says the language has a joker in it. There is nothing wrong with the language because the very able Civil Service Commission wrote the language, the same people who are going to administer it. Do not worry about that language.

Mr. Chairman, when that great committee, of which my friend from Iowa is a member, comes in tomorrow or the next day with an authorization bill, we are going to supply the money just like we do for any other legislative program. All we are asking your great committee to do is to follow the procedure of this House. When the armed services want any money, how do they get it? They go to the Committee on Armed Services, and they authorize it, and then they go to the Committee on Appropriations. When the farmers want money, what do they do? They go to the Committee on Agriculture and it is authorized, and then they go to the Committee on Appropriations. Now, when you want money, why should you not do the same thing?

When you do that, we are not going to say that we are going to slow you down. That is not the purpose of this language. We tell you now—and I do not believe any member of the subcommittee will deny it—that when you come in next week we will give you the money. All we are asking you to do is to follow the regular appropriating procedure of this House. When you do that you will not have in the next 10 years another $10 billion deficit that you and I and all the rest of us have created.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought to be voted down. You would be making a mistake if you do not do it, and I say that in all sincerity, and I humbly ask you to vote "no" on this. I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HYDE) there were—ayes, 52, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 2131), not to exceed $700 for newspapers, services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and not to exceed $251,250 for expenses of travel, $5,950,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to speak on this question, but I sought this time to ask for some information and I shall direct my question to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. I am very friendly to this legislation and I will support it, but not being a member of the committee that has it under consideration, I would like to have an answer to this question. The Government employees have had taken out of their checks ever since the beginning of this program whatever they owed to the fund. Now, the question I want to ask is this: Has the Federal Government matched that money dollar for dollar into that fund as the law requires?

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Have they paid the interest on the money that the Federal employees have paid into that fund every year.

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Then, if the Federal Government should, at one lick, pay into the fund the money they are obligated to pay into the fund, plus the interest they owe on the money that the Federal employees have paid into that fund, would that fund then be solvent?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. That is all.

The Clerk read as follows:

SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For expenses necessary in connection with construction of approved public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, including preparation of drawings and specifications, by contract or otherwise; acquisition of sites, including soil investigations and tests; not to exceed $200,000 for expenses of travel; administrative expenses; and for preliminary planning of public buildings projects; $38 million, to remain available until expended, and not to exceed $500,000 of this amount shall be available for construction of small public buildings projects outside the District of Columbia pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, as amended (40 U. S. C. 341): *Provided*, That any unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated to the General Services Administration for sites and expenses or sites and planning shall be available for the purposes hereinabove set forth and may be consolidated with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That no part of such funds shall be used during the current fiscal year for preparation of drawings and specifications, acquisition of sites, design, planning, construction, or in any other manner for or in connection with proposed Federal office building No. 7 on square 167 in the District of Columbia (project No. 3–DC–05, General Services Administration prospectus submitted July 13, 1956).

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the floor to direct a question to the chairman of the subcommittee. Mr. Chairman, in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1958 there were funds appropriated, in fact $195,000, for a customhouse at Madawaska, Maine, in which there was set aside $5,000 for site. In examining this matter it has developed that the money available for site is not adequate. I ask if in the provisions on page 10, Sites and Expenses, Public Buildings Projects, it would be possible that from this fund there would be drawn sufficient money to make up any deficit which might exist by virtue of the additional cost for site in connection with this project which is already approved?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my friend—and I want to be perfectly frank about it—I do not know, but if I had to guess right now, I do not think it would because that was an especially appropriated fund last year. It was covered as a specific appropriation item in the appropriation bill last year. May I suggest to my friend that we all want to help him. He works hard and is in a difficult position now through no fault of his own. The gentleman has some high-priced land there. He has a factory in his town. Land is a little bit scarce. They tell me they do not have quite as much in the gentleman's country as they have down in my country.

Mr. McINTIRE. I might say it is quite important to set up a customhouse at the end of the bridge. There is the problem of relocating a railroad if we get the site at the appropriate location.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to my friend that when he goes back home, he get hold of both parties, the railroad and the factory, and see if he can get some heads together and drive a good, hard bargain. Then I suggest he get hold of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Then we will all get together and see if we can help him. I do not think the gentleman from New York is going to throw anything away and if the gentleman will do that, we will all see if we can help him work out something.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very kindly.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For construction of public buildings projects outside the District of Columbia pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, as amended (40 U. S. C. 341), $177,255,000, to remain available until expended, of which amount not to exceed $700,000 shall be available for site and construction costs for the project at Milledgeville, Ga.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 11, line 19, strike out "$177,255,000" and insert "$187,255,000."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for the purpose of the construction of a postal terminal annex at Denver, Colo. The General Services Administration, pursuant to the authority given to them more than 8 years ago, acquired a site near the Union Station at Denver, Colo., for the purpose of constructing a Denver terminal annex. The necessity for this building has been proven time and time again.

After the purchase was made by the General Services Administration of this site, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service visited Denver, Colo., and had an opportunity to observe the workings of the postal employees. They found that many of them were out in the street in the dead of winter separating the mails. We have, some 3 or 4 blocks from the Union Station, an old building formerly used as a banana warehouse whose working facilities are such that if it were under State supervision it would be condemned as a fire trap. When the lease-purchase legislation was approved the application of the Denver Post Office was put down No. 2 on the list and was submitted to the respective committees of the respective Houses and approved.

The Post Office Department pursuant to the authority given them had plans and specifications prepared for the construction of this building and issued an invitation for bids, but the only bids they received would cost the Government approximately $15 billion under that program.

I am asking in this amendment that you approve sufficient funds for a project the necessity and need for which has been established time and time again by every committee in the Congress and every executive department that has ever looked into the matter. If the appropriation of a sufficient sum to construct this terminal annex is adopted, then you will save the Government lots of money. You will save it in rent, you will save it in operations. The plans by the Post Office Department have already been drawn, the architects have submitted their plans, and all they have to do is to proceed with the construction of this building on the site the Government has owned for more than 8 years. After the Government has spent a large sum of money in the acquisition of this site and nothing has happened during that period of time, now is the time for you to take action, give us sufficient funds, and proceed with the construction of the terminal annex. I ask your favorable consideration and vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, the committee to have the remaining 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we all love our friend from Colorado. He is putting the committee in the awkward position of opposing a very worthy project. There is no question about it, but again I point out to you the reason we are going to have to ask you to vote against this amendment.

There is not a single building in this list which is exclusively a post office. There are dozens all over the country that should be built. I am suffering too. I have one in my town that was built to accommodate 125,000 people, but now the town has 900,000 people in it. We have owned the land for 9 years too, but I am in no worse shape than dozens of you.

Frankly, I speak the committee's sentiment, and I know I speak my own, when I say that the Post Office Department has no business being in the construction business. The Post Office Department was set up to carry the mail, and it does a fine job of it. Now to set up a duplicating construction agency, as it is under the present setup, is compounding the cost of construction and slowing it down. On the other hand, you have a fine agency, the Public Buildings Service in GSA, which for over 100 years has built post offices and all the other Federal office buildings.

All of this construction should be placed where it belongs. So far as I am concerned, and I think I am speaking for the committee, if the jurisdiction is given to the General Services Administration, we will get busy and supply the funds and build these post offices that ought to be built. That would not take away from the Post Office Department the jurisdiction to contract for service stations and little buildings out in the neighborhood sections of the community. I am talking about the post offices in the county-seat towns. As far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], but I do not think it is treating everybody else fairly who wants to have a post office, to put one in this bill, because there is not a single, exclusively post-office building in this entire lot. This committee did not have jurisdiction. That is the reason they are not in the bill.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. I have been quite in sympathy with this bill right on through, and I joined my colleagues on that side a moment ago. Now, I am quite shocked here to find in this report, and I direct this question to the distinguished gentleman. What is this "fighting the depression"? On the first page of the report, there is this language: "fighting the depression."

Will the gentleman tell me what that is?

Mr. THOMAS. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. ALGER. Is this a bill to fight a depression or do I misread this report?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly, it is not going to aggravate the depression or make it worse.

Mr. ALGER. What depression are we talking about?

Mr. THOMAS. Have you not heard?

Mr. ALGER. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, you go back home and you will no doubt find that you have about 30,000 or 40,000 people unemployed.

Mr. ALGER. I have just been back home, let me say to the gentleman, and may I say further that the level of income for the month of February——

Mr. THOMAS. Then your town is different from the rest of the towns in the United States.

Mr. ALGER. Then I am proud of that. But, I merely asked the question to get an answer.

Mr. THOMAS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I will give the gentleman an answer if he will repeat his question.

Mr. ALGER. The report says "fighting the depression."

Mr. THOMAS. Why, of course.

Mr. ALGER. What depression?

Mr. THOMAS. Do you realize there are 5,200,000 unemployed people in the country?

Mr. ALGER. That is 7.6 percent of the total working force. There are 62 million employed.

Mr. YATES. The President of the United States in a press interview himself used the word "depression."

Mr. THOMAS. Let us not kid each other. We are all in the same boat together. You have unemployment in your town and I have unemployment in my town. We have a serious problem confronting us in my judgment in this country when we have 5 million or 3 million or 4 million people unemployed. I hope I am wrong, but it would not be too surprising if when the figures come out there will be 5½ million unemployed for the month of March. Of course, in that kind of a situation, we are in some kind of serious economic trouble. Everybody knows that. I want to be serious about this.

Mr. ALGER. Is that a depression? I would like to ask the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. In my book, yes—in your book, no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. About this statement in last night's Star regarding the high deposits in the banks here. What would you say that means?

Mr. THOMAS. The District of Columbia has one of the highest per capita incomes of any city in the world so they are a little better off than the people in my town or your town. They are in pretty good shape here. Gentlemen, I ask you to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer at this section of the bill an amendment to provide for a post office in my own district. Because, since 1939, we have been promised a post office at Fort Mill, S. C., and the General Services Administration has made a survey in which it has been determined that we need that post office. The Post Office Department has promised the building and we are awaiting its beginning. I am going to vote for the 66 projects which are already in this bill in the hope of helping stop recession. But it occurs to me that if some of us are hurt, all of us are hurt, and maybe there should be some justification here or somewhere for those whose post offices have been approved but not constructed.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would like to explain to the gentleman from South Carolina the reason why the language was used in the case of Milledgeville, Ga. It was the only project in the entire 146 that exceeded the cost of the prospectus submitted to the Committee on Public Works. So the language is remedial in that it is changing that figure to $700,000 in keeping with the request of the Post Office Department and the General Services Administration.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. I was not questioning the fact that it was in the legislation. I said I was going to vote for it because I want to support the endeavor of any Member here who is attempting to help his own district, as long as the Nation does not suffer.

It occurs to me that some of us have been needing help since 1939, and I have the records to prove it, and we might need a little help in this bill. I say it is time we took some observation as to what the rest of us need. I hope the committee will do that.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the committee a few facts regarding the Fort Mill Post Office, long a necessity, long neglected.

In 1939 a site was purchased for a handsome and spacious new building, and the Post Office Department gave the citizens and customers every reason to expect relief from the crowded situation then existing. At that time Fort Mill's population was only 2,500 and the office served an estimated 4,800 people. At that time it was a third-class office with annual receipts of less than $10,000.

Today the population is 4,000 plus, and the office serves an estimated 8,000, the office is second class and for 1956 its receipts were approximately $28,000. 1957 figures are not immediately available, but are probably higher. Then, can we so reason that the office is needed now, far more than in 1939, in fact the need is three times as great.

The Fort Mill Post Office moved into its present building in 1920, 37 years ago. Sufficient rent has not been offered to improve or expand. The overall floor space is approximately 1,350 square feet, of which 350 square feet is utilized for lobby, leaving only 1,000 square feet of working space for a postmaster, his assistant, two clerks, two city mail carriers, two rural mail carriers, and a parcel post delivery man. In rush seasons additional personnel are required.

We desperately need the new Fort Mill Post Office. I regret this committee did not see fit to include post offices in its appropriation.

An entire area would benefit from the construction of this post office. New construction means construction jobs, money flowing in the community, the town would be benefited and beautified.

The Post Office Department has promised us this new building. I hope and pray their promises materialize. I have brought our need to the attention of the department by letter, by telephone, and otherwise. I now call the attention of the Members of Congress to our situation.

Let me give the Congress a few facts about the fine city of Fort Mill, and vicinity:

GOVERNMENT

City is governed by mayor and six aldermen. Tax levy is 42 mills. Assessed valuation for taxes—$1,804,600. Twenty five miles of paved streets are in use. Modern sewerage system. Abundance of water. Efficient volunteer fire department with three modern trucks.

INDUSTRY

Two large plants of the Springs Cotton Mills employing 2,300 persons with an annual payroll of $6 million. Value of manufactured product, $33 million annually. Plants are run 6 days a week. They are being constantly expanded. Fort Mill also is the home of the big new executive office building and pilot plant of the Springs Mills, employing some 300 clerical workers and technicians. Building was erected in 1953 at cost of $3 million. In addition to the Springs interest there are other smaller industries.

SCHOOLS

Fort Mill has 2 new and modern high schools, 3 elementary schools, 2 gymnasiums, and a beautiful 3,000-seat stadium, representing an investment in excess of $3 million.

CHURCHES

There are six churches within the corporate limits with a total membership of more than 3,000. One church is ready to occupy a new building and other churches have just completed additions costing more than $200,000.

RECREATION

Fort Mill's recreation facilities are unsurpassed. Beautiful 9-hole golf course, soon to be expanded to 18-hole course; swimming pool, bowling alley, large clubhouse, etc. Tennis courts and other facilities soon to be constructed.

OTHER FACTS

The city is served by the Charlotte-Augusta division of the Southern Railway, Greyhound Bus Lines, Queen City Bus Lines and Carolina Stages. A new dial telephone system with 1,500 telephones. A National Guard heavy weapons company with its own spacious armory, one bank with weekly clearings of about $175,000. A weekly newspaper. Principal farm products are cotton, peaches, grain, and dairying.

Also located within 3 miles of Fort Mill is the large electric power producing dam of the Duke Power Co.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I ask your consideration, your sympathy, and your help for this fine community in my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Line 23, on page 11, and lines 1 to 6 on page 12 have not been read. I have an amendment to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U. S. C. 356), $310,900: *Provided*, That hereafter no part of any funds in this or any other act shall be used for payment for sites, planning or construction of any buildings by lease-purchase contracts except buildings used solely for post office purposes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 12, line 5, after the word "except", insert: "(1) contracts entered into prior to July 1, 1958, and (2)".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. That amendment follows in the bill subsequent to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee may offer his amendment after the present amendment is disposed of.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, the meaning of the proviso that begins on line 2 and ends on line 6, page 12, of the bill is somewhat ambiguous in the light of the immediately preceding provision of the bill to which it is appended.

The preceding provision beginning on line 24, page 11, and ending on line 2, page 12, provides $310,900 to meet payments due in 1959 under contracts entered into pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U. S. C. 356), prior to the effective date of the bill. Yet the proviso provides that after the effective date of the bill no funds appropriated thereby or by any other act shall be used for payments for sites, planning, or construction.

The amendment will make it clear that the proviso does not bar the use of appropriated funds for administrative and other expenses, including site acquisition, design costs, and construction supervision, necessary for the performance of contracts entered into prior to July 1, 1958, thus removing any ambiguity in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a mistake for us to completely discontinue the lease-purchase program right at this point. We have been trying to get the program under way for the last 3 years. As a matter of fact, strenuous efforts have been made on the part of the General Services Administration to get the necessary financing to effectuate lease-purchase contracts. They admit that there has been delays but the principal reason for the delay has been the unrealistic interest rate limitation that was originally placed on the program. As soon as that interest limitation was raised, contracts began to approach the stage of being signed, and as of this moment there are 15 contracts for construction of lease-purchase buildings already signed by the government and construction can begin on them tomorrow if this committee does not kill the program today.

Then there are another 15 projects on which financing bids already have been received and construction contracts are awaiting signature. I say to the members of the committee that if you want to get these projects started immediately, you ought to adopt my amendment. If you want to stop the lease-purchase program after July 1, 1958, that is one thing, but do not undo all of the work that the General Services Administration has completed, and on which it has expended money in an effort to get these contracts ready for execution, right at the time when the program is beginning to roll.

I, of course, would be the last person to stand here and contend that you can build buildings under lease-purchase arrangements for less money than you can under direct appropriations; but you cannot build a house for less money on the installment plan than you can by paying cash. You cannot buy an automobile on the installment plan without paying a whole lot more for it than you would pay if you had the money in your pocket to plank down in cash to the dealer.

I got these figures this morning, and was surprised to learn that on an FHA-insured loan for a house, a 25-year loan of $10,000, the borrower will pay back $18,710.93 during that 25-year period, an increase of 80 percent over the amount he would have to pay for it if he had the money in the bank.

Go downtown and offer to buy an automobile and you can get a good one for $2,768 if you have the money; but if you have to finance it over a period of 36 months it will cost you $3,320.04.

I do not legislate on the basis of newspaper editorials, and I know that the members of this committee do not do that either, but I would like to read briefly from editorial comments in newspapers published in Washington and Kansas City.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JONAS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. JONAS. I read the following from the Washington Post of a day or two ago:

As for the method of financing Government buildings, we doubt that lease-purchase ever had a fair trial. The interest rate was set too low during the program's official lifetime to attract private capital. Since the 4-percent ceiling was lifted—in connection with the clean-up of the projects which had Congressional committee and Budget Bureau approval before the law lapsed—that capital has been forthcoming, and the interest rates on recent contracts have been dropping steadily.

To be sure, buying a building on time costs more than buying for cash. But direct appropriations, so long as the Government is in debt and faces further deficits, also means borrowing. Before Congress approves total abandonment of lease-purchase, it ought to determine whether that method is more expensive than appropriation financing. We suspect there would be little difference. And lease-purchase would have the advantage of making possible a more orderly, sustained, and economical building program—if Congress would leave it alone.

There is a difference in cost under direct appropriations and under lease-purchase, and the difference involves just two items—the difference between what the financing costs and what the Government has to pay for the money it borrows. Usually that difference is about 1½ or 1¾ percent. The only other difference is the matter of taxes we pay under lease-purchase to the local communities; and there is, goodness knows, enough criticism now of the Federal Government absorbing so much of the tax potential of the cities and local communities that they have difficulty financing local operations. I do not believe the amount of taxes we will pay local cities and counties under lease-purchase contracts is money that is absolutely lost. I do not think we ought to consider it as necessarily adding to the cost to the American people of this program.

May I read also just one brief comment from the Kansas City Star of March 22, 1958, which struck me as pertinent. I quote:

It strikes us that there are several definite advantages to lease-purchase. It spreads out the cost to the taxpayer over a period of years. In this time of recession, private capital could be used to pump some needed construction funds into the economy and raise some necessary buildings. To do as much by direct appropriation would put a great burden on the public pocketbook.

A building constructed under lease-purchase remains on local-tax rolls during the period that the Government is paying off the cost. That is a definite help to local and State governments that are also hard-pressed for cash.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that in my judgment, and it is only the judgment of one member of this committee, we will be making a mistake if we vote to kill this program right when it is beginning to roll. It does seem to me that we should allow the contracts to go forward that have already been signed as well as those in process of execution. That is all my amendment does and I therefore urge its adoption.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and the entire paragraph close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we now come in an indirect manner to the crux

of the matter with regard to lease-purchase that has been discussed many times on the floor of the House and many times in the Committee on Public Works. There are obviously many who disagree with the majority of the Public Works and Appropriations Committees in regard to it and in regard to deciding this important issue as an amendment on an appropriation bill rather than by direct and clear action on lease-purchase out of the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Chairman, if the pending amendment is not agreed to, lease-purchase is dead, that is all there is to it. It is the death knell of lease-purchase if the pending amendment is not approved. All we are asking by this amendment is to continue until July the authorization for the General Services Administration to go ahead with these ready-to-go projects on which millions of dollars have been expended in working the projects out, permitting them to go ahead and use this second arm, so to speak, lease-purchase, as a method of building much-needed Federal buildings. The first arm, direct appropriations, that has been in existence for many years, has not been used since 1938 as a matter of fact. I am happy to see that finally we are doing a little something with the first arm by direct appropriations, but we cannot afford in my opinion to do all the public building needed today—in the billions—by direct appropriations and lease-purchase, as the second arm is essential not only this year but in the future, unless we are to spend ourselves into bankruptcy. These 66 buildings are a drop in the bucket. These 66 projects are a drop in the bucket to what has to be done. If economy ever returns as the vogue, if fiscal responsibility in balancing the budget in future years—it apparently being out the window this year under the same majority leadership that clasped it so zealously to its bosom last year; then we'll rue the day we cut off our second arm—lease-purchase. We will return to the hiatus of no construction which has been the rule since 1938 under direct appropriations.

I cannot believe, with the status of our economy being in our minds this year, with unemployment care programs being pushed on all fronts, that we are going to vote funds, not effective until July 1, for these 66 projects while at the same time not letting us go ahead now with more job opportunities through lease-purchase to make projects available for additional jobs now, until July 1, and thus later to go ahead with those buildings after July 1 with direct appropriations. The Jonas amendment presents a complete construction stoppage between now and July 1 and certainly makes for more jobs and for orderly continuation of a needed Federal building program.

The 271 additional projects which you will find in the minority report on S. 2261, that have not been authorized, cannot be provided without lease-purchase extension under the simplified method used to authorize the 66 we are now considering.

With regard to these 271 projects not yet authorized, to give you an example, there are three of them in the State of Florida—Jacksonville, Gainesville, and Tampa—that cannot be authorized if this amendment is not approved as a start and if lease-purchase extension is not approved by this Congress in the future—except through full individual bill procedure that has been discarded since 1938.

These 271 projects, I say to the gentlemen seated on the floor, involve most every locality in the United States. These 271 projects, if lease-purchase is not continued, cannot possibly be authorized in the future, because you will have to go through the Public Works Committee and Congress itself for individual building authorization, which has never been done since 1938. There has been no program for building since 1938, and we now have a program where they can be built, and there is no use cutting off this second arm at this time which is much needed and which will be needed much more in the future if Congress ever comes back to the idea of no more deficit spending. Anyway, the program is too big to be handled by one method—by direct appropriations and cumbersome individual authorizations.

Now, this question of comparable cost has been dragged across the debate ever since it started, and I read from the report of what is the comparable cost. And, I have never seen such loaded, one-sided figures in my life as were set out in the report between lease-purchase and direct appropriations. As it reported on page 4 of the committee report, it shows that the cost is $177,255,000 under direct appropriations and more than twice that under lease-purchase, which is a complete distortion—in that the comparison is not properly and fairly analyzed. The comparable and analyzed difference between lease-purchase and direct appropriations is 1.6 percent. One and six-tenth percent is the difference if you take into consideration the taxes that are to be paid to the local communities, if you realize you have to borrow to deficit finance through the Government at 3 percent and if you properly amortize interest payments on the lease-purchase. Now, some people say that they do not believe in paying taxes to the local community. Well, I say to you that payment of taxes to the local community is a policy set down by the United States Congress in the lease-purchase bill itself, and there were amendments proposed to that bill which our Public Works Committee has failed to bring to the floor. The committee apparently does not want to make the program workable. If the Congress wanted to do away with local taxes, they should have done so by amendments to the lease-purchase bill itself sometime ago.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is passed and that we can go forward now with construction which is needed to bolster employment and to provide orderly development of needed Federal buildings, rather than completely killing the lease-purchase program and all construction under any method until July 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, certainly, the gentleman who has just preceded me should be very happy about the lease-purchase proposition for the beautiful brochure sent around here by the Post Office Department showing a building which was built under lease-purchase, I believe, in St. Petersburg, Fla., in his district.

All I wanted to do in the limited time was to point out the additional cost between lease-purchase and direct appropriation. Of course, construction costs are the same; sites and planning are the same, but the interest-cost factor is in direct appropriations, and under a 4½-percent rate the increased cost would be $446,736,000. Add to that $504,345,000 for taxes, and you have an increased cost under the 4½-percent rate of $692,675,000. If you go up one-half percentage point, adding the interest and the taxes, the increased cost under the 5-percent rate would be $762,562,000. I, for one, want to say that I voted for the lease-purchase bill, but I am for direct appropriations. I have been for getting some of these projects built and underway under some plan. In addition, there is involved a great deal of redtape and a lot of waste of time, and we do not seem to get the job done. So, I think the direct appropriation is the way to get the job done.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The figures estimated under lease-purchase, were they submitted by the members of the committee?

Mr. EVINS. No. The figures I have read are the figures of the Comptroller General of the United States, and he shows that the increased cost under the former is approximately 70 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] said that he never saw such distortion as appears in the report of the committee with respect to the comparison of costs between the direct appropriation method and lease purchase. The committee did not prepare the information and it is not distorted. That statement was prepared by the General Accounting Office. This House will vouch for the credibility of the GAO.

We asked the General Accounting Office to prepare a fair presentation of what the financing would be with respect to each of the methods, and this is what was presented by the General Accounting Office. It is accurate.

The question that is presented to the House now is how much of a bonus do you want to pay for not breaking through the debt ceiling. Is it worth the difference in cost that is shown to exist by the GAO figures? Of course not. If you are economy minded, you cannot possibly vote for this amendment.

The argument has been made that if you vote for this particular provision in the bill you are going to have to in-

crease the debt ceiling again. It is worth something to hold the ceiling. Is it worth 10 percent? Is it worth 20 percent not to have to increase the debt ceiling? Certainly, it is not worth the cost of lease purchase when you have to pay twice as much.

The lease-purchase plan is nothing more than a bankers' bonus plan. It will pay additional interest to the bankers and mortgage people of the country in order to construct under this type of program. Under direct appropriations the amount that is saved is very significant.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. Under a direct appropriation will we not have to pay interest to the bankers, because we are going to have to borrow more money to build these projects?

Mr. YATES. Just as under any Federal debt; but under lease-purchase you are going to have to borrow at a higher rate of interest than under direct appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD.]

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, just a few minutes ago this House voted to pay $500 million into a retirement fund in order that we might be completely open and above board from the standpoint of fiscal responsibility. I think we have such an opportunity now to reaffirm our belief in fiscal responsibility and further an opportunity to save the equivalent of that $500 million which we have pledged to that fund.

The figures on page 4 and page 5 of the committee report which is available to the Members are extremely revealing in this regard. Those figures were not the figures of the members of the Committee on Appropriations. They are figures furnished to that committee and to the House Committee on Public Works by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those figures reveal that on these 66 projects, which are ready for construction this year and on the additional 14 projects which will be ready in the ensuing year some $500 million can be saved to the taxpayers of the United States by building these under direct appropriation rather than under the lease-purchase program.

The gentlemen on my left have said that the difference is only 1.6 percent. That is a misleading figure. What the gentlemen assume when they say that is that we would have to pay out of borrowings of the National Treasury if we build these projects by direct appropriation but that we would not have to pay out of the borrowings of the National Treasury if we built them under lease-purchase. That is an erroneous assumption. If we assume direct appropriations will come out of Treasury borrowings, we would have to assume also that annual payments to retire lease-purchase obligations likewise would come out of Treasury borrowings. In addition to paying the interest to Government bondholders, we would be obliged to pay to the financiers who privately financed these buildings under lease-purchase. Under lease-purchase we would be paying interest on the money we borrowed for the purpose of paying interest to those private financiers from whom we had borrowed money to put up the buildings. In other words, if we are to assume deficit financing, there would be double interest under lease-purchase.

Surely the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] did not mean to leave the impression that there would be only 1.6 percent difference in the total project costs as between direct appropriations and lease-purchase. What I am sure they meant to convey is that there would be this much difference in the rate of interest we would pay. Even if we should accept that figure, 1.6 percent compounded annually on the unpaid balance of $714 million worth of buildings for 25 to 30 years amounts to a substantial figure in its own right.

These are the figures of the General Accounting Office, which was asked by the Public Works Committee of the House to prepare a study for us contrasting and comparing the cost to the taxpayers of the United States under these two systems. These figures include not only the general purpose buildings constructed under GSA, which are affected by this appropriation bill, but also the exclusive post office construction, which is not involved here. Yet the same principle applies. If appropriations are financed out of current revenues without borrowing, the General Accounting Office reported to us that the difference in all the approved projects would be $750 million; in other words, it would cost the taxpayers that much more to build them under lease-purchase.

Then we asked the General Accounting Office to assume that we were going to have to pay for these out of the borrowings under our national debt, and to make a comparison in that regard. They said that assuming that these projects are financed out of borrowings at 3 percent with the amortization out of current revenues, the difference would be $764 million. So even with that assumption it would cost $764 million more for the taxpayers to have the benefit of these buildings built out of lease-purchase than it would cost to have the same buildings built out of direct appropriations.

So that is the question. It is just as simple as it can be. Do we want to spend twice as much for the same buildings? Do we want to pretend that we are not paying for these buildings, that we will not have to pay for them? Do we want to shove off to a future generation the responsibility for paying, and pay $2 for every dollar's worth of building we are constructing?

That is the question for us to solve here today. There could not be a better time. We cannot solve it any sooner. I think this affords an opportunity on these projects for us to save some $500 million on these 80 general-purpose buildings concerned in this particular appropriation, and I think the House will welcome that opportunity.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I should like to ask my friend from Texas if it has ever been contended to the committees of Congress by either Mr. Floete of the General Services Administration or the Post Office Department that they could be built for less money under lease-purchase?

Mr. WRIGHT. No such responsible official has ever made such a contention.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. Did the General Accounting Office in the figures you are talking about show what portion of the cost under lease-purchase was attributable to those taxes?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes; it did. In one instance of one public building in New York the construction cost of the building they said was $59 million, and over the 25-year period of amortization, they estimated that the Federal Government would probably be paying $53 million in local taxes. This is another hidden cost which accrues under lease-purchase.

The General Services Administration further stated it was going around trying to get local agreements to forego taxes. The gentleman was in the committee room at the same time I was and heard all the testimony. I believe he knows it is going to cost just about twice as much if we build them under lease-purchase as if we build them under direct appropriation.

Mr. SCHERER. Could we not amend the lease-purchase law by taking local taxes off?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is a hypothetical question. If the gentleman wants to offer an amendment to that effect we can debate it at that time. We faced this same fundamental problem in the highway program and the House solved it. We voted then to build highways on a pay-as-we-go basis rather than by a more expensive bonding proposal. Let us face it again today and face it with the same frankness and the same result.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish I had more time to debate this important issue of lease-purchase versus direct appropriation because as a member of the important House Committee on Public Works it was my pleasure to examine the prospectuses on the Federal buildings referred to in this bill, and to also work and vote for their authorizations. All of these projects are badly needed. It was the intention of our committee that these buildings be built as quickly as possible. We all know that lease-purchase has been slow and costly. This bill will save millions of dollars of taxpayers' money and will guarantee immediate construction of the listed projects without having to advertise for finance bids. I am amazed at my Republican friends who are trying to kill a direct appropriation, that will give us these needed Federal buildings immediately. One of the items contained in the bill will provide us a new combination Federal building for Benton, Ill., in my district. At the present time we have no facilities to hold Federal court without driving many miles. This is an undue hardship upon an already hard pressed people. We have over 25,000 unemployed people in my district and I need not tell you what great benefit we would receive from the work provided in the construction of this $827,000 building plus the great long-term use of it. Let us assure these communities today that we mean business by defeating all crippling amendments and passing this money bill. In closing I want to congratulate my good friends on this Appropriations Committee for their great work in bringing out this bill, particularly, its great chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the question here is not whether we are going to build these 66 buildings or not build them. The question may not be whether we pay cash for them or buy them on credit. But let me ask you, if we are going to buy them on credit, do you think it is better to pay 3 percent interest or 5 percent interest? If we are going to build these buildings, do you want to build them the most economical way or do you want to build them the most expensive way?

The Comptroller General of the United States told our Committee on Public Works in answer to a question that I asked, and I quote him I think almost exactly, because I want to be exact in the quotation:

> This is the most expensive way to devise to build a public building, the lease-purchase program.

There are 66 projects authorized. I congratulate this committee for building them by direct appropriation, the most economical way yet devised. Even if we have to borrow the money at the Government bond rate, let us go ahead and face up to it and do it the right way. Let us not waste money by paying 5 percent when we can build them for 3 percent.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. Would you tell me how you are going to build these 271 that are going to be authorized in the future, like the 66, when and if lease-purchase dies? Since the 66 projects we are now considering were authorized under the Lease-Purchase Act, how are the 271 projects going to be authorized, if they are not approved prior to the expiration of the Lease-Purchase Act.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I would say to the gentleman that if the Congress in its wisdom has imposed a limit on debt, on Government bond borrowings, how can you circumvent that debt limit wisely and in good conscience by borrowing money at 4.7 percent and 5 percent under a rose which by any other name still stinks—and that is lease-purchase?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. LOSER].

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Chairman, may I have my amendment read? It is an entirely different amendment. May it be read for information only?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. LOSER, of Tennessee: On page 12, line 2, after the figure "$310,900" strike out all the language thereafter through line 6.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Chairman, this is an entirely different amendment from the amendment that has been discussed by the Members who have preceded me. I am asking unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes to discuss my amendment—and not the amendment offered by, I believe, the gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, since the time has been fixed limiting debate that cannot be done.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York object?

Mr. TABER. Under the regular order of business, an objection is not necessary, but I would object if I have to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has asked unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the time has been fixed. The hour is late and I will have to insist that the regular order be followed.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas object?

Mr. THOMAS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOSER. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman can offer his amendment after my amendment is voted on.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Chairman, may I offer my amendment after the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina has been voted upon?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may do so, but there will be no time for debate on it.

Mr. LOSER. There will be no time to speak on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that the very courteous and very genteel gentleman from Texas has objected to a little extension of time to enable me to discuss this amendment. Everyone who has spoken, with two or three exceptions, has assaulted lease-purchase. Everybody wants to get rid of lease-purchase. I say, to the Members of this body, strike out the language according to my amendment on page 12, lines 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Then, if that is stricken, if lease-purchase is the law now, it will remain the law. It is strictly amazing to me, I say to the members of the committee, that they have overlooked completely the language found on line 5, page 12; and listen to this:

> No part of the funds appropriated in this bill may be used for purchasing sites, planning, or construction of any buildings by lease-purchase contracts except buildings used solely for post-office purposes.

So, in the future, any multipurpose bill for a public building that comes here will go to the Public Works Committee. Any bill exclusively for a post office goes to the Post Office Committee. If you want to revive lease-purchase, vote for this amendment. Then, if the Public Works Committee wants to approve a project for a post office, any Member of the House will have an opportunity to go before the Appropriations Committee and make his appeal for a direct appropriation, or he can go to the Post Office Department and appeal for a recommendation on lease-purchase. But, under this bill, lease-purchase is destroyed except solely for post-office purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. LOSER] has expired.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOSER. I heard the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee this morning say that under lease-purchase it costs 75 percent more than it does under direct appropriation to construct a public building. In other words, there is a post office in Houston, Tex., and one in Dallas, Tex., solely a post office building, that under lease-purchase, according to the committee report, will cost five or six million dollars more than it will under direct appropriation. Notwithstanding that fact, we find this most obnoxious provision in this bill on page 12, that destroys lease-purchase. In other words, there are

dozens and dozens of post offices that have been approved by the Public Works Committee that will be cut off completely unless this language is removed from this bill.

I am satisfied that this distinguished committee, headed by my good friend from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], will agree—he has already said so—that lease-purchase is bad and it ought to be destroyed, and it will be destroyed if it is not in force now. Some seem to think it is now effective. If so, a vote for this amendment will keep it in full force and effect. If it is already dead, the provisions of this bill will revive it for post office purposes exclusively. So I ask the Members to vote for this amendment. I am going to support the bill. It will enable you and you and you to go before the Appropriations Committee and make a reasonable request for an appropriation for the construction of a post office in your district. If this language remains in the bill, I say to you that you will not get an appropriation out of the Appropriations Committee, unless it comes through the Post Office Department. So I say that this amendment ought to be voted. This language should be stricken from the bill. Everybody seems to agree, except 2 or 3 Members, that this costs 75 percent more. Why not do what is right?

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], says that we ought to get rid of it. We all want to have post offices where they are needed. Under lease-purchase I say to the Members that they have taken bids on a little post office in my district three different times. Every time they have been rejected as being unsatisfactory. The interest rate is not sufficient to justify private enterprise to go into the contracting business under this lease-purchase.

There is nothing wrong with this amendment. It does not affect your bill in any way. All it does is give the Members of this House an opportunity to try to go before the Appropriations Committee and allow the construction of a post office under a direct appropriation. If this language remains in the bill, I want to warn you, and I know what I am talking about—I defy any member of the committee, including the very generous and the very fine and courteous chairman—to dispute it, if this language stays in the bill, no post offices, no building used exclusively for post office purposes, will be constructed unless the Post Office Department recommends it. The Appropriations Committee, as I understand, will not consider the construction of a solely post office building under a direct appropriation. Is not that right, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. THOMAS. I did not quite understand my friend.

Mr. LOSER. I thought the gentleman understood me.

Mr. THOMAS. No; I said I did not. Straighten me out.

Mr. LOSER. I will restate it.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman used a lot of language here. I want to cooperate.

Mr. LOSER. I know the gentleman does; the gentleman is just so kind and generous I could love him for it.

Mr. THOMAS. Ask the question now and I will try to answer it.

Mr. LOSER. I asked the gentleman whether the language on page 12, line 2, beginning with "Provided"——

Mr. THOMAS. I am familiar with the language.

Mr. LOSER. Very well; if that language remains in the bill construction work for exclusively post office purposes will continue to come through the Post Office Committee rather than Public Works.

Mr. THOMAS. That is the law today, and this language does not change existing law one iota.

Mr. LOSER. All right. Then the chairman says that the law is as I have stated. It will not hurt anything. Let us strike it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jonas amendment. First of all, permit me to remind the committee what this amendment seeks to do. It makes available and workable the program currently under way until the law as provided in this becomes effective. Actually if we pass this bill today with the language that is now in it and it becomes law on April 1, not a dollar can be spent for direct construction until July 1.

What the Jonas amendment seeks to do is to provide that those contracts that have been financed, those projects for which there are contracts under way may proceed in an orderly fashion until the 1st of July when the direct appropriation and the direct construction program will take over. The Jonas amendment does not do away with the provision for direct construction and substitute lease purchase for it; it merely provides for the continuation of the lease-purchase authority until such time as this bill becomes a law, which is July 1, 1958.

I do not share the thinking and the belief that the lease-purchase program in any way provides for double interest. You cannot pay interest on the same money twice at the same time, and there seems to be considerable misunderstanding about the difference in cost as between lease-purchase and direct construction. Actually there is no difference in cost of construction whichever way it is done; the difference lies in the cost of interest and taxes. There will be an interest cost whichever way this program is carried out. Perhaps 1½ percent higher under the lease-purchase system. As to taxes, of course that is a decided difference. But we must remember that these taxes are being paid to local government and there is considerable justification for that.

The Jonas amendment is not only desirable, it is necessary for an orderly transfer of this program and I hope it will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, of course this cannot be discussed in 2 minutes. I am very sorry the time was limited because this is a very serious matter; it involves half a billion dollars.

The main thing to which I wish to call attention is that this idea of lease-purchase is not something the Government originated; it is a method that came from private enterprise where it has worked successfully for many years and is used by various businesses as an alternative method of contracting for and constructing a building themselves. It has been found that in certain instances it is economical; in other instances it is not. Whether it should be used depends on many factors. The advantage of building yourself has been pointed out by the opponents of the amendment in a very one-sided action. The advantages of having a building erected by a specialist in that field and leasing it from him on a purchase basis has its economic advantages; and, of course, an intelligent person looks at all factors to see what the comparative costs are. The statement in this committee's report in regard to costs is economic nonsense. It does not mean anything. There have been no details of the two programs brought out so that anyone can get value from it by comparison. The trouble is trying to debate this in an appropriation bill. If you want to kill lease-purchase do it directly in the committee that has charge of the matter so that we can debate the matter intelligently. Do not do it in this manner.

I do hope the House will support the Jonas amendment and then proceed in an orderly fashion to consider what is to be done with lease-purchase.

Mr. Chairman, under privilege of revising and extending my remarks, I wish to comment further with respect to the statement in the committee report, pages 3, 4, 5, which sets out alleged costs of direct appropriations and lease-purchase. Because I was confined to 2 minutes to discuss this matter I had to speak in generalities instead of details, which I dislike. I commented that the aforementioned statement cited at pages 3, 4, and 5 which attempts to compare direct appropriations cost with lease-purchase cost was economic nonsense. Indeed it is. The figures used do not indicate the number of years lease-purchase covers. The figures do not show whether cost of maintenance and repair, taxes, and so forth, are included in the lease figures. Under the direct-appropriation formula, of course, the Government being the immediate owner, bears all these costs over the period covered by the lease-purchase agreement. The item of interest for capital investment is not allocated; indeed, without the time factor included, no one can possibly determine the item or any other item for that matter. Many other important factors are undisclosed.

In other words, the two columns of figures standing side by side, unexplained, mean little or nothing. I emphasize that the technique of lease-purchase was not dreamed up by the Federal

Government. It was taken from private enterprise where it was found to be economically sound and valuable. Big business as well as small business resort to lease-purchase from time to time instead of building themselves for a variety of good, sound, economic reasons. In each case the costs of individual construction is compared with the cost of lease-purchase and many economic facts are evaluated prior to the proper election of method. This evaluation is absolutely essential. It is impossible to even attempt such an evaluation based on the incomplete data contained in the committee report.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to transfer my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the committee came in here with a report in which there appears the following statement:

> The amount recommended over the Budget estimate in a few items are for the main purpose of fighting the depression and lessening the insolvency of the civil service retirement fund.

They are fighting a depression, but they want to take this language that is in here, on page 12 in the proviso, so that there will be a high interest between the time the bill becomes law and the first of July. Is that building up your construction work so that you can take advantage of whatever there is in employment and help people out who are out of employment, or is it kind of aiming the other way? If I was thinking about it I would figure it was the other way around.

We have had this lease-purchase proposition on the books. What happened? Already the General Services Administration has provided contracts for the construction of 15 of these buildings, beginning at the top of their list and running down 15 numbers through Durham, N. H. They will be able by the middle of May to provide contracts for the construction of 20 more and those are all on a good deal better basis than you have from what they quoted the General Accounting Office as saying. I will be perfectly frank with you. The General Accounting Office made a rather serious mistake in their figuring of what things would cost. In other words, they showed that there was a lot of interest to be charged against the Government on the lease-purchase contracts but no interest on the direct contracts. You all know that they would be paying the 3 percent interest just the same. The way they get those enormous figures for the difference in the two methods of doing business is by leaving out the interest that the Government has to pay anyway when it is running a deficit, and it sure is at this time and it is going to this year. If this is the spending program that the Committee on Appropriations has brought in so far, we will continue all next year to be running at a deficit. I think the only way we can get by with this is to adopt the Jonas amendment. Even that will give the committee what it is asking for, except that it bridges over the hiatus between the enactment of this bill and the 1st of July. Now let us vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I might make one observation that I do not think has been made, and that is this. With the Nation in debt $275 billion, having to borrow money to construct buildings now as compared with the lease-purchase plan, on which you pay interest for 25 years, is quite a problem, but with the amount of indebtedness we have and with no prospect of that indebtedness being reduced, it is most likely that we will be paying interest on the present appropriation in perpetuity. So, that is one phase of Federal indebtedness we ought to weigh carefully. I know that the provision in this law takes care of the project in my own hometown of Huntington. But we have been working on this project for 12 years. We contributed to the purchase of the site and looked longingly for direct appropriations to start construction. And now under the lease-purchase method we are ready to let the contract at a price of about $650,000 cheaper than was estimated. This provision in the Jonas amendment will allow that project to be let to contract, and let us go along with the construction; otherwise, according to the terms of this bill, the construction would be postponed until 1959. The Government has already spent about half a million on this one project alone because it has been juggled so much. Now, this contract can be let for $600,000 less than the amount originally estimated to cost. Why not let the Jonas amendment be adopted and thereby let this project be built, together with other projects of like kind, and go along with immediate construction. The various Federal agencies occupying unsuitable rental quarters need this building now. If this amendment is adopted, the General Services Administration will award a contract, start construction, and relieve unemployment. What better way to ward off a crisis?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill. Am I correct in remembering that the President a few weeks ago stated that he was going to have a program of $2 billion for building post offices in America?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee I think I remember seeing something in the papers about that. That is about all I know.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If the President had intended to carry out such a program when he announced it, would not your committee have been the logical place through which to request the funds to carry out that program?

Mr. THOMAS. If he is going to seek funds for a construction program, he certainly would go to the Committee on Appropriations. As far as I know, he has not done that.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. You cannot build them with promises. Newspaper stories will not build post offices, and that is all we have had, Mr. Chairman, is a newspaper story about the President telling the American people "I am going to build $2 billion worth of post offices." I get telegrams and letters from my constituents asking me about this, and about the only thing I can do is write back that the President did not absolutely intend to do it in the first place, because the President has not asked the Congress for the authority or the money with which to carry on such a program. And, I hope that if the President remembers he made such a promise, if he was aware that he was making it, and if he intended to carry out his promise, that he will request the Congress before we adjourn for the money to build post offices that are needed in my district and the other districts in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman, briefly.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I notice that most of the post offices that are under appropriation in this bill are quite large post offices.

Mr. THOMAS. These are only multipurpose buildings in this bill, none of them are solely post offices.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, let us see if we can clarify the situation. My very good friend from North Carolina, whom I greatly admire, has offered an amendment. What does his amendment do? His amendment really extends lease-purchase indefinitely. Let us see what the amendment offered by my friend from Tennessee does. That strikes out all the language and, of course, that extends it too. So there is no difference between the two and they both ought to be voted down.

Why do I say they both ought to be voted down? I have heard some very funny statements here, and they have come from some very fine, very good, patriotic, intelligent men. The very idea of saying that the General Accounting Office is guilty of economic nonsense. I have heard a lot of things said about many agencies, but nothing like that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I was not talking about the General Accounting Office. I was talking about these figures that were put in there in that way, with no explanation.

Mr. THOMAS. Those figures are the figures of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get mixed up in any argument with my friend from New York, either.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I was merely going to suggest that we have the Jonas amendment read.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the General Accounting Office is not making any mistakes. They find that $1 of direct appropriations will equal about $1.65 or $1.70 under lease-purchase. My friend from New York seldom is mistaken, but it is entirely probable and possible that that $1 will be $2 under lease-purchase. The Government has to borrow the money in both instances.

The General Accounting Office did not make any mistake. Do we want to substitute our judgment for the judgment of the best auditors of the country?

I am going to defend our friend, Mr. Floete, the Administrator of the General Services Administration. You can let him down if you want to, but I am going to defend him. He says, "I went to the Bureau of the Budget and I asked them this year for $400 million for direct appropriations." He tried hard to get that money because he knew the construction was needed. That is better than twice the amount we put in this bill. "Why, Mr. Floete, did you ask them for $400 million?" He said, "I am too much of a Scotchman; I do not want to throw away the taxpayers' money."

He does not want to throw away 70 cents on every dollar. But that is what you are doing. Let us be honest with ourselves and everybody else. That is what you are doing and you know it—70 cents on every dollar. Mr. Floete says, "I do not want to do it, and I asked the Budget for direct appropriations." It is not Mr. Floete's fault. This is a high authority; and the word came out only about 10 days ago to my friends over there as to what to do. And you know I am telling you the truth—about 10 days ago. Lease-purchase has been on the books for 3½ years—it even expired last July 22. Yet the word came out last week to get busy and put lease-purchase back on the books.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to throw away this money. Both of these amendments ought to be voted down.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, while the committee has increased by $75 million the appropriation for the National Science Foundation, and for that it is certainly to be commended, there will be disappointment with many of my constituents, and in that disappointment I share, that the committee did not allow the full $140 million budget request. In the district that I have the honor to represent there is a keen realization of the tremendous importance of basic science and of the dependence of our future progress in vital areas on the National Science Foundation. No agency in the entire history of our country has in comparable time made such a large contribution to knowledge indispensable to the finding of the path into the tomorrow. It would be nothing short of a tragedy if to any extent whatever the great work of the National Science Foundation should be hampered, or prevented from reaching the apex of its possibility, by lack of money. In the reservoirs of basic science rests the future of our country. That, it seems to me, should be the guide to our consideration of the appropriation we should make for the National Science Foundation.

I am hopeful that the other body will restore at least the budget figure of $140 million. It was most reassuring to learn from the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. YATES], a member of the committee, that there was the likelihood of such eventuality, some boost of the House figure, anyway. The gentleman from Illinois has given stout support to the Foundation from the first, indeed is one of its strongest champions, and in the event of disagreement he of course will be one of the House conferees.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Jonas amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Jonas amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONAS) there were—ayes 106, noes 115.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JONAS and Mr. THOMAS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 123, noes 130.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOSER, of Tennessee: On page 12, line 2, after the figure "$310,900" strike out all the language thereafter through line 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

For necessary expenses of personal property management and related activities as authorized by law and not otherwise provided for; including not to exceed $300 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed $85,700 for expenses of travel; $3,360,000: *Provided*, That to exceed $1,865,000 of any funds received during the current or preceding fiscal year for deposit under section 204 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and not otherwise disposed of by law, shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and shall be available for necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the General Services Administration under the said act, with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus personal property, including not to exceed $145,000 for expenses of travel.

EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for operation of the stores depot system and other procurement services, including contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items; not to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed $120,000 for expenses of travel; $18,165,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. IKARD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11574) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING, THURSDAY, MARCH 27

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 161 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 514, Rept. No. 1571) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2767) to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. MADDEN), reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 515, Rept. No. 1572) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5124) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of

power or train brakes. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EIGHTH OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. O'NEILL), reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 516, Rept. No. 1573), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3262) to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HELP THE UNEMPLOYED FIRST

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in a complex economy such as ours there is no one single solution for an economic decline.

Even if we had the wisdom to know all the answers we could not put them to work simultaneously.

It is obvious that one remedy must come before all the others, and that one is the necessity of helping those who have no jobs.

The quickest way of doing this is to extend the duration of unemployment insurance for those whose benefits have dried up.

Some of these people have no reserves to draw on.

They are not getting 1 cent of income.

There are no job openings for them.

Their unemployment insurance checks have stopped.

These people are in distress. They are worried. They need help.

The President and the Congress are considering various other measures which, even if they are approved, will take time to be of practical benefit to those who are presently unemployed.

What are the unemployed going to do in the meantime?

One bill which deserves our immediate approval would extend unemployment benefits for 16 weeks.

By the end of that period other measures to reverse the downward trend should be taking effect.

The extension of jobless payments is imperative. The fact that the House took only 1 minute to push through the $1,850,000,000 housing bill as the first antirecession measure, is proof that the Congress can move just as fast to extend unemployment compensation on an emergency basis if it wants to.

In the State of Michigan 5,577 workers exhausted their benefits in December, 9,000 in January, and 10,500 in February. These figures will pyramid rapidly unless relief is provided soon.

As of March 22 there were 252,272 persons out of work in New England, according to continuing claims for unemployment compensation. When we consider that only two-thirds of the Nation's workers are covered by this program, the number of unemployed must be considerably higher than the statistics indicate.

Extended benefits would prevent a loss of purchasing power and would thus help to hold the line against a further shrinkage of consumer spending.

Many of us believe that the Federal Government should finance benefits for an additional 16 weeks, by outright grants and as a shot-in-the-arm injection to relieve the distress of unemployment.

There are those who have different opinions as to details, but no one questions the need of taking some action on this problem.

The unemployed look to us for assistance.

UPHOLD THE WILL OF CONGRESS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a bill identical to one of the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman HÉBERT, which I have introduced today that would prohibit the expenditure of appropriated money for any but the purpose for which the appropriation was made. It would also prohibit withholding or impoundment of appropriated funds. I have introduced this measure because of my great concern for what I see to be a dangerous slurring of the lines of separation of power—a basic of the constitutionally established operation of Government.

Efficient machinery exists for the authorization and appropriation of money for Federal operations, in the process of which the executive branch is given its necessary hearing for the justification and explanation of its requests. This machinery was designed to make available to Congress the opportunity it needs to inform itself for action, and to allow it to perform its function as watchdog over the nonelective branch of Government. The two representative bodies discharge this responsibility in full conformity with the constitutional directives under which they operate. But the protections that the Constitution has provided are more and more being dodged by the executive branch through the practice of withholding appropriated funds. In some cases, moneys which have been specifically appropriated for one purpose in practice might actually be spent for another. This would depend upon the decision—not of Congress, where the decision properly lies, but the agency head, who is then in the position of spending Federal funds in a manner that might be contrary to the will of Congress, and so, of the people.

This is a practice that smacks of a despotism that abrogates the safeguards of the checks and balances system and touches the very roots of the democratic principle. These are strong words. But even though some may claim that no really profound damage has been done or would likely to be done, I believe that they are not too strong.

The structure of government is not an accident of chance. It was planned with infinite wisdom and care; with the reason that was born of revolt against despotism however benevolent, and against a concept of government of men rather than of law. To me, the fact that practically speaking the degree of damage might be slight is just as much beside the point as it would be to say to a man who was deprived of the right of freedom of speech that nobody would have listened to him anyway.

In my mind there could only be one justifiable reason for executive expenditure for an item other than that for which the appropriation was intended. That would be only if a new method or material was discovered that would be less expensive than the one originally approved, but which would be used for the same purpose. I would have no objection to an amendment to these bills that would give the executive branch the right to come to Congress to justify any change in the use of appropriated funds on the basis that the change would represent a saving to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this measure will fill a longstanding need. Its passage will restore to Congress the guaranty that its prerogatives will not be usurped and will prevent any future arbitrary, uncontrolled executive spending.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in a spirit of optimism. It appears that the people of Alaska will again have their day in court, as you stated they would have on August 1, 1957, when the statehood bill was set

over for consideration by this session of the 85th Congress.

Statehood bills for Alaska have been repeatedly presented to the floor of the House. I find that the Alaska bill has passed the House on only one occasion, that being when H. R. 331 passed the House on March 3, 1950. However, my feeling of optimism today is generated by the fact that the Eisenhower administration, which once expressed some reservation on the admission of Alaska into the Union, has also categorically stated that it favors the immediate admission of Alaska as a State. That announcement was first made to our committee on March 11, 1957, when a statement of Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton was presented to us. Secretary Seaton's statement was completely in accord with the statements made by President Eisenhower in his budget messages of 1957 and 1958. Also, I have been reminded that on August 1, 1957, our distinguished Speaker announced that he was "for the admission of Alaska as a State into the Union."

The Eisenhower administration in the past did have reservations regarding the admission of Alaska because of the activities of the Department of Defense in northern Alaska. Gen. Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified in March of 1957 that in his opinion, in his official capacity, "the time is right for Alaska to become a State."

So, gentlemen, it is easy to see why I feel optimistic. The President is for the admission of Alaska into the Union. His Secretary of the Interior has stated that admission of Alaska is a matter of simple justice. Our Speaker is for the admission of Alaska and has stated that it is not a partisan issue and that he did not intend to treat it as such. The platforms of each of our two great political parties have long pledged to support statehood for Alaska. And it is particularly important to note that the latest survey conducted by the American Institute of Public Opinion, of which Mr. George Gallup is the director, showed that the American public favors admitting Alaska by a margin of 12 to 1.

We owe it to the courageous and loyal Americans who have made Alaska their home to act swiftly upon this legislation pending before us. The citizens of Alaska have converted what was once thought to be a barren Arctic wasteland into a thriving economic community. The stability of that community is vital today to the defense of our country.

In a statement to our committee, Secretary Seaton said:

> Alaska became part of this country 90 years ago. Its institutions and its economy are characteristically American. The people of Alaska have a vigor and self-reliance such as we ascribe to the men and women of our western frontier a few decades back. Alaskans have courageously attacked the natural obstacles of their Territory's climate and terrain; they have built houses with modern conveniences, cities with modern facilities. To many thousands of Americans Alaska is home. It is for them a place to live, not a place to exploit and leave.

Mr. Speaker, when my State was admitted into the Union in 1912 it is estimated that we had 216,639 citizens. Wyoming had 62,555 when it was admitted, Nevada only 40,000. The now great State of California had only 92,597. Colorado is estimated to have had 150,000 in 1876 when it was admitted. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that in the 17 Western States only 2 had a larger population on the date of their admission than Alaska has today. In fact, the State with the largest area in our Union today, the Lone Star State of Texas, had 212,592 people in 1850, 5 years after its admission in 1845.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that statehood for Alaska will bring about a population increase for that area, comparable to that enjoyed by the States I have already mentioned after their admission into the Union. There is no reason why this area under the American flag cannot be as densely populated as other areas located in a similar geographic position such as the Scandinavian countries, where approximately 23 million people occupy an area of approximately two-thirds the total area of Alaska.

The dictionary states that optimism is the doctrine that the universe is constantly tending toward a better state. The admission of Alaska by this Congress will show to the world our continued application of the fundamental principles of this great democracy. I am confident that the word optimism is appropriate to use in this instance. Disposed as I am to look upon the brighter side of this issue I feel that the opportunity is close at hand when the world will be able to watch democracy at work.

TRUMAN AND MISSILE RESEARCH FUNDS

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Drew Pearson makes five confessions in his syndicated column for today. He should make a sixth confession admitting that he still didn't get his facts straight.

His first confession is that he was wrong when he said Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson did not cancel the 1946 Convair contract for development of the intercontinental ballistics missile. He says the Army Chief of Staff, General Eisenhower, ordered the cancellation.

Here are the facts:

President and Commander in Chief Harry Truman by direct order and against Eisenhower's advice impounded all long-range missile research funds.

Let us look at the record for Mr. Pearson.

On page 247 of the 1948 hearings before the House Military Appropriation Subcommittee, General Richards testified:

> The President (Truman) said we should cut down on the estimate for the research program of the Army Air Forces to the extent of $75 million. Now, the Air Forces did not want to cut down on that research and development program.

On page 186, part 11, of the hearings before the same committee on the 1949 budget, the same subject came up again and General Craigie put into the testimony:

> The result of impounding $75 million of fiscal year 1947 research and development funds is reflected in the following tabulation. Guided missiles, $17 million, long-range supersonic types entirely eliminated.

Now let us go back to the 1948 hearings and there on February 19, 1947, page 78, General Eisenhower voiced his personal protest, saying:

> In the field of guided missiles, electronics, and supersonic aircraft, we have no more than scratched the surface of possibilities which we must explore in order to keep abreast of the rest of the world. Neglect to do so could bring our country to ruin and defeat in an appallingly few hours.

Having published Pearson's misleading confession, I wonder if those who publish his column will do the honorable thing of setting the record straight and also asking, with reason, that the columnist get his facts straight.

Truman killed off the ICBM and not General Eisenhower, but when Eisenhower himself became Commander in Chief and President of the United States, he jet-propelled the missile program to make up for the 5 years of Truman's lost time.

WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY IS THE DELAY IN ROAD CONSTRUCTION AT A TIME WHEN CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT ARE TRYING TO IMPROVE THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this time in the RECORD a progress report on Construction of the Interstate System which became law June 29, 1956—some 21 months ago—which I think clearly indicated that many States are dragging their feet on getting this much-needed program off the ground. Many States have used less than 50 percent of the money made available in that 21-month period, the average being used being, nationwide, only slightly in excess of 50 percent.

When there is such a hue and cry for more jobs throughout the country, with a few exceptions as to more fortunate localities, it seems that the States would set up programs to accelerate their programs for road construction in order to minimize the effect of unemployment—particularly in those States hardest hit at this time. But it is noticeable that in many States in which layoffs are occurring today there is substantial Federal matching money—at 90 percent of the cost of the project—lying idly in the trust fund—awaiting a requisition from the States.

A study of the following tables will indicate that many of the Governors and their State road boards who are calling

most vociferously for further Federal assistance in these months of unusual unemployment trends are not making full use of the largest public works program in the history of the world. I think it incumbent on the States that are not doing so to speed up its letting of contracts and as a result put men to work now.

Under section 6 of the basic highway act, applicable to this Interstate System, the States can even borrow from the Federal Government to meet the costs of the program if State funds are not immediately available. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that no request made under section 6 has recently been denied by the Bureau of Public Roads, it is incomprehensible why some States have not set up programs to go ahead while making full use of Federal funds—particularly in view of the demands being made at present from many of the States that have used less than 50 percent of their road money—for new programs of Federal assistance to meet the present unemployment situation. I insert the following tables with explanations, in order that the Members of this House can have the latest information as to what is being done in their respective States under this available program.

This is the official table of the Department of Commerce issued February 28 which shows the lag in the program in many States:

EXPLANATION OF TABLES

The 41,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is a connected network of controlled-access superhighways which will span the Nation and connect at border points with highways in Canada and Mexico. This Interstate System will link 90 percent of all cities of 50,000 population or more, and will serve 20 percent of the total motor-vehicle travel. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 authorized a long-range program for completion of the system through the cooperative efforts of the State highway departments and the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

TABLE 1. STATUS OF THE PROGRAM

Table 1 shows the status of the Federal-aid program for the Interstate System on the date indicated, and includes all actions taken since passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 on June 29, 1956. It should be understood that data in this table represents the program status at a point of time. Progress of work from month to month results in "moves" across the table, for example, a project that had been advertised for bids during the month will now be in the "construction contracts" columns but at the end of last month it was in the "programed only" columns.

An explanation of the table column heads follows:

Unprogramed balance: Federal-aid highway funds authorized by the Congress are apportioned among the States according to formulas prescribed by law. Each State's share now available but not yet committed to projects in any way is shown as unprogramed balance.

Programed only: Funds committed for specific projects in a program which defines the location, general nature, and estimated cost of each project.

Preliminary engineering and right-of-way authorized (July 1, 1956, to date): Funds previously programed and now committed for use or already spent for preliminary engineering (surveys, plans, etc.) and/or acquisition of right-of-way, needed for construction projects.

Construction contracts authorized (July 1, 1956, to date): Funds previously programed and now committed for construction work; includes contracts advertised but not yet awarded, contracts awarded but not yet under way, contracts under way, and contracts completed.

Total programed: The total of all commitments, including all columns to the left in the table except unprogramed balance.

THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

TABLE 1.—*Status of the program as of Feb. 28, 1958*

[Thousands of dollars]

State	Unprogramed balance	Programed only			Authorized July 1, 1956, to date					Total programed		
		Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Preliminary engineering and right-of-way		Construction contracts			Total cost	Federal funds	Miles
					Total cost	Federal funds	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles			
Alabama	32,055	36,340	32,571	110.3	18,840	16,945	17,785	16,017	69.6	72,965	65,533	179.9
Arizona	7,683	21,245	19,912	91.9	9,757	9,205	18,758	17,569	121.4	49,760	46,686	213.3
Arkansas	9,644	29,083	26,171	48.0	24,009	20,970	17,775	14,811	44.9	70,867	61,952	92.9
California	23,017	5,363	4,913	.3	351,093	94,785	161,748	146,626	156.9	518,204	246,324	157.2
Colorado	23,876	9,124	8,331	26.3	10,595	9,603	28,428	24,697	137.7	48,147	42,631	164.0
Connecticut	24,948	292	263	----------	5,637	4,523	22,329	18,380	15.5	27,658	23,166	15.5
Delaware	20,758	7,710	6,875	2.1	5,134	3,458	530	477	(1)	13,374	10,810	2.1
Florida	4,507	47,100	42,390	32.8	18,185	16,319	22,216	18,887	18.4	87,501	77,596	51.2
Georgia	6,881	81,394	72,023	66.1	22,046	19,605	19,221	16,081	42.4	122,661	107,709	108.5
Idaho	29,803	12,244	11,300	39.8	5,116	4,713	5,867	4,490	26.1	23,227	20,503	65.9
Illinois	15,558	44,842	40,084	22.1	68,112	60,933	125,609	104,958	56.2	238,563	205,975	78.3
Indiana	66,700	34,300	29,814	50.2	22,589	19,438	4,091	3,336	4.9	60,980	52,588	55.1
Iowa	26,637	33,773	30,119	82.2	12,770	11,054	41,039	34,466	163.5	87,582	75,639	245.7
Kansas	21,178	18,357	16,521	75.4	18,011	16,143	34,569	31,112	146.4	70,937	63,776	221.8
Kentucky	43,148	17,614	15,853	11.2	32,658	27,548	5,480	4,932	13.6	55,752	48,333	24.8
Louisiana	9,586	38,985	35,038	40.5	21,994	19,261	18,612	15,991	14.4	79,591	70,290	54.9
Maine	18,887	9,356	8,178	10.3	4,185	3,749	10,202	8,506	7.9	23,743	20,433	18.2
Maryland	6,153	1,827	1,554	----------	14,005	12,212	41,712	37,482	32.3	57,544	51,248	32.3
Massachusetts	17,215	37,373	33,480	9.5	20,049	17,865	38,577	33,718	14.6	95,999	85,063	24.1
Michigan	39,347	60,217	54,196	85.5	22,705	20,097	64,925	56,947	77.1	147,847	131,240	162.6
Minnesota	39,511	7,402	6,772	9.8	49,960	44,374	20,642	18,047	40.5	78,004	69,193	50.3
Mississippi	4,232	29,978	26,880	86.8	11,220	9,087	41,520	36,675	110.2	82,718	72,642	197.0
Missouri	19,514	25,263	22,806	7.8	46,571	37,727	52,193	47,029	67.9	124,027	107,562	75.7
Montana	51,357	4,549	4,076	20.3	14,712	13,264	4,132	3,660	47.1	23,393	21,000	67.4
Nebraska	46,094	3,558	3,269	2.3	20,203	18,023	6,737	5,115	11.3	30,498	26,407	13.6
Nevada	22,623	9,200	8,740	23.8	15,223	14,425	5,537	5,112	10.4	29,960	28,277	34.2
New Hampshire	15,942	1,150	1,035	2.0	3,658	3,121	13,852	11,335	16.8	18,660	15,491	18.8
New Jersey	56,963	9,747	8,785	4.0	22,512	19,443	27,154	24,266	16.2	59,413	52,494	20.2
New Mexico	5,479	7,362	6,816	11.5	8,234	7,623	40,026	37,263	145.0	55,622	51,702	156.5
New York	63,913	30,287	27,112	20.1	90,644	79,684	210,228	165,518	71.2	331,159	272,314	91.3
North Carolina	44,449	35,943	32,271	141.9	14,727	12,852	40,509	34,588	245.9	91,179	79,711	387.8
North Dakota	14,134	16,357	14,683	83.6	5,793	5,128	22,884	20,679	142.0	45,034	40,490	225.6
Ohio	1,601	1,501	1,351	----------	60,184	54,042	167,410	146,492	142.2	229,095	201,885	142.2
Oklahoma	10,723	39,919	35,809	122.8	12,452	11,201	34,765	29,538	120.4	87,136	76,548	243.2
Oregon	23,452	4,087	3,749	11.5	9,046	8,317	30,588	27,983	125.6	43,721	40,049	137.1
Pennsylvania	73,199	62,867	56,356	39.0	38,136	34,267	111,484	95,883	104.8	212,487	186,506	143.8
Rhode Island	5,018	8,721	7,849	9.6	8,302	7,299	10,551	9,495	8.1	27,574	24,643	17.7
South Carolina	12,725	41,969	37,780	106.4	6,677	5,840	12,273	9,904	68.0	60,919	53,524	174.4
South Dakota	1,060	48,711	44,418	96.9	5,021	4,578	8,306	6,637	34.9	62,038	55,633	131.8
Tennessee	20,775	50,336	44,961	28.4	33,694	27,639	15,674	13,773	28.8	99,704	86,373	57.2
Texas	26,489	111,231	99,956	223.3	24,451	22,003	137,479	122,779	442.4	273,161	244,738	665.7
Utah	4,356	26,552	25,202	58.6	11,946	11,335	5,120	4,826	15.0	43,618	41,363	73.6
Vermont	1,265	19,550	17,595	10.3	9,025	7,859	6,351	4,827	7.8	34,926	30,281	18.1
Virginia	10,876	35,590	32,068	31.1	24,624	21,777	37,972	33,344	52.0	98,186	87,189	83.1
Washington	25,837	11,671	10,661	33.3	17,363	15,725	29,575	25,931	101.0	58,609	52,317	134.3
West Virginia	28,592	28,640	24,966	32.6	7,319	6,061	----------	----------	----------	35,959	31,027	32.6
Wisconsin	69,789	13,890	10,784	79.6	19,725	17,010	18,710	15,817	53.5	52,325	43,611	133.1
Wyoming	5,364	13,489	12,551	40.4	3,870	3,575	30,474	27,972	125.4	47,833	44,098	165.8
District of Columbia	11,923	3,240	2,968	(1)	9,312	8,278	9,203	8,264	.5	21,755	19,510	.5
Total	1,164,827	1,249,299	1,121,855	2,142.2	1,311,494	939,983	1,850,822	1,602,235	3,518.7	4,411,615	3,664,073	5,660.9

[1] Less than 0.05 of a mile.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads.

TABLE 1–A. ACTIVE AND COMPLETED PROGRAM

Table 1–A differs significantly from table 1 in one respect: Table 1 represents only those actions taken since July 1, 1956, while table 1–A includes work authorized prior to that date as well.

Table 1–A thus shows, as of the indicated date, all Interstate System construction work now under way, and all construction completed on the system from July 1, 1956, to date. All of these projects, of course, have previously been through the program, advertised for bids, and award of contract steps.

In both tables, some of the mileage indicated as under way or completed provides only part of the total improvement: for example, grading contracts, which will subsequently be followed by paving contracts.

THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

TABLE 1–A.—*Active and completed construction as of Feb. 28, 1958*

[Thousands of dollars]

State	Construction under way [1]			Construction completed, July 1, 1956, to date [1]		
	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles
Alabama	12,817	10,763	49.9	3,450	2,541	17.1
Arizona	10,426	9,780	71.4	2,998	2,325	46.8
Arkansas	6,263	5,000	18.5	1,432	859	4.0
California	113,554	100,781	122.9	35,350	22,198	37.9
Colorado	22,800	20,036	101.2	8,677	6,504	62.8
Connecticut	20,653	17,019	15.0	1,064	598	5.7
Delaware	530	477	(2)			
Florida	20,920	17,181	14.4	3,291	1,832	3.7
Georgia	12,109	8,639	23.0			
Idaho	4,408	3,402	14.5	1,110	765	8.5
Illinois	68,747	55,953	30.6	24,876	15,037	64.0
Indiana				4,069	2,442	4.5
Iowa	18,677	14,830	73.7	1,760	1,584	10.9
Kansas	15,332	13,747	61.2	8,522	5,402	61.8
Kentucky	5,387	4,849	13.6	4,396	2,733	2.7
Louisiana				590	295	4.1
Maine	5,058	4,331	4.7	3,794	2,273	8.3
Maryland	30,876	26,982	23.3	3,243	2,016	2.5
Massachusetts	33,363	27,950	13.5	20	18	
Michigan	45,823	39,094	55.6	20,896	14,405	65.8
Minnesota	19,358	16,870	33.0	4,227	2,647	71.6
Mississippi	22,543	19,555	58.8	2,148	1,228	27.6
Missouri	31,704	28,568	32.2	20,230	14,322	51.8
Montana	1,819	1,621	25.9	2,196	1,527	29.6
Nebraska	6,010	4,679	11.2			
Nevada	5,034	4,675	10.4	1,723	1,494	5.5
New Hampshire	8,939	7,251	9.5	1,872	1,501	2.1
New Jersey	20,003	17,842	11.9	2,143	1,464	3.4
New Mexico	22,924	21,329	87.3	14,715	13,368	63.5
New York	174,512	128,911	47.6	12,562	6,144	15.1
North Carolina	33,929	28,702	200.9	6,437	3,805	59.3
North Dakota	6,175	5,638	28.2	4,512	3,687	54.3
Ohio	114,647	98,004	98.4	13,750	8,473	31.6
Oklahoma	23,247	19,534	74.5	8,156	5,267	15.6
Oregon	14,798	13,664	66.4	11,761	9,695	56.8
Pennsylvania	97,722	84,229	73.8	18,433	11,060	27.9
Rhode Island	10,150	8,234	8.4	1,088	787	.2
South Carolina	11,971	9,415	69.4	1,176	758	12.5
South Dakota	6,292	5,336	27.6	5,033	3,236	97.3
Tennessee	4,154	3,413	7.1	27	16	
Texas	98,510	87,396	322.6	37,021	26,799	246.1
Utah	674	606	.1	3,388	2,644	12.8
Vermont	6,351	4,827	7.8			
Virginia	28,762	24,003	48.9	1,379	762	16.7
Washington	20,021	17,749	69.0	10,948	8,544	35.4
West Virginia						
Wisconsin	10,289	8,593	27.4	1,626	885	3.4
Wyoming	27,874	25,738	102.9	4,629	3,245	42.7
District of Columbia	7,040	6,406	.2			
Total	1,283,195	1,083,602	2,268.4	320,718	217,185	1,393.9

[1] Includes projects authorized prior to July 1, 1956.
[2] Less than 0.05 of a mile.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. Speaker, I am not very pleased to have to note that the State of Florida at this time is within the national average of construction contracts let. In programing of construction at this time we have more to look forward to and there remains a considerable unprogramed balance that will meet such economic problems that may exist. Under table 1 only $17,181,000 is presently being used for construction under way, and the paltry sum of $1,832,000 of Federal funds has been spent on completed construction; and Florida has construction contracts left of only $18,887,000 in Federal funds, during the 21 months' period in which $82,103,000 has been available for programing; indeed a small percentage usage of available funds. There is no doubt of the impact of this money on the State of Florida and I feel that our officials should push the program to bring about further prompt commitments at this particular time. That is the obligation of each State and particularly those who have the more serious problems of unemployment. This is a program to effectively provide the highways that we need today—not tomorrow—and this is a program that will not add ineffectively to the cost of government today but will be an expenditure from funds already available. I am sure that the State of Florida will see the advantages of such an opportunity to help itself as is presented today. I am sure that this program will meet a great many of our needs. I, for one, will urge the most prompt planning and completion of this program for the good of all America.

BUTTERFLY ORCHIDS FROM HAWAII

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Delegate from Hawaii for the beautiful lei and for the beautiful butterfly orchids sent to all Members. I think we are all enjoying this tremendously and I know they have proved very decorative here on the floor today.

MONTEREY INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN STUDIES

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower, in his 1958 education message to Congress, said:

> Knowledge of foreign languages is particularly important today in the light of America's responsibility of leadership in the Free World. And yet the American people generally are deficient in foreign languages. * * * It is important to our national security that such deficiencies be promptly overcome.

The Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies, Monterey Peninsula, Calif., was founded several years ago with just these objectives in mind. This remarkable school was based on a new idea for teaching Americans about other countries.

> A civilization—
>
> They say—
>
> cannot be thoroughly apprehended, in all its important ramifications, without a knowledge of the language which is an expression of its spirit. Similarly, a language cannot be mastered without knowledge of the civilization which molded its form. Hence, the study of both should be combined. Moreover, civilizations should be studied as interrelated and as separate comparative units. This holds good for all their manifestations, but two forms, the spiritual and the political, control all the rest.

The institute has set up an intensive course of study based on these principles. All the classes and school life is conducted in the framework of the traditions and the language of the country being studied. All classes are small, being limited to 10 students apiece, so that close personal attention can be given to each student. Study is required not only in the language itself, but also in the culture, politics, literature, art, and religion of the country concerned. The institute pays close attention to its students after they have graduated, as well as during their course of study, giving them any needed assistance and guidance in furthering their education and careers.

At the present time, the institute is offering studies in Russian, French, German, Italian, and Spanish, with plans to expand the field of studies to include

Asia. Classes are held in the cloisters of the famous Mission of San Carlos Borromeo, in Carmel, Calif., founded by Padre Junipero Serra in 1776. However, the administration and policy of the school are completely nonsectarian. Its board of trustees and board of advisers include many well-known educators and California citizens.

I feel that it is of great importance to call attention to the Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies as an example of what we, as Americans, can do, and are doing, to increase our understanding and means of effective communication with the people of the world.

AWARD OF HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS TO THE HONORABLE ANTONI N. SADLAK

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable ANTONI N. SADLAK, was honored by the awarding of the honorary degree of doctor of laws at Georgetown University here in Washington yesterday, March 25. I am sure that the host of friends and admirers of Congressman SADLACK join in their congratulations to him on this occasion. No one in public life deserves this honor, conferred by his alma mater, more than he.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased indeed to read the citation of award.

The president and directors of Georgetown College, to all who shall view this document, greetings and peace in the Lord.

The true touchstone of a man's character, the unerring measure of his integrity and worth, is discovered in the threefold relationship governing all human life: in the fulfillment of his obligations toward the Creator; in the consistent agreement of his actions with his own accepted principles; and in the uprightness of his dealings with his fellow men, and the consequent influence he exerts among them. Of these, the first two qualities are indiscernible in themselves, but their validity is amply tested and illustrated in the latter. Thus, for example, the matter has been succinctly phrased by the Bard in his oft-quoted line: "To thine own self be true, thou canst not then be false to any man."

Our academic convocation today with deep pleasure honors an alumnus whose character and integrity are well illustrated by this norm. The high regard he enjoys among his fellow citizens is indisputably attested by his reelection, six successive times, to the Congress of the United States, not as the spokesman of a single district, but as the Representative at Large of the whole State—a singular political achievement in his native Connecticut. Time does not permit even a brief review of his record in the House, in support of measures salutary for his State and for the Nation; let stand as a single example his efforts for promotion of a sound policy of expanded foreign trade. Of more recent interest, however, is his cosponsorship of a bill calling for a 5-year program of study and revision of our total taxation structure. Deeply imbued with faith and confidence in our system of individual initiative, and in the justice of incentive rewards for individual endeavor, he has vigorously advocated a fairer distribution of the burdens of both personal and corporate taxation; to the end that the necessary imposts represent rather the mutual cooperation of Government and people toward a common goal, than the punitive price of successful and prosperous industriousness.

"Exemplary in his private life as in his public career, he served with distinction as a naval officer in the late war; and as a good citizen, has lent his name and his active interest to many humanitarian and progressive enterprises. Not least among these, his alma mater gratefully records his consistently loyal and generous support of her endeavors.

With pride and pleasure, then, Georgetown hails an outstanding graduate, who learned in her halls not only the principles of law, but the deeper principles of justice and of high regard for his fellow men. As a mark of her admiring approval, in virtue of her Federal charter from the Government of the United States, Georgetown University creates and proclaims the Honorable ANTONI NICHOLAS SADLAK, doctor of laws, honoris causa.

In testimony whereof we have issued these, our formal letters patent on this annual celebration of Founder's Day, the 25th of March, 1958, of Georgetown College the 169th year.

EDWARD B. BUNN, S. J.,
President.
JOSEPH A. SELLINGER, S. J.,
Secretary.

LET'S STOP INTERVENING IN CUBA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last week the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] brought a grave matter to the attention of the House when he published on page 4948 of the RECORD a list of arms said to have been sent to the Cuban Government from the United States in the last 2 years. The gentleman does not say if these armaments were purchased by the Cuban Government or sent by the United States under our mutual security agreement with Cuba. In any case, he has done a service in opening up the question of United States policy at this critical juncture in Cuban affairs.

I trust a review of Cuban events on the floor of Congress will not bring outcries of "intervention." I am concerned with American-Cuban relations. I ask only that we examine with great care the effects of our Cuban policy—or lack of policy—upon United States prestige among the Cuban people, in Latin America, and indeed, as my esteemed senior colleague has pointed out in the Senate, in Asia as well.

Briefly, the Cuban crisis and our involvement is this. In 1952, several months before scheduled presidential elections, General Batista seized power by a bloodless coup from the constitutionally elected president, Dr. Prío. United States relations with Cuba under Dr. Prío had been cordial, and President Truman awarded Dr. Prío the Legion of Merit for his cooperation. In 1954 Batista won an election in which he was the only candidate.

Batista's disruption of constitutional procedures rankled in some sectors of the population. On December 2, 1956, a young lawyer named Fidel Castro landed a small invading force in eastern Cuba. Presently holed up in the Sierra Maestra, with forces estimated at 1,000, Castro initiates guerrilla forays which cannot unseat Batista in Habana but which have become the bane of Batista's existence. Castro's revolt symbolizes to many Cubans their unquenchable urge for a just and merciful government under law.

Last year, in Congress, our beloved and distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], whose enthusiasm for freedom and democracy led him to join the battle for Cuban independence, gave a wonderful description of the Cuban spirit that goes a long way to explain the character of the present Cuban revolt. Mr. O'HARA declared:

Wherever the seeds of freedom are planted the very soil in which they are deposited takes on the hues of a rare radiance. Strange indeed if the soil of Cuba should not, in a very much magnified measure, be fertile for the growth of the seeds of freedom because for many, many long years, when the odds opposing were terrifying, the sons and daughters of Cuba held firmly and uncompromisingly to their ideals of government for, of, and by the people with reverence for God and respect for the dignity of man.

Batista has tried to give the impression that the revolt against his regime is confined to Castro's forces in Oriente Province. Yet the Associated Press reports from Havana that about 50,000 students struck to protest what they called "a reign of terror." According to the report:

Classrooms were empty from the easternmost Oriente, stronghold of Fidel Castro's rebels, to westernmost Pinar del Rio.

Last month more than 40 religious and professional groups, whose names sound like a roster of Who's-Who Among Respectable Organizations, signed a public statement denouncing Batista's latest farce, an attempt to hold elections on June 1.

With Oriente Province in a state of siege and many of Batista's opponents in exile, it was apparent that Batista was trying to foist his candidate on the electorate. Signers of the statement, declaring the government's preparations to be the most scandalous fraud in the electoral history of Cuba, included the National Bar Association, the National Medical Association, the national associations of architects, public accountants and engineers, the Teachers Association of Havana Province, the Association of Newsmen of Havana, the young men's and young women's federations of Cuban Catholic Action, the Knights of Columbus, the Supreme Council of 33d Degree Masons, the Cuban Council of Protestant Churches, and the board of governors of the Lions Club.

A year ago in June, taking General Batista at his word that he genuinely desired free elections and hoping to stop further bloodshed, I wrote to him respectfully suggesting that he could invite the United Nations or the Organization of American States for help in conducting elections. If his party had then won at the polls, in elections supervised by a respected and disinterested international organization, none

could have protested the results. For this suggestion of a peaceful solution to avoid what promised to be a tragic bloodbath, I was accused of intervention and awarded with a din of vituperation from Batista's controlled press.

Almost a year has transpired since then and the situation in Cuba has steadily deteriorated. In the words of Macbeth, "Blood will have blood." Rebel terrorism generates government reprisals, government reprisals bring rebel revenge. In this process both rebels and government forces have perpetrated unspeakable deeds that outrage decency.

Bloodletting and horror have congealed the determination of both Castro and Batista to fight on to uncompromising victory. Caught in the crossfire is the mass of Cuban people. All they ask is to pursue their daily lives in peace and freedom. Can we help them? Will we help them? How?

In these circumstances, United States armaments are being used by the Batista government to maintain power, in violation of our solemn mutual assistance agreement.

This is not a base rumor, spread by those opposed to Batista to compromise his position with the United States. Nor is it a Communist-inspired rumor, intended to heap discredit upon the United States for its help to dictators. Indeed, although it may serve both these purposes, it is not rumor at all. Dick Rubottom, the able and conscientious Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 5 replied to questioning as follows:

Senator MORSE. Would you say in the case of Cuba our military aid strengthens the retention of that dictatorial form of government?

Mr. RUBOTTOM. Senator, the Cuban Government is certainly using the military equipment at its disposal to beat back armed insurrection which, as you know, started I think in November of 1956.

Furthermore, in a letter to me dated January 14 from William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, the following is stated:

Cuba has received arms from the United States as grant aid, which arms, pursuant to section 105 (b) (4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, may be used only in the implementation of defense plans agreed upon by the United States and Cuba, under which Cuba participates in missions important to the defense of the Western Hemisphere. This condition is also included in the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement with Cuba of March 1952 which covers grant and military assistance. Article 2 of that agreement provides that this equipment will be used only for the purposes for which supplied unless the prior consent of the United States has been obtained.

Thus it follows, if Batista is using the military equipment at his disposal to beat back armed insurrection, and if both section 105 (b) (4) of the Mutual Security Act and the Mutual Assistance Agreement with Cuba specify that United States equipment cannot be used for such purposes, clearly the intent of Congress is being breached brazenly and General Batista is violating the terms of his agreement.

Americans along with many others were profoundly shocked by the French attack on the Tunisian village of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef. We especially deplored the use of seven United States Corsair fighter planes which had been donated to France for NATO purposes only. Although the attack was French, and a breach of France's treaty obligations with the United States, the United States is reaping harvest of resentment almost as bitter as if we had participated in the bombing of that helpless village. That it would take much effort to repair the psychological damage to our moral position in North Africa, the Arab world, and beyond, was immediately recognized by Congress and the press. In the light of our horrified and immediate response to the Tunisian case, how can we explain our reticence to denounce with equal vigor Batista's misuse of United States military equipment?

The casualties at the crushing of the Cienfuegos uprising in September numbered 600, with some 60 deaths. Batista used United States mutual assistance military equipment to crush that combined revolt of rebel, naval, and civilian forces. It has been used on other occasions in the civil strife in Cuba. And still we send more. Is it any wonder that many of the decent Cuban people protest our contributions to the bloodletting in their country?

I am convinced that the United States, foresworn from intervention in Latin America, in fact has intervened in the Cuban affair, albeit unintentionally. The fact is that we do maintain military missions in Cuba and that we do send Batista military supplies. The fact is that the Department of Justice, in zealous pursuit of its duty, ordered the arrest and detention of Dr. Prío Socarrás and others for violating our neutrality laws in conspiring on United States soil to overthrow the Batista regime. If we aid Batista and cut off aid to the rebels, we in effect are intervening in Cuban affairs. And we are, as surely as in the case of Sakiet-Sidi-Youssef, identifying the United States with the oppressor.

Mr. Rubottom in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee alleged that, and I quote:

Our military aid * * * has made little difference as far as [Batista's] position is concerned.

Be that as it may, the continued flow from the United States of lethal weapons to Batista only serves to identify us with his unpopular regime.

If, as also alleged, Batista can buy weapons elsewhere anyway, I say let him try. At least we will have the satisfaction of not being a party, on any side, to the deplorable fratricide in Cuba.

Speaking of identifying the United States with the oppressor, you may be appalled, as I was, to learn of another case in Cuba. Several months after the massacre at Cienfuegos, Gen. Truman Landon decorated Col. Carlos Tabernilla y Palmero, chief of the Cuban Army Air Force, with the Legion of Merit. Tabernilla's citation reads for "exceptionally meritorious conduct in the furtherance of amicable relationships between the Cuban Army Air Force and the United States Air Force." Colonel Tabernilla is the officer who conducted the air raids on Cienfuegos. Such disregard for the sensitivities of the Cuban people, I am satisfied, was not intentional, but rather evidence of the urgent need for the State and Defense Departments to maintain better liaison.

With some $774 millions in private United States investments in Cuba, with about one-third of our needed sugar coming from Cuba, with Cuba purchasing some $610 million worth of United States exports, and with some 4,500 Americans resident in Cuba, we cannot view the Cuban situation with indifference. A prolonged civil war will make capital shy of investing in Cuba, to the detriment of Cuba's economic progress as well as to the United States investor. It will dislocate our two-way trade, so essential to the well-being of both participants. But over and above economic and strategic considerations, the needless loss of life is grievous to contemplate.

Of course, the solution for the crisis in Cuba must be a Cuban solution. But we should seek by every legitimate means to avert the threatening holocaust.

There are certain steps we can take. We can halt armaments shipments to Batista. By doing so we announce to our Cuban friends, of all factions, that we will not be a party to bloodshed. By this means we will also broadcast to the rest of Latin America, Africa, and Asia that it is not the United States which is helping to keep an unpopular dictator in power. We may have stopped arms shipments from what I hear unofficially. If so, we should make this fact public.

Secondly, we should withdraw our military missions from Cuba. Presently, we have 11 servicemen in the Army mission, 11 in the Air Force mission, and 9 in the naval mission. With popular feeling against the Cuban armed forces running so high, it is pointless to go on with a business-as-usual attitude. Moreover, the designers of the agreements which provide for Army, Navy, and Air Force missions, in their wisdom, stipulated that either party may cancel the said agreements in case of hostilities, whether foreign or domestic. It is completely in accord with the agreements for us to withdraw our military missions until such time as tranquillity returns to the island republic.

Withdrawal of military aid and military missions would put an end to the frequent accusations that the United States supports one faction against another. Withdrawal would leave the Cubans with no one but themselves to blame.

On the positive side, we should use every peaceful means at our disposal to promote a settlement in Cuba. It now appears that Cuban partisanship, made intemperate by the blood which has already been shed, desperately needs in impartial mediating influence. The majority of the Cuban people passionately wish an end to terrorism and a peaceful settlement at the ballot box. They can look to the United Nations or to the OAS for help. The idea of U. N.

help is not original. United Nations observers watched elections in Greece in 1947. A U. N. commission supervised the 1948 elections in the Republic of Korea. U. N. observers also were on hand to observe plebiscites in French and British Togoland. Here in the Western Hemisphere, Costa Rican elections went smoothly this year under the gaze of U. N. observers, with no recriminations possible at the conclusions of the elections.

I have taken these matters up with the State Department. On March 12, 1958, I received a letter from Assistant Secretary Macomber of the State Department. In part, it said:

In the circumstances presently existing in Cuba, I do not believe that the United States Government should take the lead in proposing international supervision or observation of the forthcoming elections since this would constitute interference in an internal matter of concern to the Government of Cuba and the Cuban people.

* * * * *

The Department has been studying the matter of the request for information on arms shipments to Cuba which you included in two recent letters. You will recall that, in my letter of January 27, I stated that the information you had previously requested was classified as confidential but that the question would be reviewed to see whether any details on shipments could be made available for your use. As a result of this review, the Department has concluded that the information is of such a nature that it should not be disseminated outside the executive branch at this time. I regret, therefore, that I am unable to provide you the information you desire. I can assure you, however, that the amounts of military equipment furnished on a grant basis are, in the opinion of the responsible United States military authorities, the minimum required to permit Cuba to carry out its hemispheric defense obligations and that the volume of sales of equipment which have been made is very modest.

Since March 12 the situation in Cuba has deteriorated. Civil liberties are gone again. Violence has increased and more violence is on its way for shortly after the first of April.

The State Department, understandably has been promoting a peaceful and just transference of power from Batista. No such transference now appears probable or possible. It is time we faced that fact and acted accordingly.

We can and should cut off arms shipments to Batista and withdraw our military missions. We alone should not seek to mediate, but we can join with other nations to help the men, women, and children of Cuba, the people in the deadly crossfire, by calling in the United Nations and the Organization of American States for their highest duty; namely, to bring human rights and peace where tyranny, torture, fear, and death now prevail.

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

BATISTA TO FIGHT

(By Jules Dubois)

HABANA, CUBA, March 20.—President Batista has told his friends that he does not intend to fall as other Latin American dictators, such as Juan Peron, of Argentina, have gone out. He has said he will fight to the finish.

Thus the number of dead and wounded here in the weeks to come may swamp the daily toll of a dozen or more than is recorded throughout the island.

Many Cubans will blame our State Department and the Ambassador, Earl E. T. Smith, for the situation. Our Embassy and State Department are in the doghouse with the Cuban people again.

PEOPLE ASSAIL UNITED STATES

Cuban public opinion, although throttled by the most severe censorship ever exercised by Batista, is outspoken against the United States. The people, from the leaders of the civic, religious, professional, and social institutions who demanded Batista resign, to the students, accuse the United States of pursuing a policy to support a dictator and lose the friendship of a nation.

Smith is being branded as worse than his predecessor, Arthur Gardner. Yet when he first arrived he was a hero to the Cuban people and managed to erase the animosity that had been engendered by Gardner.

POLICY CHANGE SEEN

The reason for the change of mind in Cuba appears to be a change of policy by the State Department since last August, when Smith's blunt statement after police brutality at Santiago de Cuba, a statement backed by Secretary of State Dulles, almost toppled Batista.

Cubans, more than 90 percent of whom are trying to oust Batista, insist that the latter is being retained in office by the United States. When it is explained to them that the policy of our State Department is one of correctness and neutrality in this civil war, they reply: "Yes; we know. You Americans are very correct and very neutral on the side of Batista."

A DENIAL BY SMITH

Smith has contributed to this thinking by attempting to persuade political and civic leaders here that the only solution to Cuba's crisis is a presidential election and not the overthrow of Batista by force. Smith has told this reporter that those are his instructions from Washington.

He denies that he is the architect of the policy to try to keep Batista in office until he can surrender the government gracefully to an elected successor. Batista is backing former Premier Andres Rivero Aguero for the presidency.

Cubans who talk to Smith immediately transmit their views to friends and these spread like wildfire and in the most exaggerated and inaccurate versions.

NONINTERVENTION POLICY

The policy of our State Department is one of nonintervention in the internal affairs of Cuba. The Cubans who talked to Smith say that they did not ask him to intervene, but told him that a really correct and really neutral attitude by our State Department and Embassy here can avoid the almost certain blood bath and destruction of Cuban and American property that will result when the rebels launch their final drive to try to oust Batista.

Opponents of Batista insist that Smith has been captured by Batista's friends and business associates just as Gardner had been.

They add that he has accepted the Batista propaganda that Fidel Castro and his top rebel leaders are Communists. Batista has been shouting this line to the world ever since Castro landed here from Mexico in December 1956.

YANK MEETS LEADERS

When Smith learned that the civic institutions headed by Dr. Raul De Velasco, president of the Cuban Medical Association, were going to demand Batista's resignation, he called for a meeting with the latter. It was held at his residence last Saturday.

Smith pleaded with Velasco not to close the door to Batista and to enable the latter to settle the crisis through elections. Velasco says he replied that his was a fallacious policy with the entire nation in arms against Batista and that the only solution was for the latter to go.

Velasco informed the heads of the civic, religious, professional, and social groups of Smith's point of view. Their answer was to issue their historic demand Sunday night that Batista resign.

Batista financed the registration of the Dr. Carlos Marquez Sterling party and other opposition parties. The majority of the people here, from the youth to the elders, insist they will continue the insurrection until they oust Batista or die in the process.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PANAMA CANAL ZONE: CONSTITUTIONAL DOMAIN OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have been privileged to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with assignments to subcommittees for the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and related agencies. The last includes the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government.

Thus, in the course of my duties, our subcommittee has encountered various problems relating to the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally, both in Washington and during visitations on the Isthmus and in other areas of the world. To their study I have devoted much time and effort, and have made a number of statements to the House as well as to its legislative and appropriation committees expressing some very definite views on significant phases of the Panama Canal question.

Since my first association with this subject, I have noted that ever present in the Isthmian setup are the relations between the United States and the Republic of Panama. Though these in the main have been satisfactory, I have also observed that special situations affecting the welfare of the Panama Canal enterprise periodically arise and that, accordingly, they require repeated clarification.

A recent incident in Panama, because of its grave implications, emphasizes that the Congress and the Nation should be informed further with respect to current hazards for this vital outpost of the United States.

What I say here today, I wish to assure our friends in Panama and in all Latin America, will be spoken with the utmost sincerity, good will, and affectionate esteem. I certainly would not advocate any policy except one of the fullest measure of justice and generosity for Panama; and I feel that not only have we been just in our Panamanian relations, but as hereafter shown, most generous, indeed.

However, I do believe that the time has come when extreme and radical demands for the surrender by the United States of all its power and jurisdiction in and about the Panama Canal require a frank expression of views by those in authority in the United States. To this end I venture now to address myself and request that there be no interruptions or questions propounded until I conclude.

CRISES AT SUEZ INTERACT AT PANAMA

Mr. Speaker, the American isthmus is the crossroads of the Americas, and as such has long been a topic for extended debate in the Congress. The statesmen who preceded us here and who early in this century evolved the foundations of our interoceanic canal policies, have long since passed from the scene. Nevertheless, the great monuments of their endeavors in the form of the completed canal at Panama and the treaties under which it was constructed and has been subsequently maintained and operated still remain—with the exception that certain of the treaty provisions have been generously liberalized in behalf of Panama.

The Panama Canal is not the only great interoceanic waterway; the other is the Suez. Discerning students and writers on canals have long recognized the sympathetic relationship between these two mighty interocean links and their mutual variances and influence—an interaction dramatically brought into focus by the nationalization, on July 26, 1956, of the Suez Canal by Egypt.

This drastic action at Suez was followed by voluminous propaganda aimed at wresting ownership and control of the Panama Canal from the United States and transferring its jurisdiction to some international or other authority.

Much of that uproar came from Soviet Russia and its satellites, but some came from persons who occupy high office or position in the United States. The latter, wittingly or unwittingly, have fostered what has been a long-term Communist design that dates back to the critical days of the Russian revolution in November 1917.

At that time one of the subjects discussed by the Red guard with John Reed was the internationalization of the Panama Canal. John Reed, as you doubtless know, was a notorious American Communist reporter who covered that great political upheaval and, on his death in 1920, was "canonized" by the Soviets and buried with high Soviet honors in Red Square by the Kremlin wall. And that, Mr. Speaker, was more than 40 years ago—see John Reed, Ten Days That Shook the World, Modern Library, 1935, page 235.

Regardless of its origin, or the good intentions of some who have supported this sinister aim, their demands conform to the well-known pattern of penetration and subversion featuring the tactics of the international communistic conspiracy. This clamor reached alarming proportions by early 1957 and had to be combated.

EXPOSURES SERVED TO HALT ADVERSE PROPAGANDA

In an address to the House on May 29, 1957, following my last visit to the isthmus, I discussed at considerable length the juridical basis of United States ownership and control of the Panama Canal, and its diplomatic history since opening to traffic.

Previous to my address, Representative BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, on May 24, spoke to the House on the same theme and included a panel discussion, by recognized authorities, of the diplomatic angles of the Suez and Panama Canal problems, and their basic differences.

These two addresses, together by their clarifications, served to halt for a time the 1957 adverse propaganda campaign against the United States on this subject, especially in Panama.

Even though the Isthmian uproar subsided, it was realized that under present world conditions the calm could not last indefinitely, for the Suez affair had made too strong an impact on the radical elements in Panama and elsewhere, with a renewal of the Communist "hue and cry" for the abrogation of United States ownership and control of the Panama Canal. The only questions were when and in what form would it next arise.

PROPAGANDA IN PANAMA REVIVED

In an historical sense it did not take long. On December 16, 1957, before the Second Congress of Students in the City of Panama, Republic of Panama, Dr. Ernesto Castillero, Vice Minister of Foreign Relations of the Republic of Panama, in the principal address on that occasion, and in line with Communist declarations and policy, attacked the juridical basis of the United States sovereign control over the Canal Zone and its ownership of the Panama Canal. This he did in spite of the negotiation of the Eisenhower-Remon Treaty of 1955 now being implemented.

Featured by gross distortions and omissions, as well as nonfactual statements, the principal features of his address merit listing with brief comment. These are:

First. Assertion that Panama is the "titular sovereign" of the Canal Zone just as Egypt is over the Suez Canal—a gross misstatement of the facts.

Second. Claim that under the 1936 treaty both countries have a "joint and vital interest" in the conduct of the enterprise—a statement erroneously implying joint sovereignty.

Third. Statement that the doctrine of the Suez Canal has analogies applicable at Panama and that this allegation has "impressed strongly world opinion because of the clear warning it involves"—an implied threat against the United States.

Fourth. Declaration that Panama is not receiving the benefits to which, as a partner with the United States in the canal enterprise, it is entitled—a nonfactual statement as Panama, under the treaties, is not a partner but a beneficiary.

Fifth. Assertion that, without going into "legalistic discussions or interpretations of previous treaties," Panama should receive half the gross income of the canal enterprise—a wholly absurd and unjustifiable claim that ignores realities.

Promptly accepted by the university student congress and backed by Aquilino Boyd, Panama's Minister of Foreign Relations, Dr. Castillero's proposals formed the basis of a resolution by that body and were published in the press of the world.

Creating a new wave of propaganda, immediately seized on, reiterated, and augmented by Communist agencies everywhere, this campaign is directed toward the total liquidation of United States sovereignty and control of the Panama Canal.

In this special connection, it is well to note that the proverbial practice of Communist forces is to spearhead subversion in the Free World by means of student bodies. As evidence of such procedures, I have in my possession a picture taken on January 28, 1958, at the University of Panama. Mounted in large letters above the name sign of that institution, which is visited by thousands of tourists en route to various parts of the world, is the inscription, "el canal es nuestro"—the canal is ours.

Do not these extremists and radicals in Panama realize that the high economic standards they now enjoy are primarily due to the canal and the beneficent policy of the United States toward Panama? Do they wish to kill the goose that lays the golden egg? Are they trying to cause selection of a site outside Panama for a new canal to take care of ever-growing trans-Isthmian shipping? Do they wish to destroy the best interests of their own country?

These and other searching questions that could be presented suggest that these elements should engage in extensive self-examination before embarking on their present hazardous course. It is indeed surprising, Mr. Speaker, that such troublemakers did not wait until the United States had expended vast sums on modernization of the existing canal and then agitate for taking over a far more valuable project.

ISTHMIAN AGITATIONS WIN WIDE PRESS COVERAGE

In order that accounts of these latest outcrys and demands in Panama may be readily available to the Congress, our people, and others concerned, I include to be inserted at the end of my remarks, and commend for careful examination, a selection of clippings from United States, and Latin-American newspapers.

ISTHMIAN HISTORY WELL DOCUMENTED

What is the significance of this incident of December last when high government officials of the Republic of Panama undertook to lead in a movement designed to upset the juridical basis for the Panama Canal enterprise and the equitable relations between the two countries, as well as to ignore and disregard recent treaty provisions? To answer these questions adequately it is essential to know the diplomatic history of the Republic of Panama as well as that of the Panama Canal, the construction of which was undertaken by the United States as a mandate of civilization.

These subjects, as shown by an excellent documentation on the Isthmian

Canal policy of the United States, prepared by the gentleman from Texas, Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1955, have been recorded in authoritative writings and addresses listed therein. These and many other statements published in later issues of the RECORD are commended for perusal, especially by those concerned with the diplomatic features of the canal subject.

The situation at Panama has now become acute, and demands our prompt attention. In the light of ascertainable facts the statements by these radical elements indeed constitute pure jingoism and impossible demands. Their rantings do a great disservice both to Panama and the United States and must be met forthrightly before the present crisis worsens.

PANAMA CANAL—RESULT OF LONG-RANGE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Because of the importance of the juridical base for the Panama Canal enterprise, in grasping the essentials of the current situation, I shall emphasize again what I said to the House on May 29, 1957.

The legal foundation of our interoceanic waterway consists of three key treaties:

First. The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 between Great Britain and the United States, which facilitated its construction and adopted the main points in the Convention of Constantinople of 1888 as rules for its operation, regulation, and management.

Second. The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of November 18, 1903, between the Republic of Panama and the United States. On the part of Panama, this treaty granted to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control of the Canal Zone for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal as if the United States were sovereign of the territory, and most significantly, to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama, of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority. On the part of the United States, the main point was that it guaranteed the independence of the Republic of Panama, which had just seceded from Colombia and whose existence as a separate nation, as will be discussed later, absolutely depended on the United States recognition and success of the canal enterprise.

Third. The Thomson-Urritia Treaty of April 6, 1914, proclaimed March 30, 1922, between the United States and the Republic of Colombia, the sovereign of the isthmus prior to the Panama revolution of November 3, 1903. That treaty aimed at removal of all the misunderstandings growing out of the political events in Panama in November 1903, restoration of the cordial friendship that had previously existed between Colombia and the United States, and definition and regulation of their rights and interests with respect to the Panama Canal.

The negotiation of these treaties, it should be stressed, was not accidental, but the result of long-range interoceanic canal policies of the United States developed over many years. Not only have the requirements of these treaties been carefully followed throughout the history of the canal enterprise but, in addition, the treaties are now mentioned in Public Law 841, 81st Congress, approved September 26, 1950, popularly known as the Thompson Act. This law specifies that the levy of tolls is subject to their provisions.

COLOMBIA'S INTEREST PROTECTED BY TREATY

Because of the importance of the Thomson-Urritia Treaty, and the fact that it is not as well understood as it should be, I shall summarize its principal provisions.

In article I, Colombia recognizes the title to the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad as "now vested entirely and absolutely in the United States of America, without any encumbrances or indemnities whatever." Furthermore, this article states that Colombia shall enjoy certain rights with respect to the canal, which include:

First. Transit through the canal of Colombian troops, materials of war, and ships of war, without paying any charges to the United States.

Second. Exemption from any charge or duty on the products of the soil and industry of Colombia passing through the canal, as well as Colombian mails, other than those to which the products and mails of the United States may be subject.

Third. Exemption of Colombian citizens crossing the Canal Zone from every toll, tax, or duty to which the citizens of the United States are not subject.

Fourth. Use of the Panama Railroad or any other railroad substituted therefor, in event of interruption of canal traffic, for the transport of troops, materials of war, products and mails of Colombia, paying only the same charges and duties as are imposed for such transport for the United States. In addition, officers, agents, and employees of the Colombian Government are entitled to passage on the railroad under the same terms as those of the United States.

Fifth. Transport by the Panama Railroad of Colombian coal, petroleum, and sea salt, in event of interruption of canal traffic, free of charge except actual cost of handling and transportation not to exceed one-half the charges levied on similar products of the United States.

In article II, the United States agreed to pay Colombia the sum of $25 million, which was done.

By article III, Colombia recognized Panama as an independent nation with boundaries as derived from the Colombian law of June 9, 1855, and agreed to conclude with Panama a treaty of peace and friendship to bring about regular diplomatic relations between the two countries. All this was accomplished, together with a treaty agreement between the two countries as to a boundary line.

While Panama was not a party to this treaty, yet she gave it her grateful moral acquiescence because of the supremely important benefits she derived therefrom.

Thus, it is clear that Colombia not only has substantial rights with respect to the Panama Canal, but also a treaty interest in the continued operation of the Panama Railroad, which is binding on the United States. Therefore, the abandonment of the railroad would constitute a violation of such treaty interest—a fact that hitherto has been overlooked, or ignored.

PEAK OF UNITED STATES ISTHMIAN INFLUENCE, 1903–39

The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, covering the cession by Panama of the Canal Zone to the United States and providing for the construction of the Panama Canal, was negotiated pursuant to the Spooner Act of June 28, 1902, which authorized acquisition and perpetual control of the Canal Zone to construct the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection, exclusively by the United States.

From the legislative and diplomatic history of that era, it is abundantly clear that the purpose of both the United States and Panama was to establish and maintain complete sovereignty over the Canal Zone by the United States, not only to assure the construction and proper operation of the canal in perpetuity as was provided in the Spooner Act and the 1903 treaty, but also—and mark this well—to give absolute guaranty that Colombia would never be able to reassert successfully its sovereignty over the Canal Zone, the Panama Canal, the Panama Railroad, or the Republic of Panama. Moreover, as previously stated, Colombia, by the treaty proclaimed in 1922, fully recognized and accepted these conditions.

By such important and significant facts the vast differences between the Suez and Panama Canals are strikingly shown. The fledgling Panama Government of 1903, intensely desirous of securing both life and freedom, found them in these treaty stipulations. Except for the Caesarean operation known in history as the Panama Revolution, out of which the independence of Panama resulted, and provisions of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, the Republic of Panama could never have survived; in fact, could never have been created. Besides, the United States would never have undertaken construction of the Panama Canal in a region then justly described as "the pesthole of the world" and long characterized as a land of endemic revolution that had repeatedly required the presence of naval vessels to maintain freedom of Isthmian transit.

These points were fully understood at that time by both Panamanian and American leaders. They realized that political stability was imperative for the success of the Canal enterprise—its construction, and subsequent maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection. They also recognized that such stability could be obtained only by vesting complete and exclusive sovereignty in the United States.

The great North American statesmen who developed our Isthmian policies included such eminent leaders as President Theodore Roosevelt, John Hay, John

Bassett Moore, Admiral John G. Walker, William Howard Taft, and Elihu Root. President Roosevelt always viewed the Panama Canal as the greatest accomplishment of his administration, and comparable in importance to the Louisiana Purchase. In essence, the results of their vision and efforts remained unimpaired until 1939—a period now recognized as the peak of United States influence on the Isthmus.

TREATY POWER UNDERMINES UNITED STATES AUTHORITY

With the passing of the years after opening the Panama Canal to traffic on August 15, 1914, increasing demands on the part of the Republic of Panama for revision of major provisions in the treaty structure developed. Not until 1936, however, was the first important step made with the signing of the Hull-Alfaro Treaty, which, because of opposition in the Senate, was not proclaimed until July 27, 1939, just prior to the start of World War II.

The Hull-Alfaro Treaty—unlike the 1903 Canal Treaty—was negotiated without authorization or direction of the Congress. As understood by realistic observers at the time, it marked a weakening of the dike in the diplomatic setup of the Panama Canal, but without impairment of the fundamental principle of United States sovereignty over the Canal Zone and the canal.

To better understand its important provisions, it should be noted that in the 1936 treaty Panamanian leaders sought the abrogation of the guaranty provision of the 1903 treaty because they felt that their country's independence was secure following the 1922 treaty between the United States and Colombia by which Colombia had recognized Panama as an independent nation, and believed that the elimination of the guaranty in the 1903 treaty, which they came to regard as Panama's "Platt Amendment," would add to their country's prestige.

While nowise abridging the sovereign authority of the United States over the Canal Zone and canal, the 1936 treaty did surrender important rights and privileges of the United States granted by the 1903 treaty, as for instance, the right of eminent domain for canal purposes within the Republic of Panama, all without any consideration except that of token character. It raised the canal annuity to Panama from $250,000 to $430,000 to compensate for reduction of the value of the gold dollar.

The crippling of the accessory powers of the United States, however, did not stop here. After prolonged secret negotiations started in 1953, the process was advanced much further in the Eisenhower-Remon Treaty proclaimed August 26, 1955, also negotiated without the authorization of the Congress.

This treaty gave away additional and most valuable rights and properties of the United States, also with little more than nominal consideration. It further increased the canal annuity from $430,000 to $1,930,000. The costs involved in these benefits to Panama will have to be borne either by transit tolls or taxes paid by American citizens, and may well jeopardize proposals for the amortization of the Panama Canal investment.

Certainly, the 1955 treaty was negotiated following long deliberations with the purpose and belief that the provisions would be accepted and relied on by both the United States and Panama for many years to come. Yet, the ink was hardly dry on that document before radical elements in Panama, echoing insistent Communist propaganda, have been, and are making the unrealistic and impossible demands to which I have now called attention.

To illustrate, it is well to note that the demand is being made that the United States pay to Panama one-half the gross revenue derived from the canal enterprise. These revenues during the last fiscal year were $50,774,000, but the net income was only $3,821,456, of which the present annuity to Panama of $1,930,000 is more than half. There is no wonder that the President of Panama promptly characterized this demand as unrealistic.

PANAMA RAILROAD LIQUIDATION NARROWLY AVERTED

Among the most unhappy features of the 1955 Canal Treaty was the surrender to Panama by the United States of valuable Panama Railroad property in the cities of Panama and Colon, including the terminal freight yards and passenger stations worth many millions, but excepting tracks in Colon required by switching for the Cristobal piers. Not only that, the treaty even contemplated abandonment of the railroad itself, which had been acquired by the United States pursuant to both law and treaty, with adequate compensation. Moreover, this move was made with complete disregard of the treaty rights of Colombia as to the railroad.

Apprised of the situation, Congressional leaders intervened. Under the able direction of the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Representative HERBERT C. BONNER of North Carolina, pursuant to House Resolution 118, 84th Congress, that committee conducted an independent inquiry into the railroad situation and submitted recommendations reversing those of the supervisory executive agency of the United States, the directorate of the Panama Canal Company, to liquidate the railroad. An account of this inquiry will be found in House Report No. 2974, 84th Congress. The resulting reversal, by the Congress, of the decision of the directorate, and the continuance of the railroad, was fully justified; as has also been the subsequent operation of the railroad.

The wise action of the Congress in these premises, however, was too late to save the tremendously important and valuable terminal facilities of this historic and strategic rail line.

Where does this leave us? Now, because there is no provision for replacement, we are going to have a transisthmian railroad without its originally designed and adequate terminal stations and yards. Unless Panama sells back these facilities to us—of course, at a tremendous price—new ones may well have to be constructed at our own expense.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, anything more absurd, or more ominous for the future proper conduct of our Isthmian policies? With all the capable men of broad experience in this Nation available, as was well illustrated by the railroad inquiry, why can they not be used in such situations to protect the legitimate interests of the United States and those of Panama and Colombia as well?

To say the least, our Department of State was asleep at the switch.

CANAL ZONE IS CONSTITUTIONAL TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES

The main lesson to be derived from the sustained surrenders of our Isthmian rights and prerogatives, all necessary for the proper maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal, extends beyond the limits of the Canal Zone and reaches into the very foundation of our constitutional form of Government.

As previously set forth, the acquisition of the Canal Zone and Panama Railroad was accomplished pursuant to the Spooner Act of 1902 and the 1903 Canal Treaty, with adequate compensation accorded. The Panama Canal was constructed and has been subsequently managed pursuant to laws enacted by the Congress. Thus, the full force of our Government system is implied in the evolution of our basic Isthmian Canal policies.

Long recognized by some of our great statesmen as part of the "coast line of the United States," the Panama Canal has deeper significance of far-reaching character.

The Panama Canal Zone, Mr. Speaker, is not an occupied territory, as was once erroneously reported to the United Nations by our Department of State—see Senate hearings on interlocking subversion in Government departments, part 19, March 25, 1954, page 1364. Instead, it is a portion of the constitutionally acquired territory of the United States.

Of course, if for any reason the United States should wholly abandon the canal enterprise, it would not likely wish to retain any interest or sovereignty over the Canal Zone. In such case, Panama could doubtless repossess the zone area without objection. Hence, from a practical, realistic standpoint, what purpose can these continued demands for recognition of Panama's "titular sovereignty" serve except that of creating unjustifiable friction between the United States and Panama?

Unfortunately, the surrenders culminating in the treaty arrangements still being implemented—though they have not abrogated or subtracted from our rights of sovereignty—have violated the clear intentions of the Congress and represent a threat to our national power. Certainly, the time has come when every Member of the Congress should realize what has happened: That, in large measure, we have given away our bargaining power in dealing with the Republic of Panama in regard to one of our most vital national possessions.

As has been clearly shown by numerous press and individual reports from the isthmus, the instant situation is acute.

Its proper resolution will require statesmanship of the highest order on the part of both the United States and Panama. This statesmanship, it is respectfully urged, should recognize the basic elements that enter the isthmian problem and not ignore them.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that this tragic policy of appeasement and giveaway did not originate with the present administration, but was inherited. This fact, however, should not prevent this administration, or any that follows, from taking proper action to safeguard our national interests now and in the future. This, I would respectfully submit, will be best for ourselves, best for Panama, and best for the world at large.

ISTHMIAN HISTORY MUST BE RESTATED

What is the explanation for this strange course of events. Many could be advanced, but of them the most telling is the gross ignorance of isthmian history that has developed since acquisition of the Canal Zone in 1904 and the starting construction.

New generations, both in the United States and Panama, have simply gotten away from historical facts that underlie our isthmian policies. Nor do they realize that the Republic of Panama grew out of the canal enterprise and not the canal project out of Panama.

When pondering these somber thoughts we must concentrate on how to restore just and realistic thinking. In my opinion, we shall never regain our bargaining power with Panama until there is a complete, fearless, and widespread restatement of some cold, hard facts of history and a reappraisal of them. This is the only way whereby we can produce men on both sides of the bargaining table who can fairly evaluate the respective rights, obligations, and responsibilities involved.

Meanwhile, our colleges and universities and writers of this hemisphere should delve into the subject from available sources and spread the story of the great waterway, of which the creation of the Republic of Panama was but a single, though important episode. In this, Mr. Speaker, the press can render a great service, and again I invite attention to the documentation on Isthmian Canal policy prepared by Representative THOMPSON of Texas to be found in the RECORD of March 23, 1955.

NO SUEZ AT PANAMA

The December 16 incident was no ordinary matter. Fostered by radical elements, some high up in the Government of Panama, and conforming to the program of the international Communist conspiracy, it seems aimed at lining up the nations of Latin America in support of Panama as was done among the Arab nations in support of Egypt. In that light, it represents an issue that the great countries of this hemisphere and their leaders must eventually face, for they well know what the results would be should such a movement ever materialize.

The combined exercises of United States Armed Forces in the isthmian area, April 21–27, 1957, which were observed by the representatives of 20 countries of this hemisphere, eloquently served to emphasize that no Suez crisis will be premitted on the American isthmus.

With this feeling, I have every reason to believe that our friends to the south will wholeheartedly join. Surely every consideration for their own self-preservation at this critical time of penetration and subversion requires such a commonsense attitude.

NATIONALISTIC AGITATION AT PANAMA INVOLVES SERIOUS DANGERS

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the headlines of the press, the United States has many friends among the people of Panama. To them I would suggest that demands emanating from their midst for nationalization of the Panama Canal or confiscation of its receipts, instead of making a case for Panama, are actually spreading the fires for internationalization—the long-range Communist dream.

Such internationalization both Panama and the United States would oppose. However, if brought about, how would Panama fare when subordinated to an international body as compared to the benefits derived from the country that fostered its birth? The answer is obvious.

A further point concerning the current agitation at Panama with its increased demands is the effect it must have on the Congress and the people of the United States to give fuller consideration to the subject of an alternate isthmian canal. This, as a matter of fact, is now being studied under the direction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Another observation about the situation at Panama concerns its relations with Colombia. If Panama, by sustained diplomatic maneuvering, can seriously weaken the treaty structure and secure abrogation by the United States of its key provisions, Colombia can do likewise. Then, because of the absence of any guaranty of Panamanian independence, what would be the outcome?

This would depend on what policy the United States might adopt, which no one can foresee. Certainly, our Nation cannot afford to accept grave responsibilities in the absence of adequate authority. To state the matter candidly, Panama, through securing abrogation by the United States of its guaranty of Panamanian independence, has succeeded in removing the greatest legal barrier to its eventual reabsorption by Colombia.

Also, may I ask, because of the abrogation of treaty provisions guaranteeing the independence of Panama, what would be the result if the United States should surrender all its power and authority as to the Panama Canal and Canal Zone? Would revolutionary practices immediately spring up in Panama as they did before United States occupation of the Canal Zone? And would Colombia reassert her former sovereignty? In the light of history, what is the answer? How the Communist world would revel in such a situation and how they would strive to exploit it.

Certainly the Panama Canal problem is so complex in character and so far reaching in its ramifications and consequences that it behooves all those in authority in the United States and Panama to think through every question presented before reaching conclusions and making decisions. This, in recent years, has not been done.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT NOW

In view of all the elements that enter into the present isthmian picture, the American people pose some telling questions: Why has our Department of State pursued its purblind policy of extreme concession and appeasement in dealing with canal crises over a period of many years? Why does it remain silent now, thus giving color to the radical demands of the extremists in Panama? Why does it not take a vigorous stand for the legitimate rights of our country, the exercise of which—I repeat—is best not only for the United States, Panama, and Latin America, but also for the entire world, and especially the maritime nations with vessels that transit the canal and have to pay tolls?

The more the Department of State procrastinates, the more important it is for the Congress, which is the ultimate authority, to make its own declarations of policy in the premises, to state clearly that there will be no further changes in the basic canal treaty, and that it is not going to stand for further liquidations of United States power and authority in and about the Panama Canal. Every legal and moral consideration, and the necessities for stability, demands that this be done.

To these ends, I urge prompt passage of House Concurrent Resolution 205 of the present Congress, the text of which follows:

Whereas there is now being strongly urged in certain quarters of the world the surrender, by the United States, without reimbursement of the Panama Canal, to the United Nations or to some other international organization for the ownership and operation of the canal; and

Whereas the United States, at the expense of its taxpayers and under, and fully relying on, treaty agreements, constructed the canal, and since its completion, at large expenditure, has maintained and operated it and provided for its protection and defense; and

Whereas the United States, following the construction of the canal, has since maintained, operated, and protected it in strict conformity with treaty requirements and agreements, and has thus made it free, without restriction or qualification, for the shipping of the entire world; and, in consequence of which, with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone, every just and equitable consideration favors the continuance of the United States in the exercise of all the rights and authority by treaty provided, and in the discharge of the duties by treaty imposed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) it is the sense and judgment of the Congress of the United States should not, in any wise, surrender to any government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in accordance with existing treaty provisions; and that (2) it is to the best interests—not only of the United States, but, as well, of all nations

and peoples—that all the powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions.

[From the Panama (Republic of Panama) Star and Herald of December 17, 1957]

PANAMA OFFICIAL FORESEES 50–50 ARRANGEMENT WITH UNITED STATES OVER CANAL

A new arrangement between Panama and the United States under which the two countries would share the income of the Panama Canal is foreseen by Panama's Vice Minister of Foreign Relations, Ernest Castillero.

Speaking before a student congress yesterday, Dr. Castillero said the enforcement of the Remón-Eisenhower treaty is proving that "that treaty is far from being the ideal solution" of the differences between the two countries.

Castillero, a student leader in his university days, delivered the principal address at the adjournment session of the II Special Congress of Students.

He devoted a large part of his address to a review of the achievements of the student movement since 1943, when it came to the fore in Panama's national life. The closing portion was devoted to foreign affairs, and specifically to the Panama-United States relations.

He said, in part:

"In November 1956, on the occasion of the United Nations General Assembly's debate on the Suez Canal crisis, the Foreign Minister certified before the entire world that the Panama Canal is built on Panamanian territory, that Panama is the titular sovereign of the Panama Canal Zone, just as Egypt is over the Suez Canal, and that it has granted to the United States of America only the rights, power, and authority necessary for the specific purposes of the maintenance, sanitation, operation, and protection of the canal, an enterprise in which as stipulated in the treaty of 1936, both countries have a joint and vital interest. Likewise, he set forth there, for enforcement at a future time which is not foreseeable now, the doctrine that the Suez Canal has analogies of various types with the Panama Canal, a statement which while rejected by the United States, has impressed strongly the world's opinion because of the clear warning it involves.

"In these circumstances, there is special significance to the complaint, supported daily by new facts, that our country is not receiving the benefits to which we in fairness are entitled as partners, with the United States, in the canal enterprise.

"Inasmuch as the enforcement of the Remón-Eisenhower treaty is showing that that treaty is far from being the ideal solution for these differences, it would not be strange if strength should be gained by a trend of opinion which maintains that Panama must arrive at an arrangement with the United States to receive half the income of the canal, without going into legalistic discussions or interpretations of previous treaties."

The Remón-Eisenhower treaty was signed in 1955.

[From the Panama (Republic of Panama) Star and Herald of December 19, 1957]

PROPOSAL ON CANAL SAID "UNREALISTIC"

President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr., feels that the idea of a 50–50 split of the Panama Canal's income with the United States is "not too realistic."

He indicated that since operating expenses and tolls are determined by the United States, Panama then would run the risk of getting nothing if the canal operations failed to show a profit.

Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs Ernesto Castillero, addressing a student meeting suggested such an arrangement for the future, saying that the present treaty is far from being the ideal solution to Panama-United States differences over the waterway. He referred to a split not of profits, but of income.

The presidential press office authorized the following statement in behalf of President de la Guardia.

"The idea, in my opinion, is not too realistic, inasmuch as operating expenses of the canal being established in the Canal Zone and tolls being fixed by the Congress of the United States, we would run the risk that the operation of the waterway would leave nothing.

"Even now we are striving for better salaries for Panamanian employees in the Canal Zone and it cannot escape anyone that a salary increase is an additional expenditure that would necessarily affect the earnings from the canal traffic."

After Vice Minister Castillero's address, the National Student Congress approved a resolution calling on the President and the Foreign Minister to undertake negotiations with the United States for sharing the canal's income.

In Washington some State Department officials appeared surprised at Castillero's statement, pointing out that a new treaty increasing the canal annuity from $430,000 to $1,930,000 was worked out in 1955.

[From the Panama (Republic of Panama) American of December 23, 1957]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA STUDENTS WANT CANAL NATIONALIZED

The Panama Students Federation (FEP) made it clear today that the nationalization of the Panama Canal is the ultimate aim of Panama students and the people.

A communique issued by FEP President Andres E. Castillo and Press Secretary Humberto A. Brugiati said negotiations aimed at getting Panama a 50 percent share of the revenues derived from Panama Canal tolls is only their immediate aim.

The communique further stated that the FEP would continue to fight for a revision of existing Panama-United States treaties until "our glorious national emblem flies with all its sovereign majesty over the Panama Canal."

Today's communique was the aftermath of a resolution approved by an FEP congress, asking the President and the Foreign Minister to negotiate a 50–50 division of Panama Canal income.

The resolution was presented and approved immediately after a closing address by Deputy Foreign Minister Ernesto Castillero, a former student leader, who said he would not be surprised if a trend toward negotiating a 50 percent share in Canal profits should gain force.

The idea was later branded as unrealistic by a spokesman for President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr.

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 30, 1957]

PANAMA RAISES OUTCRY FOR BIGGER TOLL SHARE

(By Marshall Bannell)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA, December 30.—An outcry has again started in Panama for an increase in the annual income received by the Republic from the United States for use of the Panama Canal area.

At present Panama receives $1,930,000 per year from the United States. This is more than double the amount paid annually 2 years ago and was agreed upon in a treaty signed by President Eisenhower and the then President of Panama, Jose Antonio Remon.

This increase in payments has not prevented further demands, however. Deputy Foreign Minister Ernesto Castillero recently, in a speech before a university student congress, demanded that the United States pay Panama 50 percent of the gross income from Panama Canal tolls. His proposal was promptly drafted into a resolution and passed by the student organization.

Canal tolls bring in well over $50 million per year and this would mean that, under Mr. Castillero's proposal, Panama would collect more than $25 million. There was no suggestion by the Deputy Foreign Minister that Panama should foot any of the canal expenses nor finance the present defense organization by the United States Air Force, Army, and Navy.

Panamanian officials complain that the Republic receives less than 4 percent of the total income from Canal tolls. The United States's answer, however, is that while gross income from Canal tolls was $88,677,449 in 1956 (highest in peacetime history), the net income after paying operating expenses was $4,179,464. And, they add, there were no charges made for the large defense forces maintained in the Canal Zone by the United States military services. The latter costs are classified information.

Even Panama's conservative President, Ernesto de La Guardia, agrees that a 50–50 split of the gross income from the Panama Canal is unrealistic and has said so publicly. But his words have not stilled nationalistic elements in Panama.

What concerns many serious-minded Panamanians and United States officials is that Panama, to use their own words, "may be cutting its own throat" through the continual nationalistic blasts at the United States.

They point out that early in December 1957 a subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine Committee, headed by Representative LEONOR SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, visited Panama and held public hearings in connection with the Panama Canal operations. One of the things they learned was that the Panama Canal is fast reaching its capacity and that either the present canal will have to be expanded or a new, sea-level canal constructed. Either will be a multibillion-dollar project.

No report will be made by the subcommittee until next spring. However, the members took time to visit several sites that have been proposed for the construction of a new sea-level canal. Their interest centered, according to Representative JOHN J. ALLEN, Republican, of California, on a route through Nicaragua. The United States holds perpetual rights to construct a canal through that country if and when a new one is needed.

So far, Gov. W. E. Potter, who heads the Panama Canal Company, the wholly United States Government-owned organization that operates the Panama Canal, has made no public comment on the clamor here for increased income for the Republic of Panama from the canal.

But many observers forecast that when the board of directors of the Panama Canal Company meet here late in January, the issue may be brought up and a statement issued. However, observers here point out that any change in the present status of payments to Panama for the use of the 10-mile-wide, 40-mile-long strip of land will have to be approved by the United States Congress.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 6, 1958]

NEW PANAMA CANAL NATIONALIZATION DRIVE ON

(By Edward Tomlinson)

The Government and the public in this country should get ready for an all-out hemisphere-wide campaign for nationalization of the Panama Canal.

High United States officials here in Washington don't like to talk about it. But the

idea has been snowballing in the minds of Panamanian politicians and nationalists ever since Abdel Nasser took Suez and got away with it.

PLAN FIGHT

Now, the university students, who always have spearheaded anti-United States sentiments in the Isthmian Republic, have organized to fight until "our glorious flag flies in triumph over the Canal Zone."

The students have received the tacit blessing of the Panamanian foreign ministry, as well as outstanding leaders of the country including the majority of living former presidents.

Efforts to wrest complete control of the vital waterway from the Yankees is nothing new, of course. Back in the 1930's an organization for the internationalization of the canal flourished. The leaders of the movement said the big ditch should belong to all nations. It was abandoned after the Roosevelt administration agreed to a number of revisions of the treaty in favor of Panama in 1936.

Another wave of nationalism swept the country after World War II, and anti-United States demonstrations became so violent that our military forces abandoned all wartime bases throughout the Republic. In 1954 widespread demands for more treaty revisions were made.

As a result, in 1955, we upped the annuity from $450,000 to $1,930,000, turned over vast amounts of Canal Zone property to the government of Panama and made many other concessions in addition.

Leaders of the campaign bluntly say that ultimate nationalization does not preclude demands for more and more treaty revisions in the meantime. Among immediate additional demands already being whooped up, is an equal division of canal revenues.

DIVISION NOTE

Note they want the revenues divided equally, not just the income. Nothing is said in the new propaganda about taking out expenses and other huge costs of operating, maintaining and protecting the colossal enterprise. The 1957 annuity amounts to more than half of the net income of $3,821,456.

Let no one think this campaign can be shrugged off, because Panama is a tiny, weak country. Egypt also is a tiny weak country. But backed by the whole Arab world in its Suez venture, it became a formidable power to be reckoned with. The Panamanians count on tremendous support from other Latin American nations.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 18, 1958]

PANAMA FACTION BIDS FOR CANAL REVENUE

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA.—What amounts to a national campaign for a 50–50 share in the gross revenue of the Panama Canal is being conducted by powerful groups in Panama.

The drive criticizes the United States for never having given Panama a fair share in the enterprise in which they claim they are partners.

The campaign, well financed and skillfully directed, gets prominent attention in newspapers here.

It is causing difficulties to Panama's capable President de la Guardia who is endeavoring to improve the already harmonious relations with the United States.

Observers see two major reasons behind this campaign. First, a few rich individuals and politicians are afraid that in a period of political calm like the present the scrupulous De la Guardia administration might investigate their private empires and take away some of their privileges.

ANTI-UNITED STATES AGITATION

Their aim is to use the press and radio to so stir up the people that they will agitate against the United States, demanding concessions impossible of attainment. This puts pressure on the President to comply with the demands of the Panama people. Thus, this reasoning goes, Senor de la Guardia has not the time to investigate activities of the instigators of this stratagem.

Also, this same pressure for impossible demands against Washington may tend to damage the President's good contacts with the United States Government.

Rumblings in the press, quoting utterances of ambitious officials, would seem to indicate that Panama ardently wants either nationalization or internationalization of the Panama Canal.

Neither is correct. The last possibility just does not exist. There never will be internationalization of the great waterway if Panama can prevent it, this correspondent has been assured. Local sentiment is summed up in a statement in a local paper which said that Panama does not need more people eating at its table.

Briefly, every dollar coming in would be welcomed, but no sharing of any largesse is contemplated.

LACK NEEDED KNOW-HOW

And what about nationalization? There is no doubt that Panamanians would welcome eagerly the canal's income and the flattering sense of possession of such a valuable property. But, individually and nationally, they shudder at the thought of trying to operate it. They do not have the know-how. Neither do they want the responsibility.

So all the hullabaloo about internationalization or nationalization is seen to be solely for political or economic reasons—either to hamper the present administration in Panama or to pressure the United States into more handout benefits to this country which claims partnership status in the Panama Canal.

Setting off current agitation in Panama was a statement made to a university student group by Dr. Ernesto Castillero P., Deputy Minister of Foreign Relations. He said Panamanians should aspire to a 50–50 share of the revenue of the Panama Canal.

It appears that either Dr. Castillero made the statement for applause value or because he had been asked to include it in his talk. Certainly, it became clear he had not given it much thought because when asked if he referred to the gross or the net revenue of the Panama Canal, he did not know. Finally, he said he was referring to the gross ($50,774,000 for the last fiscal year).

PLAYED UP IN PRESS

The Castillero statement was headlined in the press, some papers playing up the idea of getting more money from the United States, which currently pays $1,930,000 to Panama as an annuity as well as millions of dollars in salaries to Panamanian workers and more millions in purchases from Panama.

Immediately, Senor de la Guardia pointed out that such a suggestion was unreal. A businessman, the President knew that giving away half the gross revenue of the canal would not leave funds for the necessary salaries and expenses. While the President considered the proposal analytically, many of the people in the street considered it emotionally in terms of getting something for nothing.

Almost immediately, however, the Minister of Foreign Relations, young, attractive Aquilino Boyd, announced he backed Dr. Castillero's statement.

This sassing the President is understandable only because Senor Boyd is young, impetuous, and aspires to be President himself in 1960. This was his bid for the nationalistic vote in the future elections.

POLITICAL WEAPON

It is recalled that Senor Boyd also participated in the university roundtable conference on interoceanic canals last spring in Panama City. Reportedly, this conference was organized to embarrass the United States by having foreign nations declare its treatment of Panama "unfair." The conference backfired and was a fiasco.

A recent article typical of certain anti-United States statements says the Foreign Minister and Deputy Foreign Minister reflected the "just and legitimate aspirations" of the Panamanian people. The writer added that these two officials have said publicly what the people of Panama have been thinking for years.

The article ends with incendiary statement that, although the author is anti-Communist, he would be ready to organize and head a Communist Party here if by so doing Panama would get justice for its claims.

[From the Americas Daily, Miami Springs, Fla., of January 1, 1958]

UNITED STATES NOT CONCERNED ABOUT PROPOSAL OF PANAMA'S STUDENTS

WASHINGTON, December 31.—United States officials have refused to comment on the proposal of the National Student Congress of Panama that Panama be given half of the gross revenue from the Canal Zone.

Officials pointed out that the United States and Panama renegotiated their treaty in 1955 and both sides appeared to be satisfied with the provisions. Under the revised treaty Panama's annual share of the net profits of the canal was set at $1,930,000.

Under the proposed plan Panama's share during the fiscal year 1957 would have been $25,387,249.

A spokesman for President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr., described the proposal is "unrealistic." He said that since the Canal Zone Government establishes the costs of operation and the United States Congress sets the transit tolls, "we could be faced with a situation whereby the operation of the canal produced nothing."

The spokesman pointed out that Panama was seeking better wages for Panama citizens working in the Canal Zone.

[From the Americas Daily, Miami Springs, Fla., of January 29, 1958]

PANAMA TIRED OF TREATMENT AS JUNIOR PARTNER, ARIAS DECLARES—UNITED STATES-PANAMA WORKERS SHOULD GET SAME PAY

NEW ORLEANS, January 28.—A former Panama President said his nation is tired of being treated like a junior partner in the Panama Canal project.

Ricardo H. Arias, now Panama's Ambassador to the United States, said "Panama has not gotten the benefit it should have from the canal." He was here today to address the Mississippi Valley World Trade Conference.

After all, it is a partnership arrangement; we provided the land, and the United States the knowhow to dig the canal. But Panamanian workers, toiling side by side with workers from the United States, doing identical jobs, got less money than those from the United States," said Arias.

Arias said he hoped Congress would equalize the pay of United States and Panamanian workers in the Canal Zone. Such a bill passed the Senate last year, but died in the House.

Arias said an equalization of pay help quash the feeling among Panamanian students that the canal should be nationalized. He said he did not think talk of nationalization would hurt the bill's chances in Congress.

"You cannot tell a man doing the same job as the next fellow that he's going to get less pay," Arias said. "Panama is tired of being treated like a junior partner."

Arias served as President of Panama until 1956. He said he doubted the United States

would dig a canal through Nicaragua because of dissatisfaction with the Panama situation.

[From the Scripps-Howard newspapers]

PANAMA STEPS UP DRIVE TO TAKE OVER THE CANAL

(By Edward Tomlinson)

PANAMA CITY, February.—Nationalist politicians and the press are calling for "equal partnership in the operation of the Panama Canal," while several well-organized groups are demanding outright nationalization.

Newspaper editorials, columns and special articles flail away at Uncle Sam for "humiliating treatment" of Panama. El Dia refers to the "United States dominated canal" as "that imperialistic enterprise."

University students, always the tools or dupes of political agitators, rant against "North American desecration of our national integrity." A huge banner on the university grounds facing the main highway leading from the airport proclaims that "The canal is ours."

Significantly this catch phrase is much like the Brazilian Communist slogan, "The oil is ours," aimed at United States oil companies operating in Brazil.

Canal treaty revisions made by the Eisenhower administration in 1955 have brought numerous financial and economic benefits to Panama. The yearly payment was raised from $450,000 to $1,930,000. We returned to Panama $25 million worth of real estate in Colon and Panama City. Panamanian citizens working in the Canal Zone are now required to trade in Panamanian stores instead of the zone commissaries. But the newspaper La Nacion still calls it "the fraudulent treaty."

A columnist in the same paper says January 25, the anniversary of the signing of the document, "should be declared a day of national mourning."

Many of the newspapers do not even acknowledge the legality of the Panama Canal Company, the United States Government agency that operates the waterway. An editorial page column in La Estrella, the most important newspaper in the country, calls on the Government of Panama not to deal with the company on the grounds that "it is not a juridical body."

The Panama Government officially is behind this campaign. The Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Ernesto Casillero, has called for a 50–50 sharing of the canal revenue. Not the profits, mind you. The present annuity already amounts to more than half the annual net profits. He wants half the gross revenue, and no sharing of the expenses of operation.

The campaign is being stepped up to enlist the sympathy and support of other Latin-American countries. The University of Panama is staging an international seminar of hemisphere economists to consider the scope of the treaty.

Some newspapers go so far as to suggest that Panama should reestablish diplomatic and trade relations with Moscow. Says one columnist: "If Panama should resume diplomatic and trade ties with Russia, we would get sputniks, tractors and machinery. Along with every machine would come a Russian technician, and every technician would be a Communist."

In short, "If the Yankees won't turn the canal over to us, let's go Communist."

PANAMANIAN JINGOISTS IGNORE FACTS OF HISTORY

Mr. Speaker, the extreme lamentations in the various outcrys from the isthmus cannot remain unchallenged. All the world should know that Panama emerged as a sovereign nation under the protection of the United States, and that under this sponsorship it has grown and prospered, as was clearly foreseen by the founding fathers of that republic.

In the field of international relations it has been signally honored. Its statesmen have been members of important international commissions. Its flag now flies on hundreds of merchant vessels in various waters of the world.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it is high time to ask if the reckless demagogs and jingoists of Panama are going to cast down the ladder whereby their country rose to independence and eminence, or will the better judgment of its more thoughtful citizens, who are mindful of historic facts, prevail?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

BRISTOL BAY, ALASKA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the residents of Bristol Bay, Alaska, are victims of a grim tragedy. The people of this strategic area depend upon salmon for food, for income, for the foundation of their wholesome, resourceful, self-reliant way of life. During the past 10 years, they have seen the quantity and value of the red salmon yield decline approximately 50 percent. Three times, the President of the United States has declared Bristol Bay a disaster area.

Bristol Bay today is a sombre scene of disillusionment and frustration. Its residents, with characteristic respect for law and foresighted concern for the future, have dutifully observed governmental restrictions designed to promote the cause of conservation. Aware that the great salmon resource of Alaska was developed by the conservation practices of their fathers, and grateful to their forebears for this marvelous legacy, the people of Bristol Bay have willingly sacrificed so that future generations of producers and consumers might enjoy the benefits of Alaska red salmon. The decline of the red salmon yield is not a consequence of indifference to conservation on the part of the people of Alaska. Those who depend directly upon red salmon for their very way of life struggle valiantly to retain a heritage received from their forebears. All credit to them for doing so.

Unfortunately, the effects of the reduced salmon yield are evident not only in the saddened faces of the people of Bristol Bay. The stomachs of little children reveal the consequences of the decline. Reports of malnutrition have reached me from doctors in Alaska, who emphasize the health problem that exists among the fishing people of Alaska who struggle gallantly but sometimes unsuccessfully against the horror of starvation.

Mr. Speaker, a principal cause of the decline of the red salmon yield is no mystery. Modern science has afforded proof that Japanese capture of Alaska-spawned salmon on the high seas of the North Pacific is a basic factor in the creation of this critical situation. In its report accompanying House Resolution 451, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries said this:

> In the last few years, takings of salmon by Japanese fishermen in the North Pacific have risen from 2½ million fish per year to 60 million, a large number of which are believed to be of American origin, the taking of which will seriously affect future Alaskan salmon runs. United States fishermen are prohibited from catching salmon on the high seas.
>
> The scientific evidence to support these views is available to those charged with affording protection to the American fisheries on an international level.

We know that the Japanese fish on the west side of the provisional line, 175th meridian west longitude, under terms of the North Pacific Fisheries Treaty of 1952. They operate in season, 7 days a week. They use gill nets. They boast of having harvested during a 10-day period in June 1957 over 5 million red, or Sockeye, salmon.

We know that at 180°, where Japanese boats operate, 4 out of every 5 salmon are of Alaska origin. East of 180°, but still within the area wherein Japanese fishermen harvest, 9 out of 10 salmon are of Alaska origin.

This knowledge of the travels of America-spawned salmon has been achieved through careful study of parasites, scale rings, fin bones, and blood counts. Analysis of these factors has distinguished the American salmon from his Asian cousin. Scientific tagging operations have proved that America-spawned salmon travel west of the provisional line which the Treaty of 1952 tentatively established as the hypothetical limit of their salt-water journey. The line of 175th meridian west longitude is not sacred. It has no properties of magic. The protocol to the treaty of 1952 provided that it was established as provisional, and subject to confirmation or readjustment. The basic principle of the treaty was an agreement by Canada and Japan "to abstain from fishing" for salmon "originating in the rivers of the United States of America." In return, the United States agreed "to continue to carry out necessary conservation measures." I believe that readjustment of the provisional line is long overdue, and that failure of Japan to agree to readjustment is a shortsighted unwillingness to promote the objective of the treaty—the conservation of fishery resources for future generations. Indeed, the preamble to the treaty states that it is in the "common interest of mankind" to insure the maximum sustained productivity of the fishery resources of the North Pacific Ocean.

As spring is upon us, the days lengthen and the sun warms the earth and the spirit of man. But this year, Mr. Speaker, I see in the warmth of spring a cold shadow that threatens the way of life of over 7,000 Alaskans and perhaps countless other Americans. It is the shadow cast by the boats of Japanese fishermen, who even now prepare to

enter the North Pacific for another frolic among Alaska-spawned salmon. But this may well be the last season when our Japanese neighbors will be able to exploit a resource developed by virtue of the industry and sacrifice of American citizens, for scientists have asserted that another season's activity by the Japanese in harvesting the America-spawned sockeye may cause the extinction of the resource. Donald L. McKernan, Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, said only recently:

> Japan's high seas fishing policy threatens to exterminate the rich Bristol Bay salmon stocks of Alaska. * * * It is obvious from scientific evidence that a major part of this year's salmon run to Bristol Bay was intercepted by a foreign power on the high seas.

Cannot the commonsense, good will, and enlightened self-interest of Japan be invoked to prevent the destruction of Alaska sockeye salmon? Is a season's catch of Alaska salmon on the high seas worth the extinction forever of a great legacy? Would not Japan, and all the world, benefit by immediate action to save the Alaska salmon?

Mr. Speaker, the problem of Japanese capture of salmon of North American origin is not novel; what is novel is the urgently critical situation that now exists as a result of such Japanese activity and the fact that it is carried on contrary to the spirit of the Treaty of 1952. As long ago as 1937, our State Department protested Japanese fishing of America-spawned salmon, pointing out that "but for consistent adherence to a policy of conservation, the Alaska salmon fisheries unquestionably would not have reached anything like their present state of development." The State Department's protest of 1937 pointed out that the Alaska salmon resource was developed by the sacrifice of American fishermen. The protest went on to say:

> Because of such sacrifices, and the part that American citizens have played in bearing the cost of conserving and perpetuating the salmon resources, it is the strong conviction and thus far unchallenged view on the part of millions of American citizens on the Pacific Coast interested in the salmon industry and on the part of the American public generally that there has been established a superior interest and claim in the salmon resources of Alaska.
>
> It must be taken as a sound principle of justice that an industry such as described which has been built up by the nationals of one country cannot in fairness be left to be destroyed by the nationals of other countries.

That protest against Japan's fishing of America-spawned salmon was written 20 years ago. During the interim, we have fought and won a war against Japan. Thereafter, we negotiated with the Japanese on the basis of mutual respect, and together with Canada, three sovereign nations signed the treaty of 1952. Under that treaty, Japan accepted the principle of abstention and we covenanted to continue our conservation practices.

We have kept our covenants under the treaty. Americans do no salmon fishing in the international waters of the Pacific Ocean. Americans do not harvest immature fish, as the Japanese have been doing. In 1957, Americans in the area of Bristol Bay, Alaska, dependent as they are upon fishing, harvested fish only on an average of about 2¼ days per week during the peak of the fishery, which occurs from June 25 to July 25. At least 20 percent of the salmon caught by American fishermen in 1957 bore skin marks indicating that they had escaped from the small-mesh Japanese nets.

I believe we can take pride in our respect for our covenants and our proven attitude of friendliness. Our position stands out in shining contrast to the Russian position regarding fishing in the north Pacific. The Soviet Union bullyingly and bluntly informed the Japanese that Japanese nationals would not fish beyond the so-called Bulganin line, drawn solely by the Russians themselves, for their own convenience. Let the Soviet Union conduct itself in such a manner. American standards are higher. We have built a position of world leadership largely upon our willingness to go halfway with other sovereign nations, and I believe that we should always maintain that cooperative attitude.

However, I disbelieve the paradoxical contention that our position of world leadership forces paralysis of our efforts to protect a heritage of our people. Such a contention insults our diplomatic service. I believe that our negotiators in the State Department are forceful, sincere, and persuasive enough to protect American citizens in a rightful cause, without creating the impression that the United States, like the Soviet Union, is indifferent to the welfare of the Japanese people.

There is no inherent contradiction in a firm policy on behalf of Alaska's salmon heritage, expressed by a call to the Japanese Government to adhere to the spirit of the treaty of 1952, and friendly relations with the Japanese people. Our desire for peace does not require that we abandon a great God-given resource. As a constituent of mine at Bristol Bay stated, there is a difference between a foreign policy that is peaceful and a foreign policy that is pusillanimous.

Consider the advantages to Japan if we do nothing, and sit idly by while Japan ravages the America-spawned salmon once again. Our Japanese friends will harvest another season's bounty. In 1959, however, there may be nothing left, for them or for us.

Consider, on the other hand, the advantages to America and the world if the Japanese follow the principle of abstention in 1958 and thereafter. A way of life is preserved; a valuable resource is safeguarded for future generations; the people of Bristol Bay live on in self-reliant prosperity.

I think the equities of this situation are apparent, and that our National Government, "instituted among men" in order "to secure life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," has a clear moral obligation to the people of Bristol Bay to spare no diplomatic effort to prevent the extinction of sockeye salmon, a resource developed largely by the simple sacrifice of American nationals.

Mr. Speaker, the obligations of the United States, as leader of the free world, are complex. But they are not contradictory. Skilled diplomacy and clear insight into the goals of negotiation will light a path down which the United States can tread, always faithful to these obligations:

First. The obligation of the United States to those Americans of the past who have passed on a great legacy in our Nation's salmon resource.

Second. The obligation of the United States to those Americans who harvest and produce, for the world's benefit, the salmon of Alaska origin.

Third. The obligation of the United States to the people of the world. Our first obligation is to perform acts of peace. Our second obligation is to preserve natural resources upon which a crowded planet depends for sustenance. Forty years from now, this globe will be inhabited by over 4 billion people. Present problems of providing food for the world's population will seem negligible in the face of the demands of such numbers. Today, we mourn those instances in which our ancestors were careless with precious resources of the soil. Tomorrow, our descendants may mourn our carelessness or indifference regarding the precious resources of the sea.

Thus far, Mr. Speaker, I have outlined the urgency of the problem. I have indicated the extent of Japanese activity, and I have said that the United States should urge the Japanese to desist from further capture of Alaska-spawned salmon and that we do so without timidity.

We should do so with conviction that our cause is just. It is just from the standpoint of the treaty, whose underlying principle is abstention. It is just from the standpoint of our citizens and the food requirements of the world.

We should do so with a spirit of friendliness. We are sensible of the fact that Japan faces extraordinary economic difficulties.

They were outlined only last Thursday by one of Alaska's leading editors and publishers. Not long ago, Mr. Robert B. Atwood, editor and publisher of the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily Times, was in Tokyo with a group of editors during an around-the-world tour. While there Mr. Atwood examined into the Alaska fishing situation from the Japanese viewpoint and in his March 20 editorial wrote:

> From the Alaska point of view the problems are simple to solve. But when they are tossed into a hopper full of world problems, the simplicity is lost and a solution is difficult to find.
>
> Alaskans want the Japanese to quit catching Alaska-spawned salmon. There is evidence that the Japanese fishermen are picking up these salmon before they have a chance to get back to the spawning streams. This leaves the Alaskans with less fish to catch.
>
> Alaskans also complain that the Japanese invade the American markets with their fishery products, especially canned salmon and crab, and undersell the same Alaska products. The Japanese operations are conducted at less cost, making it possible for the product to be sold at a lower price.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The overall problem stems from the fact that Japan is the backbone of democracy and the free world in the Far East. She

is the strongest ally of the Western Nations in Asia and has tremendous potentials for further strengthening the position of the free world in the battle against international communism. Japan at present is anti-Communist. Russia has been a traditional hostile force and the people have no desire to joint the Communist bloc.

We appreciate Japan's cooperation in the struggle against communism. We know that the Japanese population, crowded into a small land area, is hard put to it to make a living. We know that the United States has given assistance generously for the sake of the island people and in self-interest. We know that the Japanese depend upon their fishing for sustenance in a way few other people do anywhere on this globe. If something is taken away, there must be a replacement. Our country should join with the Japanese Government in finding that replacement, of one kind or another, for the red salmon. We could offer scientific assistance to help the Japanese compensate for the loss of the coming season's America salmon catch. We could make available whatever surplus produce or capital is required to assist Japan in attaining a way of life that does not depend upon reaping what others have sown.

As I have sought to point out, this is not simple trade competition. This is not a proposition of a cheap Japanese product displacing an American product, produced at higher wages by American workmen with higher living standards. This is something quite different. I want to emphasize just as strongly as I can that it is certainly to the interest of the Japanese themselves, as well as imperative to the American interest and most especially to the Alaska interest, that this Japanese high-seas fishing of Alaska stocks be suspended, and promptly. If it continues, it will not only mean that this resource which must have been in being almost since time began will not longer be available to Alaskans. It will mean that it will not be available to anyone. It will not be available because it will have been destroyed by man. It will have been destroyed by Japanese fishermen. That is the basis upon which we must now proceed. This is an emergency. Action must be taken now, not later. Later will probably be too late.

Mr. Speaker, the Japanese people, by suspending now the harvest of salmon of American origin, would find the American people cooperative, helpful, and generous in joint efforts to realize the legitimate economic ambitions of Japan. But the Japanese might well consider the attitude of the American people after Japanese fishing on the high seas has totally depleted the salmon resource, leaving nothing but a barren curse upon the peoples of both countries.

Now what has America tried to do to protect salmon which, but for their capture on the high seas, would occupy American streams at birth and death?

As I have noted, the treaty established an abstention line, which was merely provisional and which science has since proved to be inadequate to accomplish the purposes of the treaty. The protocol to the treaty contains detailed procedures for changing the abstention line in accordance with scientific information.

The protocol directs the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, established under the treaty, to determine, as expeditiously as practicable, if salmon of Asiatic and North American origin intermingle in the North Pacific Ocean, and to "conduct suitable studies" in accordance with which relocation or confirmation of the provisional line would be recommended in order to "best divide salmon of Asiatic origin and salmon of United States of America origin, from which certain contracting parties have agreed to abstain." Failure of the Commission to recommend unanimously the confirmation or relocation of the provisional line was a contingency which the protocol foresaw. In that event, the contracting parties would refer their differences "to a special committee of scientists consisting of three competent and distinterested persons, no one of whom shall be a national of a contracting party, selected by mutual agreement of all parties for the determination of this matter."

The provisional nature of the abstention line is self-evident, then. The parties agreed to definite procedures for the reevaluation of the line, and for its relocation, if necessary to conserve the resource.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission held its last annual meeting in November 1957. At that time, the American section came forward with detailed scientific evidence proving that red salmon of American origin are found in substantial numbers as far as 15° west of the provisional line which the treaty established. The American section made two proposals. It called for the establishment of a special committee to carry out the directives of the protocol by making suitable studies on the basis of which a new line could be established which would best divide the salmon of the two continents. Recognizing the urgent nature of the problem, the American section also proposed a temporary zone in which all fishing would be suspended until the special committee could complete its studies and submit a report.

What was the attiude of the Japanese section to these very sensible proposals? The Japanese agreed to the establishment of a special committee, but with the provision that no action be taken upon the committee's recommendations until after the 1958 fishing season. And the Japanese refused to even consider the subject of a temporary cessation zone. That is the dreary record of Japanese disregard of the objectives of the treaty.

In view of the gravity and immediacy of the problem, and the attitude of Japan, it appears that our remedies under the treaty have been exhausted, for the Commission meets next in November 1958, too late to protect the salmon of American origin during the coming summer season.

Many good minds and hearts have addressed themselves to this problem, Mr. Speaker. From some has come the suggestion that the United States abrogate the treaty of 1952. Moral justification for the abrogation is based forcefully upon the contention that the Japanese have frustrated the purposes of the treaty and have violated its spirit.

But it is well, I think, to turn our thoughts to the practical effects of abrogation, and to recall that in the absence of the treaty, Japanese fishermen would be free to roam throughout the entire North Pacific. The principles of international law, regarding freedom of the seas, under which we live today were devised in a society which was not oriented towards conservation, as we are, and which had little scientific knowledge of the fact that certain fish roam far at sea from the fresh-water streams in the continent of their birth. Some of our principles of international law, then, lag far behind modern knowledge of the travels of marine life and our ability to chart such journeys. Indeed, the purpose of the treaty was to fill the gaps that lie between principles of international law and the conditions and needs of the modern world. The problem is that the treaty filled the gaps only partially because the provisional line drawn was inadequate, and because the methods of amending the provisional line are too cumbersome in this time of emergency.

Abrogation, then, would give us only the privilege of ending the conservation practices which we pledged by treaty to continue. That, I think, would be a policy of despair. It would enroll America as a coexecutioner with Japan of a great natural resource. And abrogation would permit Japanese boats the privilege—admittedly limited in value since America-spawned fish travel so far to the west—of wandering east of the provisional line.

Under our constitutional doctrine of separation of powers, the responsibility for negotiations with a foreign nation lies with the President. Our role, as legislators is necessarliy limited. But we can, and we have, called the attention of the Department of State to the concern which the American people feel. Each House has adopted a resolution expressing the interest of the American people and supporting direct negotiations with Japan through diplomatic channels. I endorsed the resolution introduced in this House by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], which was adopted. I took satisfaction in the approval given by the Senate to Senate Resolution 263, introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island and based upon representations of the problem made by the Senators from Washington and Oregon. And I am sure that the Congress will want to give careful consideration to legislative proposals regarding the import for sale of salmon captured on the high seas, in order to determine whether such legislation would accomplish a useful purpose and be consistent with the national interest.

The Congress has urged firm action by our diplomats who bear a great trust and a great duty to those who depend upon red salmon for their way of life. I understand that direct negotiations are now in progress. I pray they will bear fruit before this fateful summer.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

JONAH KUHIO KALANIANAOLE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, to Hawaii and its peoples the date of March 26 will ever hold a special and tender significance: it is the anniversary of the birth of Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole, one of the most appealing figures in the saga of Hawaii. Born to the purple in 1871, the prince proved, in his more mature years, to be an inspiring champion of American concepts of democracy.

Kalanianaole was born on Kauai, a direct descendant of the last independent ruler of that island. He was a son of High Chief David Kahalepouli Piikoi and the Princess Kinoiki Kekaulike. While still in his teens, the youth was created a prince of the realm by King Kalakaua, his cousin and uncle.

After attending both public and private schools in Honolulu, the prince became a student at St. Matthew's College in San Mateo, Calif. He concluded his formal education by taking a business course at the Royal Agricultural College in England.

Forced by ill health to return to Hawaii, Kalanianaole served under the monarchy as a minor official in the office of the minister of the interior and in the customs service. When the revolution staged by the "haoles"—whites—erupted, Kuhio supported his cousin, Queen Liliuokalani. Shortly after the Republic of Hawaii was established, the unreconstructed prince was arrested, convicted, and imprisoned for conspiring to effect a royalist uprising. In 1896, following his release, he married Elizabeth Kahanu Kaauwai, daughter of a chief of Kauai. Three years later the couple, despairing of a future in their beloved islands, left for an extended tour abroad. At first the prince determined to make his exile permanent, but after 2 years of traveling, hunting, and observing the Boer War, he decided to accept unreservedly the new order in Hawaii.

Returning to the Islands in 1901, Kalanianaole immediately assumed an active part in public affairs. He joined the Home Rule Party, but his affiliation was not a happy one. Disgusted by the bigoted racial views and undemocratic practices of the organization, the prince, now an ardent advocate of the American way, renounced his association and, in 1902, joined the Republican Party. The same year he was named that party's candidate for Territorial Delegate to the Federal Congress. Victorious in his first campaign, Kuhio, with his uniquely devoted following, was never to know defeat at the polls; he served as Hawaii's nonvoting representative continuously from 1903 until his death in 1922.

Known affectionately to his constituents and colleagues alike as "Prince Kuhio" or "Prince Cupid," the affable, able, and untiring Delegate won the hearts of all with whom he had contact. Assigned to the Committees on Agriculture, Coinage, Weights, and Measures, Military Affairs, and Territories, Kuhio rendered significant services to his people. In 1919 he introduced the first of a long series of bills to accord statehood to Hawaii. The crowning legislative achievement of his career was his successful sponsoring of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act.

Aware of the tendency of his people—those of original Hawaiian blood strains—to congregate in urban centers, where, as a result of crowded tenement conditions, the race was fighting a losing battle for survival, the Delegate in 1920 introduced a bill to modify the public land section of the organic act. The measure was finally approved by the President on July 9, 1921. Under its provisions the Hawaiians and part Hawaiians were to be given the opportunity to leave congested urban areas and settle on the land as homesteaders. It was hoped that in time a relatively prosperous class of independent citizen farmers would develop.

Approximately 200,000 acres of Government land, comprising specified undeveloped areas, excluding sugarcane lands, were made available. The land so far utilized is divided into homestead lots of varying dimensions, each leased for 99 years at a nominal rental to those persons whose blood is at least one-half Hawaiian. Every homesteader is granted a loan to permit him to build a house or work a farm. The whole project is controlled by a commission—Kuhio was the first member appointed—and is financed, essentially, by a revolving fund of $2 million accumulated from rentals of public lands and water licenses.

The first settlement under the plan was established on the island of Molokai; operations since have been gradually extended to other islands. By the end of 1946 more than 4,000 Hawaiians were living in homestead communities. Approximately one-fifth of these latter-day pioneers were situated on Molokai; the remainder were scattered among residential homestead sites on Hawaii and Oahu.

Although the rehabilitation project has not as yet fully justified the hopes of Kalanianaole and other founders, the plan has produced tangible benefits. The act prevented Hawaiian settlers from speculating with their land or disposing of it. Many small residential and subsistence homesteads, moreover, have been set up in the environs of the cities and towns where many of the native Hawaiians are employed.

In the 35 years since passage of the act only about 10 percent of the eligible families have been placed on the land. Most of these are on house lots not within the original purpose of the Hawaiian Homes Commission. Where the original purpose has been tried the results have been uniformly excellent. The hopes of Delegate Kalanianaole have been fully realized. Some 160,000 acres remain to be disposed among six or seven thousand eligible families. Failure of the act to date to meet the fullest hopes of its author must be laid squarely at the door of the Territorial executive—a Presidential appointee.

Delegate Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole materially contributed to the establishment of the limited measure of first government presently existing during his first two terms in the Congress. Hawaii's people today have no more in the way of home rule on the local level than was obtained by Delegate Kalanianaole's efforts during his first two terms.

As a result of his formal complaint against the executive department—the appointed governor made in October 1911, an opportunity was afforded to the citizens of Hawaii to obtain the ownership to land as individuals by the application of the homestead provisions of the organic act enacted by Congress. These provisions had not been effectuated by a Territorial administration prior to this complaint. Though he made a major accomplishment in each of these endeavors toward giving the people of Hawaii economic and political advantages so badly needed and so long overdue, Delegate Kalanianaole's actions did not open a permanent door in this direction. His trailblazing and endeavors merely marked a trail which the Territorial administrations of succeeding years have almost obliterated.

On January 7, 1922, the prime mover of Hawaiian rehabilitation and the instigator of economic and political liberation for all the people regardless of race was called to his fathers. Despite his express desire to have his passing marked only by a simple ceremony, the grief-stricken peoples of Hawaii refused to have it so. The pomp and pageantry incident to his funeral has never been surpassed in all the annals of Hawaii. He was revered not only as a man of the purest motives, but also as the last titular prince of his line. Hawaiian and haole alike acknowledge that he, through his example and influence, was the paramount factor in reconciling the Hawaiians to the loss of their independence, and in converting them to a passionate Americanism. Truly, he was "Ke Alii Makaainana"—A prince of the people.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KRUEGER, indefinitely, on account of official business.

Mr. BARING, for an indefinite period, on account of death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. IKARD, for 1 hour, on Monday next.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BYRD, for 1 hour on Tuesday next and 1 hour on Wednesday next.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 15 minutes, on Thursday, March 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matters.

Mr. BOLAND and to include an article as part of his remarks today.

Mr. PORTER and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding it will exceed 2 pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $243.

Mr. YATES to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include related matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. UTT and include a speech by Secretary Seaton.

To the following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. MULTER in two instances.

Mr. FABRSTEIN.

Mr. PRESTON.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. FLOOD.

To the following Members (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. HILLINGS.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 10881. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11086. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 27, 1958, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1753. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposal to make available for obligation now 50 percent of the amounts estimated in the 1959 budget for the procurement of supplies, materials, and equipment for the various civilian agencies of the executive branch (H. Doc. No. 359), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7645. A bill to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations contained in instrument conveying certain land by the United States to the State of Wisconsin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8071. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey an easement over certain property of the United States located in Princess Anne County, Va., known as the Fort Story Military Reservation, to the Norfolk Southern Railway Co. in exchange for other lands and easements of said company; with amendment (Rept. No. 1568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VAN ZANDT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9281. A bill to change the designation of the Bureau of Yards and Docks to the Bureau of Civil Engineering, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9738. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., a parcel of land in the said city of Macon containing 5.39 acres, more or less; without amendment (Rept. No. 1570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 514. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2767, a bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; without amendment (Rept. No. 1571). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 515. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5124, a bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of power or train brakes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1572). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 516. Resolution providing for the consideration S. 3262, an act to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1573). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9362. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to Post 924, Veterans of Foreign Wars; with amendment (Rept. No. 1566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 11657. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the requirement that a husband or widower have been dependent upon his wife in order to qualify for a spouse's or widower's annuity on the basis of her wage record; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 11658. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that a husband or widower have been dependent upon his wife in order to qualify for husband's or widower's insurance benefits on the basis of her wage record, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLAY:

H. R. 11659. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 11660. A bill to exempt certain employers from the tax imposed for 1958 under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act if such employers were not subject to such tax for 1957; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 11661. A bill to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on self-contained air-conditioning units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 11662. A bill to provide for the grading of meat and for informing the ultimate user of such grade; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11663. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1957, to provide that benefits under that act will be payable on account of certain advancements in rank occurring prior to July 1, 1932; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 11664. A bill to amend the laws relating to the execution of contracts with Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Illinois:

H. R. 11665. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 11666. A bill to establish certain requirements with respect to the employment of barbers and beauticians in or under the executive branch of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. R. 11667. A bill to provide a program of tax relief for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 11668. A bill to amend section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCDONOUGH:

H. R. 11669. A bill to exempt from the Federal income tax income received by individuals who have reached age 65 if their adjusted gross income does not exceed $3,500 in the case of married couples or $2,000 in the case of single individuals; and to increase all personal income tax exemptions from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 11670. A bill to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered icebreaking vessel for operation by the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 11671. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 11672. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to prevent unfair competition to domestic industries from surpluses sold by receiving countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 11673. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to prevent unfair competition to domestic industry from importation of firearms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 11674. A bill to provide for temporary additional unemployment compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 11675. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, and the act approved June 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 374), to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 11676. A bill to amend Public Law 654, 84th Congress, in order to provide an expanded conservation program for wildlife through maximum use of Commodity Credit Corporation surplus feed grains; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 11677. A bill to establish certain requirements with respect to the employment of barbers and beauticians in or under the executive branch of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 11678. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act so as to enable States to establish more adequate general assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 11679. A bill to provide for temporary additional unemployment compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11680. A bill to amend the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 11681. A bill to reduce income taxes, to increase personal exemptions from $600 to $700, to provide relief for small business, to repeal the taxes on the transportation of property, to reduce the taxes on the transportation of persons, on communications, on automobiles, on automotive parts and accessories, and on radio and television sets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 11682. A bill to prohibit the withholding or impoundment of appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Con. Res. 302. Concurrent resolution to provide for printing of proceedings in connection with the unveiling of the Maria L. Sanford statue; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 11683. A bill for the relief of Rosa Maria Montenegro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 11684. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yen Fu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 11685. A bill for the relief of America Sanchez de Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 11686. A bill for the relief of Nora Kaleth Campanella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

496. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Mrs. F. W. Henke and other residents of Davenport and Harrington, Wash., urging the Congress to pass legislation prohibiting alcoholic beverage advertising on television broadcasts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

497. Also, petition of Rev. F. R. Schneider and 33 citizens of Davenport and Harrington, Wash., urging the Congress to pass legislation prohibiting alcoholic beverage advertising on television broadcasts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

498. By Mr. NIMTZ: Petition of Melvin L. Moore and 25 other citizens of South Bend, Ind., urging the passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

499. Also, petition of Mrs. Edward E. Perkins and 21 other citizens of South Bend, Ind., urging the passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

500. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Herbert C. Holdridge, Washington, D. C., for criminal action against the agents of the private corporation of the Federal Reserve bank and its collaborationists; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Education for Peace More Powerful Even Than Atoms for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Thursday, it was my pleasure to deliver an address on the theme of what I call Education for Peace.

My audience was a distinguished assembly of citizens interested in what is to be a greatly enlarged experimental school, known as the Daycroft School in Stamford, Conn.

My purpose was, and is, to show that constructive educational experimentation should go on universally—both at home and abroad. We should use education as a mighty force for the purpose of encouraging international understanding and good will.

PROPOSED SCHOOLS IN MOSCOW

I made one particular suggestion in the course of this address.

It was that one or more educational institutions in the United States consider the possibility of submitting plans to the Soviet Government, leading toward the possible establishment of one or more experimental American schools inside Russia, itself, for Russian youngsters.

Such schools in Moscow and/or other Russian centers could represent the very best in the American educational process, as regards curriculum, teaching methods, new teaching facilities and instruments, and in overall approach.

FOUR TYPES OF PROBLEMS

Naturally, I recognize realistically that any such proposal would be very difficult of accomplishment. Four questions should be mentioned at the very outset.

First, the Soviet Government would have to be convinced of the fact that an experimental American primary, secondary, or higher school was intended, as it genuinely would be, for progress in education; not for hostile propaganda or subversion.

A second point we would have to remember is this: Some people might think, in view of all the criticism of United States education itself, that we have nothing to offer to Russia, or anyone else.

The fact of the matter is, however, that there is a great deal in American education of which we may be proud. There are many experimental schools, like Daycroft, in the United States which are pioneering in new curriculums, new methods of teaching, new facilities. They are using closed circuit television. They are using open circuit educational TV stations. They are using electronic classrooms with tape recording private booths.

MUCH AMERICAN EDUCATION ABROAD TODAY

A third question which comes up is as to any precedent for such schools.

The answer is that more and more young Americans are already studying abroad, especially in summer and in late college years. More and more American universities are making cooperative arrangements with universities abroad. There are many American schools abroad now; largely for the education of American personnel, stationed overseas.

RUSSIA HAS TRADITION OF USING FOREIGN PERSONNEL

A fourth question which comes up is as to any precedent in Russian experience, itself, for such a school.

The fact is that there is an old and long tradition of friendly relationships between Russian educational development and educational influences from outside Russia.

When the Russian Academy of Sciences was established back in 1725, and upon the founding of Moscow University in 1755, teachers, professors, and scientists from abroad—especially from Germany, France, and Switzerland—were invited by the Russians to participate in the building up of academic programs.

This tradition persisted for almost 200 years. Early in the 19th century, the Russian Government sponsored study trips to Europe for young teachers trained in the Russian Pedagogical Institute at St. Petersburg.

Of course, with the advent of the Communist revolution, in 1917, the tradition of friendly contact was interrupted.

The Soviet Union later resumed cultural exchanges with foreign countries, but it did so as primarily an instrument for the spread of international communism.

NEW UNITED STATES-U. S. S. R. AGREEMENT

Now the United States and the U. S. S. R. have signed a precedent-making East-West cultural agreement.

It remains to be seen whether the letter and the spirit of the agreement will be carried out as we, for one, earnestly hope it will be.

Here, in education, is presented a marvelous opportunity for fulfilling the great objective of friendship and exchange.

Finally, let me note that in the course of my remarks before the Daycroft Foundation, I pointed out that we do not approach this subject of American schools in Moscow from a standpoint of attitude of superiority.

It is not as if we presume that we know it all about education. It is not as if Russia were in the relatively primitive condition that she was in the days of the czars when she felt she had so much to learn from western advances.

But the fact is that a sound example of American goodwill in schools in Russia might become, in effect, a radiating center of understanding and student friendship.

I send to the desk now the text of my Daycroft address and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

I am privileged and honored to join with you in this fine occasion.

It is always an inspiration to join with builders when a new edifice is to be begun.

Tonight, we have assembled to help build not simply an inspired edifice of glass and steel and stone. It is not simply a 10-story tower, marvelously conceived from an educational and architectural standpoint.

For the new physical plant at Daycroft will be all this, and more.

What you will be helping to construct is an edifice of the spirit, where man discovers more of himself and the world about him.

From this lighthouse, literally and figuratively, will, we trust, emanate a beacon of understanding. It will be a beacon to a brighter tomorrow—a beacon through the darkness, wherewith man can remove that which obscures his vision.

The poet Dante has written, "Give light, and the people will find the way."

And it was another great spirit, Goethe, who on his deathbed had left this mortal world with the plea, "More light."

Tonight, we assemble to seek more light so that we may illuminate the path ahead in this age of space, this age of the atom, this age of the jet.

BOTH PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND PRIVATE CITIZENS MUST ACT

It is fitting that the board of trustees announces this evening the plans for the new and enlarged Daycroft School.

For this action indicates that Americans in private life are sensing the awesome challenge which confronts them. It is the challenge to match our progress in the physical realm by progress in the educational and in the spiritual.

It is well and good to remember that we, in public life, we who are privileged to serve in the legislative or executive branches of government, must come to grips with the hard-core problems of our times. We must meet head-on the military, political, social, economic, and moral problems of this age, at home and abroad.

We members, for example, of the Outer Space Committee of the Senate, and our House counterpart, must outline policies which will assure American leadership in the race for outer space.

We members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and our House counterpart must advance United States mutual security policies which will assure American leadership and partnership with the Free World.

But despite all the work which we, in public life may do, we might fall short of our goal without your help. We need leadership from you, in private life—you businessmen, you educators, you leaders in the world of communications, in advertising, public relations, the professions, and all the other diverse fields represented here tonight. Unless you take the initiative, side by side with your public servants—searching, seeking to open the door to the wonder world of tomorrow, then, we may not succeed.

WE DARE NOT PASS THE BUCK

To pass the buck in this age is to pass up a golden opportunity.

This is a golden age. But the age of the intercontinental missile is also an age of universal peril.

Never before has it been more important that you and I, that every American put his hand and his heart to the constructive tasks which he, in his own role, can fulfill.

No American can afford today to say, "Let George do it." No American can pass the buck or the blame to anyone else. Each must contribute to the wisdom, the good will and the faith necessary to find the solution to the greatest of all world problems—the maintenance of the peace, the avoidance of world war III, the preservation of civilization.

We must see to it that we never have to use the terrible weapons of destruction that the physicists and chemists have brought into being.

Who will see to it? You and I must see to it. Every official—and every citizen—in Washington and in Hartford and in Albany and Harrisburg and Boston must see to it.

Every man must put his shoulder to his own wheel.

The Congress cannot expect the President to do the Congress' work for peace, nor vice versa.

The educator cannot pass the buck to the parent, nor the parent to the educator.

The executive who has been successful in private business cannot pass the buck to the scholar, nor can the latter fail to fulfill his practical responsibilities.

THINKING CAN TURN FLANK OF HISTORY

Every man and woman must think through the challenge which he or she, as an individual citizen of the United States of America, faces.

It is the process of thinking itself which will provide the answers to the great problems of our time.

It was a wise man who has said: "Beware of a thinker. He may turn the flank of history."

It was Des Cartes who said: "I think. Therefore, I am."

It was a more modern-day leader of French letters who said: "I revolt. Therefore, I am."

He meant the revolt against any tyranny over the mind of man.

THE AGE OF DISCOVERY

The Communists have long since sensed that the 20th century is a century of revolution.

It embraces the revolution of colonialism against imperialism, the revolution of the darker races against the heretofore supreme white race.

It is a revolution of the underprivileged against those who had ignored their responsibilities to the homeless, the jobless, the rootless.

But the 20th century is also the age of exploration.

Man has reached greater heights and plumbed greater physical depths; man has discovered more within this century than perhaps in all the 19 centuries of the Christian era which have gone before.

But man's discoveries have unfortunately still been largely in the physical fields, the material fields.

Man has discovered laws and forces which had been awaiting his unlocking all these centuries. The laws and the forces have existed since the dawn of time, but man has heretofore been blind to them.

The forces of electricity and of atomic power have always existed.

The laws by which man could escape his own planet and literally reach for the stars have always existed. But only now has man been able to find the key to these laws.

REDISCOVER THE SPIRITUAL LAWS

It is for us, however, now to discover, or rather to rediscover, particularly the spiritual laws which had been understood in Biblical times, but which man himself had for so long forgotten.

It is by these spiritual laws or forces that man can achieve the happiness, the fulfillment, the beauty, the harmony, the health which are his.

They are the laws by which the all-knowing, all-powerful, all-seeing Creator, God, guides this universe for good.

A SCHOOL TO BREAK THROUGH OLD BARRIERS

Where else but in a school can this very process of discovery and rediscovery, of exploration, and of thinking be nourished and fostered?

We need new "breakthroughs" in American education as much as we need "breakthroughs" in individual sciences.

Here in Connecticut, Daycroft can be and will be a "breakthrough" school—cracking the barriers of outmoded concepts and techniques.

Within the classrooms, the laboratories, the library of Daycroft, students will be discovering the laws of nature, and through spiritual understanding, the good, the spiritual forces that we are now largely unaware of.

Daycroft, or any similar nobly conceived institution can be a revolutionary force, in the finest sense of that term. I mean a force like other great historical innovations—the first kindergarten in America, a force like the first adult education school, or any of

the other great "firsts" on the American educational scene.

THE CRUCIAL QUESTIONS, "WHY?" "WHY NOT?"

The key to improved education is, of course, bold, thinking leadership. The thinking leader is the man or woman who asks and answers the questions: "Why?" and "Why not?"

If you will look back at all the great discoveries of history, you will find that the inventors, the experimenters, instead of accepting the existing order of things, asked "Why?" and "Why not?"

If something better can be found, why accept outmoded concepts?

If students can be taught better by tape recordings or filmstrips or closed circuit television, why not? If students can grow more with new-type textbooks, with new concepts of discipline and self-discipline, with new systems of school grades and school credits and school curriculums, why not?

That does not mean that there should be change for change's sake. But it does mean that thinking leadership must not be slaves to the educational practices of the past. We must use the very best which the past has to offer, but it is not necessarily the final word.

A RACE BETWEEN EDUCATION AND CATASTROPHE

The famous author, Mr. H. G. Wells, with his keen sense of prophecy, once said "Civilization is a race between education and catastrophe."

Never has this been truer than today.

Each day's news confirms that we must either educate ourselves to higher levels of thinking, or, possibly, fall victim to the very instruments of destruction which we are creating.

In too many places, the assumption is that the differences between the United States and the U. S. S. R. will be solved one way or the other in the immediate future. That may not be the case.

The world has already lived with one generation of aggressive communism.

We may find that we will have to live one, two, three, or many more, generations with communism. In other words, we must be vigilant for the present, but we must be vigilant as well for the long pull.

So, we must turn our thoughts toward preparing, not simply this generation, but the next generation, and generations beyond, for East-West competition.

ATOMS, SCIENCE, NOW EDUCATION FOR PEACE

I am going to be very specific.

In 1953, President Eisenhower delivered his history-making atoms-for-peace speech before the United Nations General Assembly.

This year, he has presented the dramatic concept of science for peace.

This evening, I submit to you that what this world needs is education for peace.

The schools of the United States, and the schools of every other nation of the world, should dedicate themselves to this greatest of all tasks: educating tomorrow's generations for the preservation of civilization.

Education for peace can be more powerful even than atoms for peace.

Why?

Because the mind—the brain of man—is even more powerful than the atom.

But I refer to far more than the material gray matter. I refer to the immortal spirit, the spark of the divine, which is within each of us. Demosthenes phrased it this wise: "What we have in us of the image of God is the love of truth and justice."

But now, let's get down to further cases.

ESTABLISHING AMERICAN SCHOOLS IN MOSCOW

As much as a new beacon of American education is needed here in Connecticut, or anywhere else in the United States, such a beacon is needed even more in one particular place.

I refer to Moscow in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

And so, I should like to propose tonight that several American educational institutions—at primary, secondary, and higher levels—consider the concept of establishing, with the consent of the Soviet Government, experimental branch centers in Moscow, and possibly in other leading Soviet cities.

I should like to see American educational institutions develop plans for submittal to the Government of the Soviet Union whereby the best in the American teaching process would be made available, if only as pilot projects, inside the U. S. S. R.

Already there are many American schools abroad. These schools are attended by youngsters of American diplomatic, economic, and military personnel. Often these schools are flooded with applications from foreign students as well. Many are admitted to the limit of capacity.

In addition, United States universities are beginning to establish branches abroad.

What I am proposing are United States educational lighthouses inside the U. S. S. R.

But let me make this point clear.

COMPETITIVE COEXISTENCE INSIDE MOSCOW

My aim is not propaganda, for it would be neither feasible nor desirable that this concept or the whole idea of education for peace be used as a propaganda tool.

My aim is simply to send word to the Soviet teaching profession, to Soviet intellectuals, Soviet students, that educators and interested laymen in the United States would like respectfully to explore the possibility of establishing centers of experimental learning for Russian students inside the U. S. S. R.

Such schools would not be intended for use against the Soviet system, against Soviet education, the Soviet Government, or the Soviet way of life.

Rather, their purpose would be to demonstrate in action that the United States is interested in friendly, productive relations with the present and future generations of Russia.

Let there be a model of competitive coexistence of educational ideas right inside Moscow.

IN THE EAST-WEST "THAW," THERE IS HOPE

If this idea seems impractical; if you think it would run into a stone wall of Soviet opposition, let me say this: We must leave no stone unturned to try to reach the minds and the hearts of the Russian people.

We must do so by the living example of good deeds, inspired deeds, selfless deeds.

Let the word spread to the four corners of the Soviet Union that the people of the United States, as friends and neighbors in this air age, are thinking of the well-being of Russian youngsters, as we would like them to think of the well-being of children elsewhere.

We have just signed a United States-U. S. S. R. cultural exchange agreement. Perhaps, in the present warmer climate, in the present "thaw," this proposal, which in Stalin's era would have been doomed, might have a chance.

I propose that we seek to establish such educational branch centers, as equals and not in a spirit of condescension, a spirit of haughty superiority.

Soviet education has proven its technical laurels; Russian inventors and scientists have won too many honors for Americans to think that we have a monopoly on intellectual brilliance.

Rather, I make this proposal because we, too, are groping for new truths; we are experimenting, we are applying the trial-and-error process.

But there is more than this to Education for Peace. We need to exchange more teachers and scholars. We need to develop the fuller potentialities of UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

And here, at home, at Daycroft and elsewhere, we need to strengthen our own United States schools.

THE MISSION OF DAYCROFT

The students of Daycroft will, in this, the greatest age of all time for thinkers, master the one technique which we must all have—the capacity to think.

I mean to think clearly; to rid the mind of the fog of intolerance, the fog of fear, envy, jealousy, which confuses and confounds; and thus to leave the mind free to discover, to adventure, to discriminate, to create, to contemplate, to consecrate.

Yes, this Nation needs thinkers—clear, exploratory thinkers, and sound men of action.

We need such thinkers in every walk of life. We need them in government, in military science, in business, in labor, in the professions, in education.

THE CENTRIFUGAL AND CENTRIPETAL FORCES

We need boys and girls, men and women, who will sense the need for unifying action.

You know that great physicists now seek a unified field theory—a theory which will explain all the physical laws of the universe.

But even more, we need to halt the disintegration process on this globe.

In physics, there are, as you know, the centrifugal force which flies from the center out, and the centripetal which whirls inward toward the center.

What we need is to unite men, just as the Kremlin seeks to divide them.

Look about you, and see all the divisive forces at work.

DIVISIVE FORCES AT WORK

North Africa is in flames. France is racked with dissension. There is civil war in Indonesia, guerrilla warfare in Cyprus, inflation in South America. Yes, there is recession in the United States, Canada, and elsewhere.

There is maldistribution of wealth in many countries. There are territorial disputes between India and Pakistan and Afghanistan. There is feuding between the two new Arab Federations and between the Arab world and their neighbor in the Holy Land.

In my own State, there is a strike which has dragged on for 4 bitter years. In the South, there is racial tension. In the North, there are diverse urban pressures.

These are the centrifugal influences at work, tearing apart.

SOVIET DISINTEGRATIVE TECHNIQUE

Everywhere in the globe, we behold the Soviet Union aggravating such centrifugal forces.

Since the end of World War II, Russia has both centralized its own empire and sought to disintegrate the Free World. Its regime of 200 million has been expanded by conquest and subversion, to 900 million, including the 600 million slaves of Red China.

Meanwhile, Soviet agitators, propagandists, saboteurs, salesmen, are at work, especially among the 1 billion people in the Asian-African-Middle East world.

Everywhere the Red technique is to penetrate, undermine, and tear apart existing government, labor organizations, businesses, religion, military forces, and other institutions.

UNIFYING NATO, SEATO, OAS

What alternative do we have but to counter these disintegrators with unifiers to counter the destroyers with the builders?

The U. N. must be made more effective, for example, by establishing a permanent International Police Force, such as now patrols the Holy Land.

NATO must be revitalized.

SEATO must be made more fruitful in works.

The Organization of American States must be made still more meaningful in deeds.

Everywhere, there must be developed a greater unity of spirit in these and other organizations.

There should be a United States of Free Europe.

There should be a common market in Latin America; beginning, perhaps in Central America.

Why not?

But how can we achieve all this?

By better understanding. And that means better education, of course.

THE NEED FOR THE INTELLECTUAL

What we need is a rebirth of the human spirit which will explore beyond the present horizons.

We need new thinkers who will turn the flank of history. The man in a mental rut will never get this country out of a perpetual stalemate with the Soviet Union. The man in the mental rut will never solve the problem, in the economic field, of cyclical boom and bust or any of the other American problems—racial, political, social, or otherwise.

I am confident that we will be able to develop more of that type of thinking which is so essential to open up the new world, which is waiting to be discovered.

CHALLENGING CONFORMITY

Columbus was such a thinker. He sailed over uncharted seas. He challenged the old order concept of a flat earth—which, to that time, had been universally held as a dogmatic belief.

Herbert Spencer spoke of the period, several centuries ago when there was uniformity of belief.

He said, "Scientifically all men believed in the teaching of Aristotle. Religiously, all men were Roman Catholics. Politically, all men believed in a monarchy. Then, a new world opened up to humanity when it was discovered that in all things—religious, political, and scientific—every man was to be his own philosopher and, if need be, his own priest."

Our forebears were nonconformists. They boldly opened up a new world—literally and figuratively. They divided political power—for the first time—into three branches of government.

When I look out of my window in the Senate Office Building in Washington, I can see a monument dedicated to a man who challenged the old order. He met a whole series of crises at the birth of this country which, in many senses, were as difficult as ours.

But in the time of Washington, there were thinker-doers like himself who proved more than adequate to their task.

They included many men of letters.

INTELLECTUALS AMONG FOUNDING FATHERS

Let us never forget that, included among the greatest of the Founding Fathers were indeed—so-called intellectuals, so-called eggheads.

The well-educated Jeffersons, the Madisons, and others were just as essential—or more so, as the unlettered minutemen who shouldered their rifles at Concord and Lexington.

And likewise, when I look through the window of my Washington office, I can see a memorial to a man who was a thinker-doer, virtually without formal education.

The Great Emancipator did not have closed-circuit television to educate him. He had candle-light by which to pour over the Bible and his other few books.

But self-taught, moulded by the adversities of life, the man of Salem and Springfield emerged perhaps to the highest stature which any single American in our history has ever attained. He was a thinker, and he was a doer.

WHAT THE SAM SMITHS AND TOM JONESES CAN DO

And so we see the need for the men of every sort of intellectual attainment. We see the need for men and women, too, who may never have statues built in their honor, but who will help make it possible for true leaders to serve this country's destiny.

For the average American, the garden-variety American, the Sam Smith's and Tom Jones', who make up most of the 173 million of us, have just as important a role, as the leaders of thought and action.

Napoleon said that every "soldier carries a marshal's baton in his rucksack." Every citizen carries with him the future of his country.

Every citizen must learn to think and to do—to the extent that he can in his own particular field.

ADDING TO THE ONE ANGLO-UNITED STATES SCHOOL IN MOSCOW

There is a job to be done in Stamford, a job in Washington, and a job in Moscow.

There, in the capital of Russia, today, is but one Anglo-American school—for the youngsters of parents in the British and American Embassies.

Who knows if education for peace may one day enable American schools to be established there, along the very lines which you are pioneering tonight.

CONCLUSION

It has been a great privilege and pleasure to be with you tonight.

I am sure that your efforts will reach fruition.

I am sure that you will build here an edifice of which you, yourselves, will be proud, and in which your loved ones may take great pride.

But more important than the physical plant that you will be building are the intangible values to which you are contributing.

You will be building men and women—explorers, achievers of breakthroughs. You will be enabling youngsters to grow to their greatest potentialities.

So, let this beacon shine forth from the lighthouse.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Mr. Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, relative to his hopes for early statehood for Alaska.

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

SEATON HOPES FOR EARLY STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

(By Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration is wholeheartedly supporting proposals that Congress during its present session grant statehood to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. I very much hope we can marshal sufficient bipartisan support in Congress to achieve this objective.

Although the battle for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii has been going on for many years, it appears that prospects for success are brighter now than ever before. There is increased public understanding in the United States of the facts concerning the two Territories, and a consequent increased public demand that both be admitted to statehood.

While the decision is one solely within the power of Congress to make, I hope the statehood bills will be kept separate so that each of the Territories can be judged on its own merits by Members of Congress.

This year, the Congressional leadership apparently believes the case of Alaska should be considered first. While I have no objection to that, I do believe it is both desirable and fair that the leadership give public assurance that Hawaiian statehood will be brought up for a vote in both Houses immediately following consideration of the Alaska bill.

Fear that Alaska would not be considered was one of the considerations which prompted the Senate to vote to join the 2 bills in 1954. That action tolled the death knell for any hope for statehood in that session of Congress.

HISTORY MAY REPEAT

To combine the bills in this session would probably have the same undesirable effect. Yet, it is understandable that unless the friends of Hawaiian statehood are assured of consideration for their bill soon after Alaska history may repeat itself.

In this year's budget message the President again voiced his complete support for statehood for both Territories. In action consistent with the President's request and the platforms of both major political parties, the Department of the Interior has done everything it can to further the cause of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. Statehood for either, I firmly believe, should be a nonpartisan subject. Partisanship in this area of debate serves no good purpose; it can only cloud the real issues and hinder constructive efforts to deal with them.

REGARDLESS OF PARTY

Simple justice demands that both Territories be admitted to the Union now.

As for myself, I haven't the slightest concern about who, or which political party, may get credit for Hawaiian or Alaskan statehood. Whether Republicans or Democrats, the people of both Territories are Americans, and they are entitled to full citizenship. I know of nothing in the Constitution of the United States which gives preference to one political party or the other, or, more importantly, sets up political party affiliations as a test of fitness for statehood.

My travels in Alaska as Secretary of the Interior have strengthened by earlier view, expressed as a Member of the United States Senate in 1952, that Alaska is ready for admission to the Union, and that the majority of its people earnestly want statehood at the earliest possible moment.

TIME FOR ACTION

The arguments for admission of Hawaii are equally persuasive; the objections are equally timeworn.

This is the year to end the long frustration of the hopes of the people of the two Territories. Both Alaska and Hawaii are more than able to pay their way as full-fledged members of the Union. As never before, we have reason to expect they will soon be able to do so, as the 49th and 50th American States.

Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House that the time has come for an all-out support for increasing unemployment insurance benefits and the extension of the duration and the coverage of same. Thousands upon thousands of unemployed workers in Pennsylvania and other States have already exhausted their benefit rights under existing law. Many more thousands daily face the same prospect. Countless others unemployed in this and other States are without unemployment insurance protection, casting them upon the State and the community for any relief from their economic distress. Remedy of this situation by State legislatures is virtually impossible until after January 1959. Congressional action is urgently needed now. I urge that you support a flat increase in duration rather than the establishment of one uniform period for all States. Likewise, I urge your support for a unilateral Federal increase above benefit levels rather than establishment of a fixed amount for all States.

Time is running out for action on this serious situation. I believe that the citizens at home ought to have before them a schedule of the different weekly benefits, duration of benefits, assessments against payrolls and other pertinent information in order that a decision when it is made is based upon the true economics of the situation rather than upon a desire to win public political support. I would like to read and present a few of the weekly benefits from the following table for the information of the citizens at home.

Unemployment insurance under State laws, Jan. 1, 1958

State or Territory	Average weekly benefit paid for total unemployment, January–June 1957	Maximum weekly benefit	Average weekly wages in covered employment, 1956	Maximum weekly benefit as a percentage of average weekly wages		Duration of benefits	Percentage of claimants who exhausted benefits, July 1956–June 1957	Average employer tax rate, 1957 (percent of taxable payrolls)	Concurrent supplementary unemployment benefits allowed
				1957	1939				
United States	$28		$81				22	1.3	
Alabama	20	$28	65	43	87	11.7–20	36	1.1	Yes.
Alaska	37	$45 to $70	138	33	41	15–26	15	2.7	No issue.
Arizona	26	$30	81	37	61	10–26	20	1.3	Yes.
Arkansas	20	$26	55	47	95	10–18	33	1.1	Yes.
California	29	$40	90	45	50	15–26	13	1.4	Yes.
Colorado	28	$35	80	44	62	10–26	21	.5	Yes.
Connecticut	30	$40 to $60	86	47	56	8.6–26	23	1.2	Yes.
Delaware	31	$35	90	39	58	11–26	25	.8	Yes.
Washington, D. C.	26	$30	77	39	59	11.5–26	35	.7	Yes.
Florida	21	$30	67	45	81	5–16	42	.7	Yes.
Georgia	22	$30	63	48	87	20	33	1.2	Yes.
Hawaii	25	$35	62	57	85	20	19	1.0	No issue.
Idaho	28	$40	73	55	82	10–26	25	1.3	No issue.
Illinois	29	$30 to $45	90	33	56	10–26	20	1.0	Yes.
Indiana	26	$33	85	39	58	5.6–20	38	1.0	No.
Iowa	26	$30	74	41	67	6.7–24	35	.5	Yes.
Kansas	27	$34	76	45	66	8.4–20	27	1.0	Yes.
Kentucky	24	$32	71	45	69	26	26	2.0	Yes.
Louisiana	22	$25	72	35	90	10–20	38	1.4	Yes.
Maine	20	$33	66	50	74	26	16	1.6	No issue.
Maryland	27	$35 to $43	74	47	65	26	17	1.0	Yes.
Massachusetts	30	$35 and up	75	47	57	7.1–26	20	1.6	Yes.
Michigan	34	$30 to $55	97	31	53	9.5–26	26	2.0	Yes.
Minnesota	25	$38	79	48	62	18–26	20	1.0	Yes.
Mississippi	20	$30	55	54	97	20	24	1.7	Yes.
Missouri	22	$33	78	42	61	12.5–26	20	1.0	Yes.
Montana	25	$32	75	43	60	22	20	1.3	Yes.
Nebraska	25	$32	70	45	66	9–20	35	.9	Yes.
Nevada	32	$37.50 to $57.50	86	44	57	10–26	21	2.0	No issue.
New Hampshire	23	$32	67	48	70	26	13	1.6	No issue.
New Jersey	32	$35	87	40	55	13–26	26	1.7	Yes.
New Mexico	25	$30	74	41	73	12–24	22	1.2	No issue.
New York	30	$36	89	41	51	26	11	1.7	Yes.
North Carolina	18	$32	60	54	89	26	18	1.4	No.
North Dakota	27	$26 to $35	68	38	69	20	21	1.4	Yes.
Ohio	32	$33 to $39	89	37	54	9.2–26	16	.7	No.
Oklahoma	25	$28	76	37	61	6.7–26	41	1.0	Yes.
Oregon	31	$40	84	48	53	12.9–26	19	1.4	Yes.
Pennsylvania	28	$35	78	45	60	30	17	1.5	Yes.
Rhode Island	27	$30	70	43	70	7.9–26	30	2.7	Yes.
South Carolina	21	$26	58	45	99	10–22	35	1.1	No issue.
South Dakota	23	$28	67	42	69	5.7–20	38	.9	No issue.
Tennessee	21	$30	66	45	78	22	33	1.7	Yes.
Texas	23	$28	75	37	65	8–24	38	.7	Yes.
Utah	29	50 percent	74	50	70	15–26	19	1.3	Yes.
Vermont	23	$28	68	41	66	26	17	1.3	Yes.
Virginia	21	$28	66	42	74	8–18	31	.5	No.
Washington	30	$35	84	42	57	12–26	20	2.3	Yes.
West Virginia	22	$30	82	37	59	24	13	1.0	Yes.
Wisconsin	30	$38	83	46	55	10–26½	40	1.1	Yes.
Wyoming	29	55 percent to 55 percent plus $6	74	55	78	12–26	27	1.1	Yes.

You will note that most of the plans call for a specific duration period either percentagewise or a fixed number. Personally I believe that the sound method of approach would be that Congress use a base with a minimum duration schedule sufficient to carry over the serious period immediately ahead. My suggestion would be a minimum of 40 to 45 weeks with a minimum payment to be no less than two-thirds of the average weekly earnings with a minimum of $25 under any conditions. However, all States would be compelled to reach an equalization in payroll assessment before being permitted to assess the general public in a general tax for this purpose. If you will note the schedule immediately preceding this paragraph you will note that some States have a payroll tax as low as five-tenths of 1 percent while other States hit the maximum of 2.7 percent. I believe it would be eminently unfair to the industry in the higher payroll tax States to be forced through general taxation to pay for States in the lower brackets.

In order to aid recovery I would further suggest that H. R. 10974, which I sponsored early in this session to increase social-security benefits, reduce age limits, and open the road for retirement of older workers, be favorably considered.

Coupled with an amended liberalized unemployment compensation bill, this social-security bill will start the first real move toward the solution of the problem of the aged worker in America. For too long, we have discussed, studied, investigated, made reports, but have failed to put into effect concrete action to alleviate the situation. I think this Congress has a moral duty to immediately set to work in the fields I have just covered.

The Grave Situation of the American Plywood Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, the following statement, which I made to the House Committee on Ways and Means, contains some statistics showing the grave situation the American plywood industry finds itself in due to Japanese imports. These figures should interest all Members of the House who believe in affording some measure of protection so badly needed by American industries being adversely affected by reciprocal trade agreements:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I feel it a privilege as well as a grave responsibility to appear before this committee to discuss the problems of one of the important enterprises within my district in relation to our foreign trade policy. Concerned as we all are with the maintenance of a strong economy, it is incumbent upon us to consider well the impact of our international trade programs upon domestic industries that have served this country well for generations.

The industry to which I refer is the hardwood-plywood industry, manufacturing veneers for use in home construction, furniture, millwork, and many other commercial and industrial purposes. The hardwood-plywood industry has suffered serious economic reverses owing to the present administration of our foreign trade policy, to the extent that in the foreseeable future this industry will cease to operate in domestic production unless decisive remediable action is taken.

To document the damage done by foreign competition, may I cite a few statistics which will illustrate the problem. The use of hardwood plywood in the United States has skyrocketed from 869 million square feet in 1951 to 1,630 million square feet in 1957, for an increase of 87 percent. In spite of this favorable market, domestic industry shipments registered an actual decline of 3 percent comparing the years 1951 and 1957. On the other hand, imported hardwood plywood, chiefly from Japan, has risen from 64 million square feet in 1951 to 850 million square feet in 1957, for a staggering increase of 1,200 percent. To put it another way, in 1951 domestic producers accounted for 93 percent of the market in 1951 and now account for only 48 percent. In 1951, Japan provided only 1 percent of the domestic consumption, but in 1957 provided 42 percent of domestic consumption. Perhaps an even better indicator is the marked reduction in profits by domestic producers during the same time period: from 12.26 percent in 1950 to 5.75 percent in 1955 to 2.4 percent in 1957.

The reason for this radical alteration in the domestic market is simple and clear: Unreasonably low prices based on low-wage labor in Japan. While the average unit labor cost in the United States is $38.50 per 1,000 square feet, the average unit labor cost in Japan is $4.17 per 1,000 square feet. On this basis Japanese imports have seriously disrupted domestic industry and, through continuing expansion, threaten to drive the domestic producers out of production entirely. Operating through a cartel, Japanese plywood exporters have increased plant capacity 400 percent since 1951 and continue to expand, virtually threatening to dump this increased output on the American market unless some restrictive agreement or legislation is written to prevent this flood of cheap plywood products from entering the United States.

Frankly, I do not have much faith in agreements dependent entirely upon the good will of the foreign governments or even on the judgment of administrative agencies of our own Government. In this regard, I fear that the Congress has been excessively willing to abdicate its primary responsibilities in this field. Japan agreed in 1955 to restrict its exports to the United States and violated that agreement by exceeding its own quota in every year following. After the industry applied for relief under the escape clause in September 1954, the Tariff Commission in 1955 denied relief in spite of the fact that the industry qualified under every section of the statute. Owing to the timing of the decision, one cannot help feeling that the domestic industry was sacrificed to prevent embarrassment to the State Department in the negotiation of general trade agreements. Furthermore, the President has frankly stated that he opposes import restrictions on industrial products.

There are two suggestions I would like to make regarding protection of the hardwood-plywood industry and other industries similarly situated. A simple increase of the duties on plywood would not solve the problem even if they were to rise to 100 percent since the Japanese prices are so low. Such increases would have the collateral effect of eliminating all other foreign producers from our markets. The only reasonable approach, therefore, is the application of an import quota designed to allow the domestic industry to maintain a fair share of the market. It should be noted that such quotas are in effect already in relation to some products which threaten American industry, and an application of such a quota to hardwood plywood would constitute only an extension of this practice.

In the long run, it is my confirmed opinion that adequate recognition of the needs of domestic industry will not be obtained until the Congress rescinds its almost complete delegation of authority to the executive branch to negotiate trade agreements. At the very least, Congress should exercise a veto over trade agreements in order that American business receive fair consideration. It is anomalous that Congress should evidence its concern for small business by many legislative measures while allowing the executive branch to enter into agreements which effectively curtail the operations of small business.

May I express my gratitude for the opportunity to appear before your committee today. I am certain that the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress will recognize the plight of the hardwood-plywood industry and other industries having like difficulties, and will take action to ameliorate their condition.

Fortieth Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, this date marks the 40th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Byelorussia.

Like many of its eastern European neighbors, this nation which proudly proclaimed its independence 40 years ago, is held captive by Soviet Russia. Its people are not free, as they would be, if they were governed by their own will and desires.

But the observance of this anniversary serves a useful purpose. It points out the fact that here is a people, one of numerous small nations which would throw off the yoke of Soviet despotism if they could.

The love of freedom and democracy still lives in the hearts of the men and women of Byelorussia. On this anniversary of their declaration of independence, it is appropriate for us to let them know that we in free America are thinking of them, that they have our sympathetic understanding and our moral support in their aspirations to be free. If they keep up their faith and courage, as I am sure they will, their dreams will yet be realized.

Deceit, Deception, and Duplicity in the Rural Electrification Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this week one of the best and truest friends of rural electrification and the farmers of America delivered a great speech in the capital city of Wisconsin.

The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is no stranger to Wisconsin. Twice he has been the overwhelming choice of the people of Wisconsin for the Democratic nomination for President of the United States. He has visited us many times, and his fine record of service to the people of all the United States—the farmers, the small-business men, the working people in mine, mill, and shop—has gone ahead of him. The people of Wisconsin love Senator KEFAUVER. I only regret that I was unable to be with him personally on his latest visit.

In his address Monday, which was delivered to the 22d annual meeting of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, the senior Senator from Tennessee reviewed the dangers that confront the REA cooperatives in this period of economic recession, efforts to raise interest rates, and curtailment of programs to conserve and develop our natural resources in the interest of all Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this address by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

DECEIT, DECEPTION, AND DUPLICITY

(Speech by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat of Tennessee, delivered at the 22d annual meeting of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, Madison, Wis., Monday, March 24)

I have very pleasant memories of the great State of Wisconsin. I have been here

many times. And every time I have come I have received a warm and friendly welcome.

I have enjoyed serving in the Senate with BILL PROXMIRE. I want to thank you for sending him to Washington. The REA program has no better friend than Senator PROXMIRE. He is working tirelessly for the benefit of all the farmers, and REA is one of the topics which he is most familiar and concerning which he is most effective.

I served on the Judiciary Committee with Wisconsin's senior Senator, ALEXANDER WILEY. Although we are of different parties, I want to pay tribute to him as a supporter of REA.

It is good to be with Gaylor Nelson. He is a man who is really devoted to this State and the progressive principles for which it stands. Gaylord Nelson tirelessly serves the cause of good government. I am always grateful for the work he did in the last two Demorcatic conventions—I am proud to have a friend like Gaylord Nelson.

In particular I am glad to be here at this meeting of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative. Since I come from the Tennessee Valley, I have always been interested in the progress that rural electrification has made in Wisconsin.

Many of the people in this audience were pioneers in the REA movement. Their achievements have been of benefit not only to the farm families of Wisconsin, they have contributed to the development of the rural electric cooperative movement all over the United States.

Your programs here, the rural electrification and Federal power programs have done more perhaps to raise the status of farm families from that of second-class to first-class citizenship than any other programs for the benefit of the farmer. I thank you for what you have done for the program in the past. I thank you for the honor of letting me be here with you today.

The REA was one of the most successful programs launched by the New Deal. It has helped to revolutionize life on the American farm. It is so popular with the farmers and those who depend on farmers that no one dares attack the REA directly. Yet it has been attacked before. It is being attacked now.

I suppose that the most direct and brazen attack on REA came in the period of the 1948 presidential election. The resentment of the friends and supporters of REA contributed much to what happened in that election. The farm people of this whole great area turned the tide of 1948.

Since then it has not been prudent for politicians to attack the REA program directly. They do it by subterfuge. Their weapons are deceit—deception—and duplicity.

One thing you must not forget. That is that the Eisenhower administration is implacably against public power in all its aspects. It has been from the first day it took office. It is today.

You must not forget that only the election of a Democratic Congress in 1954—in the midterm of President Eisenhower's first term as President—prevented the piecemeal destruction of the whole public power system.

There were plans to tear the TVA apart. There were plans to turn it in whole or part over to the private utilities.

There were plans to turn the sale of power from the great projects of the West over to the private companies.

There were plans, as you know, to strangle REA cooperatives through high interest rates and tight money.

The administration would have been back at the job this year if the American people had not sensed the danger and carried the Democrats back to power in the Congress in 1956.

But the administration's purpose has not changed one iota.

The revelations about the Dixon-Yates contract set the Eisenhower administration back on its heels. I am glad that I had the opportunity to help drag out into the light some of the facts about that Dixon-Yates contract. I am glad that the deceit—deception—and duplicity which were then revealed brought such a protest from the American people—including, I am glad to say, a great many Republicans—that the dismemberment of the TVA was stopped in its tracks.

The Eisenhower administration seems to think that the public has forgotten about Dixon-Yates by now. It is back at its job of trying to cut the throats of the REA cooperatives.

Back in 1952 General Eisenhower, who was then a candidate for the first time said that "we will support REA programs."

Again in 1956 the President said, "We will continue to strengthen such long-established, indispensable programs as rural electrification and rural telephone service."

And what did President Eisenhower say to you in a wire sent to your great annual meeting in Dallas this year?

He said, "Rural electrification ranks high among the programs helping to make rural America a better place in which to live and work. Members of the REA-financed electric systems, serving as partners with the Federal Government, have contributed much to the strength of their communities across the land."

But at the very same time that message was being read at Dallas, the administration in Washington was drafting legislative proposals which eventually would have eliminated the rural electrification programs we know today.

Your protest about the so-called insured loan fund was finally heard at the White House. It was decided that it could never get through Congress in that form. So the administration tried again. This time it came up with what it calls a revolving fund which sounds nice but which in this case would not be a fund nor would it revolve.

This was calculated to be a very shrewd move. Many people have known for a long time that some REA supporters have in the past advocated a revolving fund to finance the REA program.

Now personally I see nothing wrong with the current way in which the REA program is financed.

I see nothing wrong with the interest rate now being charged to you. You are not being subsidized, countrary to what some of the private power companies have been telling the American people.

What the Eisenhower administration offers you now is something which would apply the good name of revolving funds to a method of financing which would let REA cooperatives soon revolve themselves into the hands of people who would like to hamstring or destroy the present program.

It purports to be a program which would encourage private participation in financing the loan programs. Here again we have the familiar theme of the Eisenhower administration. Whatever it proposes in whatever field seems to end up benefitting the mortgage bankers. The same kind of mortgage bankers who were caught redhanded in the Dixon-Yates mess.

The plan sets up a so-called loan insurance scheme. You still would have to hunt for your money but in case you defaulted the banker would still get his money.

The Secretary of Agriculture would subordinate your present mortgage in order to give the mortgage banker a higher lien on new money advanced.

The Secretary could sell your mortgage—and he could sell it to enemies of the REA program if he wanted to.

The plan provides no leniency. If you fall behind you would be foreclosed.

No refinancing methods are provided. Once stuck with a high interest you would stay stuck with a high interest rate even if cheaper money became available.

The REA administrator to all intents and purposes would be abolished—he isn't even mentioned in the proposed administration legislation. The Secretary of Agriculture—who is Ezra Taft Benson—would take charge of the new plan—with the Secretary of the Treasury standing by his shoulder controling financing and rates.

The plan is rigid. It is stacked in favor of the mortgage bankers instead of the cooperatives. It could lead to bankruptcy of cooperatives, take over of your properties by private utilities, and higher rates for your members.

And I had better say right here that this Eisenhower administration plan is never going to get through Congress controlled by Democrats. But it shows unmistakably where the heart of the Eisenhower administration really lies—no matter what it says to the contrary.

In no instance when the interests of the people and the interests of the private power companies have clashed has the Eisenhower administration ever decided with the people.

Let us translate this into individual terms and see what all this really means.

Most of you people assembled here are farmers or at least for a goodly portion of your lives you were engaged in farming activities. In 1952, farm income in the United States was $15.1 billion and personal interest income was $12.3 billion. Personal interest income has now risen, from $12.3 billion, which to say the least is quite a bit of money for such a small number of people that receive interest income—to $19.5 billion, which is a 58½-percent increase. At the same time, the farm income has dropped from $15 billion to $12 billion.

Lest anyone be taken in by a recent Department of Agriculture release which showed that per capita farm income rose to a record high last year of $993, let me make this observation.

First of all it is true that per capita farm income had reached an estimated high of $993.

But the interesting point is how this came about.

In my estimation it came about because the farmers of America, have been "Bensonized." Last year some 2 million persons left our Nation's farms due to the administration-Benson farm policies.

So you can see it would be quite possible, as is fact in this case, for per capita farm income to rise while total farm income is falling; all we have to do is make sure enough people leave the farms.

And now the administration wishes to add insult to injury. They are not content in consistently lowering your standard of living but now they want to take your member owned rural electric cooperatives away from you.

We have grown too complacent. We have assumed that by some act of God everything would be all right, and that the rural electric cooperatives and all they stand for—indeed all such people's programs—would grow and prosper without constant or increased cultivation, hard work, and diligence.

As the record of the past 5 years so amply points out, this is a false assumption. It is axiomatic that monopoly interests must destroy all opposition and competition, or else themselves be destroyed. I need not tell you that you are competing against one of the most formidable monopolies that has ever existed in this Nation—the private power monopoly. The weight of power is on their side for they have helped elect the party of monopoly to office.

Your enemies, their pad for lackeys and elected officials, are ruthless. They will stop

at nothing—they will stoop to any depths—to defeat you. They will, as they are doing, spread their fraudulent propaganda through our education systems, and they will, as they have and are doing, by State legislators, State commissioners, and Federal legislators.

And what can we do about it? My answer is take the offensive. And in so doing keep this thought uppermost in mind. The rural electric cooperatives are creatures of politics. You will live and prosper or die as the result of political action. This plan of action I offer you is not novel or unique, but I do suggest that perhaps we should exert a little more effort along these lines.

Certainly you have taken the offensive in many instances, and I would like, in a moment, to mention two of them. But you must be relentless in your actions. Not only must you take the offensive at every opportunity but you must create your opportunities. Pursue your wishes, desires, and aspirations until you have achieved them, for only in this way can you hope to succeed.

In both these specific instances I am going to mention, where you have taken the offensive, I would like to pay tribute to the local rural electric cooperatives, the various statewide associations, and your National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

At this point, I would like to pause a moment and pay specific tribute to your national association. Your national association is the most influential nationwide association supporting not only the REA program but the Federal power program; and for their forceful and positive stand, all of America owes your national association and you who support it a debt of gratitude. I am not being overcomplimentary when I say were it not for your national the progress made to date in bringing electrification to rural America and providing the multipurpose development of our water resources would have been severely hampered, curtailed and slowed down. In many instances your national organization has fought the private power monopoly interests to a standstill, and in many other noteworthy instances, your national and you have triumphed over the monopoly hordes that pervade our economy. And in fighting the defensive battle over the last 5 years, the value of your national cannot be overestimated.

Turning now to specifics, the first recent victory for the people I would like to discuss with you is the tax amortization victory. As you know, after a long, hard fight, legislation was finally passed last year which sharply curtails the industries that can participate in this subsidy giveaway, and excluded, by definition, is the private power monopoly. And, further, in August 1959, the entire program will be terminated.

After a long series of fights, after long years of appealing to and informing the public of this subsidy, and after an extensive hearing involving the Idaho Power Co. and their tax amortization certificates, in which White House pressures, and many other instances of nefarious dealings were brought to light, this long-awaited legislation was finally passed.

But the job in this area is not nearly done. We have only scratched the surface. For the almost $5 billion subsidy accruing to the private power companies, and being paid for by the ratepayers and taxpayers, has not been taken away from them. Legislation and State utility commissions are still needed. And this is why I say that we must take the offensive and pursue it to the end. Favorable rulings must still be obtained from most of the State utility commissions.

I am happy to say that in the progressive State of Wisconsin such a ruling has already been obtained. But our efforts should not be relaxed until the several utility commissions throughout the United States forces all private power companies to cease charging the ratepayers for capital expansion.

And so too in the case of liberalized depreciation. As a result of the amendment passed to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, section 167, a subsidy is accruing to the private power companies which over the next twenty-odd years will amount to some $18 billion. This is some six times the amount which has been loaned to the rural electric cooperatives and which will be repaid to the Federal Government with interest.

I was happy to observe that progressive Wisconsin continues to be progressive. For in this instance, too, the Wisconsin State Utility Commission has disallowed this subsidy, but again similar rulings must be obtained in every State of the Union.

You should support and push through to final victory the bills that have already been introduced in the Congress to take away these subsidies from the private power companies.

And when you have achieved a favorable ruling from all State utility commissions on rapid tax amortizations and liberalized depreciation and when the Congressional bills that have been introduced have been signed into law eliminating these subsidies on the Federal level, then you can say in this one area the job has been successfully consummated.

And the other instance I would like to mention involves the ruthless and fraudulent propaganda advertising campaign that the private power companies have been waging over the years against the rural electrification and Federal power program. As we all know, these campaigns are being paid for by you and me—the ratepayers. For many years the rural electric systems have attempted to defend themselves against this propaganda by pleading and requesting the Congress and the affected State utility commissions to disallow such expenditures. We are not attempting to curtail freedom of speech, but merely attempting to provide the means whereby these private power companies would have to pay for this fraudulent advertising out of their own net income or profits.

For the past 12 months or more I personally have been corresponding with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Russell C. Harrington, asking him for a ruling on political propaganda such as that sponsored by America's Independent Electric Light and Power Companies. I have consistently charged that such ads were false and misleading. And finally our constant hammering and persistent agitation bore fruit. For after an investigation by the field directors of the Internal Revenue Service into this matter, it has been held that contributions paid for by the participating companies in the ECAP program did not constitute allowable deductions for Federal income-tax purposes.

But again I say we have finished only half the job.

For unless the State utility commissions rule that such advertising must come out of the participating companies' profits, the rate payer will still end up footing the bill.

I must pause again to compliment the progressive State of Wisconsin for your public service commission has recently ruled that such propaganda advertising, which is used to influence the public opinion or used against public ownership of electric facilities, is not just and reasonable for inclusion in the operating expenses and utilities.

I say again, not until every commission has ruled, as your commission has, can we say the job in this area is complete.

The job the rural electrics have cut out for themselves is a formidable one. Unless you continue to fight relentlessly for your program we will soon know of the rural electrification program only by resorting to the history books.

You must keep one thought uppermost in mind. You are creatures of politics, as I mentioned a moment ago, and unless you make sure on the local, State, and national level that those people are elected to office who will uphold your rights to engage in supplying low-cost electricity to the rural areas of America, you may soon find the rural electrification program a passing phenomenon on the American scene.

Before I close I would like to mention one important and overwhelming fact to you. As you know, I am sure, we are rapidly becoming a nation characterized by city, industrial, and modern suburbia living. Much of the sentiment attached to the rural electrification program is rapidly waning, not due to any disinterest on the part of those personally connected with the program, but due to the fact that agriculture no longer occupies the potent political, economic, and social position it once occupied. A new generation has grow up since 1935.

It is imperative that we take cognizance of this matter. We must inform those who are not familiar with our program of its great social benefits and of its proven economic feasibility. For unless they are made aware of these facts they may soon be electing members to offices who are opposed to all that your program stands for.

My suggested solution to this problem is not a simple one, but one which must be undertaken and consummated if the rural electrification and Federal power program is to survive. We must go into the cities and join up with peoples' groups. We must work with organized labor. We must work with other urban and industrial groups, for only by working together on mutual problems can we hope to gain support for the programs we here hold so dear to our hearts.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 137th anniversary of Greek independence. On March 25, 1821, the Archbishop of Patros unfurled the national flag of Greece and the war of independence against Ottoman rule began. Fighting against great odds, the revolutionaries were ultimately successful. In 1827 Greece elected Demetrios Capodistrias as President, and in 1832 obtained recognition of her complete independence.

This is, of course, only one of many great events in the history of Greece. One of the basic sources of our western culture is ancient Greece. Our philosophy, art, architecture, political ideas, and language owe much to the greatness of the ancient Greeks.

It is against the background of these noble people that we must judge our present policies. I have in mind particularly our shamefully unfair immigration policy. The Greek quotas are discriminatory, and inasmuch as Americans of Greek origin are known to be exemplary citizens these policies are unwise.

This anniversary of Greek independence is an occasion for rededicating ourselves to continuing friendship with the Greek nation. On many occasions

in the past the United States and Greece have fought together for freedom and independence. We were allies in both World Wars and in the Korean war. The encroachment of communism in Greece was successfully halted by the Truman doctrine. It is through such friendship and assistance that the great western tradition of freedom continues to survive. Let us ever be mindful of the continuing contribution of the Greek people to this great tradition.

Comradeship Is Fatal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the last in a series of eight articles by the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities, on the Communist conspiracy aimed at the United States. This series by Mr. WALTER recently appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer:

COMRADESHIP IS FATAL

(Last of eight articles by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities)

COMRADESHIP VEILS HANDCLASP OF DEATH

Present-day leaders of the international Communist empire, in the course of their careers of murder and terror, have deliberately destroyed more men, women, and children than populate the Eastern United States. Despite the long history of Soviet treachery and deceit which lies in full view of the civilized world, we find ourselves being subjected once more to the sweet persuasion which seeks to lead us into comradeship with men whose real intents are best observed in their broken promises and lust for power.

In recent months the emphasis has been on coexistence and disarmament conferences. Now the demand is for a summit meeting at which President Eisenhower and the heads of the governments of the Free World would sit down with the bosses of the Iron Curtain countries to end the cold war.

We may well wonder what new and bitter hoax awaits us. The plausibility of Nikita Khrushchev and his colleagues, coupled with the eager willingness of many quarters of the Free World to believe them, appear to have rebutted common sense and our own experience.

Who are these Communist leaders with whom our representatives would meet at the summit? The Committee on Un-American Activities has examined their careers searchingly. We believe a study of these men will demonstrate beyond doubt the character of communism's masters and the hopelessness of attempting to negotiate with them as if they were men of good faith. Here they are:

Nikita Khrushchev: As First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Khrushchev 2 years ago denounced the dead Josef Stalin as a vicious murderer and terrorist. A few years earlier, Khrushchev was hailed as the faithful disciple and companion-in-arms of Comrade Stalin.

Khrushchev's rise to power in the party coincided with the notorious purges of the mid-1930's. He actually played a leading role in the mass terror of that period. Stalin sent him to the Ukraine to carry out the party purge there. He is, as a result, one of the most hated men in the Soviet Ukraine today.

In carrying out his assignment, he was as systematic as he was ruthless. He openly boasted that "we have destroyed a considerable number of enemies, though not all."

A salient feature of his record is his relentless onslaught against independent farmers. His rise to power was accompanied by the betrayal and the physical destruction of his closest associates. At the helm of the party, he lost no time in undermining and finally ousting Georgi Malenkov and Vyacheslav M. Molotov, his political rivals in the collective leadership, and in establishing himself in Stalin's fashion as the master of the Soviet.

Khrushchev is the sworn enemy of the democratic form of government. He reviles the United States as being devoid of political freedom and economic stability and ruled by a handful of greedy capitalists who enslave the working people.

His fanatical belief in the superiority of the Communist system leaves no doubt in his mind that, whether there be peace or war, the ultimate communization of the world is certain.

To obtain this objective, Khrushchev displays versatility and flexibility in selecting the device he considers most effective and promising at the moment: Nuclear blackmail, subversion, propaganda, interference in the domestic affairs of other states, or exploitation of anticolonial and nationalist feelings in Asia and Africa. All these expedients serve the single-minded goal of Soviet aggrandizement and of accelerating the march of communism.

Nikolai A. Bulganin: The Premier of the Soviet Union is a familiar figure, whose mild manner, well-groomed appearance, and carefully barbered goatee has reminded casual observers of a professor or a German bandmaster.

It is well to remember, however, that Bulganin began his career as an efficient officer of the Cheka, the initial version of the Soviet Secret Police. It was the main instrument of the Red terror, waged by the new Bolshevik rulers againt real and imaginary opponents of the Communist regime.

As one observer noted, "a complete lack of principles, a thoroughgoing ruthlessness, a constant readiness to be a scoundrel brought Bulganin promotion to Moscow."

Bulganin played a conspicuous role in plotting against freedom in Poland and Czechoslovakia. In the summer of 1944, Bulganin was instrumental in the decision to refuse military assistance to the Polish patriots in Warsaw, who had risen in arms against the Nazis.

Rude to subordinates, he tolerates neither criticism nor opposition. In spite of his recurrent protestations of belief in peaceful coexistence between the United States and the U. S. S. R., Bulganin remains an implacable foe of American democracy, which he accuses of predatory and aggressive designs.

Like other Kremlin chiefs, Bulganin is bent on the disruption of the Western alliance as the initial step toward the destruction of the American way of life. Both during and after the Stalin regime, he took a leading part in plotting Communist strategy against the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Walter Ulbricht: Exerting practically unlimited power as head of the Communist Party in East Germany, Walter Ulbricht also holds the title of First Deputy Premier in that Soviet puppet government. He represents a dangerous and relentless enemy of America and all it stands for.

A founder of the German Communist Party in 1918, he managed to survive Hitler, the purges under Stalin, the postwar executions of East European leaders, and Khrushchev's anti-Stalinist campaign.

His hour of triumph came in April 1945, while Berlin was in flames and the battle for the city was raging. Ulbricht was flown in from Moscow to set up the German civilian government.

There are few fields of life in East Germany in which Ulbricht has not imposed subservience to the Soviet Union. He has ordered servile imitations of Russia in the fields of science, linguistics, and education, the theater, architecture, and sports. He has made the organization of the East German state a miniature replica of the Soviet Union.

The magnitude of discontent with his regime became evident with the revolt of East Berlin in June 1953. Ulbricht suppressed it ruthlessly with Soviet armed power.

His prosovietism is surpassed only by his anti-Americanism. He has distorted history to paint America as the villain on the world stage. Regardless of talk of peace and peaceful coexistence, Ulbricht's goal remains unchanged: the communization of all of Germany as a decisive step toward the communization of the whole world.

Janos Kadar: Communist Party head in Hungary and, until recently, Premier of that country, Janos Kadar is a Communist quisling for the Kremlin and a master of the doublecross.

He is a man of ambition but no integrity; of a personal drive but no character; of natural political skill but devoid of high intelligence. So loyal is he to communism that after 32 months of imprisonment and torture under one Red regime, he became the willing servant of the Kremlin in the reconquest of Hungary in November 1956.

In November 1956, when Hungary attempted to throw off the Soviet yoke, Kadar set up a Soviet puppet government and invited Russian tanks into Budapest. Some 32,000 persons were killed and parts of the capital reduced to rubble in smashing Hungary's bid for freedom. At the height of the counterrevolution, Kadar justified the brutal treatment of his countrymen:

"A tiger cannot be tamed by bait. It can be tamed and forced to peace only by beating it to death."

Wladyslaw Gomulka: First Secretary of the Communist Party in Poland, has managed, by making a few concessions to workers, peasants, and the Catholic Church, to head off a Polish repetition of events in Hungary.

But while his road to socialism may differ slightly from the Russian road, it is still communistic. Gomulka has made that point abundantly clear.

He denies being a national Communist, a term he calls an American invention. As proof, he notes that his program includes the main aims of every Communist Party.

(1) Seizure of power by Communists; (2) establishment of a Communist dictatorship; (3) nationalization of industry, and (4) the promotion of international communism in foreign affairs.

His present power dates to 1956, when he staged a comeback after falling into disfavor in 1948. Stubborn, relentless, he is fanatically devoted to communism, although it has brought his country insoluble problems. He is struggling with opponents within his own party; whether he will survive as Poland's leader, only time will tell.

Mao Tze-tung: Chairman of the People's Republic of China, less than a year ago he announced a new freedom for Communist China:

"Let a hundred flowers bloom and let a hundred schools of thought contend," he suggested generously. Some Chinese took him seriously—and faced a new wave of terror.

It was Mao who proclaimed the People's Republic in October 1949. The fiction of China's disassociation from Russia was shat-

tered with his signing of the Sino-Soviet Friendship Pact in 1950 in Moscow.

He never makes a speech in which he does not pay tribute to the U. S. S. R. At Stalin's order, Mao sent vast Chinese armies to fight Americans who were resisting Communist aggression in Korea.

To crush resistance at home, Mao ordered what he called mass shock, in which 12,000,000 Chinese—according to Communist figures—were wiped out.

He has conducted a hate-America campaign for years and still refuses to account for American soldiers missing in the Korean war. As part of his drive, he has endorsed defiance of the United Nations, atrocities against prisoners of war, violation of the Korean truce, and subversion throughout Southeast Asia.

Chou En-lai: Premier and, until recently, Foreign Minister of Communist China, Chou appears affable in his personal relations. In this he resembles his boss, Mao Tze-tung. His past has been that of a fanatic and dedicated Communist and the basic pattern of his policy—a combination of force and deceit—has been evident for years.

In foreign policy, where Mao has given him a relatively free hand, Chou has operated with the same combination. His record in Korea is particularly sordid.

Defying the United Nations, which branded Red China as an aggressor, Communist China fought against the American and U. N. armies for nearly 3 years. When communism lost the war, Chou became one of the instigators of the false accusation that the United States had used bacteriological warfare in Korea.

Under the armistice terms, Red China promised to return captured prisoners of war; instead, Chou used them in an insidious game to barter American lives for United States concessions. His promise not to increase armaments in North Korea was violated almost from the beginning of the truce.

Lately, he has switched again to deceit. At the Afro-Asia Conference in Bandung, Chou made a dramatic offer to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the Formosa question with the United States. But it soon developed that the only basis on which he would negotiate was the immediate surrender of the island to the Communists.

There we have some of the leaders with whom we are asked to negotiate a peace. We must remember we are not dealing with partners but with adversaries dedicated to accomplish our destruction with every ruse and subterfuge which they have used successfully in enslaving almost half the world.

Fortieth Anniversary of Independence of Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, and under leave to extend my remarks, I extend the following greeting to the people of Byelorussia and their kinsmen in their continued fight for freedom from the yoke of Communist tyranny and oppression:

Every American, faithful to our tradition of freedom for all peoples, will sympathize with the aspirations of the Byelorussian people to achieve independence and self-government. Their cultural and historical contributions have greatly benefited the world. I join with other freedom loving peoples the world over in wishing you a return to full independence and sovereignty.

Challenges for Nurses Ever Increasing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, in our current rush to train people for trades and professions directly allied with the conquest of outer space and the maintenance of an adequate defense position, we sometimes forget the faithful, trained people who carry on day after day in promoting the health and social welfare of the American people.

Recently, I expressed my genuine sentiments on this subject as it relates to the nurses of the world, of the United States, and of the State of Michigan. My remarks were carried in the February issue of the Michigan Nurse in the form of an article entitled "Challenges for Nurses Ever Increasing." The publication is regularly issued by the Michigan State Nurses Association.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

CHALLENGES FOR NURSES EVER INCREASING

(By Senator CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan)

During these opening days of the Congressional session, every lawmaker is preoccupied with defense and the challenges facing the United States in the space age. Two schools of thought seem to be emerging, one an attitude of hysterical urgency and the other a giant ladle of soothing syrup, heavily dependent on the old platitudes about America's invincibility.

Personally, I subscribe to neither. I do not recommend that the United States be penny wise and defense foolish. I do not recommend that we hastily pour out billions for the military. I do not recommend for a moment that we be complacent.

Of course, one cannot help but question the warnings of mortal peril when he sees with his own eyes our mighty B-52's and our atomic submarines and when he listens to expert testimony on the power of our Strategic Air Command. But neither for a moment should one swallow the hogwash distributed in some quarters that because America never lost a war, she never will.

So I am advocating a new school, one which I consider highly sensible and highly patriotic. It is the "act now and act fast" school. The survival of our Nation in the space age depends, in my opinion, on the acceptance of this view as the path which patriotism must take.

In answering the call to strengthen our Nation's resources in the battle against communism, it seems to me that all citizens should direct attention to the nursing front, a vital part of national security in peace and in war. It is just as important to increase the number, capability, and flexibility of our nursing battalions as it is to build our Military Establishment.

In the end, of course, the Nation controlling outer space will control the world, but to achieve that at the expense of our democratic traditions, or to achieve it by sacrificing the peaceful objectives of science, nursing, and medicine, would be to abandon all that we have fought for and cherished in the past.

On the peace front new drugs, new medicine, and peaceful uses of the atom are revolutionizing the medical and nursing professions.

The new drugs prolong life and open new vistas of healing. We find ourselves, therefore, with a new group of semi-patients—living longer, but dependent upon other human beings to keep them in good physical and mental health. Serving this portion of the population is one of the new challenges to the nursing profession.

The tensions of modern living have increased the number of mental and nervous ailments at the very time new methods of relieving them alter the entire pattern of treatment by nurses and doctors. Tranquillizers alone have brought about major innovations.

On the disaster front—when war, emergency or tragedy strike—the nurses move to the front and center of the stage. Nothing can substitute for their services and abilities. Today, in the age of the atom and hydrogen bombs, the challenge to the nursing profession is greater than ever.

As science pentetrates farther into outer space, a whole new set of health and nursing problems will confront mankind. What happens to a man mentally and physically in a craft rocketing through space? How is he affected by cosmic radiation, extremes of heat and cold, extreme outward pressures? Will leukemia and cancer attack him more virulently under any of these circumstances? What will be the psychological affects on man of weightlessness and loneliness?

These are challenges for science, for medicine and for the nursing profession. I can think of no higher patriotic duty for the nurses of the Free World than to move in and face them.

To begin with, all public health and community nursing services must expand as defense and other emergency communities are built up. Accident prevention and treatment become prime necessities. The nurse must be in a position to cope with new mental states as well as new physical diseases.

The nurse must work to recruit new members of the profession. Today in the United States we have 259 nurses per 100,000 persons. For minimum good care that figure should read 300. Michigan, I regret to say, is below the average, with less than 200 nurses per 100,000 people—a ratio we must work to build up. As the nursing profession works to add to its numbers, all patriotic citizens must join in the same cause.

Yes, the challenges to citizenship and patriotism in the space age are many. But if I had to single out one segment of our people who could be counted on to respond and respond nobly, I should not hesitate for a moment. It would be, of course, that brave and dedicated person—the nurse.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussians, or the White Russians, have lived in their historic homeland in

northeastern Europe for at least 1,000 years, perhaps a great deal longer. Long before Russians had formed their independent state, Byelorussians had a sovereign state of their own. They enjoyed an independent existence during most of the Middle Ages and early in modern times. Early in the 17th century Byelorussia was overpowered by the invading Russians, and their country was annexed to the czar's empire.

Thus for almost 300 years, Byelorussia ceased to be a separate state. It became part and parcel of the Russian empire, and the government of the czars did their best to eradicate all vestiges of Byelorussian nationality among its inhabitants. Fortunately the czarist overlords were not successful in their attempt. By devious means Byelorussians contrived and succeeded in keeping alive their national spirit for liberty and freedom. And in the First World War when the czarist regime collapsed, Byelorussians seized upon the opportunity and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918.

That epoch-making event in the Byelorussian history became a landmark, and to this day it is being celebrated by all liberty-loving Byelorussians as their national holiday. Even though the independence proclaimed 40 years ago did not even last a year, the undying hope it engendered still lives in the hearts of Byelorussians. They dream of a day when the detested Communist regime will be overthrown and they can once again breath the fresh air of freedom. I am glad to join those stouthearted Byelorussians in the celebration of their independence day, and add my hopes for the attainment of their national goal.

Joseph Scott, Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, a rich chapter in the history of Los Angeles has been completed with the death of Joseph Scott.

It would be difficult to say whether the growth of this great city paralleled the life of Joseph Scott or vice versa. Probably to say both would better serve the truth, for he arrived there when it was a pueblo of 60,000 persons in 1893 and from then on engaged in almost every conceivable activity that has been associated with the growth of this western metropolis.

If any man has lived a more full and vigorous and useful 90 years than Joseph Scott, I have yet to hear of him.

As a citizen, as a devoted father of 11 children, as a lawyer, as a churchman and as a leader of causes for good, Joseph Scott excelled. Joseph Scott never ducked a fight, nor did he ever shirk a duty or responsibility. His energy, his ability and his capacity for work were tremendous.

A native of England born of an Irish mother, he arrived in this country as countless thousands of other immigrants before and since, penniless and friendless. But his driving ambition and his boundless industry wrote an American success story for him.

A devout Catholic, Joseph Scott was one of the lay leaders of his church in the United States and his church paid him high honor. He was active always in politics up to the very time of his death. In 1928, he nominated Herbert Hoover for the Presidency at the 1928 Republican National Convention.

His contributions to his community, to his State and to his Nation were countless, and they constitute now a rich part of our American heritage.

Life is gone for Joseph Scott. But his work for good against evil will live long after him.

United States Policy Toward the Communist Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, for some time close observers of the Soviet Union and the Russian Communist empire have seriously questioned whether our Government has a positive and winning policy toward the Soviet Union. The tremendous opportunities afforded us for a political counteroffensive against Moscow by the captive status of the non-Russian nations both in the European and Asiatic sectors of the Soviet Union have in no way been taken advantage of by our Government. Yet this could mean the difference between war and peace, victory and defeat, in our struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. I am convinced that a well-thought-out policy toward the U. S. S. R., with prime emphasis given to the captive non-Russian nations in that primary empire of Moscow, would go a long way in preventing a hot war and in assuring victory for the free world in the cold war.

The fourth program of the Georgetown University series considers in part this very problem. It was my privilege to participate in this final forum along with the Honorable Charles J. Kersten, of Wisconsin, author of the famous Kersten amendment to the Mutual Security Act, and Mr. John E. Means of the Georgetown University faculty. In reading the script of this program it will be observed that agreement was reached that the policy of peaceful liberation goes beyond the containment program. The peaceful liberation policy calls for a political offensive directed at the heartland of the Communist empire, especially the Soviet Union itself. Despite the administration's espousal of this policy, it unfortunately has not yet implemented it.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that in time we shall recognize the fact that our most potent weapons for victory in the cold war, our best means to avert a hot war, are available to us, for our asking, within the Russian Communist empire itself. It will require not only knowledge but also courage and political art to make use of these weapons which the captive non-Russian nations, from the Danube to the Pacific, provide us. We desperately need a United States policy toward the Communist empire.

Performing a valuable public service, the Georgetown University Forum made possible the expression of this need in the fourth program of a series. Its directors, Rev. Francis Heyden, S. J., and Rev. Daniel E. Power, S. J., deserve the highest commendations for the public service they have performed in the planning and producing of this series of television and radio programs.

Under leave obtained, I insert in the RECORD this fourth program entitled "United States Policy Toward the Communist Empire":

Mr. WALKER. United States Policy Toward the Communist Empire is the topic for the 582d consecutive broadcast of the Georgetown University Radio Forum. Today's participants are the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Congressman from Ohio and member of the House Judiciary Committee; the Honorable Charles J. Kersten, former Congressman from Wisconsin and author of the famous Kersten amendment to the Mutual Security Act; Mr. John E. Means, Department of Government, Georgetown University.

United States Policy Toward the Communist Empire is the final program in a series of four. On the basis of these preceding subjects this final program will be devoted to an examination of United States foreign policy toward the U. S. S. R. The discussions will consider certain fundamental questions: Has the United States an adequate policy in relation to the Soviet Union; has the announced policy of peaceful liberation with regard to all the captive nations in the Russian Communist empire been implemented; is the Allen Dulles notion of freedom by evolution and Soviet education a very end of the containment policy? The recent proposals made by Mr. George F. Kennan and the recent campaign for the removal of Secretary of State Dulles will also be considered. Our leading question today: Has the United States an adequate policy in relation to the Soviet Union? Congressman Kersten, I wonder if you would care to comment on this question?

NEED FOR IMPLEMENTED LIBERATION POLICY

Mr. KERSTEN. Well, Mr. Walker, I believe we do not have an adequate policy toward the Communist empire. We are continuing to follow a policy of containment under another name, that is, the policy of evolution or some such phrase. We have never implemented a policy of liberation, a policy of peaceful liberation. When this policy was first announced, back in 1952, it was immediately attacked by the Russian Communists, and the whole left-wing group throughout the world began to attack it as an irresponsible policy, as a warmongering policy, when actually the policy of containment is the real war policy that is driving us toward an ultimate war, and we see some of the fruits of that today.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Means, I believe you are in favor of the policy of containment. I wish you would state your position at this time concerning that.

Mr. MEANS. I agree with Mr. Kersten that we do not have an adequate foreign policy at this time. I think the reason is that the policy of containment, which was our foreign policy from 1947 to 1952, has not been pur-

sued with conviction. After 1952 and the successes of the policy of containment we had a complete corruption of the policy of containment by the so-called liberationist movement. The policy of liberation, as I see it, is, should we indiscriminately encourage revolt and commit ourselves to a specific arrangement without any clarity as to the consequences.

I think the policy of containment, on the other hand, is a policy which takes into account the realities of international political life. It seeks to rise above the emotional indignations of the policy of liberation, and, to me, it represents the physical strength, armaments, determination, and solidarity with the other free nations of the world.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I believe that we do not have any definite or adequate policy against the Communist empire. In the first instance, we wait until the Russians make some kind of a move and then we frantically, perhaps sometimes through fear, try to react. I think that is the trouble with our present policy and the root of the evil of the disturbed situation in the world today.

Mr. WALKER. Gentlemen, throwing the discussion open, what do you feel is the solution to this situation?

Mr. KERSTEN. I would like to comment, Mr. Walker, on the remark made here by Mr. Means with regard to the containment policy and its successes. I believe the containment policy has resulted in tremendous disasters since the end of World War II. It has resulted in the acquiescence, in the enslavement of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union and the satellite nations of Eastern Europe and China. That has been the score of the policy of containment.

On this question of containment, I think we have to make a vital, basic distinction right here and now. Containment has always meant, as I understood it, to permit the Russian Communist Party to maintain the hold over these nations. I advocate a policy of peaceful liberation, which means the ultimate freedom of these nations. Such a policy includes certainly the containment of the Communist advances. But it goes beyond the policy of containment and it seeks ways and means to cause the political defeat of the Russian Communist policy.

I would like to ask Mr. Means whether he is for or against the ultimate freedom of the captive nations. If he is for the freedom of the captive nations, then he must be in favor of a policy of liberation.

Mr. MEANS. I am in favor of the freedom of the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. KERSTEN. Then I think you would adopt our thesis, a policy of liberation; isn't that so, Mr. Means?

Mr. MEANS. First of all, I would like to ask you, Mr. Kerston, what do you mean by "peaceful liberation?"

ESSENTIAL MEANING OF LIBERATION POLICY

Mr. KERSTEN. I mean by a policy of peaceful liberation to use all means short of war to cause the political defeat of the Communist Party. The great error in the policy of containment is that it believes—designed and based upon the idea that by containing them, doing nothing however to interfere with them internally—they will eventually change, evolve, peacefully change into something decent. In my opinion, you have to decide whether or not the Communist Party, the Russian Communist Party can ever change or evolve into something decent or whether it has to be defeated politically from within.

Mr. MEANS. First of all, getting back to the liberation of the Baltic States, the policy of containment is as solicitous of the Baltic countries as other protagonists of liberation. But I think containment tries to refrain from confusing the issues of the fight for personal freedom, personal liberties, constitutional guaranties with the fight for national liberation. The two are not necessarily the same. I think in this fight for national freedom, national liberation the Communists have joined in wholeheartedly. I would like to say also the policy of containment is an active policy, it is an organic policy, it is a flexible policy. It has been a success. The short range goal of containment, of course, is to hold the political line. I think it has been successful in this respect. We have smashed the Berlin blockade. The Truman doctrine has been a success.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I hope that you are not confusing the Truman doctrine with any policy of containment. The Truman policy was a vigorous offensive politically, and also militarily, designed not to contain anything but to drive the Russian Communists out of Greece and Turkey.

Mr. MEANS. As I remember the address that Mr. Truman made to Congress, he said that we are now announcing a policy, announcing a policy of holding the line against communism, which is precisely what the policy of containment seeks to postulate. And to continue, the successes of the policy of containment, I think the efforts of Western European integration, the rearmament of the free world, I think the air bases which have been built up in Britain and in the Mediterranean, and also Japan has been rearmed and is now holding its own against the Communist influence——

Mr. KERSTEN. I notice, Mr. Means, that the high priest of containment, Mr. George Kennan, in today's papers was violently attacked by former Secretary Acheson. Now, Mr. Kennan is the author of the policy, as he set out first in his famous Mr. X article in Foreign Affairs in July 1947. We now find this high theoretician of containment actually advocating the withdrawal of troops from Europe and withdrawal of military strength. It seems to me that containment is in a box. It has proved to be unsuccessful following World War II. It is proving to be unsuccessful today. The tragic error, the basic error of containment or evolution is to permit the Russian Communist Party to be undisturbed in its control, in its decimation of the nations and cultures behind the Iron Curtain. We have to take a stand on that. Are we in favor of the freedom of those nations or do we want to permit them to remain in Communist hands until we can convert the incontrovertible Communists?

Mr. MEANS. To get back to the first point that you have mentioned, that Mr. Kennan was attacked by Dean Acheson, if I interpret Mr. Acheson's remarks correctly he did not attack Mr. Kennan's policy of containment. He attacked Mr. Kennan's recent series of lectures over the BBC, which have little to do with the active policy of containment. I also believe that concerning Mr. Kennan, I am not an apologist for Mr. Kennan and I have not read this series of lectures over the BBC, but I think any statesman who seeks to advance the national interest in the face of rapidly changing circumstances has no other guide but that of expediency. I think he must be willing to temporarily abandon a long-range policy in order to seize a short-range gain, if such be the true course of expediency. On the other hand, he must not be overly shortsighted in analyzing the expedient or else he runs the danger of doing permanent injury to the national interest in the pursuit of the expedient. I think this is what Mr. Kennan might be guilty of doing.

OUR MORAL COMMITMENT TO THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. FEIGHAN. You previously mentioned about the administration's policy to maintain the freedom of the Baltic States. I recall that in October 1953 Secretary of State Dulles appeared before the Kersten Committee in which he unequivocally gave a commitment that he would not permit the enslavement of the Baltic nations to remain. Now I understand that last October a Mr. Marks, who is the first secretary of the American Embassy in Moscow, was permitted to go to Riga, Latvia, and he came back and gave great praise for the tremendous strides that have been made in Latvia. I wonder if this is a change from the previous policy of massive retaliation to just trying to fight little local wars. I also wonder, since we do not recognize Red China, will not send any diplomats to Red China, is this a change in the policy which would agree to the retention of the status quo, namely, the enslavement by the Russians of all their empire?

Mr. MEANS. As I understand this——

Mr. FEIGHAN. And I do think the Secretary of State should answer that. I think the people are entitled to know.

Mr. MEANS. As I understand this, I think if there is a change in policy on behalf of the administration. I think it is because it has seen the frustration, it has experienced the frustration of trying to follow a guideless policy.

Mr. KERSTEN. Do you think, Mr. Means, that we have ever tried to adopt a policy of liberation; and, if so, what have we done? I can think of a number of things we should have done but we have never done.

Mr. MEANS. I think we have tried to follow the policy of liberation in a negative type of way by not doing anything positively and by trying to disassociate ourselves with the policy of containment. We have given the impression to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain that we are following a policy of liberation, and that it shall be our purpose to try to relieve——

Mr. KERSTEN. The mere giving of the impression, of course, is not the actual implementation of the policy. That is what I am advocating. I am advocating a policy of peaceful liberation, using all means short of war to defeat the Russian Communist hold on the Communist empire. Are you in favor of the freedom of these people, of these captive nations, or aren't you? That is the simple question.

Mr. MEANS. Of course, I am.

Mr. KERSTEN. If you are in favor of it, then you are in favor of the policy of liberation, it seems to me.

Mr. MEANS. I am not in favor of a policy of liberation as now being expressed, because to me it means confusing ourselves with grandiose, unrealistic, and even meaningless phrases.

Mr. KERSTEN. Let's get away from words and let's take a few concrete actions. Would you, for example, favor any of these. I will say that I favor the withdrawal of diplomatic recognition to the Communist Party governments, I favor an all-out attack upon the Communist Party throughout the world; I favor the driving of a wedge, or rather, the recognition of the conflict there is between the Russian Communist Party and the enslaved nations. Today the great error of most world statesmen is the identifying of the Russian Communist Party with the peoples of those nations. In that area a real war is going on. It is going on between the Russian Communist Party and those nations. The Russian Communist Party is destroying those nations. That is a hot war. When we try to coexist and negotiate with this Russian Communist Party, whether it is a Mr. Gomulka, who just came from Moscow, or whether it is a Mr. Tito, who also deals and identifies himself with the policy of Moscow, when we cooperate with these Communists we are cooperating, in my opinion, with the destruction of the nations and cultures behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. MEANS. First of all, I think we have to consider the realities of international political life. I can see absolutely no purpose being gained by withdrawing recognition from the countries behind the Iron Curtain. In order to know something about them, we have to have contact with them.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Our contact is with the Communists, not with the peoples.

Mr. MEANS. I think you have to take into consideration who runs the country, who is in charge of the political processes of the country, the Communist Party or the mass of the people.

Mr. FEIGHAN. We know they are not representative of the will of the people.

Mr. MEANS. I wonder who is actually representative of the will of the people. Could you say that a group of emigrés represent the mass of the people behind the iron curtain?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I think the mass of people themselves represent themselves, those who are behind the iron curtain countries. You take Gomulka, you take Kadar, you take Tito, they were all superimposed upon the people. And they are the Communists—

Mr. MEANS. Yes. But my point is that we have to deal with political entities.

Mr. KERSTEN. Mr. Means, if the Communists took over the United States of America and killed 10 or 15 or 20 million Americans and established slavery here, and any one of us survived, would we want any country in the world to deal with an American Communist enslaver of our Nation?

Mr. MEANS. That isn't the point.

Mr. KERSTEN. That is exactly the point. That is exactly what is happening in those other countries.

Mr. MEANS. You are speaking of a probability; I am speaking of what is here and now.

Mr. KERSTEN. Here and now is the Russian Communist Party conquest of these enslaved nations. That is a reality. We have taken the unreal position of identifying that Russian Communist Party with those nations, and we are seeking to negotiate with it. That is where our first basic misstep has been taken. We should adopt a policy of not only stopping this negotiating with these enslavers, but also of helping these people to cause its political defeat at its Moscow base. This we have not done. This I advocate that we start doing in order that we can look forward to sometime when the true basis of peace can be established.

COLD WAR DEMANDS POLITICAL OFFENSIVE

Mr. FEIGHAN. I agree with you on that. We are now really in a war, with the military being somewhat quiet but the political war is going on. That is the war which the Russians have been successful in, and that is the war that we have to fight, a political war in order to bring liberation to the people. We can't bring liberation to people if we are just going to have a policy of reacting to whatever the Russians do.

Mr. MEANS. Speaking of the policy of containment, and also the word "enslavement" has been mentioned here several times, I think it is unfortunate that inasmuch as in 1953 in his message to Congress the President, in speaking of the enslaved nations of the world, seems to equate acquiescence of the United States policy under Mr. Truman with the policy of enslavement and containment. That is not the purpose of containment——

Mr. FEIGHAN. Excuse me. There is no policy of recognition of the status quo by President Truman.

Mr. MEANS. No. The policy of containment does not advocate the policy of the status quo. It goes beyond that. It seeks to build up in the countries on the periphery of the Soviet Union economic, social, and military stability so that they themselves will be able to fight the Communists, so they will not become victims of communism but rather the bulwarks of communism.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Don't you think the uprising in East Germany in June 1953 and the Polish revolt at Poznan in June of 1956 and the Hungarian freedom-fighters revolution of October 1956 indicate clearly that the people want their freedom, their national sovereignty, and they want to get rid of the Russian domination? I call it slavery.

Mr. MEANS. I think the riots and the uprisings in Hungary and in East Germany and even in Poland are indicative of the false impression that liberation has given. Liberation, to me, means the advocation of premature uprisings, and this is what I think those uprisings were.

Mr. KERSTEN. It seems to me it is quite clear we have done nothing to implement a policy of liberation. We have done a lot of talking, but unfortunately the same policy planners who established this containment idea following World War II hamstrung the administration under President Truman and I think they are doing the same thing under President Eisenhower. I think under both administrations—this is not a party quarrel, this is a basic difference in philosophy—some of these policy planners think you can change the Russian Communists, you can convert them some way or other; just contain them for a while and they will get good. This is impossible. It has proved to be bankrupt. These policy planners are the ones who should be attacked these days, not the military. They have been the victims of the false policies of the policy planners behind the scenes of both administrations.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I might add that the implementation by the administration of this so-called policy of peaceful liberation is in the results of the uprisings in Germany and in Hungary. In East Germany what did we do? We gave them surplus butter. In the case of the Polish uprising the Department of State has been desperately trying to bolster the Communist regime in Warsaw with foreign-aid help. In the case of Hungary, the most significant thing that we did after the Hungarians had driven the Russians from their soil and the reorganized Red army hesitated on the Russian border for 4 days, during this period we sent a message to the Kremlin through that dictator Tito that our Government didn't favor hostile governments on the borders of the Soviet Union. This was a signal to the Red army to return to Hungary with the assurance that the United States would do nothing about it. That is about the sum and substance of what the present policy amounts to.

UKRAINIAN DEFECTIONS IN HUNGARY

Mr. KERSTEN. Congressman Feighan, I think I could point out to you that during the Hungarian uprising not only did the Hungarian army shift en masse to the side of the freedom fighters, they were the freedom fighters to a large extent, but a number of Ukrainian divisions defected from the Red army. This was a wonderful opportunity for the President at that time, as the leading soldier statesman in the world, to appeal to the armies behind the Iron Curtain to turn their guns against the Communist Party. This is one thing that could have been done. It was not done because it would have been an act—another experience I could cite is the existence of the Iron Curtain itself. With the Rockefeller group in 1955 I sought to promote a real offensive for the tearing down of the Iron Curtain, but these same policy planners were against it and they stopped it. This was a positive act. This is the type of thing that should be done. There are a number of other things that could be done.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I agree with you. In addition, we should have recognized the then government of Hungary or at least call, as I requested the President to do, an emergency meeting of the United Nations to send a mission in there.

Mr. KERSTEN. Whenever you try to defeat the Communist Party politically, you find a number of people in the U. N. section of the State Department and other echelons of the State Department, these holdover policy planners who are neither Democrat nor Republican, who will not do anything to embarrass the Communist Party in the U. N. or elsewhere or in any world forum.

Mr. MEANS. The words "political offensive" have been kicked around several times by both of you gentlemen——

Mr. KERSTEN. It has been kicked around in words but it has not been implemented.

Mr. MEANS. I want to ask you, what do you mean by "political offensive"?

Mr. KERSTEN. There are a number of things that should be done. Diplomatic recognition should be withdrawn from Communist Party governments. We should not be fooled by this idea of national communism. We should do what we can to have the Iron Curtain torn down. We should appeal to the armed forces behind the Iron Curtain. There have been a number of indications that there are great potentialities there. We should call the Russian Communists for what they are. They are the world enslavers today. They are the real warmongers, and the policy planners won't permit that kind of thing to be said about them.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Another thing we could do, as President Eisenhower recommended here in Washington before the Advertising Council several years ago, is to create an economic bloc of the free nations of the world. He was very much praised for that, but these policy planners just put the kibosh on that at once.

Mr. MEANS. The policy of containment, as I understand the policy of containment, seeks to do just what Congressman Kersten has advocated.

Mr. KERSTEN. You mean the liberation of these nations?

Mr. MEANS. The policy of containment and the policy of liberation should not be taken as alternatives to each other. I think a policy of liberation is a natural extension of a policy of containment.

Mr. KERSTEN. Then we are in agreement. I think we should certainly contain the Communist Party, but we should go beyond that. We should defeat the Communist Party behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. MEANS. Of course. But I think——

THE POLICY-PLANNING BLOC IN UNITED STATES POLICY

Mr. KERSTEN. This is what the policy of containment has stopped us from doing since the end of World War II. The policy planners are responsible for it. They are the real culprits in our Nation today, and they are bringing an all-out war upon the American people.

Mr. MEANS. I think the policy of liberation——

Mr. KERSTEN. By permitting the consolidation of Communist Party power.

Mr. MEANS. The policy of liberation, I think, conceives of the overthrow of the Communist governments in terms of time. Time, to me, in this quarrel seems to be of the essence.

Mr. FEIGHAN. May I interrupt there?

Mr. KERSTEN. It cannot be an eternity.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Don't you feel that the uprisings, particularly in October 1956 in Hungary, show that the people are not waiting for this period of political evolution which is envisaged in about 50 or 100 years, that the people want to be free and out from under their slavery of the Russian Communists? We have no policy except to build up the military. We do not strike at the real heart of the problem; that is, a political offensive. Instead, we just stay in and when the Russians do something, then we react. We have no positive leadership.

Mr. MEANS. I agree there is no positive leadership. However, I do not think it is the fault of the policy of containment. I think it is because the policy of containment has not been pursued with convictions.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The policy of containment has caused the defeat and enslavement of 16 nations since the end of World War II. And how can you possibly say that it has

succeeded or ever would succeed. We need a policy of liberation that looks toward the ultimate freedom of these captive nations.

Mr. MEANS. I can't conceive of the policy of containment, as you say, has been the defeat of these nations. The policy of containment was not implemented until 1947, and since then only one country, if I recall correctly, and that is Czechoslovakia, has been actually——

Mr. KERSTEN. What about China? That is not an inconsiderable part of the world.

Mr. FEIGHAN. What about North Vietnam?

Mr. KERSTEN. What about North Korea?

Mr. MEANS. The policy of containment is strictly oriented to Western Europe. That has always been the policy——

Mr. KERSTEN. No.

Mr. MEANS. Always been the philosophy of containment.

Mr. KERSTEN. The policy of containment was actually put into practice in Korea. We were not permitted to defeat the Reds in Korea. The containers, the State Department policy planning containers, were the ones that were the cause of the first major defeat of the United States arms in American history.

Mr. MEANS. How would that then jibe with your policy of political defeat? Now you are speaking of Korea as a military defeat.

Mr. KERSTEN. There we had a situation in Korea that had to be resolved. The war was started, and having been started it should have been pursued to victory, but it wasn't. We should defeat the Communists politically, and they can be defeated politically.

Mr. FEIGHAN. One way in which I would seek to defeat the Russians politically is to agree to meet with them, but set up the agenda so that, all right, No. 1, we will discuss the failure of the Russians to agree to the Yalta Pact; have free and unfettered elections under U. N. supervision and not let the Russians say, "We will deal about this and we will deal about that." I think that if we have a political offensive directed to the people, that will bring liberation eventually.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, gentlemen. This program has been presented in the interest of public education by Georgetown University. Your moderator, Weldon Walker.

Address by Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton Before the Commonwealth Club of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following address by Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton before the Commonwealth Club of California, San Francisco, Calif., on March 21, 1958, concerning the power development of the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON, BEFORE THE COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., MARCH 21, 1958

My principal purpose in appearing here today is to emphasize some relevant facts about the administration's proposal for the power development of the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project. Last month Congressman CLAIR ENGLE of your own State, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, appeared before this same forum and strenuously attacked that proposal.

The administration believes that the Trinity waterpower resources should be developed jointly, with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. building the powerplants and transmission facilities and paying for the use of the falling water for 50 years.

The opponents of this plan want the Federal Government to undertake the entire development by itself.

Those are the alternatives.

As is often the case with waterpower matters which get into the political arena, a great deal of heat has already been generated—far more than the amount of power which will ever be produced, no matter what the construction decision is.

Your previous speaker on this subject tried to create the impression that the proposal for joint development of Trinity is a sinister and revolutionary invention created by the present administration on its own motion—a giveaway to private interests designed to alter the entire tradition of water resource development in the West.

Is that a fact?

The answer is a flat "No."

In the first place, the Department of the Interior submitted its proposal in response to a specific directive from the 84th Congress in 1955—a Congress controlled, incidentally, by the opposition party. By many Congressmen who supported the Trinity authorization, this directive was considered an assurance that the power development would take place under a teamwork plan.

Second, in the selection of a partner in the development, the Federal Government, in accordance with a half-century tradition, gave preference to local public power organizations in California. When none came forward, the Department recommended a proposal negotiated with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Third, joint development is of ancient and honorable ancestry, with advocates for more than a half century in both political parties. Leasing of power privileges in Federal reclamation projects to public and private agencies was authorized in reclamation law as long ago as 1906. This authority was reenacted in 1939 during the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Prior to 1953 the Federal Government entered into at least 26 agreements for hydroelectric development with non-Federal organizations, public and private.

Let me cite you just two of those cases.

The Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior made a contract with the California-Oregon Power Co. for the building of a dam and powerplant on the Link River in Oregon. When do you suppose this contract was made? In 1917, during the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

The Corps of Army Engineers entered into a contract for the installation of a powerplant at the Narrows Dam on the Yuba River in California. When? In 1941, during the Presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt. And who do you suppose the partner was? None other than the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

So you see that sometimes even a good politician can become a totally inaccurate and hysterical historian.

Now let's get down to details on Trinity.

The advantages of the administration's teamwork plan are clear. They have been pointed out many times.

1. The teamwork proposal would reduce the demand for Federal appropriations by $60 million.

2. The teamwork proposal, at the end of 50 years, would put $175,524,000 more into the Central Valley project account than the all-Federal plan. To equal this $175,524,000 under all-Federal development, it would be necessary to increase the firm power rates for all Central Valley customers by 20 percent.

Some opponents of the teamwork proposal seem quite happy to lose this $175 million—or have Californians lose it—for the sake of all-Federal development. Well, these politicians may not care about $175 million, particularly when it belongs to someone else, but I'm sure the people of California care about it, particularly when they remember what it may be used for in this instance: to help bring water—badly needed water—to the homes and farms and industries of their State.

Such a program will require the investment of an astronomical amount of money.

For example, 4 additional units in the Central Valley project, now being planned by the Bureau of Reclamation, would require more than $1¼ billion. The Yolo-Zamora unit will require nearly $3 million. The Folsom south unit, over $42 million. And that isn't all: the Auburn unit will require nearly $140 million; and for the East Side division—complete with 13 major reservoirs, 5 powerplants, and hundreds of miles of conveyance conduits—we will need a whopping $1,100,000,000.

Given such gigantic costs for water resource development, doesn't it make sense to look to all possible funding sources and thus have the greatest possible surplus in the Central Valley project account? That's exactly what the administration concludes. That's why it's for joint development.

Now let's look at the alternative plan. "Let the Federal Government build all the Trinity facilities," its advocates say. "Let the Government produce power at a cost of more than 8 mills, put this in a package with the entire Central Valley project's power, and sell it for less than 5 mills."

That's simply another way of saying that power users throughout the entire system can and should pay for the loss.

During the House hearings on this subject, the chairman of the full committee—your previous speaker—had some fun by accusing me of trying to bamboozle him and his associates. Later he relented a bit and softened his charge of bamboozling to hornswoggling. I'm grateful we gained at least that much ground with him.

As long as we are on the subject of bamboozling and hornswoggling, I want to point out that when it is claimed that 8-mill power can be sold for 5 mills with no loss to anybody, there must be a bamboozling bookkeeper in the house. Sure, either by bamboozling or hornswoggling you can change the price tag. But you can't turn 8-mill power into 5-mill power no matter what you do. And you can't restore the millions of dollars lost by any such oratorical hanky-panky.

Confronted by this simple and incontrovertible fact, certain opponents of the administration's plan have tried to obscure it by letting fly a volley of suggestions, some of them strange indeed.

Here's one: "Mr. Secretary," they say, "why don't you raise power rates in the Central Valley project by 20 percent? Then, even under all-Federal development, you would still have that $175 million." Well, if they believe such a project-wide rate increase is equitable and fair, why doesn't one of them—Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, for example— introduce legislation in the Congress to bring it about? For myself, I believe such an increase would be a plain injustice; I don't believe in penalizing the many to favor the few.

A second suggestion is that the proposed contract require the company's payments to fluctuate automatically in accordance with fluctuations in power production costs.

Well, no mortal man—not even a politician—has ever been given sight to pierce the veil of the future, to know for certain that Central Valley power costs will go up rather than down. With, for example, a major breakthrough in either the fission or the fusion process, or in some other process for

producing power, the Central Valley project surplus might well be cut by an automatic escalation provision.

The present contract at least assures that the Central Valley project surplus will increase, not decrease.

As Secretary of the Interior, I must advocate to the Congress that the United States accept no less.

Let me point out right here that the bills before Congress, drafted in the Department, require that the final arrangements with the company be no less favorable than those in the company's proposal. As I told a committee of the Congress recently, I shall make every effort to get even better terms if Congress approves joint development.

Now, another maneuver.

The administration's proposal would continue two existing contracts providing for Pacific Gas & Electric to wheel and firm up power produced at Federal dams.

These two contracts have been criticized by the General Accounting Office for being too generous to Pacific Gas & Electric, and that fact gives no end of delight to enemies of the new administration plan, who cheerfully forget some important facts in the record.

These two contracts in question are not an invention of the present administration. We inherited them. They were negotiated and signed in 1951, and I must admit that it is intriguing to hear my predecessor, the Honorable Oscar Chapman, and his Commissioner of Reclamation, Mike Strauss, criticized by members of their own party for giving away too much to a private power company. Such charges I just cannot believe. It is much more likely, I am convinced, that the General Accounting Office judgment simply reflects a difference of professional opinion between its technicians and those on the career staff of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Now what is the Department's stand?

In every way possible we shall endeavor to have the two existing contracts improved before they are incorporated in the final contract with the company. In fact, the drafts now pending already contain important new concessions by Pacific Gas & Electric not included in the contracts of 1951. If, in addition, the Congress should by legislative directive insist upon periodic renegotiation of the existing contracts, I should certainly have no objection, even though the firming contract already provides a means whereby the Federal Government can at any time unilaterally change its rates.

Surely, however, no one can seriously argue that the existing contracts should be canceled. To deprive the Government of access to the Pacific Gas & Electric transmission lines and to take from it the firming power which Pacific Gas & Electric now provides would have only one result: To force the Federal Government to build its own transmission lines and its own steam generating facilities. You can imagine the waste, the duplication, the inefficiency, and the quite proper Congressional opposition to such an undertaking—one which might well be the first step toward forcing a Valley-type authority on the State of California.

Probably the most important distraction in the whole debate is the systematic attempt to cast doubt on the accuracy of the Government's computations.

Here some of the oppositions are shooting with a rifle and not a shotgun. The Bureau of Reclamation figures, they say, are all wrong, but only on the Trinity generating facilities. All the other figures—on the Trinity Dam, the Clear Creek Tunnel, the Whiskeytown Dam—those figures, produced by the same Bureau engineers, are unimpeachable. In fact, as Congressman JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, pointed out during the hearings, Congressman ENGLE uses them all the time in support of the Trinity project as a whole, apparently with no awareness of any inconsistency.

It has been alleged, for example, that recapturing the generating facilities at the end of 50 years could cost the Government more than the original investment, $55 million. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has agreed to set a $10 million ceiling on the recapture cost. Ten million dollars is greater than $55 million only in Wonderland.

It has been alleged that if the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. builds the Trinity powerhouses, the Federal Government will have to spend additional millions at the San Luis project for off-peak pumping facilities.

The truth is that, according to the Bureau of Reclamation career experts, these facilities should be constructed no matter who builds the Trinity powerhouses.

Finally, it has been alleged that joint development will increase costs during the 50 years to Federal agencies and other preference customers by $275 million. The career technical experts in the Bureau of Reclamation again disagree. The cost, they say, is not $275 million but $139 million; the difference is due primarily to a difference in estimates of the future flow of water available for generating power.

The Department's lower figure is based on a conservative estimate of streamflows by Bureau of Reclamation engineers. But remember this: the same estimate is the one which the Department has used to arrive at its Central Valley project surplus figure of $175 million. If the Bureau technicians were to use the more liberal streamflow estimate, this surplus figure would be greater still.

You can't have the one high figure without the other.

Now, with your permission, I'd like to turn from the statistics to the intent behind them.

In a country with free speech, anybody has a right to discuss national water and power policies. No one would deny the existence of that right. It is essential to wise policy-making and wise administration. But nothing good is to be gained by irresponsible and groundless attacks on the competence and intelligence of career people in Government agencies—people whose sole job it is, from one administration to the next, to make technical computations with a high level of accuracy and not to establish policy.

Upon the calculations and judgment of such career technicians depend the plans not only for the Trinity power facilities but for all future additions to the whole Trinity division; the whole Central Valley project; and indeed, the entire structure of Bureau of Reclamation projects in 17 States. Let me assure you I shall continue to combat any irresponsible attack on their intelligence, competence, and honesty. To scuttle public confidence in them is to do irreparable damage to future Federal-State reclamation development in California and throughout the West from here to Texas.

In the Trinity debate, that method of attack should come to an end.

Instead, if the opponents of teamwork are unalterably opposed to anything but all-Federal development—and its inevitable corollary, Federal monopoly—let them say so and plainly.

If the opponents of teamwork believe that Federal power development—below-cost power development—is more important than water development, let them say so and plainly.

If the oponents of teamwork believe that now is the time to start California on the road toward a Valley authority, let them say so and plainly.

If the opponents of teamwork are willing to sacrifice $175 million in the Central Valley project account plus $83 million in Federal taxes, plus municipal and State taxes merely to try to prove that only the Federal Government can do a job right, let them say so and plainly.

And let them do another thing: let them join with the advocates of the pending proposal in getting it out of the House committee and bringing it to a vote in the current session of the Congress.

It's time now to resolve this issue and get on with the next stage of the job.

They Don't Grow Douglas-Fir in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been a widespread campaign of massive misinformation on the plywood import situation, not only here in the Congress but across the Nation and especially in the Pacific Northwest where the people are suffering a severe depression and are especially inclined to grab at economic straws.

The instigators of this campaign appear to be a few big manufacturers of hardwood plywood—and I emphasize the word "hardwood." Their hardwood plywood production is mostly located in the eastern part of the United States. However, these same firms also engage in the manufacture of softwood plywood and their mills for this purpose are, of course, mostly located in the Pacific Northwest. By confusing the issue these firms, through their highly paid lobbyists and public-relations people, have actually managed to talk some otherwise level-headed Pacific Northwest newspaper editors, labor executives, and even Members of Congress into believing that the importation of Japanese hardwood plywood has had a terrible impact on the market for Douglas fir softwood plywood.

On March 24, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] told the House that—

> The present heavy imports of Japanese plywood are depriving about 8,000 Pacific Northwest and southern plywood-plant workers and the loggers who supply them raw materials of employment.

The fact of the matter is that absolutely no softwood plywood is imported into this country from Japan and only a very, very small amount of hardwood plywood is produced in the Pacific Northwest. The impact, if any, on the softwood plywood industry of Japanese hardwood plywood imports is so small as to be unnoticeable.

Yet, responsible officials of some of the largest firms in the country are on record to the contrary. One of them, Vice President J. L. Buckley, of the Georgia Pacific Corp., a huge combine, has decided to attack me personally on the subject following my public refutation of some of his loaded statistics.

The following is the text of Mr. Buckley's first letter to me on the subject of plywood imports, dated March 7, 1958:

> DEAR MR. PORTER: Confirming our conversation of yesterday, I am attaching hereto

the recommendations of forest products committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce concerning importation of plywood. As you will note from this strongly worded resolution, which is the combined opinion of some 25 members of the forest products industry in Oregon, it very strongly advocates a lid being placed on importation of plywood.

The latest report from the Department of Commerce on plywood imports for the year 1957 shows the following:

Year:	
Total plywood imports:	*Feet*
1951	74,000,000
1956	706,000,000
1957	847,000,000
Imports from Japan:	
1951	13,000,000
1956	527,000,000
1957	680,000,000

Imports from Japan increased 29½ percent in 1957 over 1956 during the period when the so-called voluntary quota imposed by the Japanese manufacturers was in effect.

It is significant that importation of Japanese plywood has risen from 13 million feet in 1951 to 680 million feet in 1957. There is every indication that additional capacity is now being installed in Japan so that this upward trend will continue. We are very concerned that with the tremendous advantage Japan has over American manufacturers due to their lower wage scale, they will be able to capture as much of the American market as they wish to. What is now a serious menace will, in a very few years, be a catastrophe for the American plywood industry.

As I told you, I believe you could do your constituents and the Oregon plywood industry a great favor if you would call this to the attention of the Congress on the floor at some early date.

We have a whole file of information on the subject, and I will be glad to forward you additional data if you so wish, but I believe the above resolution and the statistics speak for themselves.

It was a great pleasure to meet you and I hope you will call on me at any time and I, in turn, hope to keep in touch with you.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGIA PACIFIC CORP.,
JAMES L. BUCKLEY,
Vice President.

Some time before I was contacted by Mr. Buckley I had initiated an investigation of plywood imports with my own resources and at the same time I requested an up-to-date statement of the situation from the professional analysts in international trade available to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Our results were quite positive and I proceeded to say so when I was interviewed on the subject by the able Washington correspondent for several daily papers in Oregon, Mr. A. Robert Smith.

Following is the text of the plywood article written by Mr. Smith, which appeared in the Portland Oregonian, the Salem Statesman, the Eugene Register-Guard and the Medford Mail-Tribune:

WASHINGTON.—Underconsumption of plywood at home, and not Japanese plywood imports, is the chief cause of the slump in the softwood-plywood industry in Oregon and Washington, most members of the Oregon Congressional delegation have concluded.

The five Democratic members of the delegation sought authoritative information on the subject several weeks ago when they received a complaint from the Josephine County Democratic Central Committee. The Grants Pass group complained of Japanese plywood imports and urged adoption of trade restrictions by the United States.

Representatives WALTER NORBLAD, Republican of Oregon, and RUSSELL V. MACK, Republican of Washington, recently went to the White House to urge Sherman Adams, the President's assistant, to look into the possibility of imposing a quota on plywood imports from Japan. Both Congressmen are sponsors of legislation to restrict importation of Japanese hardwood plywood to no more than 15 percent of domestic consumption of hardwood plywood. The legislation does not cover softwood plywood.

The Library of Congress, at the request of Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, made a study of the plywood situation which revealed that for the first 11 months of 1957, plywood imports from Japan totaled 783 million square feet of which 99.6 percent was hardwood plywood and 0.4 percent was softwood plywood.

"Imports therefore had a negligible effect on the fall in domestic prices (of softwood plywood)," the analysis stated. It explained the fall in prices as due to the decline in housing starts the last 2 years, after the plywood industry had expanded productive capacity during the postwar housing boom.

"Many people in the Pacific Northwest, even some of those closely connected with the plywood industry, do not know that Japan has already set up a voluntary export quota on hardwood plywood shipped to the United States," said Congressman PORTER. "The quota is 400 million square feet a year, a considerable reduction from the amount shipped to this country from Japan last year. There is every reason to believe that Japan would be sensible enough to establish a similar quota for softwood plywood should the necessity arise—but the plain fact is that, at this time, imports of softwood plywood to the United States from all countries is not enough to have any noticeable effect on plywood production in the Pacific Northwest."

The Oregon Democrats consquently rejected the plea of the Grants Pass party organization. The only other complaint against the Japanese received by PORTER's office was from James L. Buckley, vice president, Georgia-Pacific Corp., Augusta, Ga., who enclosed a resolution he said was passed by the Portland Chamber of Commerce's forest products committee calling for "restraints" against Japanese plywood imports. Harold B. Say, Washington representative of the Portland chamber, said he had heard of no recent complaints about plywood imports.

Hardwood plywood imports compete with hardwood plywood produced domestically in the Southern States. PORTER's office surmised that Georgia-Pacific was making a plea in behalf of its southern operations, not those in the Northwest.

Congressman NORBLAD said he had no complaints this year from plywood producers.

"But I had lots of them last year, and I assume they still feel the same way," NORBLAD explained.

Asked why he sought to restrict hardwood plywood imports, NORBLAD said he thought it was competitive with softwood plywood in a general way, "just like codfish is competitive with salmon in that people who eat one may not the other."

PORTER argued that "there is virtually no competition between softwood and hardwood plywoods, since the two products are used for completely different purposes except in a few instances involving quantities of the product so small that the net effect on the market is negligible."

The Library of Congress report said softwood plywood is chiefly used in subroofing, subflooring, and concrete forms. Hardwood plywood, whether from Japan or the United States, sells at a price well above softwood plywood and is used for wall paneling and for veneers on doors.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, said his office received pleas in behalf of hardwood plywood imports from a Tacoma firm which makes doors which have a core of domestic softwood plywood and a skin of imported hardwood plywood.

In the absence of any showing that Japanese plywood is hurting Oregon mills, the Oregon Democrats are opposing any tariff restrictions. They point out that Japan is a big customer of American goods, much of it from Oregon, notably wheat and lumber. They argue that if the United States doesn't allow Japan to sell its products here, American producers won't be able to sell in Japan.

The United States-Japan Trade Council reported that Japan buys about twice as much as she sells in the United States. Last year Japan bought $1,219,000,000 in American goods and sold $625 million in Japanese goods here.

The National Lumber Manufacturers Association reported that in 1956 Japan bought about one-tenth of the Douglas-fir lumber exported from the United States, or 28,160,000 board feet.

The Department of Agriculture reported that "the United States exports 40 to 50 million bushels of wheat to Japan annually—over 50 percent of Japan's total wheat imports. In 1956, 9 percent of United States wheat exports went to Japan."

This column appeared in the March 17 edition of the Portland Oregonian. It was read by Mr. Buckley and prompted him to send me a copy along with an unnecessarily insulting letter, dated March 21, which I quote in its entirety as follows:

DEAR MR. PORTER: I was quite surprised to read the article in the Oregonian March 17, 1958, attached, as it would appear that the information which I attempted to leave with you on my personal visit March 6, and my subsequent letter of March 7, concerning the seriousness of imported Japanese plywood to the Northwest plywood industry, was either misunderstood or ignored.

There is obviously no point in prolonging this discussion with one whose mind is obviously closed. However, for the sake of the record, I would like to straighten out your office on two points:

1. The plea that we are making is on behalf of our own and other Northwest plywood producers, as well as southern plywood operators.

2. My address is Portland, Oreg., and not Augusta, Ga., as my card and letterhead indicated.

Please send me a copy of the Library of Congress study.

J. L. BUCKLEY,
Vice President.

I had the pleasure of instructing Mr. Buckley in my letter to him of March 24, as follows, with copies to his company president and to the chairman of the board of directors:

DEAR MR. BUCKLEY: I have in hand your rather impertinent letter of March 21, in which you allege that my mind is obviously closed to your arguments as presented personally and in your letter of March 7. For the sake of the same record you mention, I would like to state that my mind is not closed on this or any other subject.

Your information on the effect of the importation of Japanese plywood on the Pacific Northwest softwood plywood industry was neither misunderstood nor ignored. Quite the contrary. I investigated your points thoroughly and I subsequently understood your statements as a plea for relief on the part of a company which is engaged in the manufacture of hardwood plywood. The

information which you provided was quite obviously slanted to make it appear to apply to softwood plywood, but the facts failed to sustain your argument.

It is interesting to note that nowhere in your letter of March 7 is the word "hardwood" used. The letter refers only to "imported Japanese plywood." You fail to allow for the fact that no softwood plywood is imported into the United States from Japan and that virtually no hardwood plywood is produced in the State of Oregon, none in my district as far as I can determine.

I do not intend to go into the merits of legislation affecting the importation into this country of hardwood plywood. It is, fortunately, not my problem. My research indicates that competition between the two species is negligible.

As for the other point in your letter of March 7, regarding the fact that the able Washington correspondent for the Portland Oregonian and other Oregon dailies listed your address as Augusta, Ga., rather than Portland, Oreg., I am looking at the letterhead on which you wrote your letter of March 7. It is not the same as the letterhead you used for your letter of March 21. The only addresses given on your letter of March 7 are: "in reply address Post Office Box 1350, Savannah, Ga." and "Georgia-Pacific Plywood Co., Georgia-Pacific Paper Co., Southern Finance Building, Augusta, Ga." It was from this letterhead that Mr. A. Robert Smith, a fine and accurate reporter, got the address which he used in his story.

The statements which I made to Mr. Smith and which were quoted in the Portland Oregonian of March 17 outline quite well what my investigation indicates. I stand behind the statements completely. However, my mind is not closed to further discussion despite the sharpness of your criticism.

On March 12 the New York Times published a story regarding the annual report of the Georgia-Pacific Co., showing that the firm's gross sales for 1957 were up to $147,649,000, an increase of 21.7 percent over 1956. The report also showed income up to $8,532,000, an increase of 14.8 percent over 1956. The New York Times story quoted the president of your company, Mr. R. B. Pamplin, and the chairman of the board, Mr. O. R. Cheatham, as saying that these increases in sales and income were achieved despite "generally unsatisfactory market conditions and depressed prices in certain segments of the forest products industry due to overproduction." The segment of the industry referred to is obviously the softwood plywood segment and the reason for the so-called overproduction is quite obviously the reason given in the 1956 annual report of the Georgia-Pacific Co.: "The decline in housing starts."

Importation of Japanese hardwood plywood is not mentioned, to my knowledge, in either report. I certainly agree with Mr. Pamplin and Mr. Cheatham that the present unsatisfactory market conditions in the softwood plywood industry are the results of overproduction, though I prefer to regard it as underconsumption because of too few housing starts, brought about in turn by ill-conceived tight-money policies on the part of the Republican administration.

If you have further information regarding the impact of the importation of Japanese hardwood plywood on the Pacific Northwest softwood plywood market I would be happy to study it and I would be pleased also to discuss the matter again with you in person.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

(Enclose: Copy of report on softwood plywood industry.)

(Copies to Mr. R. B. Pamplin, Mr. O. R. Cheatham, Mr. A. Robert Smith.)

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this type of economic hoax to stop. With the Pacific Northwest already bending under the repeated fiscal blows of the Eisenhower administration, this is no time for special interest groups to be playing grim semantic games with the people I represent. It is utterly amazing to me that some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, even some of those from the Pacific Northwest, have been misled by the propaganda of these monster corporations into making inaccurate statements on the floor of the House to the effect that thousands of Pacific Northwest plywood workers have been thrown out of work because of Japanese plywood imports. The facts prove otherwise.

In his usual light-hearted manner, my friend Fletcher Knebel said in his widely read column Potomac Fever the other day that—

Unemployment appears to have increased in almost every line of work except the one where little men run around the stores marking up prices.

That's a good description of what is happening in Oregon, where unemployment has been a greater problem than in any other State. Yet, the prices of life's daily necessities, especially food, continue to rise.

The cruelest blow of all comes when big-money groups like the Hardwood Plywood Association attempt to make pawns of these distressed people in their financial chess games.

Mr. Speaker, they do not grow Douglas fir in Japan and the Japanese are not exporting any softwood plywood to the United States. All this irresponsible talk about the Japanese importing Soviet softwood timber for the purpose of manufacturing plywood for re-export to the United States is without any basis in fact.

I hope that no member of the distinguished House Committee on Ways and Means will be misled by such ridiculous statements. It certainly is true that many of the people I represent are unemployed—but none of them owes this distressing state of affairs to the importation of Japanese plywood.

Tax Reform Statement by New York Democratic Congressional Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1958, the New York Democratic congressional delegation issued the following statement. Because of its timeliness, I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

We believe that tax reform is long overdue. It was necessary during normal economic periods to remove inequities in the law. During this recessionary period it is not only a wise policy, it is required to restore health to the economy.

We urge immediate relief in several areas.

1. A tax cut must be given to the individual taxpayer. Whether by additional exemption, reduction of the rate or waiver of a portion or all of the withholding tax is unimportant. The tax relief must be granted on the widest base possible to the greatest number of taxpayers. That will be a real impetus to our economy.

2. Tax relief for small business should be enacted immediately. Small business failures hit a 20-year high in 1957. They will continue to lose out in their competition with big business if we delay.

3. Small business firms should be permitted a tax allowance for reinvestment so that they may retain a portion of their earnings for necessary growth and expansion.

4. The benefits of the alternative methods of depreciation should be extended to purchasers of used property. There is no reason to limit this benefit to purchasers of new equipment.

5. As an aid to small business firms, corporations should be granted an election to be taxed as partnerships.

6. In order to provide added equity financing to small businesses, the "minimum accumulated earnings credit" should be increased.

7. Equal opportunity should be extended to all taxpayers who wish to provide for their own retirement. The Keogh-Jenkins bill will remove discrimination from the present law.

All of the above measures have been thoroughly studied by Congress. They are sound and necessary. We wholeheartedly support them and urge all our colleagues regardless of party affiliation to work for their immediate enactment. These tax adjustments are needed not only to equalize opportunity, but also to serve as an immediate stimulant toward economic recovery.

Memo by Hon. Clyde Doyle, of California, on House Un-American Activities Subcommittee Public Hearings Recently Held at Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 26, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I insert for the information of all the Members of Congress and any other readers, the following texts growing out of the week's work in Boston, Mass., recently of a subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee. We were there in public hearings from Monday to Friday, inclusive.

The letter hereinafter set forth is typical of several I have received and I know, in addition to those which have come to me, our committee office has likewise received quite a few:

CANTON, MASS.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Through the splendid public service of radio station WBZ, Boston, which rebroadcast your entire House Un-American Activities hearings here last week, I was able to follow the splendid work your committee is doing. I had some insight into the problem as a member of Army in-

telligence during World War II, and as a county officer of the American Legion, am proud to know we are highly unpopular with the Communists, also that the Legion is strongly supporting your efforts.

I wrote my fellow Legionnaire DICK WIGGLESWORTH today, asking him to support H. R. 9937 as you requested. Please express my appreciation too, of the dignified way the hearings were conducted, and the patient way your members handled those frustrating witnesses.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. ABELY.

The editorial by the Boston Traveler for Friday, March 21, 1958, herein set forth is typical of editorials made concerning our subcommittee's work:

STRENGTH AT THE CORE

Anybody who's inclined to underrate the strength of the Communist Party in America had better change his opinion.

Testimony given in Boston this week before the House Committee on Un-American Activities has included mighty good evidence that the Reds are far from finished.

Stronger than ever before, is the way the vicious movement is described by Armando Penha, who spent 8 years in the Commie ranks as an FBI counterspy.

This is what FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has been saying all along. And certainly nobody, including most of the Reds themselves, knows more about what's going on in the party huddles than he does.

The fact that the Communists have pared their ranks does not mean that they've grown weaker. On the contrary, by dropping inept members they have trimmed down to a hard core of dedicated workers. They can work more effectively now than when they were handicapped by weaklings.

Hoover's recent book, Masters of Deceit, points a warning of this situation. And men like Penha, who know what they're talking about, can back him up.

Meanwhile, though, it's gratifying to know that we have a hard core of Americans working undercover in the Commie ranks. The Reds know these agents are around, but they don't know who they are. So much the better for us, to have the Communists biting their fingernails, wondering which men to trust.

Let's keep them bothered and bewildered.

Also, the editorial in the Boston Pilot for March 22, 1958, is also typical and significant. By the way, the Pilot was established by the second bishop of Boston in 1829.

SPOTLIGHT ON THE LEFT

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is now holding hearings in Boston and something like 40 witnesses will be heard before the local appearance of the committee is ended. Along with the old familiar names that have been mentioned for years we have added now a new batch of characters who, in the considered view of the committee, have some connection, present or past, with the Communist operation in America.

Many sophisticated Americans are likely to take the work of the committee lightly; they cannot bring themselves to believe that the Communist conspiracy in the United States is a serious one. It is acknowledged (it pretty much has to be) that we did have a time when a rather impressive section of our intellectuals in America were flirting with Marxism and its implications; further, it must be admitted that some became persuaded Communists, many became sympathizers, and positions of importance in Government, science, education, and communications were infiltrated for espionage and other reasons. Even when all this is allowed, however, many have the feeling that that is all in the past now and the few hard-shell Communists remaining are not significant in the life and thought of our country.

This has a reasonable flavor about it and one of its appeals is that it takes a sort of comfortable, unworried view of our national security. Unfortunately it is not nearly as rational as it appears and if used as a basis for action it can be so unrealistic as to be dangerous. It is true, we may be sure, that there are many less people of Marxist sympathy in Government than formerly, and it is also true that there are many less Communists in the country than in earlier times. People have also learned for the most part not to confuse genuine liberals, even if working for unpopular causes, with Reds or their sympathizers. All of this is gain. It does not however remove the core menace of communism in America.

If the Communist apparatus is pruned at the present time the parent tree is not for that reason less vigorous; the precise opposite may be true. When the peripheral appurtenances are removed the strength may be better conserved in the hard core that remains. This is not to say that its present danger is greater than formerly, it probably is less; it does suggest that its potential danger is still immense and made the more so because people consider it insignificant.

This is the message of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and this explains why it works to expose locally those still involved in the Communist conspiracy and those giving it even clandestine support. Care should be taken always, of course, to protect the reputations of the innocent and to show consideration to those who, once involved, have truly abandoned past connections and sympathies. The committee in its local appearance has shown its concern in this regard and has conducted itself with dignity.

An advertisement intended to welcome the committee to Boston carried, among several others, a text from the executive secretary of the American Civil Liberties Union stating that "The House Committee on Un-American activities ought never to have come into existence, and ought to be abolished." This is almost the only thing that cannot be properly offered against the committee. People can complain, if they choose, about its policy, its practice, its personnel or whatever; they cannot complain about its existence. Congress requires and must have information and assistance in planning its laws on national security and it must provide this through a committee working in this vital area. When it does its congressional duty in justice and dignity it deserves and should receive the respect of all our citizens.

And, Mr. Speaker, since my return from the Boston subcommittee assignment I have been asked by several Members of the House as to what sort of a closing statement I made on behalf of the committee at the close of the hearings. Hence, on account of such expressed interest I am including herewith my remarks publicly made in the court room for the information of all who are especially interested in the work of our House Un-American Activities Committee in connection with our public hearings:

STATEMENT READ PUBLICLY BY ACTING SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CLYDE DOYLE, CALIFORNIA, AT CLOSE OF HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES SUBCOMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AT BOSTON, MASS., ON MARCH 21, 1958

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I have made just a few notes here which I will refer to in my brief statement on behalf of the committee.

First, I wish to call your attention to the fact which has not yet been emphasized in these hearings, that this subcommittee here in Boston these four days is a subcommittee of a committee of nine. This House Un-American Activities Committee is not a special committee. It is a standing committee of the House of Representatives. It has been a standing regularly qualified committee approved unanimously by the House of Representatives on many occasions ever since 1946. I will not take time to read the charter. It is here. It was adopted in 1946 and under that charter we are here, duly qualified and following our legal requirements.

I wish further to say this: that because of the thoroughness of the staff investigations and cooperation with the FBI agents, this committee knew in advance that on account of lack of time here in Boston these hearings would be necessarily brief. We could not possibly cover the extent of the Communist operations in this New England area. But we believe we had knowledge, and now we have more knowledge from all reliable sources, of a considerable extensive Communist Party subversive activities in the New England area, amounting to several hundred identified members in the Communist Party in the New England area. If we had time, therefore, we could call up to around 300 identified Communists in this area, your neighbors. To do so would have taken weeks of hearings, instead of just a few days. Furthermore it would require assignment of our capable staff to this area, whereas they have obligations in other areas also.

But in the few days that we have been here, we believe we have had a fair sampling of several phases of Communist subversive operations, especially in this area.

What then has been accomplished, in our judgment, as a result of these hearings? These are some of the objectives of accomplishment.

In the first place, we have seen repetition here in the Boston, New England area, of a pattern of Communist activities and techniques which verifies and confirms the very same pattern of secret and habitually deceitful and subversive activities and tactics throughout our Nation.

We also have brought forth reliable evidence proving that there is in this highly sensitive and important industrial area a Communist Party activity which should be paid more attention by the public officials, both municipal and statewide, in cooperation with the Federal officials. I respectfully make that suggestion.

More specifically, there has been developed here new and convincing evidence regarding the existing loopholes in the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and other existing legislation, designed to identify and stem the flood of Communist propaganda that is daily reaching the source of our Nation from Soviet Russia, and from other people, specifically doing it in cooperation with the Soviet Communist control of the Soviet Republic in this cold war.

And we wish to emphasize that this Communist subversive activity right here in the New England area and throughout our Nation is part of the cold war. It is not chickenfeed; it is not just merely propaganda. It is part of the cold war. There are no bullets being fired, but it is war nevertheless.

There has also been revealed further reliable factual Communist underground strategy and tactics penetrating entirely legitimate and loyal organizations, church groups, labor groups, youth groups, schools, lodges, and public offices.

It has also been revealed further definite information respecting efforts of the Communist Party and conspiracy to penetrate certain vital industries by way of colonizing

by Communists, many of whom hold high educational degrees in education, bachelors of science and engineers; and yet fulfilling their Communist Party dedication, they take menial jobs, at far less salaries in sensitive industry in order to carry out Communist Party directives, than they could earn at the profession for which they are especially equipped and trained.

We will take back to Washington for consideration by the Congress all the factual material here gained in connection with our study and consideration for the enactment of legislation.

There is, however, a collateral result, which is very valuable and continuing, as a result of these hearings, which I believe will have a salutary and important effect to this entire geographical area. This should be a daily reminder for you folks who have the pleasure, privilege and inspiration of living in this area of the continuous Communist Party subversive threat, both day and night, not merely as a philosophical concept, but as a menacing dynamic force of intrigue and subversion, operating as part of the Soviet cold war against the American way of life, which was, in fact, born right here within a mile of this building, if you will recall.

We wish to thank the two former FBI agents.

I wish to say just a word. As I have sat here these 4 days, now and then I have noticed when the FBI was mentioned a sort of a sneer, and I mean a sneer, on the face of, thank God, very few in the courtroom. But I have noticed it. You have noticed it. And, of course, the citizen that sneers at the FBI sneers at the constitutional government in the United States.

We wish to thank, therefore, these two American citizens who gave up commensurate income and went to work for the FBI at a mere pittance in order to serve their country. We thank them for their helpfulness to us.

Now, before concluding, I would like to express the appreciation of our committee to our staff, our professional staff. It is no picnic that they have to come into an area and work day and night to try to get factual, reliable information. It is a hard, unpleasant task, and the committee appreciates the thoroughness with which our staff in this area have done their job. They always do it that way.

Then, too, we wish to thank the Federal judges, Francis Ford, the distinguished Federal judge who occupies this courtroom and courteously turned it over to us. We thank United States Marshal Ralph Gray, and all his most capable and thoughtful and helpful deputies. We thank, of course, Capt. Daniel Murphy, the department of public safety, of this great Commonwealth and his very able staff, for helping with our staff and with these hearings.

And then, too, I want to thank the listeners in the courtroom again who have been most courteous these 4 days, and we appreciate it very much.

Finally, I must not overlook, on behalf of the committee, the caretakers of this building, the janitors, the elevator operators, and all these men and women who have gone out of their way to, even after hours and other times, to make it convenient for us and our staff. We notice those things as American Congressmen. We notice those little things. They are very important.

And finally, I would like to express our unanimous and very cordial and sincere thanks to all members of the press, of the radio, and television profession and fraternity. We noticed the thoroughness and the accuracy and the very constructive way in which you have reported and shown these hearings. As a matter of fact, we might put you all on our staff as a part of our educational department. We thank you very much for your consideration to us.

We want to thank, too, the large number of people who have written to us or who have sent us orally their expressions of appreciation for what the United States Congress is trying to do in this difficult field.

Have you anything else, Mr. ARENS?

Mr. ARENS. No; thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. On behalf of the Congress, then, I thank you, and the United States Congress wishes you all well.

(Whereupon, at 11:58 a. m., Friday, March 21, 1958, the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)