Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 1958

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

Our Father, God, once again by Thy mercy at the day's beginning we would lift our gaze from the tyranny of drab details to the beckoning splendor of the heavenly vision to which we dare not be disobedient.

Grant us such a revealing sense of the aching need of our distraught world as will make us glad and eager sharers with Thee in its redemption from all that brings horror and havoc on the earth which could be so fair. In a world where the mystic loveliness of dawn is always mocking the darkness and declaring that the night is not eternal, lead us through the passing shadows to the daybreak of Thy coming kingdom's sway. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 26, 1958, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

OIL IMPORT QUOTAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the President of the United States has issued an order of importance to a vital American industry. It represents an effort to bring some order into the chaotic oil-import situation.

The President's order cuts back oil-import quotas and seeks to use the Buy American Act as a means of insuring compliance with the voluntary oil-import program. Effective action would be welcome news to the industry and to the people who are dependent upon it for their livelihood.

I have not had an opportunity to study carefully the details of the order. I hope it will be effective, because the need is great.

The flood of oil imports has struck a heavy blow, not only at the industry, but also at communities and at State governments. The decline in the industry has meant smaller payrolls and shrinking revenue for State and local governments.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's order be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the supplementary report of the Special Committee To Investigate Crude Oil Imports, which was approved by the President.

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

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF CRUDE PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Whereas following the receipt of advice from the Special Committee To Investigate Crude Oil Imports, I have determined that essential national security interests are adversely affected by the purchase by the United States of crude petroleum imported in quantities in excess of those now or hereafter specified under the voluntary oil import program or of petroleum products refined in the United States and composed of or derived from such crude petroleum, in whole or in part; and

Whereas I have determined that such purchases would not be in the public interest: Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes, and as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. For the purposes of the application of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1520, 41 U. S. C. 10a–10c; 63 Stat. 1024, 41 U. S. C. 10d), commonly known as the Buy American Act, pursuant to this order: "domestic petroleum product" means crude petroleum of wholly domestic origin and any product refined in the United States entirely from such crude petroleum; "nondomestic petroleum product" means crude petroleum not wholly of domestic origin and any product refined in the United States which is not derived entirely from crude petroleum of domestic origin; "complying petroleum product" means crude petroleum of foreign origin or any product refined in the United States in whole or in part from crude petroleum of foreign origin, all of which has been, or will be imported by a firm which, during the period of contract performance and for the 3 months preceding the month in which a bid is submitted to a Government department or agency, has imported crude petroleum in compliance with the voluntary oil import program.

SEC. 2. The heads of all executive departments and agencies are requested to reexamine existing policy with respect to the application of the Buy American Act to petroleum products and to apply the provisions of that act so that, (1) unless a domestic product is unavailable or its cost is determined to be unreasonable, the purchase of a nondomestic petroleum product will be made only if it is a complying petroleum product, and (2) in considering bids no price differential will be applied between domestic and complying petroleum products.

SEC. 3. Every contract entered into by any executive department or agency for the purchase in the United States of imported crude petroleum or petroleum products refined in the United States and derived in whole or in part from imported crude petroleum shall contain the following provision: "The contractor agrees that during the contract period he will comply in all respects with the voluntary oil import program."

SEC. 4. The administrator, voluntary oil import program, is authorized to issue certificates of compliance with the voluntary oil import program which may be accepted as conclusive evidence of such compliance. In the absence of such a certificate, a certification or representation of compliance made by the supplier may be considered presumptive evidence of compliance.

SEC. 5. Executive Order No. 10582 of December 17, 1954, "Prescribing Uniform Procedures for Certain Determinations Under the Buy American Act," shall not be applicable to crude petroleum and petroleum products.

SEC. 6. This order shall be applicable to contracts entered into 30 days after the date hereof.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 27, 1958.*

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 25, 1958.

Memorandum for the Secretary of the Interior:

I have approved the recommendations embodied in the supplementary report dated March 24, 1958, of the Special Committee To Investigate Crude Oil Imports as set forth in the attached memorandum. I direct you to incorporate these recommendations in the administration of the voluntary oil-import program.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In its report of July 29, 1957, the Special Committee To Investigate Crude Oil Imports recommended that the plan which was promulgated should be reviewed at least once a year.

The Committee has been continuously studying the effectiveness of the program and respectfully submits a supplementary report of its further recommendations in support of its findings.

Respectfully yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT, MARCH 24, 1958

In accordance with the recommendation in its initial report of July 29, 1957, the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Committee has reviewed the voluntary plan to limit imports of crude oil in districts I–IV.

The vast majority of crude oil importers have complied with the voluntary program and their imports have conformed to the quotas which were assigned them. In a number of instances, companies did not import the full amount of their assigned quotas during this period.

The Committee recognizes the fact that three substantial importers were not in compliance during this period which creates an inequity as respects cooperating importers, and it considered alternatives such as the imposition of mandatory controls. On balance, however, the Committee agreed that the voluntary plan should be continued, but on a more effective basis. This will involve a minimum of governmental regulation, the least possible restraint on our free enterprise system, and a lesser interference with normal trade relations.

One year ago the normal progress of all phases of the crude-oil industry had been disrupted by the Suez situation. Production and refining activities were greatly stimulated and this resulted in additions to stock beyond customary levels. As a result of this abnormal condition, accompanied by a reduction in anticipated demand, crude oil production has been declining. Accordingly, since the date of the Committee's original report, the domestic producing industry has been adversely affected by conditions other than the competition of foreign imports.

In its original report, this Committee, after careful analysis, determined that an import ratio of 12 percent to production in districts I–IV would not discourage exploration for crude oil and its production to an extent adversely affecting the national security. After reviewing developments since the date of its original report, the Committee has concluded that this ratio should continue to be maintained in order to accomplish the objectives stated in our original report. In order to maintain this relationship between imports and production in districts I–IV under the voluntary program, it will be necessary to reduce imports into these districts to 713,000 barrels daily of crude oil, which is 12 percent of the average production in this area for the past 3 months.

The administrator of the voluntary plan has held hearings in accordance with his responsibility to newcomers. It is recognized that our private enterprise system must allow freedom to individuals to engage in productive pursuits and not be frozen out of any legitimate area. Within the framework of the voluntary plan there must be room to some extent for such newcomers with immediate requirements and also to take care of hardship cases that may develop.

Over the years production had been increasing at a rate consistent with the growth of our economy and it had been anticipated that such growth would have made room for these cases. Production having declined, however, this accommodation of newcomers will be achieved by present importers moving over and accepting a cutback in their allocations, which reflects not only that cutback dictated by the decrease in domestic production but also provides room for newcomers. For the purpose of this program an "importer" is defined as one (1) who was engaged in the importation of crude oil into the United States during the last half of 1957, or (2) had an approved allocation under the voluntary oil import program on January 1, 1958, or (3) had existing refinery capacity within the United States.

The schedule that has been developed in accordance with these determinations is effective April 1, 1958, and includes subsequent revisions up to September 1, 1958, in accordance with the time in which new importers have scheduled commencement of their programs.

This report authorizes allocations for certain listed companies. Other applications, except for district V, either for a new allocation or for a revision of a presently approved allocation will be deferred by the administrator until September 1, 1958.

In its original report, the Committee set forth in some detail its recognition of the important foreign policy aspects in the problem of limiting petroleum imports. Its determination of the relationship between imports and production at that time was designed, among other things, to give due effect to these foreign policy considerations. Its present determination, which continues the previously determined relationship between importers and production, involves no change in this regard.

When domestic production resumes its normal upward progress, such indicated increase in demand would be examined so as to continue a proper relationship between imports and domestic production on the basis of national security considerations.

At the request of the Committee, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has investigated the impact of imports of distilled products on the voluntary program.

In response, the Director has stated that his investigation has led him to the conclusion that the importation of distilled products has not been a threat to the voluntary program. All categories of distilled products were examined, including residual fuel oil, and the study revealed that in 1957 the imports of principal competitive items, other than residual fuel oil, had actually declined substantially below 1954.[1]

The Director called attention to reports of plans of some importers for future importation of unfinished distilled products. So far as is known now, the projected imports in these categories for the first 6 months of 1958 will represent an increase of 12,900 B/D over the end of 1957, but that they still will approximate the level of 1954.

This situation will be reviewed periodically and the Committee kept advised both by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the administrator of the voluntary import program.

The review of products importation by the Office of Defense Mobilization did not include imports by governmental agencies which are substantial.

[1] While residual fuel oil is outside the purview of this Committee, the review by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization indicated no basis for determination that imports of residual oil are a threat to the national security under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act.

We recommend, to strengthen the voluntary program, that the provisions of the Buy American Act be incorporated in the procurement policies of all agencies of the Government purchasing petroleum products in all areas of the United States, including but not limited to the General Services Administration, the Post Office Department, and the Department of Defense.

The Department of Defense has historically purchased its requirements by exemption from the Buy American Act. The Secretary of Defense has signified his intention to change this policy, subject to the provisions of the accompanying amendment to Executive Order No. 10582, and to issue new regulations embodying the objectives of the Buy American Act.

Because of the practice in the industry of commingling crude oil from both foreign and domestic sources, it has been recognized that in certain sections of the country the requirements of the Buy American Act would be difficult to administer, and therefore those areas have previously been exempted.

In order that the program be effective and to assure compliance on a practicable basis, vendors will be required to furnish a certificate from the administrator of the voluntary import program that the materials they propose to furnish, if partly of foreign crude origin, have been or will be imported in full compliance with the voluntary program. The agencies affected will issue such implementing instructions to attain this objective as their regulations may require.

Crude oil imports into district V will continue to be governed by the imports program approved by the President on December 12, 1957. Imports into district V are currently substantially under the amounts permitted under this program.

In the report of July 29, 1957, the Secretary of Interior was directed to administer the program "under policy guidance from the Office of Defense Mobilization."

Adequate policy guidance is outlined in the report so that it is recommended that the Secretary of Interior continue to administer the plan without the necessity for further advice, except as may be outlined in subsequent reports of the Committee.

The attached table shows the recommended imports into districts I–IV for the individual companies.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.
DONALD A. QUARLES,
(For the Secretary of Defense).
ROBERT B. ANDERSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.
HATFIELD CHILSON,
(For the Secretary of the Interior).
JAMES MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.
SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce, Chairman.

Revised allocations for crude oil imports, district I–IV

[Thousands of barrels daily]

Company	Present allocation	Effective date of allocation	Apr. 1, 1958 (−9.08)	June 1, 1958 (−9.90)	July 1, 1958 (−12.20)	Aug. 1, 1958 (−13.73)	Sept. 1, 1958 (−14.82)
Atlantic Refining	58.9		53.5	53.1	51.7	50.9	50.2
Gulf Oil	111.6		101.3	100.6	98.0	96.3	95.1
Sinclair Refining	62.2		56.5	56.1	54.6	53.7	53.0
Socony Mobil	67.1		60.9	60.5	59.0	57.9	57.2
Standard of California	66.8		60.7	60.2	58.7	57.7	56.9
Standard of New Jersey (Esso)[1]	72.0		65.4	64.9	63.2	62.1	61.4
Texas Co	54.5		49.5	49.1	47.9	47.0	46.4
Subtotal	493.1		447.8	444.5	433.1	425.6	420.2
Aurora Gasoline		Sept. 1, 1958					3.5
Bay Refining	3.2		2.9	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.7
Cities Service	32.6		29.6	29.4	28.7	28.1	27.8
Clark Oil		Apr. 1, 1958	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Continental Oil		Aug. 6, 1958				5.0	5.0
Crown Central	5.0		4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3
Danaho Refining		July 24, 1958				.5	.5

[1] Includes American Bitumals.

Revised allocations for crude oil imports, district I–IV—Continued

[Thousands of barrels daily]

Company	Present allocation	Effective date of allocation	Apr. 1, 1958 (−9.08)	June 1, 1958 (−9.90)	July 1, 1958 (−12.20)	Aug. 1, 1958 (−13.73)	Sept. 1, 1958 (−14.82)
Delta Refining		Aug. 3, 1958				3.0	3.0
Dow Chemical	.3		.3	.3	.3	.3	.3
Eastern States Petroleum	18.3		16.6	16.5	16.1	15.8	15.6
Gabriel Oil	7.5		6.8	6.8	6.6	6.5	6.4
Great Northern	33.0		30.0	29.8	29.0	28.5	28.1
Hess, Inc	[2] 11.5	July 1, 1957	10.4	10.4	10.1	10.0	9.8
Ingram Oil		July 15, 1958			3.5	3.5	3.5
International Refining	12.3		11.2	11.1	10.8	10.6	10.5
Lakehead P. L	.3		.3	.3	.3	.3	.3
Lake Superior Refining	5.0		4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3
Northwestern Oil	13.5		12.3	12.2	11.9	11.7	11.5
Ohio Oil		Aug. 12, 1958				3.5	3.5
Phillips Petroleum	12.0		10.9	10.8	10.6	10.4	10.2
Pure Oil		June 10, 1958		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Republic Oil		July 1, 1958			4.0	4.0	4.0
Shell Oil	7.5		6.8	6.8	6.6	6.5	6.4
Standard (Indiana)	29.8		27.1	26.9	26.2	25.7	25.4
Standard (Ohio)	8.2		7.4	7.4	7.2	7.1	7.0
Sun Oil	50.4		45.8	45.4	44.3	43.5	43.0
Sunray Mid-Continent		Sept. 1, 1958					5.0
Southwestern Oil	2.9		2.6	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.5
Tennessee Gas & Bay Petroleum		June 16, 1958			3.5	3.5	3.5
Texas Asphalt	2.3		2.1	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0
Texas City Oil & Refining		July 1, 1958			4.0	4.0	4.0
Tidewater Oil	34.2		31.1	30.8	30.0	29.5	29.2
United Refining		July 1, 1958			3.0	3.0	3.0
Subtotal	289.8		265.2	268.5	279.9	217.4	292.8
Total	782.9		713.0	713.0	713.0		713.0

[2] Retroactive to July 1, 1957.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on January 23 the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee completed its hearings on the satellite and missile programs. At that time, the 7 members agreed unanimously upon 17 recommendations which we felt should be pursued to strengthen the defense of this country against aggression.

Those recommendations necessarily ranged over a wide field. Action upon them could not be completed within a matter of days, weeks, or even months. The Preparedness Subcommittee is maintaining a continuous surveillance to determine the extent to which they are being carried out.

Today, I wish to call particular attention to one of those recommendations. It was that urgent attention be given to the reorganization of the Defense Department in the interest of efficiency and greater strength.

During the course of our hearings, we were told by the Secretary of Defense, Neil McElroy, that he hoped to have recommendations ready by the end of March. Mr. President, we are approaching that point. I have every confidence in Mr. McElroy, and I know that he will meet his deadline if it is at all possible.

The question of reorganizing the Defense Department must be approached with great care. There are many conflicting viewpoints. Proposals range from leaving things just where they are to the creation of a strong centralized organization along the lines of the Prussian general-staff system.

I have no advance information on the specific nature of the Defense Department proposals. I have not formed any preconceived ideas which cannot be changed, as to what the final structure should be. It is my intention to weigh the proposals in the light of the evidence, and come to whatever conclusion in my best judgment is prudent and effective.

But it seems to me that there are certain guideposts which must characterize any proposals which will be acceptable to the Congress and acceptable to the country. Some of those guideposts represent "do's" and some represent "don'ts."

High on the list of "don'ts" is the necessity of avoiding reorganization solely for the sake of reorganization. Pure motion—motion without purpose and without direction—could create the illusion of progress, but would not strengthen the security of the Nation.

Furthermore, I am convinced that this Congress and this Nation will not tolerate an organizational form which creates a man on horseback. The tradition of civilian control over the military is deeply ingrained in the national spirit.

We Americans consider our Military Establishment to be that arm which defends—but does not control—our free institutions. I think that philosophy is accepted as wholeheartedly by our military men as it is by our civilian leaders.

We are not going to have the creation of institutions which would alter it. Whatever plan is offered must achieve fundamental goals. Among these goals I would list:

First. Machinery which will enable decisions to be made quickly, promptly, and efficiently, and effectively.

Second. Clear and unmistakable channels so that authority will be vested in those who have responsibility.

Third. The elimination of the type of featherbedding which has been so eminently successful in the Pentagon in delaying a solution to problems.

Fourth. Clear provisions for flexibility, so the Defense Establishment will be able to change with the times and with technology.

Mr. President, I anticipate that this issue will be one of the most important in this session of the Congress. It will dominate our deliberations to a considerable extent, and the outcome could well determine the future of our Nation. I hope the President will soon send us the results of the various Defense Department studies. This is one question upon which urgent action is required.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour statements be limited to 3 minutes.

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

REPORT ON NAVAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on naval research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, covering the period July 1, through December 31, 1957, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Laona E. Underkofler, of Ames, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of liquor to the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Kapaa Businessmen's Association, of Kapaa, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to establish bauxite mining in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RECHECKING OF APPLICANTS FOR EMERGENCY FEED RELIEF, 1956 AND 1957—RESOLUTION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Committee on Agriculture of the Oklahoma State Legislative Council, relating to rechecking of applicants for emergency feed relief during the years 1956 and 1957. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

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

A RESOLUTION RELATING TO RECHECKING OF APPLICANTS FOR EMERGENCY FEED RELIEF DURING THE YEARS 1956 AND 1957

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture of the Oklahoma Legislative Council of the State of Oklahoma that the United States Department of Agriculture has commenced the rechecking of all applicants, approved as such,

for emergency feed relief during the years 1956 and 1957; and

Whereas during all of said period of time the State of Oklahoma had been declared a drought disaster area and applicants eligible for such emergency feed relief; and

Whereas the program was devised, adopted and applied for the purpose of providing to a drought disaster area necessary feed for livestock at a minimum cost without discrimination so as to protect the livestock interests of all; and

Whereas the efforts now being made to reexamine eligibility of applicants retroactively contrary to findings made and action taken by local committee action; and

Whereas the farmers and ranchers have relied upon the findings and determination of the local representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture in accepting benefits under the emergency feed program during said years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Committee on Agriculture of the Oklahoma Legislative Council, That the Secretary of Agriculture for the United States of America be requested to accept the fundamental principles under which the program was planned for area benefit rather than individual benefit, and that he further accept the findings and action of the local committee as final; and further to stop any further action toward redetermining eligibility of applicants.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN BROOMCORN—RESOLUTION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Agriculture Committee of the Oklahoma State Legislative Council, relating to the importation of foreign broomcorn and its adverse effect on Oklahoma and other broomcorn-producing States. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN BROOMCORN AND ITS ADVERSE EFFECT ON OKLAHOMA AND OTHER BROOMCORN-PRODUCING STATES; URGING THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND EACH MEMBER OF THE OKLAHOMA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO SUPPORT A TARIFF INCREASE ON FOREIGN IMPORTS OF BROOMCORN

Whereas Oklahoma is the largest broomcorn producer in the Nation, raising nearly one-third of the entire output of the United States; and

Whereas the production and sale of broomcorn constitutes the sole livelihood for a major segment of Oklahoma farmers; and

Whereas in 1956 the season average price of Oklahoma broomcorn was $475 per ton, and in 1957 it was $275, making a decrease of approximately 42 percent; and

Whereas imports of foreign broomcorn increased from 973 tons in 1955 to 5,960 tons in 1956, or approximately 80 percent; and

Whereas because of higher harvest costs, domestic production of broomcorn is placed at a competitive disadvantage with foreign broomcorn producers, who utilize cheap labor, such as exists in the fast developing Mexican broomcorn industry; and

Whereas, should foreign broomcorn imports continue to increase at the present rate, they will have a disastrous effect upon the domestic broomcorn market of this State; and

Whereas the continued existence of this major Oklahoma agricultural industry and the livelihood of the farmers engaged in this pursuit depends upon immediate relief from the crippling effect of foreign broomcorn imports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the agriculture committee of the State legislative council, duly assembled at Oklahoma City, Okla., on February 28, 1958—

SECTION 1. That the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson and each member of the Oklahoma Congressional delegation are hereby urged to take all possible action to increase the tariff on foreign broomcorn imports as set forth in the Tariff Act of June 17, 1930, as amended, from $20 a short ton to $150 a short ton.

SEC. 2. That a copy of the full text of this resolution as endorsed by this committee be transmitted to the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, and to each member of the Oklahoma Congressional delegation.

UNEMPLOYED IRON-ORE MINERS—RESOLUTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution I have received from the Board of Education of Independent School District 694, Buhl, Minn., relating to unemployment of iron-ore miners. I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred.

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

RESOLUTION 126

Whereas a serious unemployment and unstable economic situation exists in our immediate area and the Mesabe Iron Range, with hundreds of iron-ore miners unemployed and many more to be laid off as time goes on; and

Whereas this serious situation has created undue hardship and suffering upon these unemployed and their families: Now, therefore, be, and it hereby is

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Independent School District 694, Buhl, Minn., requests the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate Federal funds and aid for a public works program in this area affected by this serious unemployment situation and thus help relieve the hardship of these unemployed and their families and to effectuate the securing of the same; copies of this resolution will be sent to Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, and Senator EDWARD THYE.

TOLL-FREE BRIDGE BETWEEN FORT FRANCES, ONTARIO, CANADA, AND INTERNATIONAL FALLS, MINN.—RESOLUTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution I have received from the Board of County Commissioners of Koochiching County, Minn., relating to the construction of a bridge between Fort Frances, Ontario, Canada, and International Falls, Minn.

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

Whereas the citizens of Fort Frances, Ontario, Canada, and International Falls, Minn., realize that there is need for a bridge to connect the 2 communities and the 2 countries which would be adequate to accommodate the great increase in traffic, particularly motor vehicle traffic, between the 2 countries and whereas it is felt that there should be no delay in formulating the plans and obtaining the necessary consents for the arrangement of the financing and the constructing of the bridge which we urge and insist must be a toll-free bridge: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we adopt this resolution favoring the construction immediately of the bridge and to urge that immediate action be taken which would lead to the construction of the bridge and that a copy of said resolution be forwarded to our State Senators THYE and HUMPHREY and our Congressman BLATNIK, urging and requesting that they do all in their power to obtain favorable action for the construction of the bridge.

ACCELERATION OF PUBLIC-WORKS PROGRAMS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just received a resolution adopted by the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 694, Buhl, Minn., urging Congress to accelerate public-works programs in areas affected by serious unemployment.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

RESOLUTION 126

"Whereas a serious unemployment and unstable economic situation exists in our immediate area and the Mesabe Iron Range, with hundreds of iron-ore miners unemployed and many more to be laid off as time goes on; and

"Whereas this serious situation has created undue hardship and suffering upon these unemployed and their families: Now, therefore, be and it hereby is

"*Resolved,* That the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 694, Buhl, Minn., requests the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate Federal funds and aid for a public-works program in this area affected by this serious unemployment situation and thus help relieve the undue hardship of these unemployed and their families; and to effectuate the securing of the same, copies of this resolution will be sent to Honorable Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, Honorable Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, and Honorable Senator EDWARD THYE."

Gerald Anderson moved the adoption of the foregoing resolution and upon support thereof by Thomas Simonson, the same was adopted and so declared at a duly called meeting held March 17, 1958, by the following vote: Ayes 5; nays 0.

STANLEY J. HILL,
Chairman.

Attest:

THOMAS C. SIMONSON,
Clerk.

RESOLUTIONS OF HENNEPIN COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just received two resolutions adopted by the executive council of the Hennepin County Bar Association endorsing both S. 1165, relating to pay of military lawyers, and the Jenkins-Keogh bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the two resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately re-

ferred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Armed Services:

HENNEPIN COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 24, 1958.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The following resolution was adopted by a majority vote at a meeting of the executive council of the Hennepin County Bar Association on March 10, 1958:

"*Resolved,* That the president is authorized to write to the Minnesota Senators and Representatives that the executive council acting on behalf of the Hennepin County Bar Association favors Senate bill 1165 relating to pay of military lawyers and urge their favorable support."

Your favorable consideration of Senate bill 1165 will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,
MATTHEW J. LEVITT,
President.

To the Committee on Finance:

HENNEPIN COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 24, 1958.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At a meeting of the executive council of the Hennepin County Bar Association held on March 10, 1958, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved,* That the president is authorized to write to the Minnesota Senators and Representatives that the executive council acting on behalf of the Hennepin County Bar Association favors the Jenkins-Keogh bill and urge their favorable support."

On behalf of our association we earnestly request your favorable consideration of the matter set forth in the resolution.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,
MATTHEW J. LEVITT,
President.

BRIDGE BETWEEN FORT FRANCES, ONTARIO, AND INTERNATIONAL FALLS, MINN.—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as the sponsor of the bill (S. 3437) authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct and operate a new highway bridge between International Falls, Minn., and Fort Frances, Ontario, Canada, I was particularly pleased to receive the attached resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Koochiching County, Minn.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

A special meeting of the board of county commissioners was held at the courthouse in International Falls, Minn., on the 20th day of March 1958. A quorum being present, the following resolution was introduced by Commissioner Lessard, who moved its adoption, and which motion was seconded by Commissioner Mueller and asked to be carried:

"Whereas the citizens of Fort Frances, Ontario, Canada, and International Falls, Minn., realize that there is need for a bridge to connect the two communities and the two countries which would be adequate to accommodate the great increase in traffic, particularly motor-vehicle traffic, between the two countries; and

"Whereas it is felt that there should be no delay in formulating the plans and obtaining the necessary consents for the arrangement of the financing and the constructing of the bridge which we urge and insist must be a toll-free bridge: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That we adopt this resolution favoring the construction immediately of the bridge and to urge that immediate action be taken which would lead to the construction of the bridge and that a copy of said resolution be forwarded to our State Senators THYE and HUMPHREY and our Congressman BLATNIK, urging and requesting that they do all in their power to obtain favorable action for the construction of the bridge."

PATRICK J. DONAHUE,
County Auditor.

MINNESOTA AFL–CIO FULL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the executive council of the Minnesota AFL–CIO Federation of Labor recently adopted a full employment program to combat rising unemployment. There is no doubt that the recession which is nationwide in scope has hit the State of Minnesota with more than average severity. The Minnesota AFL–CIO full employment program is a constructive, forward-looking imaginative program for immediate action on all levels, Federal, State, and local.

I ask unanimous consent that the program be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the program was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MINNESOTA AFL–CIO FULL-EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The executive council of the Minnesota AFL–CIO Federation of Labor in its regular meeting on March 1, 1958, hereby adopts the following as the Minnesota AFL–CIO full-employment program to combat the increasingly serious recession and rising unemployment which is occurring in the State of Minnesota and the Nation as a whole:

A. STATE AND LOCAL

1. That the industrial commission establish new wage orders for industries not recently covered by minimum wage orders, and that present wage orders be vigorously enforced.

2. That the next State legislature be urged to adopt a statewide minimum wage law providing for an adequate minimum wage for intrastate employment by statute.

3. That local governmental units be urged to elect coverage under the Minnesota unemployment compensation law.

4. That the present inadequate benefits in State unemployment and workmen's compensation laws be substantially increased in the next session, and that coverage of the unemployment compensation law be extended to all employers of one or more employees.

5. That the State highway department and other agencies of State government and all the political subdivisions of the State be urged to accelerate all highway and other public-works programs for the purpose of expanding employment and bolstering the economy.

6. That all affiliate organizations be urged to press vigorously for wage increases and other programs such as supplemental unemployment benefits which will expand the purchasing power of employees and, therefore, the general public.

B. NATIONAL

7. That we support the McCarthy-Kennedy unemployment compensation bill in Congress which would provide for nationwide standards in the field of unemployment compensation, and require States to pay more adequate benefits for 39 weeks' duration.

8. That we urge the Congress to adopt national and adequate standards in the field of workmen's compensation, which States will be required to observe.

9. That we urge the Congress to increase substantially the Federal minimum wage rate from its present $1 amount, and to expand the coverage thereunder.

10. That all possible measures be taken to reduce interest rates and to otherwise encourage construction and other forms of business expansion.

11. Tax reduction in the lower income brackets and increased allowances for dependents in State and Federal income-tax laws, and as an immediate measure, a temporary suspension of withholding taxes on incomes up to $5,000 per annum.

12. That we support Federal aid to education, and an accelerated school construction program.

13. A farm price-support program and other farm measures which will insure to farmers fair income, and on parity with other segments of economy.

14. Expansion of the Federal social-security program so as to provide for adequate benefits for all retired and disabled employees and their dependents, and to include medical care as provided in the Forand bill.

15. Federal aid to economically distressed areas.

REPORT ENTITLED "NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES" (S. REPT. NO. 1428)

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 56, as extended, I submit a report entitled "National Penitentiaries" and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Missouri.

REPORT ENTITLED "JUVENILE DELINQUENCY" (S. REPT. NO. 1429)

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 52, as extended, I submit a report entitled "Juvenile Delinquency" together with the individual views of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the individual views, be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Missouri.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3568. A bill for the relief of Herbert Westermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3569. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain Federal lands for certain lands owned by the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

S. 3570. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase certain real property from the city of Knoxville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

S. 3571. A bill to provide for equal treatment of all State-owned hydroelectric power projects with respect to the taking over of such projects by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3572. A bill to authorize land exchanges for purposes of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ENTITLED "INTRODUCTION TO OUTER SPACE"

Mr. BRICKER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 283), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the statement entitled "Introduction to Outer Space," prepared by the President's Science Advisory Committee, shall be printed as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed 50,000 additional copies of such Senate document, of which 15,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 15,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and 20,000 copies shall be for the use of the Special Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, established by Senate Resolution 256, 85th Congress.

EQUAL TREATMENT FOR ALL STATE-OWNED HYDROELECTRIC POWER PROJECTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the correction of an inequity in the New York State-St. Lawrence hydroelectric project. I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3571) to provide for equal treatment of all State-owned hydroelectric power projects with respect to the taking over of such projects by the United States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. IVES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The explanation presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The bill is intended to correct a discrimination against New York State's St. Lawrence project contained in Public Law 278, 83d Congress, enacted August 15, 1953. That law provides that all State and municipal hydroelectric projects shall be exempt from the recapture provisions of the Federal Power Act, and from the related accounting requirements, but specifically excepts the St. Lawrence project.

Of course, all State projects are subject to the Federal power of eminent domain regardless of the provisions of the Federal Power Act. The act merely provides a formula to determine the amount to be paid. This was recognized by the Congress in enacting Public Law 278.

The bill as originally drafted did not exclude New York's St. Lawrence project from the operation of Public Law 278. No explanation for the change was ever given. When asked why the St. Lawrence project was excluded Congressman HARRIS replied:

"There are so many proposals dealing with the St. Lawrence River that someone brought up the question and the amendment merely exempts the St. Lawrence River from the provisions of this exemption. That is all in the world there is to it." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 8, p. 10927).

This statement was inaccurate. The St. Lawrence license had already been issued to the power authority 2 weeks before the statement was made and there was then no controversy as to the manner of dealing with the St. Lawrence.

The exclusion of the St. Lawrence from Public Law 278 has the continuing practical effect of increasing the annual charges which must be paid when the project begins operation later this year.

Since Public Law 278 makes the St. Lawrence project subject to recapture under the formula provided in section 14 of the Federal Power Act, the Federal Power Commission must keep original cost, depreciation and surplus earnings accounts for the project which it no longer has to do in connection with any other State project. Before the law was passed these records were kept for all projects and the Commission estimated that the cost of keeping them represented approximately 30 percent of all costs incurred in supervising State and municipal licenses. Unless the law is changed, the Commission will charge the power authority the cost of keeping such records and this may increase the annual charges the power authority has to pay to the Federal Power Commission under the St. Lawrence license by as much as 50 percent.

The people of the State of New York and other users of St. Lawrence power will have to pay the bill.

There is, of course, no distinction between New York State's St. Lawrence project and other State projects which would justify this extra expense and extra burden on the accounting staffs of the power authority and the Federal Power Commission. The laws should be changed to provide equal treatment for all State projects.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], has asked that the bill (S. 3496) to provide for the beneficiation of certain low-grade manganese ores purchased by the General Services Administration be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

I am informed that procedure meets with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations and with the approval of the minority leader. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 3496 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

EXPANSION OF PUBLIC FACILITY LOAN PROGRAM — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 17, 1958, the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] introduced, for himself and other Senators, the bill (S. 3497) to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor of this bill and that it appear as such on any further printing of the bill which may be made.

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

REHABILITATION ACT OF 1958—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 25, 1958,

The names of Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. POTTER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3551) to provide evaluation of rehabilitation potentials and rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals who as a result thereof can achieve such ability of independent living as to dispense with the need for expensive institutional care or who can dispense with, or largely dispense with, the need of an attendant at home, to assist in the establishment of public and private nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators) on March 25, 1958.

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

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

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Address delivered by him at Lincoln Day dinner, Allegheny County Republican executive committee, Pittsburgh, Pa., February 13, 1958.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address entitled "The Farmer's Interest in the Export Market," delivered by him to the National Conference of Organizations on International Trade Policy, in Washington, D. C., on March 27, 1958.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address on the Washington meeting of the Organization on International Trade Policy, delivered by him at Rockford, Ill., on March 24, 1958; and program for the Washington conference.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Statement prepared by him on 138th anniversary of Greek independence.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judi-

ciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, April 21, 1958, at 10 a. m., in room 424 Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations:

Mendon Morrill, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge, for the district of New Jersey, vice Alfred E. Modarelli, deceased.

Edwin D. Steel, Jr., of Delaware, to be United States district judge, for the district of Delaware, vice Paul C. Leahy, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and myself, as chairman.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE PARLIAMENT OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, some distinguished guests are now in the Vice President's office; they are Members of the Parliament of Great Britain. I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and at the conclusion thereof the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be recognized.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT escorted into the Senate Chamber several Members of the House of Lords and House of Commons of Great Britain, who took the seats on the floor of the Senate assigned to them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there is no better way for two countries to come to understand each others' virtues, defects, and problems than for the people of one to meet with and get to know the people of the other. It is particularly valuable for representatives of the legislative bodies of the two countries to come together. Therefore, it is with special satisfaction and pleasure that we welcome today this outstanding group of members of the British Parliament.

Our British friends and we in America speak the same language, at least more or less the same language. Much more important, however, is the fact that we share a common history and political, religious, and cultural heritage. In particular, both countries emphasize the paramount importance of the individual as opposed to that of the state. In this fact can be found, I believe, a major strength of both of our countries.

It is eminently fitting that these distinguished members of the British Parliament should meet with us, their American counterparts. However, it is also good that they have the opportunity to travel outside of Washington to various parts of our country. I sincerely hope that, in spite of their schedule, which I fear is a trifle full, they will have an opportunity to meet American citizens in all walks of life. Needless to say, it will be of great value to the people of the United States to have the opportunity of associating firsthand with these leaders of our great ally.

I have studied and traveled in England. Your hospitality was superb. The warmth of your welcome was unsurpassed. I have met many of your students and professors who have visited the United States over the years under the State Department's exchange program. You will surely be pleased to know that all of your people give a good account of themselves in our schools and colleges. We are delighted to have them as we are to have you.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope that your stay will be both pleasant and profitable. I know that, as a result of your being here, the many ties that bind our two countries together will be made even stronger than before.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, we are privileged to have in the Senate Chamber today 12 distinguished Members of the British Parliament who are visting the United States under the Department of State's International Educational Exchange Service. Our British colleagues are returning a visit made by a delegation from both Houses of Congress to the United Kingdom as the guests of Parliament in the fall of 1955.

Those of us who had the great pleasure of making that journey, and, indeed, anyone who has ever had the pleasure of visting the British Isles, will always remember a most hearty and pleasant reception. Such visits do permit the making of valuable firsthand impressions. The ladies and gentlemen of the British Delegation, after leaving Washington at the end of this week, will journey to Williamsburg, where they will see mirrored our common Anglo-Saxon heritage. From there they will proceed to New Orleans, and then individually to those parts of the United States which are of the greatest personal and professional interests to them.

It is indeed a pleasure to be able to welcome you here, and I express the fervent hope that your visit to this country will be as pleasant as was ours to the United Kingdom. I assure you that you will have the opportunity to observe at firsthand the great reservoir of good will and friendship which your country enjoys on this side of the ocean. Visits of this type cannot but break down the many barriers of misunderstanding, and result in ever closer bonds between our countries. I am sure that I am expressing the sentiments of my colleagues in the Senate when I say that I hope that when you return home you will do so in the knowledge that your visit has further strengthened the many bonds of understanding between the United Kingdom and the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as minority leader of the Senate, I should like to join in extending a bipartisan welcome to our distinguished visitors from overseas. All of us are mindful of the common heritage of our two countries. Some of us were privileged during the dark days of World War II to observe the stoutheartedness of the British people under attacks which were then being made. I, myself, happened to be in London on the night of the last of the so-called old-fashioned raids there, at the time the V-1's and V-2's first came to the British Isles and over their capital.

I believe no ally which this country has had over the years has been a stouter one in time of trouble than the British people. If we were ever challenged again to preserve human freedom, there is no nation which I should like to know we were standing shoulder to shoulder with to help maintain a Free World of free men, than the nation so ably represented by the delegation visiting us today.

I might say parenthetically I am pleased that by happenstance the Members of Parliament came to sit on this side of the aisle, for if I only had this many additional Senators, the minority party would be the majority one.

However, I do not greet you in any partisan sense, because I want you to know that while the center aisle divides our two great parties in the Chamber of the Senate of the United States, the welcome you receive is from a unanimous Senate speaking on behalf of the American people to the British people, and we are pleased to have you here.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to introduce the members of the British Parliament in the visiting delegation. As I read their names I ask them to rise, so that my colleagues may identify them. Then I hope we shall have an opportunity to shake hands and greet each other.

The leader of the delegation, Sir James Henderson-Stewart.

Lord Rea.

Lord St. Oswald.

Mr. Charles Doughty.

Miss Margaret Herbison.

Mr. Michael Hughes-Young.

Mr. R. Godman Irvine.

Dr. J. Dickson Mabon.

Mrs. P. McLaughlin.

Mr. E. Popplewell.

Mr. W. A. Wilkins.

The Reverend Llywelyn Williams.

(As their names were read, the distinguished visitors rose in their places, and were greeted with applause.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement regarding our distinguished visitors be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BRITISH PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

Sir James Henderson-Stewart, Bart., Member of Parliament, leader of the delegation: Born 1897. Liberal Unionist Member for East Fife since 1933. Educated Edinburgh University. Created a baronet in 1957. Served with the British Expeditionary Force, 1917–19 and in World War II.

Joint Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Scotland, 1952. Former leader of the National Liberal Party in the House of

Commons. Member of the council, Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons.

Lord Rea, O.B.E.: Born 1900. Educated Westminster and Christ's College, Oxford, and at Grenoble University. Served in the Grenadier Guards, 1918–19.

Liberal leader in the House of Lords since 1955. President of the Liberal Party, 1955–56. Justice of the peace. Lord Rea led a British Parliamentary delegation under the Inter-Parliamentary Union to Burma and Indonesia in 1954.

Lord St. Oswald, Member of the House of Commons: Born 1916. Educated at Stowe. Took his seat in the House of Lords on March 19, 1957. Captain, acting major, Eighth Royal Irish Hussars. Served in southeast Asia, 1943–45. Wounded, mentioned in dispatch. Korea, 1950–52.

Mr. Charles Doughty, Q. C., Member of Parliament: Born 1902. Conservative Member for Surrey, eastern division, since 1951. Educated Eton and Magdalen College, Oxford. Barrister-at-law. Served in the Coldstream Guards, 1940–45. Mrs. Doughty will accompany her husband.

Miss Margaret Herbison, Member of Parliament: Born 1907. Labor Member for Lanark, northern division, since 1945. Educated at the University of Glasgow. Tutor for the National Council of Labor colleges. A member of the National Executive of the Labor Party.

Was Joint Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, the Scottish Office, 1950–51.

Mr. Michael Hughes-Young, M. C., Member of Parliament: Born 1912. Conservative Member for Wandsworth Central since 1955. Educated at Harrow and the Royal Military College, Sandhurst. Before the war, he was commissioned in the Black Watch and served with the French Army and with the King's African Rifles in Africa. He retired as a lieutenant colonel in 1948.

He was on the staff of the publicity department, Conservative central office, and was Parliamentary Private Secretary to the Minister of State, Board of Trade, March-April 1956. Created as assistant government whip in April 1956.

Mr. R. Godman Irvine, Member of Parliament: Born 1909. Conservative Member of the Rye division of East Sussex. Educated at St. Paul's School and Magdalen College, Oxford. Barrister. Served with the Royal Navy Volunteer Reserve, 1940–46, as a lieutenant commander. He was chairman of the National Farmer's Union branch and chairman of the Agricultural Land Tribune, Southeastern Provinces. He farms in Sussex. Mrs. Irvine will accompany her husband.

Dr. J. Dickson Mabon, Member of Parliament: Born 1925. Labor and cooperative Member for Greenock, Scotland, since 1955. Educated at the University of Glasgow. Served in the mines. President of the Glasgow Union, 1951–52, and of the Scottish Union of Students, 1954.

Mrs. P. McLaughlin, Member of Parliament: Born 1917. Conservative Member for Belfast West since 1955. Educated at Trinity College, Dublin. Member of the executive committee of the Ulster Women's Unionist Council. President of the Allen Club for Old People. District Commissioner, Girl Guides.

Mr. E. Popplewell, C. B. E., Member of Parliament: Born 1889. Labour Member for Newcastle on Tyne West since 1945. Government whip since May 1946. Justice of the peace. Vice Chamberlain of Her Majesty's Household, 1947–51. Created a C. B. E. in 1951.

Mr. W. A. Wilkins, Member of Parliament: Born 1889. Labour Member for Bristol South since 1945. Assistant whip since October 1947. A Lord Commissioner of the Treasury, 1950–51. Member of the Bristol County Council, 1936–46. Mrs. Wilkins will come to the United States with her husband but will probably not accompany him on his Washington visit.

The Reverend Llywelyn Williams, Member of Parliament: Born 1911. Labour Member for the Abertillery Division, Wales, since November 1950. Educated Swansea University. Congregational minister of religion, 1936–50. He was a propaganda speaker for the Labor-Party for many years and a lecturer in the Workers' Educational Association. He was a delegate to the Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 1952–53.

Mr. THYE subsequently said: Mr. President, I prepared some brief remarks which I had intended to deliver at the time the members of the British Parliament were in the Chamber, just prior to the short recess, when the Senate received its distinguished visitors.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD just prior to the recess.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

It is indeed a great pleasure to have with us here today this distinguished group of Members of the British Parliament. In the group I understand there are representatives of the Conservative, Labor, and Liberal Parties and of both the House of Commons and the House of Lords. It is particularly interesting to note that there are two lady members in the delegation.

We have all heard of the great friendliness and hospitality shown 11 of our colleagues in Congress when they visited Great Britain in the fall of 1955. It is therefore doubly a pleasant duty to welcome this group to this Chamber today.

In addition to visiting Williamsburg, Va., and New Orleans, I am told that they plan to travel alone or in small groups to various parts of the United States. I hope they will gain thereby an idea of the great scope and variety of our country. It usually comes as a surprise to visitors from abroad to discover that, although the various sections of this country are basically unified, there are also many interesting regional differences.

Over the years the United States Government has invited many guests to our country, but there have been few, if any, visitors more welcome than these outstanding Members of the British Parliament. Today as the Free World faces a greater challenge than ever before in history, it is vital that our two countries, tied together by bonds of language and history, move ever closer together. Our distinguished British colleagues as they mingle with us today stand as a symbol of the closeness of the friendship and cooperation existing between our two countries, which we all hope will become ever closer and closer.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senate will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The members of the visiting delegation were escorted to a position on the floor of the Senate in front of the Vice President's desk, and were there greeted by Members of the Senate, who were introduced to them by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KNOWLAND.

Following the informal reception, the distinguished visitors were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PAYNE in the chair).

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 the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1082. An act for the relief of Katina Apostolou;

S. 2062. An act for the relief of Yasna Trevizan; and

S. 2124. An act for the relief of Tasia J. Somas.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10843) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4544) for the relief of Louis S. Levenson; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FORRESTER, Mr. DONOHUE, and Mr. BURDICK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 303) establishing that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, April 3, 1958, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 14, 1958, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 10843) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

CURRENT PROBLEMS IN ATOMIC POWER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of our Members and the public to a significant speech by the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM before the National Nuclear Congress at Chicago on March 19, 1958. As Senators know, he is chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the current session. The title of his speech is "Current Problems in Atomic Power Development," and he covers many of the pressing problems which are confronting us in the atomic energy field.

Of particular importance in the speech is his emphasis on civilian control of the

peacetime development of outer space. He also calls attention to our continuing bottleneck in the production of plutonium—which is much needed for our small atomic weapons program.

The continuing and insidious problem of overclassification of information on research work in atomic energy also comes in for condemnation by Chairman DURHAM. In the past I have had some remarks to make on this subject, and I commend Mr. DURHAM's comments for your consideration.

Lastly he provides a rundown on the status of the atomic power program, and efforts by the Joint Committee to work with the AEC in developing an acceptable program. These efforts are commendable and worthwhile. The junior Senator from New Mexico has been through some atomic power battles and will want to see proof positive on the part of the Chairman and other members of AEC, the Bureau of the Budget, and the White House, as to their idea of an accelerated domestic and foreign atomic power program as a package, before there will be assurance that this country's program will move forward as rapidly as it should.

I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

CURRENT PROBLEMS IN ATOMIC POWER DEVELOPMENT

Speech before Atomic Energy Management Conference of Atomic Industrial Forum and National Industrial Conference Board, Chicago, Ill., Wednesday March 19, 1958, by Hon. CARL T. DURHAM, of North Carolina, chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy

It is a pleasure to talk once again to members and guests of the Atomic Industrial Forum and the National Industrial Conference Board at this joint luncheon. I use the phrase "once again" advisedly, since I talked to the forum at your New York meeting last fall, and to the NICB at your Philadelphia congress last year.

Today I propose to discuss some of our current problems in atomic-energy development, both the military and peacetime aspects. These problems for the most part have been disclosed by the joint committee hearings this session, by its informal seminars on the atomic-power program held last fall, and by its trips to atomic installations here and abroad. Because of your interest in questions of management and information, I have tried to emphasize these aspects of the issues of public policy which I discuss.

In a sense my talk today may be said to be a followup on my Philadelphia speech of a year ago. In that address I reviewed some of the hard facts in the atomic-energy field, and attempted to point up some of the hard questions which are necessary to an understanding and solution to the problems which face us. I also made some recommendations as to policies and programs which I believe are necessary to meet our national and international obligations in the atomic-energy field.

BASIC QUESTIONS

I believe we have made considerable progress in recognizing most of the facts and hard questions to which I called your attention last year. For example, the problems of increased costs and slippages in schedules of prototype reactor projects, together with the basic questions of where the money and direction for an expanded program are going to come from, have received considerable attention in the past year.

I regret to say that we are still not out of the woods in terms of revised policies and expanded programs necessary to cope with the situation. The root problem is the question of leadership in atomic technology, and the role of the United States and the AEC in assuming such leadership.

However, I still remain an optimist as to how it will all come out. I am particularly pleased that AEC, with the active participation of its new Commissioners, shows signs of assuming some of the qualities of leadership and a willingness to cooperate with the Congress, which are so necessary to the success of any program.

MILITARY APPLICATION PROBLEMS

Getting down to cases, let me first review some of our problems in the military field. To begin with, let me point out that we continue to make improvements in weapons technology. Our weapons development and production has been in advance of their means of delivery, particularly as to missiles. There has been no lag in the atomic warhead phase of the missile program.

Civilian control

Last year I pointed out that most of our progress under the 1946 and 1954 Atomic Energy Acts is attributable to the fact that we have had a civilian Atomic Energy Commission responsible for the entire atomic energy program.

This policy of civilian control is presently being put in jeopardy in two different ways. First is by the process of nibbling—of proposing detailed changes in the Atomic Energy Act and practices thereunder which may enhance the role of the military. For example, in H. R. 10348, which provides for exchange of information and materials with our NATO allies, there is an obscure provision which extends a Defense Department veto over the declassification of restricted data from weapons to all military applications, including naval reactors, and nuclear aircraft and rocket development conducted by the AEC.

Outer space propulsion

More important, we are also faced with serious challenge to civilian control in the field of outer space propulsion. Hearings held by the Joint Committee revealed atomic energy will play a key role in long-range space ships with heavy pay loads. The atom will be important both as a heat source for the initial thrust, and as a source of electrical power to accelerate possible ion propellents once a ship reaches outer space.

But as recent events have shown, the combination of the Defense Department and the promoters of conventional fuels and aircraft is making a strong play for military development of space vehicles. I recognize that there are reasonable arguments for and against giving the complete responsibility to AEC along the lines of S. 3117 and H. R. 10271 introduced by Senator ANDERSON and myself. However, I do believe we must remain true to the principle of civilian control, and as a minimum preserve AEC responsibilities for atomic power development for space vehicles.

Plutonium production bottleneck

Our second problem in the military field concerns our needs over the next 5 or 6 years for additional amounts of plutonium for an expanded small weapons program. I regret to say that the Defense Department has made no progress in getting out of its bureaucratic treadmill of basing its plutonium requirements on current AEC productive capacity. This absurd situation has been repeatedly called to the attention of the military since the first joint committee meeting was held on the subject in 1947. I hope the new Secretary of Defense will substantially revise his planning procedures in time for his first appearance with the joint committee in the next month. Meanwhile, we are looking forward to the design study for an advanced large-scale plutonium producing reactor which the joint committee authorized last year.

Aircraft nuclear propulsion project

Our third and last problem in the military field, relates to the aircraft nuclear propulsion project, or ANP as it is called. Plans for the so-called early flight program received a serious setback by the Under Secretary of Defense and the President on March 5 of this year. For a while last year and early this year we thought the ANP program was getting on the right track. Management improvements in terms of placing responsibility for the ANP program in a single office under the direction of one man—so long recommended by the joint committee—were finally accomplished.

The project was even able to get by several advisory committees and an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, now retired. But it came a cropper with another committee, or subcommittee, appointed by Dr. Killian. This committee, after only an afternoon's briefing and a cursory field trip, made its recommendation to the President and Defense Department without even discussing its tentative findings with the officials responsible for the technical direction of the work. In the joint committee's hearing on March 5, it was brought out that a full year has been lost in the shuffle of schedules as presented to the committee a year ago. Thus the ANP program remains as a colossal monument of maladministration by the Defense Department.

Naval reactor progress

We can retain some pride that in the field of naval reactors we continue to make progress under the leadership of Admiral Rickover and the AEC naval reactors branch. During the past year the *Nautilus* accomplished its daring Arctic exploration under the polar ice, and the new and most modern atomic submarine, the *Skate*, set a record on its first run to England. Our main problem with respect to nuclear submarines is how to get more of them, particularly the type from which the Polaris or other intermediate range missiles can be launched.

PEACETIME APPLICATIONS OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Coming now to peaceful applications of the atom, we can point to considerable accomplishment in the last year. The diversified types of experimental reactors in the AEC 5-year program sponsored by the joint committee reached criticality and began low power operations. Our first full scale atomic power plant at Shippingport also went into operation in 1957 and continues full power operations. Progress is being made in some of the private reactor projects, such as the Vallecitos experimental reactor, and the Dresden project near this city of Chicago.

During the past year in the foreign field, the International Atomic Energy Agency was established and the treaty ratified. As you know, our former colleague, Stub Cole, is Director-General of this agency, and Bob McKinney whom you heard last night, is the senior United States Representative. The new Euratom atomic power agency has also been established, and AEC has announced that a cooperative program is being developed.

Declassification

Progress is also being made in other aspects of the atomic energy program. AEC reports that continued emphasis is being given to declassification of civilian reactor technology. Possibly more important has been the declassification of many phases of the controlled thermonuclear project.

Reference to the Sherwood project reminds me of a colloquy during the 202 hearings a

few weeks ago. Representatives of the Commission were pointing out how liberal they were in declassifying parts of this project. At this point, I asked the question which has troubled me for some years: "Why don't you declassify the entire controlled thermonuclear project?" Various reasons were given as to why this would be bad, including the problem of a backlog of unpublished information which would require 2 years to untangle. The latter reasoning points up dangers to research efforts carried out under secrecy wraps, and raises the further question whether the program should ever have been classified.

Certainly, with the Russians probably at a comparable stage of development in controlled thermonuclear research, the Commission ought to ease up on the present stringent criteria blocking widespread industrial access to information being developed in the program. Continued exclusion of competent American industrial firms and their engineering talents from this important work will not only fail to serve national security interests but will penalize us in our efforts to compete effectively with the Soviet bloc nations in scientific advancement.

The overall problem of security classification may need some rethinking in the light of Under Secretary Quarles' statement before the joint committee as to the independent progress achieved by the Russians in their weapons program as follows:

"We believe that there is no important areas of nuclear weapon technology known to the United States that the Soviets will not be able to attain through their own efforts.

"We believe this competence has been achieved in a large measure independently of outside sources of information."

Undoubtedly the technical accomplishments of the Russians, apparently unaided by United States developments, will ultimately require a complete reappraisal of our classification and security policies.

Industry consultation

Improvements have also been made during the year in AEC's policy of consultation with industry as a group. Heretofore, AEC had followed this policy only with respect to its licensing program, with generally good results. With some encouragement from the joint committee, AEC has extended this policy to its indemnity program and then to its reactor development program last December. More recently the Commission has indicated a possible willingness to undertake group consultation on its contract policies. A first step was taken in a recent informal seminar held by the Atomic Forum. The Commission is also undertaking group consultation on its patent policies through a series of public hearings.

Patents

Incidentally, the question of patents also received some consideration during the 202 hearings. The committee was informed once again that AEC is not making an extensive enough effort to protect United States patent rights in foreign countries, to the detriment of all industry in the United States and particularly the industrial contractor which did the development work on which the patent was based. Problems of compulsory cross-licensing of private inventions under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 were also discussed in the statutory hearings.

Bureau of Budget holdbacks of funds

Possibly the greatest single problem encountered by AEC since Congress adjourned last August—with the exception of the raw materials cutback, and expanded atomic-power program—was the problem of the holdback of funds for AEC authorized projects which the Congress had appropriated. When members of the joint committee returned from their trip to Vienna and European atomic-energy installations last fall, we naturally began to inquire how the program Congress had authorized was coming along. To our surprise, we found that many projects had either been delayed substantially or not started at all. Thus, for example, we found that all funds for construction of the EBR II had been held up, and that no construction funds for the plutonium recycle reactor project had been made available.

In view of these apparent unnecessary delays, I wrote a letter to the Commission dated November 7, 1957, requesting complete information as to the holdbacks, and inquiring as to what efforts AEC was making to get the money. It has taken a series of letters and conferences with the AEC Controller's office over a period of several months to get all the facts. In summary it appears that of December 1, 1957, a total of $360,656,000 in construction appropriations were held back. Analysis of individual cases revealed that AEC was not always diligent in trying to obtain its funds from the Bureau. However the procedure adopted by the Bureau of requiring rejustification of budget requirements each month on an urgent project basis made it extremely difficult for contractors and AEC administrators to come through with the necessary backup each month. It was only after repeated inquiry by the joint committee that action on releasing these funds was begun in December and January of 1958.

From the above discussion, you can see that we on the joint committee were gratified, but not impressed, by a series of AEC announcements in the last month or so about the authorization of design of a large-scale accelerator, and a fuels technology center, at Argonne. They were authorized a long time ago, but false economy and poor management by the executive branch had held them up all the time.

Civilian atomic-power program

Now if the AEC's Government atomic-power-development program could be said to have been stalled for lack of funds last fall, the Commission's power-demonstration program and the private atomic-power-development program perhaps could be said to have been marking time, possibly for the same reason.

As you will recall there appeared to be considerable confusion as to what the objectives of the program were and should be, and what kind of a program was needed to implement various assumed objectives. Various responsible groups such as the Atomic Industrial Forum, the American Assembly of Columbia University, and the National Planning Association, pointed out the seriousness of the situation and the necessity for arriving at some solution as to objectives, program, and methods.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as the Congressional "board of directors" for the Nation's atomic energy program, has long felt the need for positive and vigorous action in our atomic power development program. In view of the confusion over the existing program and its objectives, the committee convened a series of informal seminars this past November to consider the views of reactor experts and representatives of the atomic industry.

The results of these seminars confirmed the committee's belief that greater efforts will be needed to spur a program which is still very much in the research and development stage. The results also tended to confirm the impression that there is no present general shortage of engineers and scientists and that the main roadblocks are technical and financial.

It was in this context that I wrote a letter to Chairman Lewis Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission, on November 27, 1957, requesting the Commission to develop, with the cooperation of the Joint Committee, some realistic program objectives and an accelerated program to carry them out. The Commission accepted this invitation and considerable progress has been made toward a definition of objectives. Progress has also been made on the scope of the program, but there are outstanding questions as to methods of getting the job done which must be resolved.

While it obviously is not possible or appropriate to reveal the details of what the Forum Memo has called "Suspense in Washington" I believe it is in the public interest to sketch the program objectives which have been discussed and to which no serious disagreement has been raised. These objectives may be summarized as follows:

1. To achieve economic atomic power in the United States at early date.
2. To render maximum help to our foreign friends, particularly our NATO allies, in their program to achieve nuclear power in large quantities as soon as possible.
3. To fortify our worldwide leadership in the peaceful applications of atomic energy, particularly atomic power.
4. To obtain more plutonium.

As you can see, they are pretty much the same ones that we all have been talking about for some time. But it does do some good to get them down on paper, and then begin to set target dates, and monetary levels of effort. Then we have to scope it out and figure out the methods of financing and direction.

But no matter what methods are adopted, we can be sure that any expanded program will take substantially more funds, Government and private, and a great deal of effort by all participating organizations.

This raises the final question of whether it is worth it. I think such an accelerated atomic-power program is at least as important as building post offices and levee projects ahead of schedule to combat the recession. In this connection we should note that reactors and laboratories and reprocessing facilities use a great deal of concrete and steel.

But far more important, it seems to me, is our obligation to ourselves and the Free World to maintain our world leadership in atomic technology. We all know that the Soviet Communists are engaged in an all-out effort to beat the United States in science and technology, including atomic energy. History has shown that when a nation starts on the downgrade in its leadership, as measured in the development of its energy resources, it usually loses out as a world power. I don't think we want that to happen here.

I would like to emphasize that the program which I hope we can come up with will be one which provides for a cooperative effort with, rather than an all-out competitive effort against, our friends and allies in Britain and the North Atlantic countries represented in EURATOM and the OEEC. In cooperating with them, we help our own atomic equipment industry get some experience in building reactors.

In conclusion, I should like to point out that we have time enough—but with precious little to spare—to come up with an adequate atomic-power program in this Congress. I believe that the AEC in good faith is trying to develop a workable program which will be acceptable to all concerned. If despite these efforts, for reasons of fiscal policy or otherwise, the Commission is not able to come up with an adequate program, then the joint committee and the Congress must try to fill the gaps.

Well, gentlemen, that about completes my sketch of some of our current problems in atomic-energy development. I couldn't cover them all, such as the raw-materials problem, but I hope you may have obtained some insights on the way our mutual problems are viewed from Capitol Hill.

Thank you very much.

LOUIS S. LEVENSON

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4544) for the relief of Louis S. Levenson, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on August 30, 1957, the Senate passed, with an amendment, H. R. 4544, for the relief of Louis S. Levenson.

The House has disagreed to the Senate amendment, and has requested a conference.

I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, agree to the conference asked by the House; and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate. This motion has been cleared with the minority.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. CARROLL, Mr. ERVIN, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

KATINA APOSTOLOU

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1082) for the relief of Katina Apostolou, which was, in line 7, after "States" insert: ": *Provided,* That the natural parents of Katina Apostolou shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

YASNA TREVIZAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2062) for the relief of Yasna Trevizan, which was, in line 7, after "States" insert ": *Provided,* That the natural parents of Yasna Trevizan shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

TASIA J. SOMAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2124) for the relief of Tasia J. Somas, which was, in line 7, after "citizen" insert ": *Provided,* That the natural parents of Tasia J. Somas shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on June 26, 1957, the Senate passed S. 1082, and on August 20, 1957, it passed S. 2062 and S. 2124. These bills would grant to the minor children adopted or to be adopted by citizens of the United States the status of nonquota immigrants, which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien minor children of United States citizens. On March 18, 1958, these bills were passed by the House of Representatives, each with an amendment to provide that the natural parents of the beneficiaries shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

This language is acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the bills S. 1082, S. 2062, and S. 2124.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that we hope to conclude consideration of the highway bill sometime during the day. I then expect to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1427, H. R. 8268, to amend section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The bill has been cleared by the minority, and I understand it was favorably reported by the Committee on Finance. I hope Members will take notice of this announcement.

SOUTH-POLE DOG

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a week ago today, I introduced a bill, S. 3529, to prevent the separation of a sled dog from his master. I introduced that private bill to provide that when Navy Lieutenant Tuck was mustered out of the service, he might keep the service dog he raised at the South Pole. I was informed at that time that the Navy Department, according to laws and regulations, had to consider this sled dog as being surplus defense property and subject to public auction, and that Lieutenant Tuck would be precluded from bidding at that auction.

I have now received a letter from the Navy Department, informing me that positive action has been taken to circumvent the regulations and allow Lieutenant Tuck and his dog, Bravo, to be mustered out of the Navy together. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be complete on this case, I ask unanimous consent that the letter I received from Rear Adm. C. C. Kirkpatrick, and a newspaper article, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF INFORMATION,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1958.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR THYE: I wish to thank you for your personal interest and assistance in restoring a dog, namely Bravo, to his master, Lt. (jg.) Jack Tuck.

As you know, Lieutenant (jg.) Tuck raised Bravo, the only remaining pup from a litter of nine Huskies, during the past Navy Antarctic Expedition, Deep Freeze III.

Certain regulations, which stem from the laws of the country, exist to protect Government property for personal use. We both recognize the need for these regulations but when they involve the love of a dog for his master, I am sure they do not apply.

With your great interest, Senator, and positive action taken within the Navy, we were able to circumvent the redtape in order to accomplish a humane act.

Bravo will be given an honorable discharge for his heroic service to man during the long 6 months he spent at the South Pole and turned over to the custody of his master, Lt. (jg.) Jack Tuck.

Let me again express the Navy's gratitude to you for all your assistance in this comparatively minor incident in the affairs of the world today but of tremendous interest to a dog and his master.

Most sincerely,

C. C. KIRKPATRICK,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
Chief of Information.

BRAVO, NAVY SLED DOG, IS NO LONGER SURPLUS

Bravo, the part-wolf sled dog born in Antarctica, won't be sold by the Navy as surplus property after all.

With magnificent disregard for legal obstacles, the Navy has slashed redtape and will give Bravo an honorable discharge in the near future.

This will enable the dog to remain with Lt. (jg.) Jack Tuck, one of the Navy men and scientists who lived at the American South Pole base last year.

Lieutenant Tuck, who was Bravo's principal nursemaid and trainer, will be leaving the Navy soon to enter college. If all goes well, he and Bravo will get their discharges about the same time.

Involved in making this possible were Secretary of the Navy Gates, a fine hand at snipping entangling redtape, three admirals, two United States Senators, and a host of others.

The Navy's preoccupation with Bravo began with a telephone call Friday, March 14, from Dr. Thomas W. McKnew, vice president of the National Geographic Magazine, to Rear Adm. Charles C. Kirkpatrick, Navy Chief of Information.

Dr. McKnew was passing on the concern of Dr. Paul A. Siple of 131 North Jackson Street, Arlington, scientific leader of the American expedition, about Bravo's fate. According to Dr. Siple, Lieutenant Tuck was heartbroken over the prospects that Bravo, who will be featured in an article in the magazine's April issue, would be sold along with four others for which the Navy paid $233 each.

"Wouldn't it be a good thing for the Navy," Dr. McKnew wondered, "to keep the dog or turn him over to Lieutenant Tuck?"

"Tom," said Admiral Kirkpatrick, "I think it's wonderful. I'll guarantee you, and I don't know how I'm going to do it, that this dog will be sold only over my dead body."

He set Navy machinery in motion and in time the case of Bravo came before Rear Adm. R. J. Arnold, chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

"All right," agreed Admiral Arnold, "we won't sell the dog."

Navy business took Admiral Kirkpatrick off to Florida. Before leaving, to make sure there'd be no slip-up, he left instructions, "Don't let anything happen to this dog without informing me."

When the admiral got back, nothing had happened, literally nothing. The inevitable legal questions had arisen. The obstacles were (1) the dog had been declared surplus and (2) there was no legal way, it would be against the law, in fact, to give him away.

By this time, Senator THYE, Republican, of Minnesota, was taking a hand in Bravo's favor. He telephoned Rear Adm. Thomas L. Becknell, Jr., Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and learned about the difficulties.

"I'll introduce a bill," promised Senator THYE.

"Wonderful, go ahead," said Admiral Becknell.

And now, Senator CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, had become interested (Lieutenant Tuck is from Erie), but the Navy was of a mind to take matters into its own hands even at the risk of a Congressional investigation. Not only would Bravo not be sold, but he would be turned over to Lieutenant Tuck if the officer wanted him. With customary Navy thoroughness, a call went through to the lieutenant, and he certainly did want the dog.

CLARK CALLS GATES

That was about the time Senator CLARK got on the telephone direct to Secretary Gates, an old friend and fellow Philadelphian.

"What are you doing to this dog?" Senator CLARK asked.

"What dog?" asked Secretary Gates, who has a few other matters on his mind.

Senator CLARK told him.

"I'll get on it right away," Mr. Gates replied.

A little later he was consulting with Admiral Kirkpatrick. "Let's just give him to Lieutenant Tuck," it was suggested. "Never mind the law and hang the consequences."

"Fine, let's do it," the Secretary replied.

That's how it came about that Bravo, now at the Seabees base at Davisville, R. I., will get his honorable discharge.

MINNEAPOLIS JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the junior chamber of commerce in Minneapolis has for the past 4 years been active in promoting a program for the improvement of labor-management relations. On Tuesday of this week, the Minneapolis JC's opened their Jaycee labor-management relations forum for the fourth year, and it was announced last week that the national board of directors of the Jaycees, meeting in Tulsa, Okla., recently, decided to adopt the Minneapolis plan as a national project. This will mean that the plan will be featured at the Junior Chamber International World Congress in Minneapolis in November of this year.

Mr. President, in recognition of the service being rendered by the Minneapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce in the field of labor-management relations, I ask unanimous consent that an article which was published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of March 23, 1958, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CITY JAYCEE PROJECT IS MODEL FOR UNITED STATES

(By Sam Romer)

A made-in-Minneapolis Jaycee project will become the pattern for a national—and perhaps an international—junior chamber of commerce program for promotion of improved labor relations.

It is the 4-year-old Minneapolis Jaycee labor-management relations forum, which gets under way this year Tuesday at the Leamington Hotel.

Jaycee officials Saturday disclosed that the national board of directors, meeting at Tulsa, Okla., decided to make the Minneapolis plan a national project—the only national project approved by the board this year.

This will mean that the plan will get special attention when the Junior Chamber International World Congress is held in Minneapolis in November. A specially prepared booklet will be distributed to some 750 delegates from 52 nations explaining the program.

A special feature of the forum is the annual awards dinner when a labor-nominated employer and a management-nominated union leader are honored for their contributions to industrial peace.

This year the award winner will be Marshall J. Diebold, vice president of Northrup, King & Co., and Harry E. Leonard, financial secretary of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 1160.

A feature of the awards dinner this year will be the presentation of a special award to Dr. Herbert G. Heneman, Jr., University of Minnesota industrial relations professor and assistant director of the university industrial relations center.

Heneman, who has been an adviser to the Jaycee group since its inception, will be given an honorary life membership in the committee.

Principal speaker at the dinner, which will start at 6:30 p. m., will be Joseph Finnegan, Washington, Director of the Federal Mediation Service.

The committee is headed by Kenneth Hall, with Robert Fjerstad as vice chairman and Al Arbeiter, secretary. It has about 25 active members.

DEATH OF L. M. WINTERS, LIVESTOCK EXPERT

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, one of the world's leading authorities on livestock breeding was recently struck down by a heart attack while serving with the International Cooperation Administration in Baghdad, Iraq. Mr. L. M. Winters served on the staff of the University of Minnesota from 1928 until his retirement in 1956 as professor of animal husbandry. In his position as livestock adviser with ICA, Mr. Winters was bringing to Iraq his wealth of experience and knowledge of animal husbandry. Our Nation has lost the services of an excellent goodwill ambassador.

In tribute to the contribution which Mr. Winters has made to our country's livestock industry and that of Iraq, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an article and an editorial which were published in the Minneapolis Star of March 18 and March 19, respectively, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Minneapolis Star of March 18, 1958]

L. M. WINTERS, LIVESTOCK EXPERT, DIES

L. M. Winters, one of the world's leading authorities on animal breeding who developed the Minnesota No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3 breeds of hogs, died following a heart attack Sunday in Baghdad, Iraq, it was learned today.

Winters, 66, had been in Iraq since August 1956, as livestock adviser with the International Cooperation Administration mission to that country.

A member of the University of Minnesota staff since 1928, Winters retired in July 1956 as professor of animal husbandry.

In addition to his work in developing the famed Minnesota hogs, Winters was instrumental in developing two new sheep breeds, the Minnesota No. 101 and Minnesota No. 102. He also helped develop miniature pigs for livestock and medical research.

Mr. Winters was a native of Lake City, Minn. He earned his bachelor of science degree at Minnesota in 1919, a master of science degree at Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, in 1920, and a doctor of philosophy degree at Minnesota in 1932.

He was professor of animal husbandry at the University of Sackatchewan from 1920 to 1928, when he came to Minnesota.

He is survived by his wife, who is expected to fly back from Iraq this week, and a niece, Mrs. Ernest R. Mose, 110 East Eighth Street, Minneapolis.

[From the Minneapolis Star of March 19, 1958]

L. M. WINTERS

When L. M. Winters died in Iraq this week he was setting up a livestock research program, the same work he carried on so successfully for 28 years at the University of Minnesota.

He is known to the public for his development of new breeds of hogs—Minnesota No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3. But much of his achievement came ahead of that. He first learned how to measure the results of experimentation. Then he determined that the crossing of swine breeds brought increased vigor. Then he established systems of continuous crossing of bloodlines. His methods are the basis of most swine breeding in the Midwest. The experimentation now going forward borrows heavily from his pioneering.

Dr. Winters liked to share with his associates any credit for accomplishments. He was responsible in large measure for the cooperation in livestock research by the six university experiment stations. One station director has said, "Winters taught us how to work together." That is what he was teaching a Middle East country when he died.

MAINTENANCE OF DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a telegram I have received from William J. Quinn, vice president, Red Owl Stores, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the proposed reduction in dairy price supports. I think it is an important message.

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

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 26, 1958.*

Senator EDWARD THYE,
Washington, D. C.:

The following wire was today sent to President Eisenhower:

"A cut in dairy price supports will result in no appreciable reduction in consumer prices but will materially reduce dairy incomes. We urge you to sign the bill pending on dairy price supports to function at least until a new comprehensive program can be adopted."

WILLIAM J. QUINN,
Vice President, Red Owl Stores, Inc.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a letter dated March 20, 1958, which I have received from the Dodge County Farm Bureau, Dodge Center, Minn., also favoring the freezing of price supports of milk at present levels.

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

DODGE COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Dodge Center, Minn., March 20, 1958.

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

DEAR MR. THYE: Our farm bureau dairy committee met Wednesday, March 19, 1958,

and passed a motion that we favor the freezing of price supports of milk at present levels.

DODGE COUNTY DAIRY COMMITTEE.

DEATH OF JAMES A. FINNEGAN, SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I call to the attention of my colleagues the untimely death of the Honorable James A. Finnegan, secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, formerly president of the Philadelphia City Council, and an active leader in the ranks of my party on the national scene. During the campaigns of 1952 and 1956, he took a very active part traveling throughout the country in support of the presidential candidate of my party, and in the latter campaign he served as campaign manager.

While Jim Finnegan devoted his life to advancing the cause of the Democratic Party, he had a host of friends among my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and throughout the ranks of all Americans who are interested in public affairs.

Born and brought up in the city of Philadelphia, he served as administrative assistant to my distinguished predecessor, the late Francis J. Myers, Senator from Pennsylvania. With a record in World War II of active combat in France with a troop-carrier group, Jim Finnegan returned to Philadelphia after the war to become a leader in the reform movement which did, I think I may say, have an impact on the life of our city and of our community, beyond its borders.

Mr. Finnegan was the kind of man who made of the art of practical politics an honorable profession.

Just as every Member of this body reached the Senate through the use of his own talents in the field of politics, so Jim Finnegan, using his talents in that field, was able to advance the cause of good government and liberal government, and to hold up to the young people of America the politician as a figure of integrity and decency.

I mourn his passing as a close and dear friend. I am certain that his memory will linger long with many a favorable thought in the minds of all who follow the affairs of my city, my State, and the Nation for many years to come.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I associate myself with the Senator from Pennsylvania in his testimonial to the character of Jim Finnegan. I knew Jim Finnegan during the last 6 or 7 years. While I was in agreement with him on the political course which he took, my affection for him went far beyond that.

He was one of the men who make our political system work for the best interests of all the people. I think he established himself in the minds of all who were associated with him as a man of the strongest character. Even though he was soft spoken, and even though his relations with those with whom he disagreed always remained good, nevertheless he did what he thought was right under favorable and, frequently, under unfavorable conditions.

I think his passing is a real loss. I extend my sympathy to his sister. I think all of us have lost not only a good friend, but also a valued public official.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mrs. Johnson and I join with the Senator from Pennsylvania and my colleagues in extending to the family of Jim Finnegan our deepest sympathy. He was a dedicated man and a strong party man. He believed in the little people of the Nation. He devoted a great part of his time and his efforts to making the Nation a better place for them in which to live. I deeply regret his passing. I know he will be missed, not only in Pennsylvania, but throughout the Nation.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I join with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, although with extreme regret, in what he has said relative to Jim Finnegan. Jim Finnegan and I belonged to different political parties. He was a strong party man. I think that in our country we need men and women, both Democrats and Republicans, who believe sincerely in the ideals of their parties and work at all times to carry those ideals into effect. Jim Finnegan was a man of that type.

I deeply regret his passing. His death is a real loss to Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join with my colleagues in expressing sorrow over the passing of Jim Finnegan. He was a fighter—a clean fighter—but a man who always went into the battle to win.

We will miss him. We will miss the spirit and the inspiration which he furnished to Democrats all over the country.

It is indeed sorrowful that at a comparatively early age this man of great promise has passed to his reward.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Montana. I shall be happy to carry to his bereaved family the kind things which have been said about him by so many of my distinguished colleagues.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, I want to join in paying tribute to a really fine citizen, Jim Finnegan, of Pennsylvania, whose death has saddened all who knew him. And all who knew him, loved him.

Jim Finnegan was one of the finest men in politics that I knew—one who never lost his idealism. The Philadelphia story is one which has thrilled all those who believe in good government. Senator JOSEPH CLARK, now a Member of this body, was one of those good citizens who banded together to bring a new day to Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, but I doubt if they would have been successful in the long run if it had not been for the support they got from Jim Finnegan.

I knew Jim as a campaigner. In the primary campaigns of 1956 he was the manager of Adlai Stevenson when Adlai and I ran against each other in many States. Never have I had a fairer or more honorable contest. In the general election campaigns of that year both Adlai and I went to the people under the same guiding hand—that of Jim Finnegan. Again I have never known a more scrupulously sincere or honorable or resourceful manager. During that time I got to know him as a friend, and I shall miss his friendship very much. We shall all miss him.

THE BRUSSELS FAIR

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in recent years within the realm of propaganda our State Department seems to possess a genius for stumbling along from one blunder to another. For some reason our State Department at times seems to put our worst foot forward when we step out onto the international stage.

Once again we appear to have done just that in connection with the costly United States exhibit for the upcoming World's Fair in Brussels, Belgium. Not only is a major section of our United States exhibit an exercise in bad judgment and poor taste, but it puts undue emphasis on problems and completely ignores progress. It is especially objectionable in that it constitutes a serious reflection against the American South. And the devilish part of all this is that the exhibit, so destructively critical of the American Southland, is being paid for by American taxpayers, who are already overburdened. This exhibit could not have been more designed to reflect against the American Nation if it had been made in Moscow by the Kremlin.

A timely and effective editorial in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent, entitled "Big United States Exhibit at Brussels Plays Up 'Problems'" is an informed commentary on this latest bit of "screwballism" by our alleged propagandists.

According to the editorial in the Independent's issue of March 18, the New York Times is quoted as authority for the story that three architecturally symbolic buildings at the fair will house a report on three of the Nation's big problems—segregation, the city, and nature.

Then the Independent's editorial further quotes, in part, the New York Times story as follows:

> In the first pavilion, a jumbled crystal shape, visitors will see a maze of enlarged newspaper clippings telling about southern school difficulties, bus boycotts and discrimination in housing, and about slums and urban sprawl, floods and erosions.

The pavilion housing this phase of our exhibit, we are told, is 20 feet long, 12 feet high, and 12 feet wide.

The Anderson Independent then inquires editorially if this "Is the sort of exhibit on which we are going to spend millions to try to impress the world with the United States?"

Mr. President, the question is well taken.

And I am sure there will be general agreement with the Independent's conclusion: "If this is the way to do it, somebody is crazy as a loon."

Before reaching this well-warranted conclusion, the Independent's editorial tells us:

A conference at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology last year advised the State Department to play down the self-righteousness of this country and play up the evils and sore spots. For what reason we would not know. Dr. Walt W. Rostow, an economist, suggested the exhibition be in the nature of unfinished business.

What I should like to know, and I am sure the other Members of this body would appreciate learning, is what makes any one man, especially an economist, a propaganda expert? I thought we had such experts already on the State Department's payroll.

It would be enlightening to know what body of experts helped dream up this nightmare.

Did the State Department special planners hatch out this one?

Did the Voice of America strategists have their hand in this pie?

How about the international office of the Department of Commerce? Did they concur?

Perhaps the CIA was solicited for its opinion.

And how about the White House adviser on psychological strategy—or was he even consulted in this miscarriage of how to win friends and influence people?

As the Independent's editorial pertinently states:

You can safely wager that Russia won't have pictures and displays of its crowded slums, its long lines waiting to buy food, its prison slave camps, its executions, and its women digging sewers.

It is worthy of special mention, as the Independent points up editorially, the Senate has approved tentatively a total of $14,300,000 for United States participation at the fair, and then the Independent drives home a haymaker editorial comment as follows:

The American taxpayers would be suckers to throw away their money on such poisonous propaganda. It is not too late to call a halt.

In enlightened self-interest, in the name of American achievements since the foundation of the Republic, in consideration of the harassed United States taxpayer, I feel we have the duty to inquire further into this propaganda fiasco before we in the Senate become a final part of this sabotage of our information program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the editorial which was published in the Anderson, S. C., Independent.

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

[From the Anderson (S. C.) Independent of March 18, 1958]

WHO'S CRAZY NOW?—BIG UNITED STATES EXHIBIT AT BRUSSELS PLAYS UP PROBLEMS

The costly exhibit of the United States at the world's fair in Brussels, Belgium, this spring and summer will reflect against the South as effectively as if Russia instead of the United States taxpayers were paying for it. A so-called side attraction to the big building in the United States area arouses our ire.

We hereby quote from a news story in the New York Times which describes three architecturally symbolic buildings at the fair which will house a report on three of this Nation's big problems—segregation, the city, and nature.

Here is the paragraph that describes the first of the three pavilions which is 20 feet long, 12 feet high, and 12 feet wide:

"In the first pavilion, a jumbled crystal shape, visitors will see a maze of enlarged newspaper clippings telling about southern school difficulties, bus boycotts and discrimination in housing, and about slums and urban sprawl, floods and erosions."

The second and third fancy buildings, presumably as curiously concocted as the jumbled crystal shape of the first, will have less chaotic walls, according to the Times. There will be photos and charts documenting moves toward the improvement of the Negro's status and so on. One picture in the third building will show white, Negro, and oriental children playing together.

Now is this the sort of exhibit we are going to spend millions on to try to impress the world with the United States? If this is the way to do it, somebody is crazy as a loon.

The Senate approved tentatively a total of $14,300,000 for United States participation at the fair, to which 51 countries have been invited.

The appropriation is supposed to match that of Russia, which has been putting out all kinds of propaganda and rumors that it would spend a vast fortune on its exhibits.

It seems at the moment the United States is merely trying to beat Russia's spending instead of doing an intelligent job of telling the world about our country.

Is bragging about the Little Rock school mess and the illegal enforcement of a Supreme Court decision by Federal troops, displaying the worst side of the bus problem and all the sore spots in our growing country the proper way to spend money to show the rest of the world the greatness and goodness of America?

What is the purpose of the United States exhibit anyhow?

Is it to give the United States a black eye or to show some of the many good qualities?

Does the United States have any obligation to the rest of the world to dramatize slums, social disputes, our unemployment, our highway deaths, and our mental institutions? We have plenty of evils, and every other country has them.

You can safely wager that Russia won't have pictures and displays of its crowded slums, its long lines waiting to buy food, its prison slave camps, its executions, and its women digging sewers.

There'll be plenty of pictures of the Bolshio Ballet, the Russian art museums, plenty of other modern machines, including of course, old and new model sputniks with perhaps a slice of the moon.

A conference at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology last year advised the State Department to play down the self-righteousness of this country and play up the evils and sore spots—for what reason we would not know. Dr. Walt W. Rostow, an M. I. T. economist, suggested that the exhibition be in the nature of unfinished business.

The American taxpayers would be suckers to throw away their money on such poisonous propaganda. It is not too late to call a halt.

BACK-DOOR APPROACH TO REDUCTION OF THIRD-CLASS MAIL RATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the wonderful world of Washington lobby activity is woven from illusions with many subtleties. This realm of make-believe takes on many forms. But the motives are always the same—to achieve by flanking action that which cannot be won by frontal assault. An example of this approach to influencing the course of legislation has come to public attention in recent days, in connection with the bills recently enacted to raise postage rates.

During consideration of the postal-rate bill, Washington metropolitan newspapers carried large advertisements, over the imprint of the Association of First Class Mailers, protesting the 5-cent rate for out-of-town first-class mail. The ads exhorted: "Stop the Stamp Tax. Defeat the 5-Cent Stamp." Since those advertisements appeared, some interesting information has come to light about the purposes of the Association of First-Class Mailers. These facts indicate that when we scratch a first-class stamp, we may find a third-class mailing permit.

In the issue of the Washington Daily News of Friday, March 21, 1958, Mr. Jack Steele, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, reported that the president of the Association of First Class Mailers is Horace H. Nahm, of New York City. Mr. Steel reported:

The ad listed the association's headquarters at 352 Fourth Avenue, New York. This is the address of Hooven Letters, Inc., of which Mr. Nahm also is president. Hooven letters is a printing firm and mailing service which handles primarily third-class (or so-called "junk") mail.

Mr. Nahm, in testimony last year before the House Post Office Committee, identified himself as a former director of the Direct Mail Advertising Association—a group of "junk" mailers. A check of the directors of the Association of First Class Mailers revealed that several others are primarily users of third class mail.

In view of what Mr. Steele has reported, there is great significance in material contained in the Postal Affairs Newsletter of the Mail Advertising Service Association, an organization of direct-mail advertising producers and distributors. This newsletter, signed by Mr. Max T. Lloyd, executive secretary of the Mail Advertising Service Association, states:

Part of the funds contributed to MASA's postal affairs fund have been used to support a two-thirds page ad by the Association of First Class Mailers in the Washington Post headed "The Wooden Nickel Comes Back." Harry Maginnis at ATCMU (Association of Third-Class Mail Users) also contributed generously to the cost of the ad. * * * Since the burden of the fight has been shifted to the first class issue, there may be occasion for other such ads.

Mr. President, I have wondered why third-class mail users would wish to shift "the burden of the fight" to first-class postage. Perhaps the answer is given by other material which appeared in Mr. Lloyd's newsletter to members of the Mail Advertising Service Association. Mr. Lloyd's newsletter stated:

The 5-cent rate is crucial to every other rate in the bill. There has been strong argument on the 2-to-1 ratio for first and third class. If the 4-cent first-class rate is voted in conference, it might possibly bolster the defense for a 2-cent minimum bulk third class.

Although this evidence may not be conclusive, there is every indication that much of the assault against a 5-cent stamp for out-of-town first-class letters has been engineered by third-class mail users, in the hope of winning a 20-percent reduction in the 2½-cent rate approved by the Senate. And there are indications that this manipulation may be continued, since Mr. Lloyd's newsletter reports:

We would like to financially back the AFCMU, ATCMU and continue our campaign via phone, telegrams, and newsletters. But to do this, we need more money.

The newsletter of the Mail Advertising Service Association also contained material critical of my position in favor of raising postage rates in order to have them more nearly cover the Post Office Department deficit. I have no reason to apologize for changing my mind about the need for increases, after having heard the Postmaster General and members of his technical staff testify on behalf of more realistic rates. If Senators cannot change their minds after weighing facts and information, there is little need for us to gather on this floor to debate and to cast our votes on decisive issues of national policy. We could stay at home and be polled by mail, or we could run a set of punch-hole cards through a Univac machine, to decide these major issues.

I changed my mind on postage rates because, as I have stated earlier, the Postmaster General and his staff made an effective case before our subcommittee, while the so-called user groups made a weak case. I note, too, that the user groups are now attacking the Postmaster General because he allegedly changed his mind, over a period of 2 years, with respect to a local and out-of-town differential on first-class mail rates.

Mr. President, the Postmaster-General, Mr. Arthur Summerfield, and I are not of the same political party. But I defend his right to change his mind on a vital issue, as I changed my mind on a different aspect of the postal question. Only recently, the able and distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], a man whom I value as a friend, changed his mind on signboard regulation. If I recall correctly, the great, late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan, changed his mind on foreign policy, and became an advocate of international cooperation, after having once been a leading isolationist. I glory in the right of public officials—yes, and of ordinary citizens—in this great free Nation to change their minds.

If I am not mistaken, the authors of our great Federal Constitution changed their minds a few years after it was written and adopted, and added the first 10 amendments, which we know now as the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, I do not wish to labor the point as to the origin of much of the public clamor against increases in first-class postage rates. All groups of mail users make significant contributions to our channels of information and to the vitality of our economic life. Perhaps the third-class users are justified in using whatever means are at hand to protect what they believe to be their best economic interests. That is for them to decide. But the Senate should know, I believe, that some of the big users of third-class mail are "wrapping themselves in first-class stamps" because such fantasy may give leverage to reduce the rates for so-called junk mail.

The postage rates adopted in the Senate bill are fair and realistic, in my opinion. If the bill which I supported becomes law, these will be the increases in all major categories since the end of World War II:

	Percent
1st-class letters	51
Airmail letters	60
2d class (newspapers, magazines)	95
2d class (advertising portions only)	108
3d class	103

The post office deficit has been running at the rate of $700 million annually. During the past decade this deficit has totaled $5.4 billion. The interest alone on the postal deficit has been $648 million—enough to pay for both Hells Canyon and John Day Dams, in the Columbia Basin. When the cost of Government operations is not covered by revenues, the deficit must be made up from taxes or from increased borrowing. Why should the huge sum of the postal deficit be assessed against all the taxpayers of the Nation, rather than to be paid by the users of the mails?

Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the article entitled "When Is a Lobby?" which was written by Mr. Jack Steele, an able Scripps-Howard staff writer, and was published in the Washington Daily News of March 21, 1958.

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

[From the Washington Daily News of March 21, 1958]

EYEBROWS RAISED OVER MAIL GROUP'S ACTIVITIES

(By Jack Steele)

It's getting hard to tell a lobby without a program.

Take a group that calls itself the Association of First Class Mailers. It is trying hard to induce Congress to vote down the proposed 5-cent letter rate.

Several Members of Congress have raised some questions—as well as their eyebrows—as a result of an advertisement by the association in a newspaper here.

The ad proclaims in big, black type:

"We urge Congress: Stop the stamp tax. Defeat the 5-cent stamp."

Inquiries today developed this information which may answer some of the questions raised by Members of Congress:

Neither the association nor its president, Horace H. Nahm, of New York, is registered as a lobbyist—according to the secretary of the Senate's office where such registrations are filed.

However, a heated denial that the association has failed to register came from its representative here, William L. Sturdevant, Jr.

Mr. Sturdevant was located in the Wyatt Building which was given in the ad as the association's office here.

The ad listed the association's headquarters at 352 Fourth Avenue, New York.

This is the address of Hooven Letters, Inc., of which Mr. Nahm also is president. Hooven Letters is a printing firm and mailing service which handles primarily third-class (or so-called junk) mail.

Mr. Nahm, in testimony last year before the House Post Office Committee, identified himself as a former director of the Direct Mail Advertising Association—a group of junk mailers.

A check of the directors of the Association of First Class Mailers revealed that several others are primarily users of third-class mail.

And at least one is an official of a big magazine publishing house which uses both second- and third-class mail.

Mr. Nahm insisted, however, that the 200 members of the group were "dedicated to protecting the interest of first-class mail."

And Mr. Sturdevant vigorously denied that the association is a front for junk-mail users.

CONSUMERS WILL NOT GAIN FROM DAIRY PRICE CUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, only 5 days now remain before the deadline on which the price supports for dairy commodities are scheduled to be reduced by order of Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

It has often been pointed out, Mr. President, that this proposed cut in dairy farmers' incomes will not benefit the consumers of milk. Yesterday, I received from one of the leading grocery executives in the North Central States a telegram which bears this out.

This is impressive testimony, Mr. President. This man knows what he is talking about. He knows the facts—that consumer prices do not reflect the cut in farm prices which has been taking place in recent years. The margin is simply sopped up by higher profits and higher wages in the processing and marketing trades. While times are made harder for the farmers, it becomes easier and easier for the big dairy processing and marketing corporations to increase their returns.

I wish to read into the RECORD the telegram which I received from this grocery company executive. It comes from Mr. William J. Quinn, vice president of Red Owl Stores, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn. His telegram reads as follows:

Senator PROXMIRE,
Washington, D. C.:

The following wire was today sent to President Eisenhower: "A cut in dairy price supports will result in no appreciable reduction in consumer prices but will materially reduce dairy incomes. We urge you to sign the bill pending on dairy price supports to function at least until a new comprehensive program can be adopted.

Mr. President, I wish to compliment Mr. Quinn most highly, not only for his accurate understanding of the economic facts concerned in this issue, but also for his courage and statesmanship in speaking out on behalf of the farmers who live in the communities served by the Red Owl stores. He demonstrates a real understanding of the interdependence of the entire economy in these farming communities.

I earnestly hope President Eisenhower will heed Mr. Quinn's advice. I can think of no one better qualified by practical experience and knowledge to give a businessman's judgment of the terrible

consequences that will follow from this step to further depress farmers' incomes.

Mr. President, I have another matter to present during the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

CANON OF ETHICS FOR THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, several weeks ago I introduced a bill to remove from the law the present provision that permits the Commissioners of the regulatory agencies and others to accept honorariums and gratuities from persons and groups whom their agency is set up to regulate.

This morning I received in the mail from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission a letter and an enclosed draft of a Canon of Ethics which is being considered by the SEC. This Canon of Ethics has been forwarded to the respective chairmen of the other five major, regulatory agencies.

Mr. President, this Canon of Ethics is an excellent beginning in establishing a firm moral code for the independent agencies. I call particular attention to two provisions proposed in the preamble to the code:

> It is deemed contrary to Commission policy for a member or employee of the Commission to—(a) engage, directly or indirectly, in any personal business transaction or private arrangement for personal profit which accrues from or is based upon his official position or authority or upon confidential information which he gains by reason of such position or authority; (b) accept, directly or indirectly, any valuable gift, favor, or service from any person with whom he transacts business on behalf of the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the SEC for proposing to prohibit the acceptance of gifts of any kind from persons with whom the agency transacts business.

I hope that a code similar to this draft will be accepted by the regulatory agencies and by all other departments of Government.

But regardless of whether this code is accepted, I feel it is absolutely mandatory to secure the passage of the bill I have introduced, to strike from the law the present legal approval of the acceptance by public officials of honorariums and expenses from persons whom their department or agency has been established to regulate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a part of rule 1 of the Canon of Ethics for members of the SEC, enunciating the general statement of policy, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

> It is deemed contrary to Commission policy for a member or employee of the Commission to—
>
> (a) engage, directly or indirectly, in any personal business transaction or private arrangement for personal profit which accrues from or is based upon his official position or authority or upon confidential information which he gains by reason of such position or authority;
>
> (b) accept, directly or indirectly, any valuable gift, favor, or service from any person with whom he transacts business on behalf of the United States;
>
> (c) discuss or entertain proposals for future employment by any person outside the Government with whom he is transacting business on behalf of the United States;
>
> (d) divulge confidential commercial or economic information to any unauthorized person, or release any such information in advance of authorization for its release;
>
> (e) become unduly involved, through frequent or expensive social engagements or otherwise, with any person outside the Government with whom he transacts business on behalf of the United States; or
>
> (f) act in any official matter with respect to which there exists a personal interest incompatible with an unbiased exercise of official judgment;
>
> (g) fail reasonably to restrict his personal business affairs so as to avoid conflicts of interest with his official duties.

ORGANIZATION OF THE BLIND

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, today I wish to announce my support for S. 2411, the bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], to assure the right of the blind to organize.

No one can deny that the blind—as well as any other group of citizens—should have the right to organize freely and to speak for themselves.

In law and in theory, the blind do have this freedom now. But in practice, all too often they do not. The National Federation of the Blind feel very strongly that often they are denied the right to organize and to be heard. Through their national organization, which now covers 43 States, and through similar organizations, the blind have associated to promote their own viewpoints in dealing with the many professional and governmental agencies which are responsible for programs on behalf of the blind.

Among our blind citizens there is widespread feeling that professional social workers and officials in the State and Federal agencies for the blind operate on a "papa-knows-best" basis. Efforts of the organizations of the blind to help formulate and carry out policy are often rebuffed, and efforts have even been made to punish those who participate in these organizations.

The AFL–CIO recognized the need for official sanction for the right of the blind to organize, when, at its recent convention in Atlantic City, it endorsed S. 2411.

The bill would do two things: First, it would direct that in forming and carrying out its programs, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the fullest degree possible, consult with representatives of organizations of the blind, and that the Secretary encourage participating State agencies to do likewise.

Second, it would direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to adopt regulations to prevent Federal employees who deal with the blind from using their office or influence in any way to oppose the right of the blind to organize or to oppose in any way the work of organizations of the blind.

The difficulties encountered by organizations of the blind have persisted for so long that it is not reasonable to hope that the problem will cure itself. Therefore, I urge the Senate to join in supporting this proposed legislation, so as to assure that the blind will have the right to associate and to speak for themselves.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Monday of this week, 7 Senators on the minority side of the aisle, led by the able junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], introduced a measure to authorize an additional $500 million for urban renewal. As explained by the junior Senator from New York, the purpose was to stimulate and accelerate urban renewal throughout the United States during this period of economic downturn.

Mr. President, this is a move with which I am wholly in accord. I desire to commend my colleagues across the aisle in seeking to step up the pace of this vital program, which not only provides jobs but creates opportunity for private enterprise to invest and provide employment. For every dollar which the Federal Government expends for urban renewal, it is estimated that at least $10 are spent by local communities and private enterprise to develop the areas which are cleared of slums and made available for higher uses. The net result is a major economic boost to our hard-pressed cities—large, middle size, and small—as well as a vast social improvement through the wiping out of slums which are costly pockets of social as well as economic deterioration.

I hope to cooperate with Members on both sides of the aisle who favor speeding up urban renewal, and am confident that with their help we can get the Senate to approve a much more nearly adequate program.

However, the enthusiasm shown by my seven Republican colleagues inspired me to check on what the Republican administration downtown was doing with the funds already authorized for urban renewal and other phases of the housing and related programs. I believe all of the seven Senators who are cosponsoring the urban-renewal measure are usually listed among those calling themselves Eisenhower Republicans. I find that Mr. Eisenhower himself has impounded or failed to allocate $305.4 million of funds already authorized by the Congress, of which $204 million was authorized for urban renewal. So with all good will toward my distinguished colleagues—with whom I repeat that I desire to cooperate—I suggest that enthusiasm should begin at home, and perhaps these Eisenhower Republicans can prevail upon their leader to release the impounded funds so that the speedup which they advocate can begin at once without waiting for the enactment of their bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, a table showing the housing and urban-renewal funds authorized by the Congress which are, as of this date, either impounded or withheld by the President's Budget Bureau.

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

Balance of housing funds impounded or withheld by Budget Bureau as of March 26, 1958

[In millions of dollars]

	Authorized	Released	Unallocated or impounded
FNMA special assistance:			
Available to President	450	413.6	36.4
Cooperative (sec. 213)	200	160.0	40.0
College housing	925	900.0	25.0
Urban renewal: Capital grant fund:			
Total	1,450	1,246.0	204.0
Regular fund	1,350	[1] 1,246.0	[1] 104.0
President's reserve	100	None	100.0

[1] $50 million to be released on Apr. 1, 1958.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement which amplifies the description of the $305,400,000 funds to which I have referred, and which also discusses administrative policies which are holding back the use of $972 million in FNMA funds and retarding the public housing program.

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

The 305.4 million shown in this table consists of $204 million for urban renewal, $25 million for college housing, $40 million for cooperative housing and $36.4 million in Fannie May (FNMA) special assistance funds.

Now, I want to be absolutely fair and admit that for part of this money there are mitigating circumstances. It is my understanding that the $40 million for cooperative housing cannot now be spent because there are insufficient applications coming in. I also understand that $50 million of the $204 million authorized for urban renewal is to be released April 1. One may well inquire why the $50 million has been withheld so long while the recession was deepening, but even taking these two items into account, there still remains $215.4 million impounded in these various programs for which I have been unable to find any mitigating circumstances whatsoever.

Of the urban renewal money, $100 million was intended by the Congress to be released under circumstances exactly like those which have prevailed by the last several months. Section 103 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949 provided a reserve fund of $100 million to be released "upon a determination by the President, after receiving advice from his Council of Economic Advisers, as to the general effect of such increase upon the construction in the building industry and upon the national economy, that such action is in the public interest."

The conditions in the building industry have been depressed not just for the last few weeks but for many months. Private housing starts totaled less than 1 million last year—which was the poorest year since 1948—and the rate in the first 2 months of this year was even lower.

Not only should this $100 million be released immediately by the President but all of the other remaining funds in the $305.4 million should be released to accomplish the objectives that it is now clear that some Senators on the other side of the aisle join with the Democratic members of the Housing Subcommittee in advocating.

In addition to the programs held back by the President's action in impounding available funds, other programs have been slowed down as a matter of policy by the administration. For example, one of the important purposes for which Fannie May (FNMA) was created was to purchase VA and FHA mortgages so that mortgage credit could be drawn into these programs.

Fannie May (FNMA) is authorized by law to establish the purchase price which it will offer. Obviously, if it sets large discounts, it will make the sale of such mortgages unattractive and reduce the number which it buys. This is precisely what it has done, and the result has been that Fannie May (FNMA) has failed to accomplish the purpose of this program. In fact, many experts in this field testify that the effect has been to draw down the entire market and thereby adversely influence the entire FHA and VA mortgage money supply.

I include at this point a table which shows that of the $2,754,000,000 authorized so far by the Congress for the purchase of mortgages at the Fannie May (FNMA) secondary mortgage market less than two-thirds has been spent or committed. A total of $972 million is available for the purchase of mortgages. A modification of Fannie May (FNMA) policy at this time would have a tremendous influence upon the rate of home construction under these two programs.

FNMA secondary mortgage market

Authorized by Congress for purchase of mortgages	$2,754,000,000
Expended or committed as of February 28, 1958	1,782,000,000
Available for purchase of mortgages	972,000,000

Much the same deliberate slowup by the administration has virtually throttled the public-housing program. The Congress, in the Housing Act of 1956, authorized 70,000 additional public-housing units. As of this date, only a negligible number is under construction. Only 8,200 have been placed under annual contributions contract after 21 months.

The hearings conducted by our Housing Subcommittee in the field last December produced considerable evidence that the program has been throttled by redtape and that a change of attitude in the administration would cause this important program to move forward along with the housing programs which I have already discussed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in conclusion, I respectfully urge upon my friends across the aisle to join Democratic advocates of housing in a truly adequate housing bill this year. I submit that it should include:

First. An urban-renewal program at the rate of $500 million—not merely for 1 year ahead, but for the next decade, so that cities all over the country can plan ahead with assurance the funds will be forthcoming.

Second. Steps to revive the public-housing program and make it again a living force for better housing.

Third. A program for moderate-income people who simply have not the earning power to get decent living quarters in the private housing market.

Fourth. Revisions in FNMA and FHA policies and practices which will make the governmental programs already established fully effective in boosting home building as a major means of creating jobs and ending the recession.

I regret the junior Senator from New York could not be present on the floor when my remarks were made. I gave him notice I would make them. Unfortunately, he could not be present.

I further regret that the eloquent Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who now occupies the chair, cannot reply, but I have no doubt that in due course a rebuttal will be forthcoming.

ARAB STATES BOYCOTT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, about a week or 10 days ago, I spoke in the Senate about the continued boycott by the Arab States of Americans because of their faith.

I call attention to a resolution on that subject adopted by the presidents of 17 major American Jewish organizations. I have communicated with the Department of State on the subject, and with its permission I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the reply to my letter of inquiry as to what the State Department is doing about the matter.

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

MARCH 19, 1958.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Your letter of March 6, 1958, addressed to the Secretary of State is concerned with the Arab League boycott of Israel as it is directed against American firms and citizens. The statement of the presidents of the major American Jewish organizations which was attached to your letter sets forth the effect of the Arab League boycott on persons of the Jewish faith, whether American or otherwise, and reflects the tensions which have existed in the area since the formation of the State of Israel.

The position of this Government on measures of economic warfare being taken on a worldwide basis by certain Arab States against persons of the Jewish faith and firms having connections with such persons is well known to the Arab governments. The United States Government does not recognize this boycott of Israel which is maintained against that country by the Arab League, it does not condone policies of the Arab States which discriminate against United States firms or citizens, and it has protested the boycott to the Arab States.

The statement attached to your letter calls particular attention to the situation in Saudi Arabia and states that this Government renewed the "discriminatory Dhahran agreement" after the adoption by the United States Senate of a resolution condemning religious discrimination against Americans by foreign countries. This Government has made no agreement concerning the assignment of official or military personnel to Saudi Arabia. However, the assignment of all persons is of course subject to the provisions of Saudi Arabian visa regulations and visas are required for all American personnel assigned to Saudi Arabia. On various occasions in the past the Department has expressed to the Saudi Government its special concern over restrictions on the admission of persons of the Jewish faith into Saudi Arabia. In reply, officials of the Saudi Government have informed the Department that their visa regulations are related to the tensions arising from the Arab-Israel dispute and are not designed to discriminate against citizens of other countries on a religious basis. As the United States Government does not countenance any foreign interference with our own visa regulations, we have not felt able to take more direct issue with the visa regulations of a friendly foreign state.

After the adoption of Senate Resolution 323 on July 26, 1956, copies thereof were

transmitted to our Embassies in the Arab countries with the instruction that our representatives were to seek every opportunity to emphasize to the governments to which they were accredited the primary principle of our Nation—that there should be no distinction among United States citizens based on their individual religious affiliations.

The Department is constantly working within and outside the United Nations toward a settlement of the basic problems in the Arab-Israel conflict. The Department will continue to take every appropriate opportunity to emphasize the concern of the United States over the existence of restrictions enforced by certain Arab countries with respect to persons, including American citizens, of the Jewish faith. Certainly the Department will not administer treaties or executive agreements in a manner which will discriminate against American citizens because of religion.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am deeply convinced that what is being done by the Government does not have the vigor and the initiative which I think is called for by the spirit of the Senate resolution adopted on this subject in July 1956 protesting against the very kind of discrimination against and boycotting of Americans because of their faith, or of American companies because they have Jews in their management or boards of directors, or because a Jew owns a ship which seeks to enter an Arab port.

The United States fought wars in bygone days for causes lesser than this. Certainly no one wants us to fight a war on this account; but vigorous diplomatic action, I think, is called for; and I hope very much that the State Department will take it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS FROM APRIL 3 TO APRIL 14, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 303.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 303), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, April 3, 1958, they stand adjourned until 12 oclock meridian, Monday, April 14, 1958.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement about the legislative program for the information of the Senate.

On completion of action on the road bill, the Senate will proceed to consider today, or as soon as possible thereafter, the following bills:

Calendar No. 1305, H. R. 8794, to provide an exemption from the tax imposed on admissions for admission to certain musical performances;

Calendar No. 1395, S. 3295, to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to increase the authorization for the fisheries loan fund established under such act;

Calendar No. 1417, H. R. 1140, to amend Public Law 85-56 to permit persons receiving retired pay for nonregular service to waive receipt of a portion of that pay to receive pensions or compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

Calendar No. 1421, H. R. 4815, to provide permanent authority for the Postmaster General to establish postal stations at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces, and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 1422, H. R. 7907, relating to contracts for the conduct of contract postal stations, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 1423, H. R. 7910, to revise the laws relating to the handling of short paid and undeliverable mail, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 1425, H. R. 9240, to revise certain provisions of law relating to the advertisements of mail routes, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 1427, H. R. 8268, to amend section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

Calendar No. 1441, S. 3050, to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers and for other purposes; and

Calendar No. 1442, S. 3120, to exempt the production of durum wheat in the Tulelake area, Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif., from the acreage allotment and marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

I do not know in what order these bills will be considered, but it will not necessarily be in the order I have mentioned them.

I may say that the minority leader has cleared all these bills on his calendar, the one he presents to the majority leader, and so far as I know there is no serious objection to any of them. I should like to have the attachés of the Senate prepared for the consideration of these bills and I should like to have the secretary of the majority and the secretary of the minority inform any Senator who may be interested in the bills that the bills will be considered following the passage of the road bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, may we have a statement from the majority leader on how long the Senate is expected to stay in session today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That depends on when we conclude consideration of the road bill. I do not have any idea about it. I would not like to have the Senate sit very late today, but I am anxious to have the Senate complete action on the road bill today. Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee is in a better position to say. How many amendments are at the desk?

Mr. GORE. I am not advised of any more than one or two further amendments which may require debate. It is not a very good idea to hazard a guess, but I should certainly think we should be able to finish by 5 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That pleases me very greatly, and I hope the Senator's prophecy will be borne out.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for himself and his colleague [Mr. MURRAY].

ATTACKS ON CLERGY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum——

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. For what purpose?

Mr. BUTLER. Before the minority leader left the Chamber, I asked him to yield me 10 minutes. I think the present occupant of the minority leader's chair, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], will be willing to do so, in order that I may make a statement not in connection with the bill before the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose of having a quorum call was to let the Senate know what the unfinished business was before the Senate. I am perfectly willing to withhold my request, so that the Senator from Maryland may proceed, and at the conclusion of his speech I shall renew the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that the Senator from Maryland can secure the time he has requested from the time allotted on the bill itself.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland 10 minutes on the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator yield me sufficient time, not exceeding 15 minutes, on the bill, so that I may conclude my statement without being interrupted, with the understanding that the time not used will be yielded back?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield to the Senator from Maryland 15 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, America's strength, in my opinion, lies in the fact that we are a deeply religious people. Since the days of the Founding Fathers of our Republic, both Houses of the Congress have opened each session with a moment of devotion.

The first amendment to the Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. . . ." The complete separation of church and state provided in the Constitution has engendered a respect on the part of all our citizens for religious leaders of every faith. This respect has served to keep the clergy apart from the day-to-day affairs of collective bargaining and political activity. It is a relationship toward the clergy of all faiths which most of us approve. This American tradition was breached when Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW-CIO, and a trusted lieutenant of Walter Reuther, attacked the clergy before a Senate committee.

Last month the Senate witnessed a most unusual spectacle, the Senate caucus room being taken over by Walter Reuther to denounce the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. In an unprecedented demonstration of arrogance, Mr. Reuther accused our colleague of cowardice. If the junior Senator from Arizona were a coward, he would have confined his legislative interests to the problems of Arizona, and he would not have incurred the wrath of Walter Reuther.

The Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic, in an editorial on February 28, 1958, commented with respect to this unusual procedure as follows:

> Just who does Reuther think he is anyway? Who is he to tell a Senate committee how it should run its hearing? By what right does he commandeer a Senate caucus room to run a personal press conference? And on what authority does he malign the elected representative of the great State of Arizona?
>
> Everyone who has read the record realizes that Mr. Reuther is determined to capture the National Government. He wants to be President, or at least to put his own man in the White House. But few would have thought him capable of moving in on the United States Senate with the contempt that he showed Wednesday.
>
> Mr. Reuther has allowed his power as a union leader to go to his head. He has shown his ability to take over the Democratic Party in Michigan and to carry the Governor of Michigan around in his hip pocket. He is now demonstrating beyond cavil that he is ready to move from the State to the national level. The American people are fortunate that most of the United States Senators, including BARRY GOLDWATER, are not likely to allow themselves to be pushed around by the Socialist labor leader from Michigan.

The junior Senator from Arizona made the statement, with which many concur, that "Walter Reuther and the UAW are a more dangerous menace than the sputniks or anything Russia might do."

On March 7, Mr. Reuther addressed an 11-page letter to the junior Senator from Arizona which concluded with this most unusual proposal:

> If your charge that "Walter Reuther and the UAW are a more dangerous menace than the sputniks or anything Russia might do" were true, I would have no moral right to be the president of the largest labor union in the United States and Canada nor be a vice president of the largest free trade union center in the world, the AFL-CIO.
>
> Rather than stepping up the volume and the velocity of the name-calling contest, I should like to respectfully propose that we agree to a sensible, sane, and democratic method for resolving the dispute which grows out of your charge against us.
>
> Specifically I propose that each of us select three nationally prominent clergymen, one from each of the three major faiths—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—as a panel to weigh these charges that you have made and to hear my refutation of same.
>
> If, after hearing both our cases, a majority of these six distinguished gentlemen of the cloth believe you have substantiated your charge that "Walter Reuther and the UAW are a more dangerous menace than the sputniks or anything Russia might do," I will voluntarily resign from the presidency of the UAW, the vice presidency of the AFL-CIO and from the labor movement entirely.
>
> If they decide you have not substantiated your charge, I would leave it up to your own conscience as to whether you would consider yourself fit to continue to play a role in American public life.

Mr. President, Mr. Reuther's dramatic gesture was made immediately after one of his closest associates attacked the integrity of all members of the clergy before the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. It is clear to me that the real purpose of Mr. Reuther's letter was to cover up the outrageous slander against all men of the cloth voiced by Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW-CIO.

The general reaction to Mr. Mazey's outburst is indicated from the following editorial which appeared in the Detroit News on March 3 entitled "Caesar's Meat":

> The performance of Emil Mazey as a witness before the McClellan Senate committee is one more entry in the case history of the UAW and its curious and growing God-complex.
>
> If not from the throne itself, Mr. Mazey's voice was from on high, from whence he pronounced moral judgments on the clergy of two great faiths, on the legal fraternity and medical profession of Sheboygan County, on a member of the Senate committee and on a Sheboygan court which had dared to jail a UAW goon.
>
> The daily press, long a target of Solidarity House and its anathema mill, finds itself for the moment in excellent company.
>
> The offense, in which all these are joined, appears to be only that they do not believe that the law according to the UAW transcends the law of the land.
>
> The God-complex is not new in American experience, or for that matter in the annals of organized labor. The American spirit puts up with fools. But not with Caesar. What we are witnessing in the McClellan hearing room may very well be the beginning of the end.

In a letter which was released to the press on March 10, the junior Senator from Arizona responded to Mr. Reuther's proposal. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

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 relations 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 people 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 OUWERKERK. It was either 3 or 4.

"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, 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 3 or 4 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. VAN 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?

"The 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 anyway 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 severly 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-treasury 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 St. 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. Perry 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 Arizonans, 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. BUTLER. Mr. President, it is true that Emil Mazey later retracted his attack on the clergy. However, all men of good will will be interested in a letter addressed to Mr. Mazey in care of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field by Mr. T. Perry Jones, minister, First Methodist Church, Sheboygan, Wis. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

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. BUTLER. Mr. President, after reviewing the select committee's record of the disgraceful record of violence and slander during the Kohler strike, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator of South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who said:

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 Sheboyan, 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.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] may be permitted to proceed for 2 minutes to make a statement, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Alabama is recognized for 2 minutes.

DEATH OF DR. JOHN W. CRONIN

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, regretfully I rise to bring to the attention of the Senate the most unfortunate and premature death of one of our country's finest public servants. I refer to Dr. John W. Cronin, who, as Assistant Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service and Chief of the Bureau of Medical Services, was suddenly stricken yesterday while at work.

Dr. Cronin was well known and highly esteemed by the Members of the Senate. During the years in which he served as director of the hospital survey and construction program we came to know him particularly well because of his outstanding administration of a program involving many possible difficult relationships between the Federal Government, the States, and local communities. As the administrator of that program, Dr. John Cronin displayed such qualities of wisdom, of tact, and of dedication as resulted in making the program one of the most highly successful and fruitful the Nation has known. Under his wise administration thousands of hospitals and other badly needed health facilities have been built throughout the land. They will serve as constant reminders of the devotion to the public's health of this outstanding American. The Public Health Service and the 170 million people it serves so well will sorely regret his loss.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks the article about Dr. Cronin which appeared in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. And, Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to say to Dr. Cronin's wife and his two children that we share their deep sense of sorrow and of loss. I hope that the memory of the many fine accomplishments of a truly dedicated man will help assuage their grief.

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

DR. CRONIN DIES—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE UNIT HEAD

Dr. John W. Cronin, 52, Assistant Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and Chief of the Bureau of Medical Services, died of a heart attack yesterday in an ambulance en route to Casualty Hospital from his office.

Dr. Cronin, his wife, Virginia, and their two children, Virginia May and John Williams Cronin, Jr., lived at 5528 Trent Street, Chevy Chase.

A native of Springfield, Ohio, Dr. Cronin was graduated from Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, and the University of Cincinnati college of medicine. He began his career with the Public Health Service in 1932, and from 1949 to 1956 was Chief of the Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities.

In November 1956 Dr. Cronin was appointed to the post he held at the time of his death, which gave him responsibility for Public Health Service hospitals, nursing and dental resources, the medical services of the Coast Guard, Bureau of Prisons, and Bureau of Employees' Compensation, and administrator of the Hill-Burton hospital and medical facilities construction program.

Dr. Cronin has published articles in widely diversified journals on subjects including psychiatry, medical penology, occupational health, and hospital and health administration.

He was a member of the Industrial Medical Association, Southern Medical Association, an associate of the District Medical Society, and the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States.

As chief of the Hill-Burton program, Dr. Cronin consistently urged States to appropriate money for hospital, nursing home, and clinic construction. He is credited with rallying support for the program, and applying its provisions throughout the country.

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. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum without the time consumed being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. 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. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MURRAY] and me has to do with a matter which we believe to be of peculiar interest to the State of Montana.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, S. 3414, as reported to the Senate, is an excellent piece of legislation prepared to accelerate the construction of highways throughout the Nation. This incentive will apply to the interstate, primary, and secondary highways, as well as the forest and public land highways. This program will stimulate a great increase in construction activity throughout the country, at a time when it is so badly needed.

Most States will be able to take immediate advantage of these liberalized amendments, but there are a few States, including Montana, which will not be

able to take full advantage of the program with the exception of highways and roads that are wholly financed by Federal funds, such as forest highways.

The State of Montana is at present having difficulties in meeting its matching requirements for Federal funds. I am advised that if the State could get $10 million for ABC roads without having to provide matching funds there are enough projects ready to go ahead within 3 to 6 weeks to utilize this amount of money. On these projects all the planning and engineering work has been completed, and they are awaiting the posting of bids.

In the planning of the Interstate System in Montana a number of difficulties have been encountered in purchasing rights-of-way. If the State could get approximately $15 million without matching requirements, the officials feel that within a year there would be enough jobs, such as work on bridge structures, ready to be started.

S. 3414 as reported by the committee would make it possible for the State of Montana to receive 93 percent Federal funds in the construction of the Interstate System, but this would not even help the State in providing immediate sources of employment.

Montana is in need of an immediate source of employment, and it is with this thought in mind that I have sent to the desk an amendment to S. 3414 which would authorize the waiving of all matching requirements for Federal funds allocated under the Federal Highway Act for the period of 1 year, with a $15 million maximum on ABC roads and $20 million maximum on the Interstate System.

The recession has hit hard in Montana, and the State now has the dubious distinction of having the highest insured unemployment rate in the Nation, as of March 8. An accelerated highway program is a natural for providing new employment for the unskilled, as well as the skilled workers who are now seeking employment.

Since Federal construction has been decided upon by the Congress as one of the chief means of combating the recession and granting employment to the many unemployed, it does not seem to me that I am requesting too much, especially in view of the fact that Montana is the hardest hit State in the Nation, and it is urgent that immediate assistance be given to enable the State to achieve some economic stability. Montana has, in addition to the recession problem, the handicap of being the third largest State in the Union with a very small population, which in turn affects the State's revenue. These two problems make it virtually impossible for Montana to take full advantage of the highway program as it now stands.

Under my amendment the vast majority of States will be able to proceed under the accelerated program, contributing their matching share in order to keep their road building program on schedule. It will also help those few States which have had difficulties similar to Montana's, in financing their road programs.

Mr. President, I urge that this amendment be agreed to. Its adoption will provide the immediate stimulant which is so badly needed to meet mounting employment problems.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the able junior Senator from Montana has made a strong and an appealing speech and plea. In essence, the Senator pleads the cause of the States which will have difficulty in matching supplementary funds for fiscal 1959.

The committee anticipated these difficulties by temporarily increasing the matching formula from 50–50 to 70–30 for a 1-year apportionment of $400 million. The committee further anticipated the difficulty several States will have in matching funds by providing in the bill that two-thirds of the 30 percent, which is required of the State as a matching fund, can be borrowed from the United States Treasury. Thus the cash to be supplied by the States will be 10 percent of the cost of the project, as a bedrock requirement.

The distinguished Senator says that even this will be difficult for the State of Montana. I believe it will be difficult for a few other States also. However, the committee feels that the States can and will find a way to provide 10 percent of the cost of the primary, secondary, and urban projects.

Even if the committee's view should not be sustained, the amendment which the able Senator has offered would go much further than that. In the case of the Interstate System, it would provide, not in excess of $20 million, to every State without matching, whether or not the State was having difficulty in matching funds, and not in excess of $15 million to every State for projects on the primary and secondary Federal-aid systems. This would mean a total grant of $35 million to every State, without any requirement that the State provide any matching funds whatever.

Although I am usually in accord with whatever the able junior Senator from Montana suggests—and that record of cooperation and conformity of views is now in its 20th year——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I find myself unable to support the amendment, because it would apportion to States, without any recognition of territory, mileage, and financial ability, not to exceed $35 million, and that apportionment would be made to every State.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Has anything of that kind ever been done, since we started granting Federal aid for the highway systems? Have we ever appropriated a certain sum to a State without taking into consideration population, mileage, and other factors?

Mr. GORE. I do not believe so. Yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from Montana made an eloquent and effective plea for the allocation of vast sums to the forest highways. He and other Senators from the West were successful in persuading the Senate in that regard.

I believe, however, that the pending amendment goes farther than the Senate can, with prudence, afford to go. It is offered with the best of motives. So far as it would apply to Montana and other States similarly situated with respect to difficulties in matching funds, it possesses a good deal of equity. But when applied nationwide, I do not think the Senate should adopt it. I ask the Senate to reject the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I appreciate what the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads has said. I know he is a friend of the West. I know that if there were some way in which he could help us, he would go more than half way to do so.

I point out that what the senior Senator from Montana and I are requesting in the amendment is a moratorium for 1 year. We do that on the basis of two factors. First, the Montana Legislature will not meet until January 1959. Second—and I dislike to make this statement, but I must do so in all honesty—my State has the shameful distinction, on a percentage basis, of having the largest number of people drawing unemployment compensation at this time of any State in the Union. As of March 8, 1958, the figure was 14.9 percent.

It was because of the peculiarly difficult economic situation in which Montana found itself that I was constrained to offer the amendment on the advice of persons in whom I have great trust and faith, who understand the State's economic situation, and realize the importance of an accelerated highway-construction program, especially so far as it will affect secondary roads.

I most sincerely hope that the Senate will see fit to agree to the amendment at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, yesterday during the discussion of the amendment which sought to strike out section 11 of the bill, some comments were made about the cost of the relocation of utilities. Inasmuch as the discussion was somewhat indefinite, I thought it might be well to have the RECORD contain, during the course of the debate on the entire bill, the testimony on this particular subject as it was adduced before the Committee on Public Works in the form of a supplemental statement by E. C. Yokley, vice chairman of the Committee on Municipally Owned Utilities, National Institute of Municipal Law Officers. The supplemental statement will be found on page 626 of the hearings which were held between January and March of this year.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF E. C. YOKLEY, VICE CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPALLY OWNED UTILITIES, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MUNICIPAL LAW OFFICERS, RE S. 3150

Secretary Weeks and Mr. Tallamy, when they appeared before the Senate Roads Subcommittee on January 8 and 9, 1958, referred to an increase of approximately $10 billion since 1956 in the estimates for building the Interstate System. On January 9, 1958, Senator Case asked Mr. Tallamy to what extent the cost of reimbursing utilities entered into the increase of estimates of the States for completing the Interstate System. Mr. Tallamy replied that the total increase in cost of utilities, which also includes certain other costs to which he referred, involves a 3 percent increase in costs.

In order to offer some clarification of the amount of utility relocation costs, I would like to call the committee's attention to the statement of John A. Tenbrook for the Edison Electric Institute (hearings before the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, on H. R. 4260, 1st sess., 84th Cong., p. 943). Mr. Tenbrook analyzed the study made by the Secretary of Commerce (H. Doc. 127) and found that total utility relocation costs were 2.5 percent of total highway construction costs. He further found that under existing laws and practices in various States two-fifths of this amount was presently reimbursed. Thus the amount of utility relocation costs involved in further provision for reimbursement was about 1.6 percent of total road construction costs. Since 1954, when the study was made by the Secretary of Commerce, the costs involved in relocating utility facilities, has not, according to any information I have been able to obtain, increased substantially. The $10 billion increase in the estimates of cost of constructing the Interstate System caused by increased costs of rights-of-way acquisition and other increased costs should not be considered as reflecting a similar increase in costs of utility relocation. In other words, if 1.6 percent of the total cost of constructing the Interstate System in 1956 represented additional utility relocation costs, the present amount of these costs should be less than 1.6 percent—in fact not much over 1 percent.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I point out that instead of the cost of relocation being 3 percent, it is nearer one percent. On that basis, instead of involving a figure of approximately $1 billion, the difference between 70 percent of the cost and 90 percent of the cost is approximately $74 million. Even in the fiscal matters of the United States Government there is a vast difference between $74 million and $1 billion.

I should say that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] correctly approximated the situation in his discussion of the subject, as will be seen by comparing the explanation which he gave on that point concerning the cost of relocation and the statement which Mr. Yokley gave, and which has now been incorporated in the RECORD. The Senator from South Dakota is to be commended for his very keen, retentive memory, especially when there is taken into consideration the vast volume of testimony which was adduced. Nevertheless he was able to retain its essence in this particular.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, although I have risen to speak about the pending amendment, I should not care to let so nice and generous a compliment as was paid to me by the Senator from Nebraska go unacknowledged. I appreciate his very generous remarks.

Concerning the pending amendment, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has said, the committee has given consideration to the economic situation and, in my personal judgment, has been overly generous in that regard.

I expect to offer later in the day an amendment which would reestablish the 50-50 basic matching formula for the $400 million of emergency funds allocated to the ABC roads. Consequently, I shall, of necessity, be obliged to oppose the pending amendment which would waive all matching requirements for one year to the extent of the $15 million or $20 million figure which the Senators from Montana have proposed.

South Dakota is very similar to Montana in many respects. Our economies are much the same. Citizens of South Dakota are engaged in cattle and stock raising and grain farming in the prairie areas of the State. There are lumbering and mining in the mountainous sections of the State. So I think our economy is much like that of Montana, and I have great sympathy for the problems which the Senator from Montana has stated.

At the same time, I recognize that if we are to have any standards in relation to public roads, and are to maintain the Bureau of Public Roads as a construction agency, and not convert it into, presumably, a relief agency, as such, it will be necessary to maintain the same requirements for matching for the several road funds.

The Western States which have public lands within their boundaries get some concession in matching under present circumstances. On page 13 of the committee report, there appears a table entitled "Sliding Scale Rates of Federal-Aid Participation in Public Lands States Effective February 1, 1958." From the table, I note that my own State of South Dakota does not match on a 50-50 basis. The Federal Government contributes 55.83 percent of a dollar.

As to Montana, the Federal Government puts up 56.54 percent of a dollar, instead of 50 cents, as is the case in the States which do not have public domain or land owned and controlled by the Federal Government and not subject to local taxes.

The amount contributed by the Federal Government runs as high as 83.74 percent in Nevada, and 71.96 percent in Arizona.

So the Western States, where there are depressed conditions in the mining communities, have the benefit of a better matching ratio than do some other States. That applies to the ABC roads—the Federal primary, the Federal secondary, and the Federal urban roads. In addition, some type of credit is given on the Interstate System.

So the public-lands States get a little better break than 90 cents on the dollar on the Interstate System. In South Dakota, it is 91.17 percent; in Montana, it is 91.31 percent.

In view of these circumstances, and in view also of the provisions in the bill for an emergency fund from which a portion of the matching money could be borrowed by the States, it seems to me that the amendment should not be adopted. Yet I respect, not only the right of the Senators from Montana to present the amendment at this time, but also their diligence. I feel, however, that we should maintain the standard and principle of contribution by the States. This is necessary if we are to keep the public-roads program on a sound basis throughout the years.

For these reasons, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for himself and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time required for calling the roll not be charged to the time available under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. 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. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "3-24-58—D," which is at the desk. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 24, after line 9, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 13. Section 116 (c) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 is amended by inserting therein, immediately before the colon preceding the proviso, a semicolon and the following: "and any State highway department which submits plans for an Interstate System project shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings at a convenient location, or has afforded the opportunity for such hearings, for the purpose of enabling persons in rural areas through or by whose property the highway will pass to express any objections they may have to the proposed location of such highway."

Renumber the succeeding sections.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield 4 or 5 minutes to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

A NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AND LOANS TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES FOR SCIENCE EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Let me say, Mr. President, that on the first day on which bills could be introduced at this 2d session of the 85th Congress, I introduced Senate bill 2917, which calls for a national scholarship program. A few weeks later, I introduced Senate bill 3281, which would provide loans to colleges and universities for science equipment and facilities. Many of my colleagues have introduced similar bills of their own pertaining to this much needed legislation.

Mr. President, I am deeply concerned with the fact these bills are still in committee, and we do not know how long it will be before they will come before the Senate for consideration. Time is of the essence. If we are to institute a scholarship program which will effect an increase in the number of students who will enroll in courses in science, mathematics, and technology next fall, we must act quickly. High-school seniors are now making up their minds as to what they will do after their graduation next May or June. Even after these proposals are enacted into law, we know it will take many weeks to establish a scholarship program.

One of the main purposes of a national scholarship program is to encourage young men and women who would otherwise not be able financially to go to college, to continue their education beyond the high-school level. I repeat, Mr. President, that these high-school seniors are now making up their minds as to whether they can afford to continue their education. Any material encouragement we are to give them must come quickly, if it is going to affect their decision.

Furthermore, if our colleges and universities are to prepare to train increased numbers of students in the areas of science and technology, there must be loans or grants to provide equipment and expanded laboratory facilities. Even if such legislation could be considered and passed today, it would still take months to plan for, order, and install the needed equipment.

I understand that on March 13, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare completed hearings on these and other proposals. However, I have been unable to learn when further committee action can be expected.

I respectfully urge, Mr. President, that the committee act on these bills as quickly as possible. It is also my hope that when the bills are reported by the committee, they will be scheduled for action in the Senate with a minimum of delay.

During the first weeks of this session, my colleagues spoke as with one voice of the urgent need for legislation to bolster our educational system and assist our educators in their determination to excell Russia and maintain world leadership in science and technology. Mr. President, we cannot permit two successful satellite launchings by our country to lull us back into a spirit of complacency.

Theodore Roosevelt once said that too often America has had to learn by tragedy, rather than by experience. By moving quickly to enact the bills for a national scholarship program and for loans or grants for scientific equipment and expanded laboratories in our institutions of higher learning, we can prevent tragedy, and can show that we are learning by experience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota is entitled to the floor.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understand the Senator from Minnesota wants to get some time from those in opposition.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE AMERICAN SEARCH FOR PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the well-known and energetic journalist, Doris Fleeson, recently addressed the Farmers Union convention in Denver, Colo. As usual, she was provocative, imaginative, and constructive. Her speech was entitled "The American Search for Peace." It deserves the attention of every Member of this body.

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

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

THE AMERICAN SEARCH FOR PEACE

(Address by Doris Fleeson at the National Farmers Union Convention, Denver, Colo., March 19, 1958)

No better text for a nation in crisis was ever penned than the words of Abraham Lincoln in his famous house-divided speech.

"If we could know where we are and whither we are tending we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

Lincoln was reaching for a national self-awareness—the indispensable preliminary to any saving act of Government. You will notice that no word in that sentence is longer than two syllables. It is not a slogan and it is definitely not subliminal.

Lincoln was not seeking to hypnotize himself or his audience. He wanted people to understand exactly what he was trying to do. He did not want them to stop thinking; he wanted them to think harder.

As Little Rock has so recently reminded us we have still to outlive the tragedy of our failure to follow in time where Lincoln led. His words remain valid—100 years and immensely greater challenge later. If we will only consent to look at what we see, we can save ourselves.

What we see is all too apparent. It is a succession of Potemkin villages which all of us—our politicians, our press, our people—have constructed to adorn our way.

It is possible to forgive Catherine the Great for never looking behind the rich facades with which Prince Potemkin concealed the emptiness of his grandiose schemes for colonizing the south Russian steppes. He was plausible and she loved him. The divine right of kings still bemused that sleeping giant of a nation whose awakening has taken a form so menacing for freedom everywhere.

Potemkin was a superbly successful propagandist. It is interesting that one of its earliest and certainly one of the best pieces of propaganda by the Soviet Union was a moving picture entitled "The Armored Cruiser Prince Potemkin." That moving film was in a sense a salute from master propagandists to a spiritual ancestor.

I suspect that my generation felt and certainly hoped it had seen the final flowering of propaganda in the so nearly successful attempt by Adolf Hitler to rule the world. It was the sole weapon by which Hitler maneuvered himself onto the world stage with his appointment as German Chancellor.

Of that appointment the venerable German historian, Friedrich Meinecke, wrote at the time: "I said to myself with the deepest consternation not only that a day of misfortune had dawned for Germany but also—'this was not necessary'."

This was not necessary. It had only been made to appear necessary.

Today, we live in a world which, because media of communication have multiplied so enormously, the opportunities for propaganda have become infinitely greater. The use of those opportunities has followed right along in geometrical progression.

The New York Times chief correspondent in Washington, James Reston, wrote recently: "This administration is more interested in the appearance of leadership than in leadership itself, more in the appearance of power than in the reality of power, more in seeming to train Mr. NIXON for the Presidency than in actually training him."

You may have heard what the Duke of Wellington said of his commanders on the eve of Waterloo: "I do not know if my generals scare the enemy but, by God, they scare me." I do not know if Mr. Reston was terrified when he wrote those words but he well expressed what I believe to be the true grounds we have for terror.

As in all situations of crisis, there is plenty of blame to go around. But certainly no American Government has used the means and tools of propaganda to quite the same degree as the present one. It has for some time deeply troubled observers who see in it a denial of the processes on which a free society must be based.

It was the proud motto of old E. W. Scripps which read: "Give light and the people will find their way." But the light available today is not clear and strong, it is diffuse and flickering and it does not allow us to discriminate between reality and our Potemkin villages.

This is matter enough for concern, nor is counterpropaganda the answer. What has happened, in my view, is that the nemesis of propagandists has overtaken us.

It has long been noted that gamblers who make a living on the exploitation of odds stacked in their favor have a fatal flaw. They gamble themselves—and it is a rare gambler who dies rich. It is a rare propagandist who does not in the end fall victim to the siren song of his own propaganda.

You will remember that Hitler from his bunker in Berlin ordered the men around him to destroy the Germany which had lost the war. Hitler had begun with cynical master-race slogans and Jewish scapegoats,

whose money he coveted; he ended by decreeing that the master race was not worthy of its master and so merited destruction.

Our real danger is that we, too, may be trapped in our own propaganda inventions. It is bad enough that the American people have so little opportunity to distinguish between the real and the unreal. It is far more frightening that few of our leaders manage to escape the contagion of their own propaganda.

In thinking about what I should say here it occurred to me that perhaps a better title for my remarks would be: Is there an American search for peace? I suspect that had I done so, I might have felt vaguely unpatriotic and I think my sponsors might have worried more than somewhat.

And yet it seems to me that the question is valid and that if we answer it in the negative we shall have arrived at the only clear, rational, and logical explanation of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and his policies. Our friends and allies have found those policies incomprehensible and infuriating; the most charitable word they apply to him personally is guileful. But having said "No" to our question, we must ask then what Dulles is doing.

It seems to be clear that what he is striving for is a balance of world power, a balance weighted in our favor, but a balance.

Let me put it this way: What Secretary Dulles is seeking is not peace as such but a quite different state—a condition of nonwar.

I have the highest regard for the Secretary's brains. Now that the blight of McCarthyism is past, I hope it is unnecessary to mention that I accept the fact of his patriotism exactly as I do mine and yours. But I am trying to find out where we are and whither we are tending and it does not do to accept even the Secretary of State as the final word.

It may be that Secretary Dulles is the supreme realist who sees the facts about the world as they are and acts accordingly. It would go far toward explaining why what he *does so often* runs athwart of what he—and the President—say. It may be that peace as such is unattainable, though I do not think we shall know that until we have tried to achieve something more than our nonwar state.

Some younger Americans may not have much memory of a peaceful world. The generation which is now in our colleges and universities has had little experience with a time when we were not either in a war, licking the wounds of one, or preparing for still another.

Nevertheless, we at least have an emotional understanding of the meaning of peace, which in its true sense is a positive and creative condition rather than a negative and sterile one. I know no better description of it than that of the Bible, a time when the lion lies down with the lamb and the swords are turned with confidence into plowshares. It is a time in which mankind can turn his thoughts, his efforts, his resources into the pursuit of creative rather than destructive activities.

Certainly the desire for peace is one of the great forces which moves the heart of mankind. *It moves us* Americans. It must be an even deeper emotion where the horror of war has so recently made itself actually felt, rather than more or less remotely, as with us in the past four generations. It is safe to say that a Russian of Kiev or Stalingrad, or an Englishman of Coventry, would feel even more deeply about peace than most of us.

It is perhaps the most remarkable fact of our time that in the face of a universal desire for peace and hope for peace, that the best we find our leaders searching for is a state not of peace but of nonwar. Since we must assume that our leaders are persons of sense and sensibility, capable of logical thought, subject themselves to the emotions which move most of us, we naturally must ask why this is so.

Why is it that a state of nonwar, with all its costs and all its tensions and all its wastefulness—and all its dangers seems preferable to a state of peace?

Before we go into that question, we must examine the plain fact that a full-scale nuclear war today is unthinkable. No sane, no reasonable man today would commit any nation to a course of action whose outcome would inevitably lead to a new world war.

A single fusion bomb, that is a hydrogen bomb, can now release more destructive power than all of the explosive power aimed at the Axis Powers by the Allies in World War II. In any new world war hundreds of such bombs—plus countless atomic bombs—would be unleashed in 12 hours. And then the deadly, unseen, all-enveloping force of radiation would surround the world, leaving no victor and no vanquished, no combatant and no noncombatant. That is the real force, the final force, which will prevent reasonable men from pushing the button which would start a major war. It applies with the same inexorability to us as to the Russians.

We know from experience, however, that the world cannot depend on government—or rule—by reasonable men at all times. We have had the experience of Hitler and we know that if it had been within his power—if he had had H-bombs and intercontinental ballistic missiles, he would have taken the whole of the German nation with him in his suicide and incidentally the whole of mankind—if he had been able.

That is the dark threat of a state of war. We must ask ourselves then why we seem to be settling for a state of nonwar with its deadly potential of a Hitler mentality somewhere in the wings. Why does not the desire for a just, reliable, and stable peace burn within our souls and occupy our most creative thoughts?

If the couple of dozen world leaders who are capable of making decisions as between peace and nonwar or war itself are reasonable men, we must inquire as to what basis in logic and reason they have for defying the world's longing for peace and what would seem to most of us the simple logic of peace.

It could be said that this couple of dozen leaders armed with these powers of final decision over the life of mankind do not trust each other.

Mr. Dulles repeatedly argues that Russia has proved that she cannot be trusted. He can point to the failure of the Soviet Union to keep the pledges of Yalta and Potsdam. Can we say that it is unreasonable of Secretary Dulles to ask for a demonstration of sincerity before we make commitments and let down our guard?

But, on the Soviet side, can we expect anything other than its feverish efforts, obviously crowned with a degree of success, to match or overmatch or offset the ring of military bases with which we have surrounded it?

Respect for each other's murderous potential may keep both of us in a state of nonwar. It would take more than respect; it would require trust to achieve peace. But very recent history demonstrates that where friendship and collaboration between nations appears convenient and desirable it is quite possible to bridge chasms which seemed at the time far more profound than those which divide the United States and the Soviet Union. The intimate collaboration which exists between the United States and Western Germany, between France and Western Germany, would have seemed unthinkable a dozen or 15 years ago. The friendship and mutual self-help which exists between the United States and Japan today would have appeared totally unbelievable as a prospect a like distance away.

What this proves afresh is that nations do not have permanent allies, only permanent interests. Those permanent interests are now synonymous with world peace.

This being so, we can only conclude that as of now the rapprochement between the United States and the Soviet Union does not appear to be either a convenience or a necessity. We must further conclude that for political and economic considerations neither nation truly wishes or desires at this time anything other than a state of nonwar.

There is a very real question, carefully avoided on all sides in the Eisenhower administration and for some reason never mentioned by the Democrats. That is whether the economy of the United States could now tolerate a genuinely peaceful world situation.

We are spending $40 billion a year on armaments and defenses, and many are questioning whether, in view of scientific and production advances by the Soviet Union, that is nearly enough. That $40 billion a year is vastly greater than all the money spent on relief and pump-priming public works during all the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is within shouting distance of the military budget for the hot war. Defense expenditures have had an inevitably stimulating and supporting effect on the economy and unquestionably were in large measure responsible for the inflationary process which has steadily increased until now. Despite the magnitude of defense appropriations, we have seen within the past 6 months that a recession is still not only a possibility but an actuality.

There can be no question whatever that since the beginning of the Korean war and the start of rearmament the American economy has become more and more dependent on huge appropriations for defense. We have actually seen the spectacle of the American President saying that he looked for their increase to cure the present recession—a position he seems now to have abandoned.

Although these defense appropriations are noncreative in the sense that school buildings, highways, libraries, and sewerage systems are creative, the immediate economic effect is the same. That is, they put money in people's pockets. In the long run, of course, since they use up nonrecurring natural resources, they may be in fact self-destructive.

It cannot be that the economists of the administration are unaware of the dangers which will have to be faced in the economy if there comes a period in which a marked reduction in defense expenditures might be justified. Yet neither in the executive branch nor in the Congress controlled by the Democrats has a single step been taken to soften the shock of a withdrawal of defense expenditures. It is only possible to conclude that no one in the United States Government, including the Congress, who is in any position to direct or influence policy, has either confidence of peace or any sincere belief that any profound change in the situation between the United States and the Soviet Union will take place in the foreseeable future.

This becomes even clearer when we look back to the efforts made during World War II to cushion the shock to the economy which was expected when the war ended. You may remember that Henry Wallace wrote a book, 60 Million Jobs, pronounced hopelessly Socialistic by many of those who now feel that any words of caution about boom times are a gospel of gloom and doom.

Today, there is no such activity in Washington, and if there are thoughts on the subject either by Republicans or Democrats, those thoughts are even more secret than the Gaither report or the part played by Sherman Adams in the Dixon-Yates contract.

The United States today is in fact totally unprepared for peace.

Unlike the United States, the Soviet Union could probably face the prospect of peace, from the standpoint of its economy, with greater ease. There is such a wide, deep, unfulfilled need for consumer goods throughout the Soviet Union that new industries could be built and production sustained for a very long period of time. The Soviets still have far to go toward their goal of matching or surpassing the United States in the production of capital goods.

But, politically, a genuine peaceful arrangement between the United States and the Soviet Union would have profound effects on the Soviet system. Certainly Soviet dominance would immediately be challenged in its satellites. Poland and Hungary doubtless would be gone in a flash, and that alone would create almost intolerable pressures on Communist governments in Czechoslovakia and East Germany.

Perhaps this is a price the Soviet Union would now be willing to pay. Its system of buffer states made sense under the military conditions of the last war; it prevented surprise by tanks and ground equipment. That brief expanse of territory means nothing to even medium-range missiles. And the Russians, realists if nothing else, have learned the hard way that none of the satellites can be counted on as reliable in the event of war.

A genuine peace, too, will bring sharply to the fore the problem of a reunited Germany. And regardless of what our Government says in the matter, and regardless of what the Russians say, there is very considerable doubt that either nation cares to contemplate a prosperous and reunited Germany. Germany whole, once it had got over the difficulties of reconciliation, as it would, would be economically the most powerful nation of Europe. Nor can there be doubt that whatever pledges might be made about disarmament or neutralism, Germany would eventually once again become the most powerful nation in Europe militarily as well. While for propaganda purposes both Russia and the United States take an entirely different line, this is a sleeping dog both would prefer to let lie.

Then is there any hope that a true search for peace can be substituted for nonwar? Yes, there is, although it will have to be hope more deferred than not.

Recently, Nikita Khrushchev went to one of those embassy cocktail parties which he so frequently uses for pronouncements.

"Listen, you NATO ambassadors," he said, "now is a good time to talk about an agreement.

"We want to be friends with you. Why can't we sign a nonaggression pact? What's wrong with that? You say you are not going to attack us—we are not going to attack you."

Khrushchev looked around at the mounds of food. "Why don't we begin as one begins a meal? We start with hors d'oeuvres, then we go on to the fish and then to the meat.

"Let's put the simplest things first."

This is what is actually happening in Moscow and Washington today. We haven't got around to the meat and potatoes but we are nibbling at the anchovy paste on the melba toast.

We have recently concluded an agreement with the Soviet Union by which there will be an exchange of some 500 specialists and artists and athletes a year between the 2 countries. It is not much of a start, but it is a start.

The Soviet Union has replaced its dour Ambassador Zaroubin with a natural-born baby kisser, Ambassador Menshikov, who says he likes to be called Mike. There is more socializing with and by the Russians in Washington today than at any time since the period of Litvinov. Even the hostess with the mostest, Mrs. Mesta, has climbed aboard.

There is surely going to be a summit conference and it is very likely that it will be held in Washington, or very near. The question still is whether any summit conference will get down to the business, to meat and potatoes.

It is fair to say that if the election of next November were not yawning ominously before the Republican Party a summit conference would be much less likely. Washington is still full of important people who want no agreement with the Soviet Union and who are perfectly agreeable to the status quo.

In cold fact, there is not much point to a summit meeting which is really unwilling to deal with disarmament, particularly in the field of nuclear weapons. Yet, there are powerful men like Adm. Lewis Strauss, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the official adviser to President Eisenhower on atomic matters, who says that we must not stop testing nuclear weapons. Admiral Strauss bases his opinion in part on the belief that we cannot trust the Soviet Union to stop testing weapons secretly.

Last fall a specific test of our ability to record underground atomic explosions was made in Nevada. On March 6, the Atomic Energy Commission released a report which stated that the maximum distance at which the explosion had been recorded was at Los Angeles, 250 airline miles away.

Yet the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee dug up evidence that the explosion had been recorded in Berkeley, Calif., which is 400 miles away, and at College, Alaska, which is 2,300 miles away. There has been an unofficial report that the explosion—and it was a small weapon—was recorded in Japan.

The difference is profound. It is the difference between the possibility of an effective policing system which could pinpoint secret tests, and a system which could not.

The AEC now says that it gave out this crucially wrong information in inadvertence. It was a most peculiar kind of inadvertence.

But what the matter revealed, even if inadvertently, was the character of the roadblocks which are put in the way of genuine peace in Washington.

Do not mistake me. Washington loves the appearance of peace and if that is what comes out of the meeting at the summit it will satisfy many. Like patriotism, it is not enough.

It could be that the cost of such temporizing will be high. Fat, rich old nations, like fat, rich old men—and women—tend to overestimate their powers. Voltaire long ago reminded us that "history is only the pattern of silken slippers descending the stairs to the thunder of hobnailed boots climbing up from below." The Russian sputniks surely destroyed the myth that we are necessarily ahead in everything and that nature has a special interest in the survival of Americans.

I have said that perhaps 2 dozen men had what amounts to absolute or near absolute control of mankind's future, yet that future is not beyond the influence of far less influential and much more anonymous men and women.

It is well for us to remember that a single farm editor of a Midwest newspaper broke the ice on the problem of the exchange of groups of Russians and Americans. He literally forced an unhappy and reluctant State Department to let in a group of Russian farm experts. It was the success of that mission that impressed the Russians and apparently has made our officials far less hesitant about exchanges of people.

I am sure that there are other men and women, perhaps unknown and unaware of their power to move mountains, who can insist that if a summit meeting is held, it should be a genuine effort to achieve a workable peace and not a sham to make Prince Potemkin look like a piker.

God bless the little man who is impatient with hopes too long deferred, who knows that his counterpart in Russia, in China, wherever, wants war no more than he wants war. When he moves, in all his infinite numbers everywhere, no force on earth can stop him.

POLITICS AND RECESSION AFFECT WATER PROGRAMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the St. Paul Dispatch for March 19, 1958, includes an interesting editorial entitled "Politics and Recession Affect Water Programs." The editorial discusses the President's recent reversal of his opposition to starting any new Federal water supply or hydroelectric projects.

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

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

POLITICS AND RECESSION AFFECT WATER PROGRAMS

At the urging of western Republicans, and in consideration of the business recession, President Eisenhower has withdrawn his blanket opposition to beginning any new Federal water supply or hydroelectric projects in the coming year. He had advocated this course in his January 13 budget message. Modification of this position came a couple of weeks ago.

Now conservation and wildlife groups and other organizations interested in antipollution measures for streams and lakes are urging the President to disavow his proposal to abandon Federal aid to municipal sanitation projects held up by lack of local financing ability. Minnesota, Wisconsin, and other Midwest and Eastern States are participating in this program. The push for reclamation and power spending comes largely from the Western States.

There seems little justification for cutting off the pollution-control program. Funds authorized for this purpose are insignificant compared with reclamation expenditures, and are more urgently needed.

One objection to the antipollution measure is that some municipalities which should pay for their own sanitary treatment plants are refusing to go ahead now because they hope to get aid from Washington. This argument is of doubtful merit. Definite showings of hardship conditions and lack of financing ability are required for Federal assistance.

However, a constructive proposal in this connection is made by Congressman DONALD TEWES, of Waukesha, Wis. He voted against last year's pollution-control appropriation, but now says he favors a Federal guaranty of loans to municipalities for sewage-treatment plants. This plan, he believes, would make more money available and would stimulate more construction than the limited appropriations, now running at $50 million a year. Such a loan provision might well be joined with the present direct-aid plan. The combination seems both practical and desirable.

BUSINESS, LABOR BACK FARMERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it has been gratifying indeed to have all the top leaders of organized labor in the United States rally behind efforts to protect America's farmers by wiring the President to sign the resolution adopted by the Congress to prevent any cuts in farm price supports this year.

It shows the concern of labor leaders as to the effect of declining farm income on the rest of our economy. It also reflects the growing awareness of city workers that the best protection they have of reasonable food prices is a strong farm economy producing in abundance. The action of the Nation's top labor leaders flatly repudiates Secretary Benson's attempt to win city support by claiming, without foundation, that lowering of price supports would mean lower food prices in the cities. Actually, food is a bargain in America today because of our farm abundance; instead of farmers being subsidized, they are actually subsidizing the rest of the economy by getting far less than fair prices for their commodities.

Mr. President, not only labor, but many enlightened business leaders, are showing concern about the fate of our farmers. I am pleased that one good example exists in Minneapolis. The vice president of the Red Owl Stores has wired the President, urging him to sign the farm price freeze, repudiating Secretary Benson's claim that a veto would mean any real benefit to city consumers.

Mr. President, I should like to assume the role of a prophet. I expect the President to veto the joint resolution, even though I hope and pray he will not. At the same time, if he does veto it, an adjustment will be made. An excuse will be found to make adjustments in certain dairy price-support levels, and possibly in the price supports of wheat, as another means of aiding the administration to sustain its position in forcing down price supports, but at the same time offering a temporary palliative to those who are victims of economic distress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point, in the RECORD, a news article entitled "Dairy Processors Ready To Unload," from the St. Paul Dispatch of March 25.

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

DAIRY PROCESSORS READY TO UNLOAD

WASHINGTON.—The Agriculture Department prepared today to make heavier than normal purchases of dairy products between now and April 1, when new and lower price supports go into effect.

Officials said they expected processors of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk to unload *all possible* supplies onto the Government before the change in supports becomes effective. That's because the Government will pay more for these products through March 31 than after that date.

On April 1, Government purchase prices for butter drop from 60½ cents to 58½ cents a pound, cheese from 35 to 32½ cents a pound and dry milk from 16 to 14 cents a pound for one type and from 14 to 12 cents on another.

These purchase prices are designed to be sufficient to enable processors to pay dairymen an average of $3.03 a hundred pounds for milk for manufacturing purposes and 56.2 cents a pound for butterfat—the new support rates. The old purchase prices were designed to enable them to pay $3.25 for milk and 58.6 cents for butterfat.

Officials said there was a possibility that retail supplies of butter might be short during the first few days of April. Such a situation would reflect processor sale of all holdings to the Government at the old supports so as to avoid any losses.

It might take a few days, they said, for distribution lines to be refilled with butter produced from the lower-priced butterfat.

Officials said some processors may start dropping their paying prices for milk and butterfat before April 1. This would enable them to supply their retail outlets with lower priced butter earlier than if they waited until the first of the month to lower prices they paid dairymen.

There is nothing in the support program to prevent processors from lowering prices they pay dairymen ahead of the April 1 date.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the article I have just had printed in the RECORD points out that when the price support cut goes into effect, the Government will receive literally millions and millions of pounds of cheese and other dairy products, now in warehouses, which processors will unload because they cannot possibly afford to take the inventory losses they are certain a reduction of support prices will bring about.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD telegrams I have received, including one from David J. McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers of America, and one from William J. Quinn, vice president of the Red Owl Stores, as well as a radio broadcast sponsored by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association on March 24, 1958, all referring to the joint resolution on the President's desk awaiting his signature. I call on the President to sign the joint resolution before the farm recession deepens into a full-scale depression.

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

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 26, 1958.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

The following wire was today sent to President Eisenhower: "A cut in dairy price supports will result in no appreciable reduction in consumer prices but will materially reduce dairy incomes. We urge you to sign the bill pending on dairy price supports to function at least until a new comprehensive program can be adopted."

WILLIAM J. QUINN,
Vice President, Red Owl Stores.

MARCH 26, 1958.

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

On behalf of the United Steelworkers of America I urge that you sign Senate Joint Resolution 162 to maintain price supports at the 1957 level. Setbacks in the economic well-being of other groups in our country have contributed to the recession and instability in our country as a whole. We are firmly convinced that a decrease in price supports to the farmers will only contribute to a further decline in the well-being of our country.

DAVID J. MCDONALD,
President, United Steelworkers of America.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, MARCH 24, 1958

The price support freeze bill that would maintain farm price supports at least at 1957 levels is on the President's desk. It zipped right through the Senate and House, and the new solidarity in the farm bloc held tight. Efforts to break the farm Congressmen into commodity splits failed.

But, a word of caution to farmers—the bill is not out of the woods yet. Washington sources say the President will veto. And so he may. But it is possible that the recession may weight his decision. The economic problem is generally serious, and the President seems genuinely concerned. If enough of the facts leak through the palace guard to the President, he may realize that stopgapping Secretary of Agriculture Benson's farm price cuts would help bolster the whole economy.

So that's a ray of hope for agriculture. But, on the other hand, Farm Secretary Benson is very close to the President's ear. He's advised Mr. Eisenhower to veto the farm price freeze, and Benson apparently is confident that he will—so confident, in fact, that a few hours after the Senate sent the freeze bill to the White House, Benson issued the official USDA order to cut dairy prices on April 1. The price freeze was passed in the House and Senate by good strong majorities, but it would take a two-thirds vote in both of these bodies of Congress to override a Presidential veto. That doesn't seem possible at this time. Quite frankly, enough Senators and Representatives seem to have swallowed Benson's mythology, hook, line, and sinker, to prevent a two-thirds vote.

The farm Secretary has been telling the Congressmen and the public that lower farm supports will mean cheaper food. The fact that Benson's 1954 dairy price support cut did not help consumers at all is completely ignored. It's a sort of "pie in the sky" promise that Benson is dangling out before consumers—always tantalizing, but never reached. But it gets votes, both in and out of Congress, and helps Benson get his price-cutting results.

The dairy price cut, if it comes April 1, will cost dairy farmers and main-street merchants in dairy towns about $250 million. The wheat price cut, scheduled for harvest time, will cost another $250 million. These prospective farm losses led Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, majority leader of the Senate, to voice some sharp words about a veto. He said that it would be "a direct and unmistakable announcement that the administration intends to force farm prices down even lower. A period of recession," he warned, "is no time to lower the purchasing power of our farmers even further than it is now."

The President still has some 8 days in which to decide whether to sign the price support freeze bill and help farmers, or veto it and go along with Benson in cutting farm income again. Farmers and their organizations and the farm-State Congressmen have done all they can for the time being. Now it is up to the President.

CONGRESS AND DISARMAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an editorial that recently appeared in the Gazette and Daily, of York, Pa., on the date of Wednesday, March 19. The editorial is entitled "Peace and Disarmament."

The editor asks the Congress and the executive branch just what we are doing in the field of disarmament study. The editorial is candid and to the point.

I have replied to the editor, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter be printed as a part of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MARCH 24, 1958.

The EDITOR,
The Gazette and Daily,
York, Pa.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I have read with considerable interest your splendid editorial of Wednesday, March 19, entitled "Peace and Disarmament."

You have performed a public service in calling to the attention of your readers—and I trust to the Members of Congress and the executive branch of Government—the inadequacy of our preparations for disarmament discussions. Indeed, it requires planning for disarmament and peace if ever we hope to obtain those worthy objectives.

I wish to cite one ray of hope, however. The Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament is continuing to conduct extensive and intensive studies into the field of disarmament possibilities, in particular reference to the development of an effective system of inspection. The key to any hope of a successful disarmament negotiation lies in being able to design and perfect a system of inspection and detection that will safeguard our national security. It is to be assumed that neither the United States nor the U. S. S. R. would enter into a disarmament agreement unless a form of international inspection could be designed that would work and thereby prevent any evasion or cheating under the terms of the agreement.

I can assure you that the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament is studying this inspection and detection problem with meticulous care. We think we are making headway and will be able to make a contribution to the success of negotiations.

Again my thanks for your editorial.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

As far as one is able to discover, there has been little or no followup to the commendable speech on disarmament and world peace made in the United States Senate last month by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. It seemed reasonable to expect that Mr. HUMPHREY's decision to talk at length on these subjects indicated the possibility of a concern among some leading Democrats for developing concrete political proposals on disarmament, the cessation of nuclear-bomb tests, economic development programs administered through the United Nations, etc. But as yet there has been slight evidence of such concern.

Another puzzling thing is the manner in which Senators and Congressmen have refrained from stepping forward with comments or suggestions on the major international idea of recent times—that of holding a conference of the heads of the world's most powerful states. Is this a good idea or is it not? In either case, what are the issues involved and what is the relationship of the idea to the goal of peace? What specifically should the United States expect from such a conference? And what other related ideas might be discussed bearing on the problem of getting along with other countries?

It seems that the only American who is always willing to let his opinions on this matter be known is Secretary of State Dulles. There is no reason why he should not speak up. But why does almost everybody else keep quiet? It is just not possible that Mr. Dulles has a monopoly of the information, knowledge and wisdom required for intelligent observations on international conferences. Yet even those individuals and journals which are convinced that Mr. Dulles' record in diplomatic dealings is a disastrous one do not seem able to enter into discussion until Mr. Dulles has given the cue.

The hopeful prospect presented by Senator HUMPHREY's speech, and by the comments interjected during its course by various other Senators, was that of serious, continuing debate on the need for disarmament and peace and on ways to secure these objectives. It appeared that voices would be raised, that fresh approaches might be introduced, that clear policies and programs might be put forward in forms which would call for both public controversy and legislative action.

We do not mean to say that this hope has been permanently dashed. But to date Mr. HUMPHREY's venture beyond the thought confines of the cold war has not resulted in a major breakthrough, as the phrase goes. The military aspect of our foreign policy still commands most of the words, votes and money which are needed for effective national action.

Apparently as a people we have not yet accepted the fact that substantial planning for disarmament and peace is consistent with our security. It is, of course, not only consistent with security but the only road to security in a nuclear age. Until we are able to see this plainly such speeches as that made by Senator HUMPHREY are unfortunately likely to be inconsequential side remarks, scarcely heard in the thunder of preparations for a possible war.

DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning two articles appeared in the metropolitan press reporting on the recent trip of the United Nations Secretary General to Moscow. Mr. Hammarskjold reported that his 4-day visit with key Soviet leaders was beneficial and fruitful. The Secretary General also confirmed his previously held view that disarmament negotiations should be held under the auspices of the United Nations. I agree with that view. It is one the Government of the United States should enunciate and emphasize and proclaim.

He asserted that although negotiations should be held under the auspices of the United Nations, he did not object to a summit conference of the heads of governments, providing they were well prepared, such high level talk were no substitute for using the United Nations for actual negotiations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes allotted to the Senator from Minnesota have expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. These comments of the Secretary General closely parallel my own views regarding the importance of using the United Nations in the conduct of disarmament negotiations, which I outlined in a speech I delivered earlier.

In a speech I delivered earlier this month I said:

The place for disarmament negotiations is the United Nations. The United Nations, as the instrumentality of formal political cooperation established by practically all the nations of the world, is the proper channel through which policy coordination should be achieved.

I also stated in the same speech that the Security Council offered an excellent means through which all nations and all areas of the world would be represented in disarmament talks. I said:

Wherever we negotiate, we should consult with all those members of the Security Council that desire to do so. We cannot consult with every country in the world. * * * But we can get together with those countries which have been chosen by all the members of the General Assembly * * * as their official representatives, so to speak, on peace and security matters. We would thus show our regard for the views and interests of nations throughout the world and not just those who have chosen to ally themselves militarily with us in the North Atlantic region. Our own policies would be immensely strengthened by recognizing the broad interests of nations everywhere in the great issues of peace and war.

I am glad the Secretary General is stressing the importance of the United Nations to disarmament negotiations, and particularly that he should stress this importance after 4 days of meetings with Soviet leaders. It is my fervent hope that our own Government will not delay in formulating its own policies regarding the substance of any future meetings encompassing the United States, the Soviet Union, and other nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper articles to which I alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times of March 27, 1958]

U. N. AGAIN HELD KEY ARMS FORUM—HAMMARSKJOLD REPEATS IDEA SUMMIT IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR CHANNELS OF WORLD BODY

MOSCOW, March 26.—After 3 days of discussions with Soviet leaders, Dag Hammarskjold reaffirmed today his belief that disarmament talks by heads of government would be no substitute for negotiations in the United Nations.

The United Nations Secretary General said at a news conference that he favored direct exchanges between East and West at the summit or any other level provided they were properly prepared.

He said the procedure of disarmament negotiations was less important than their substance. But he said that sooner or later United Nations channels would have to be used to work out an agreement.

Mr. Hammarskjold declined to describe either the nature or spirit of his talks with Nikita S. Khrushchev, Communist chief, Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko, and other officials.

He said his 4-day visit to Moscow was without agenda. He described it as a routine effort to acquaint himself with Soviet policymakers and policies.

DISARMAMENT A KEY ISSUE

Disarmament, he indicated, is bound to be discussed when diplomats get together. The Secretary General would like to see the Soviet Union resume participation in the United Nations Disarmament Commission, but he denied having any concrete mission of persuasion. Since Mr. Hammarskjold arrived here Sunday night, the Government has several times reasserted its intention to continue to boycott the commission.

Mr. Hammarskjold said that no matter how preliminary disarmament issues were

settled, the discussions should not be permitted to drift out of the United Nations. His experience in western capitals as well as in Moscow, he asserted, convinced him that all governments recognize disarmament as one of the prominent concerns of the world organization.

The Secretary General declined to appraise the possibilities for an early East-West heads-of-government meeting. He acknowledged his personal preference for private, behind-the-scenes deliberations on touchy international issues.

NO FORECASTS ON TESTS

Mr. Hammarskjold also made these points:

The cessation of nuclear tests, proposed by the Soviet Union, is linked now with the issues of inspection and production. It would be rather irresponsible to predict the direction of these negotiations.

It is unlikely that any of the powers possessing nuclear weapons will unilaterally halt tests.

The proposed summit conference could be held at United Nations headquarters in New York but there is no need to say it should be held there. The question is a minor household matter.

U. N. CHIEF CALLS HIS TALKS IN MOSCOW FRUITFUL

Moscow, March 26.—United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold said today that his talks with Soviet leaders confirmed his view that the disarmament question should be settled within the United Nations.

Hammarskjold, speaking at a news conference, termed his 3 days of talks with Soviet leaders as fruitful and beneficial.

The U. N. chief, who came here last weekend, has conferred with Communist chief Nikita S. Khrushchev, President Klimenti Voroshilov, Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko and a number of lesser officials.

He declined to reveal anything specific about the outcome of the talks, but indicated that the wide range of subjects discussed included disarmament and the Middle East.

Declaring that "we should not let disarmament drift out of the United Nations," he said, "my experience with all governments, including this one, have only confirmed my views."

Hammarskjold added, however, that if a disarmament agreement could be reached by an East-West summit conference he would regard it not only as a major step toward the solution of the international situation but also to the work of the United Nations.

He also indicated he favored the idea of a summit conference along with all direct contacts between leaders of nations provided they were well prepared.

Referring to the Middle East, Hammarskjold said that although "such a question is very much in my lap," neither he nor the Soviet leaders offered or considered any concrete plans or solutions.

He described the discussion as more in the nature of a stocktaking of the position of various countries concerned.

[Hammarskjold also said the problem of a ban on nuclear-bomb tests is inextricably linked with international inspection and controls on bomb production. This seemed to be an endorsement of the Western position, the Associated Press noted.]

RUSSIA REPORTED SET TO HALT A-TESTS SOON

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., March 26.—An east European source said today the Soviet Union will announce suspension of its nuclear tests after finishing an extensive series now in progress.

He indicated in an interview this would be before summer, when the United States will invite U. N. observers to a hydrogen-bomb test in the Pacific.

The East European, who declined to be identified by name, said he expected the Soviet action would make it embarrassing for the United States to carry out its tests.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is now becoming fairly well established that the Soviet Union may be making in the next 24 hours, an announcement that it is banning all tests of nuclear weapons. Such an announcement would have tremendous effect on world opinion. It should also be noted that the Soviet Union has conducted a number of tests in the last 3 weeks, of a variety of weapons. I do not understand why we have not been calling that fact to the attention of the world more vividly and more pointedly. We may well have lost an opportunity for disarmament negotiations and an opportunity for international inspection. One of the main reasons why I have believed we should have sought some kind of disarmament agreement, at least on the limitation of nuclear bombs, was that we would be able to establish at least the beginning of an effective inspection system. I hope it is not too late.

I wish to encourage the President, who, according to what I have read, is thinking of breaking up the disarmament package and is willing to negotiate piece by piece, rather than on the totality of the program. If he does that, he will be deserving of our commendation and congratulations.

I also desire to congratulate the President upon his invitation to the leaders of the world to visit the testing sites of our nuclear weapons which will take place in the Pacific; but, I repeat, this is no substitute for effective negotiations for agreement on disarmament with a system of international inspection.

Now, a few words on the issue of whether, when, and how to have a summit conference, and what kind of preliminary negotiations and agreements we must have before such a conference occurs, are increasingly preoccupying statesmen and the public alike. Many of the cautious admonitions of the Secretary of State are well taken. We need concrete talks at lower levels before a summit conference should be held.

But these lower level talks should be in preparation for a summit conference, not a preparation against a summit conference. There is a difference between cautiousness and caustic contempt. However desirable caution may be, we must beware appearing to throw cold water on the whole idea of a summit conference, since most of the rest of the world is pressing energetically for it.

Dispatches this week indicate that a summit conference will be held. I think our policies and our public statements should reflect that assumption, and the preparatory negotiations which we enter should also be marked by a constructive and forward-looking approach.

In an address before the Central Wisconsin Teachers Association at Wausau, Wis., I suggested that the security council of the United Stations was a proper place for the next attempt at disarmament discussions. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my press release be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U. N. SECURITY COUNCIL URGED AS FORUM FOR NEW DISARMAMENT EFFORTS

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Democrat, of Minnesota) today urged the United States to turn to the United Nations Security Council as the logical forum for resuming disarmament efforts.

"The United Nations Security Council is the logical channel for our next effort to resume talks with the Soviet Union on disarmament and other outstanding issues," Senator HUMPHREY declared in an address before the Central Wisconsin Teachers Association at Wausau, Wis.

"For many years the Security Council has been crippled by indiscriminate use of the veto, but it is, nevertheless, the body which has, under the United Nations Charter, been formally charged with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. I think that in the current crisis of international peace and security we should resort to the Security Council and utilize its machinery to the greatest possible extent. If obstructionism or the veto should block effective Council action, then—but only then—we should carry our negotiations to other channels.

"In preparing for negotiations with the Soviet Union on disarmament and other issues of the cold war the United States is consulting on policy with the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The issues involved, however, are much broader than NATO—they affect the interests of the entire world. The cold war is not a private squabble between Moscow and the NATO powers, but a state of tension that affects the lives and fates of people on every continent of the globe. In Asia, Africa, and Latin America, nations are watching with deep concern the progress of the exchange between the major Atlantic powers and the Kremlin because they know that their own future depends on the outcome.

"Yet, despite the interest and concern of the governments and peoples of nations all around the globe, we have been treating most of them as mere bystanders. It would be to our interest to associate these countries more closely with the policies and the decisions that in the last analysis profoundly affect all of them.

"The place for disarmament negotiations is the United Nations," Senator HUMPHREY declared. The United Nations, as the instrumentality of formal political cooperation established by practically all the nations of the world, is the proper channel through which policy coordination should be achieved. The General Assembly, with some 80 members, is too cumbersome an agency for this purpose. But the Security Council, containing as it does countries from nearly every major region of the world officially chosen by the entire membership of the General Assembly, could offer a means of broad representative negotiation and consultation.

"But wherever we negotiate, we should consult with all those members of the Security Council that desire to do so. We cannot consult with every country in the world—this would be an endless and futile process. But we can get together with those countries which have been chosen by all the members of the General Assembly—the town meeting of the world as their official representatives, so to speak, on peace and security matters. We would thus show our regard for the views and interests of nations throughout the world and not just those who have chosen to ally themselves militarily with us in the North Atlantic region. Our own policies would be immensely strengthened by recognizing the broad interests of nations everywhere in the great issues of peace and war, and we would derive much profit from this

demonstration of our respect for world opinion."

Reviewing the United Nations role today, Senator HUMPHREY went on to say that "there is a need for a general, ever-open forum in which to discuss the problems of the world, to supplement the normal, separate, compartmental contracts of traditional diplomacy. It is of tremendous value to the diplomat and to the policymaker in the field of foreign affairs to have this supplementary, complementary mechanism. As has been often said, if the United Nations did not exist we would have to create it. But fortunately the United Nations does not only exist, but it works. Time and again, our country and our allies have been able to use it to advantage as one of the essential tools of modern diplomacy.

"Admittedly, the United Nations has its limitations, and we must remain alert to correct them," the Senator stated. "However I am convinced that despite its shortcomings, the U. N. provides the best international forum yet devised in which nations in time of crisis can air their grievances and achieve solutions to international disputes through discussions, debate, and compromise."

Further excerpts from Senator HUMPHREY'S remarks follow:

"It was my privilege to serve as a member of the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations during the 11th General Assembly which adjourned in March 1957. During this period world peace hung in the balance—the result of the crises in Egypt and Hungary. These twin crises dominated the 11th General Assembly, and we have not yet heard the last of them.

"The contrast between the crises in the Middle East and Hungary is striking. In the Middle East, the United Nations achieved a cessation of hostilities because the parties involved were willing to comply with the recommendations of the United Nations. In Hungary, the United Nations was frustrated because the Soviet Union arrogantly flouted its will.

"The Middle East crisis led to one of those momentous steps which may in the future come to be seen as a turning point of history. I refer, of course, to the establishment of the United Nations emergency force which is continuing to do an outstanding job in keeping the peace in that troubled area. It is a tribute to UNEF that we have not for a long time read anything in our newspapers about the trouble in the Sharm-el-Sheik or Gaza areas.

"I regret, however, that more progress has not been made toward establishing a force of similar character as a permanent arm of the United Nations. It will be recalled that such action was recommended in a resolution which was agreed to by the Senate in August of last year. I was glad to join Senator SPARKMAN in sponsoring this forward-looking resolution and I hope that in the coming year concrete steps will be taken to implement it.

"Egypt and Hungary, however, are only two examples of the value of the United Nation to the Free World. There are other examples which are less spectacular, but which nonetheless are vital. Through the United Nations progress was made in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy; constructive gains were made toward self-government and independence in the dependent and trust territories of the world; technical-assistance programs provide underdeveloped countries with a pool of skilled and professional personnel. During 1957, the United Nations for the first time devoted itself, although briefly, to the problem of outer space. It is significant that in the disarmament resolution of November 14, 1957, the General Assembly called for agreement on an inspection system to insure that the sending of objects through outer space would be exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes.

"We must, of course, prepare the way for negotiations by improving the international climate. Private United States citizens can play a major role in this area. We cannot, for instance, overstress the importance for schoolteachers to be well informed in U. N. operations so that they can better inform and teach the future citizens whose lives will be so affected by the developments of the present. Teachers should lead in our people-to-people exchange program.

"Individual and group voluntary efforts to help meet today's total challenge from the Kremlin should be encouraged on every front.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, the Security Council of the United Nations could easily be turned into a foreign ministers conference simply by having foreign ministers present. This point is forcefully made this morning in a statement from the American Association for the United Nations, addressed to the President of the United States, and printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

A STATEMENT FROM THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Conviction is overwhelming that the time has come for give-and-take negotiations between the West and the Soviet Union. As stated by the President in his state of the Union message: "The world must stop the present plunge toward more and more destructive weapons of war, and turn the corner that will start our steps firmly on the path toward lasting peace." Reasonable agreement is the sole alternative to the danger against which the President warns—and which we all know exists. It is the only way to a lasting peace—no matter how difficult such negotiations may seem at present.

NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD TAKE PLACE WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS

A dramatic proposal has been made for a summit conference between the United States and the Soviet Union. Most of the great powers seem to agree that such a conference should be preceded by a meeting of foreign ministers to prepare for it. Such negotiations may not succeed but no nation can afford to be in a position of not being willing to try them. It seems logical that such conferences would have the best chance for success if they are conducted within the United Nations which provides the moral framework under which international agreements should be reached. Decisions made at a summit conference will affect every one of the 82 nations which have accepted the principles of the U. N. Charter. Obviously, these nations will have greater confidence in such a conference if it is held within the United Nations.

The United Nations provides a neutral meeting place with a wide variety of both private and public facilities for negotiations. Not the least of these is the experienced and unique talents of the Secretary General and his staff. We believe that it is of utmost importance that the Secretary General be present at the summit table. This will give assurance to all nations that no decisions are made that will be prejudicial to the future of all, and to world peace.

Most of the problems to be discussed at the summit conference and the preparatory conferences leading to it have been the subject of U. N. negotiations and debate. Any decisions reached on such subjects must eventually come to the U. N. for implementation. Perhaps the initial conference may reach agreement on only 1 or 2 simple steps, which as the President of the United States suggested, will start the steps of the world on the path of lasting peace. The steps may be short or giant—but it is the United Nations that will have to measure them.

The Security Council can easily be turned into a foreign ministers meeting. The Charter provides that this body may have special meetings which leading statesmen may attend. The Council could issue invitations to as many foreign ministers as it wishes to meet with it. It is interesting to note that when the General Assembly opened last September, there were 46 ministers and prime ministers in attendance—including the foreign ministers of the great powers.

We believe that there is an alternative to a summit conference. The success of the President of the United States, when he made his "Atoms for Peace" address to the General Assembly in 1953 might suggest another appearance before a special General Assembly of the United Nations.

We believe that he could take the moral offensive and suggest cessation of nuclear tests for a period of time; U. N. control of outer space, and calling off the economic race which is becoming second only to the atoms race. Instead of the Soviet Union and the United States competing for the favors of undeveloped areas through economic aid, he could suggest that both countries cooperate in a great United Nations Technical Assistance and Economic Development program, whose sole purpose would be the welfare of the people receiving the aid. He could repeat his proposal that the Soviet Union and the United States cooperate in an effort to counter poverty and disease through U. N. agencies.

Every time the Secretary-General successfully mediates a dispute, or the U. N. and its specialized agencies push back the frontiers of hunger and disease, the moral authority of the world community becomes stronger.

We believe that the people of the United States want their Government to contribute to this development by holding the proposed conferences under the United Nations.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS.
CHARLES W. MAYO, M. D.,
JAMES T. SHOTWELL,
Honorary Presidents.
OSCAR A. DE LIMA,
Executive Vice President.
MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Chairman, Board of Governors.
CLARK M. EICHELBERGER,
Executive Director.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me reiterate today what I have said on many previous occasions. We must utilize the United Nations framework whenever it offers an opportunity for a constructive and imaginative approach to major problems in international affairs. Clearly it should be utilized now in our efforts to prepare for high-level summit meetings. Let us make the United Nations into an instrument of help to American foreign policy. We should not bypass the United Nations; we must use it.

I call upon the President and the Secretary of State to proclaim not only our desire but our request that the negotiations be undertaken immediately within the councils of the United Nations.

Hour by hour we are losing the propaganda battle because of timidity, caution, and an apparent lack of understanding of the urgency of the desire for peace in the world.

I appeal, as an American and as a Senator—one with some responsibility in this area—for our Government to get off dead center and move to a positive and affirmative position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota an additional 5 minutes, if he desires it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my colleague for his generosity, but I have completed my statement. I do not believe I will need more time.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator take some time and then yield to me? The Senator can yield back the time remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator for a question, if he wishes to yield me the time.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota such time as is necessary to put a question and to have it answered.

I should like to say to the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota that he has just made an excellent speech. The speech the Senator delivered some days ago in the Senate has been widely reported in the State of Colorado. I have received a score or more of letters concerning it. The writers of the letters have asked me to commend the junior Senator from Minnesota for his constructive thinking and for his fight to establish a proper approach to peace.

Today we again see a demonstration of the sincerity, leadership and purpose of the junior Senator from Minnesota in this very important field. Today we are losing the propaganda battle. Hence we must seize the initiative and move forward, as the junior Senator from Minnesota has so well said.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his encouraging words, his support and assistance, which have been very helpful.

Mr. President, I am of sad heart today when I read the headline stories. It is a paradoxical and ironical situation that a Nation such as ours, dedicated to the principles of the Prince of Peace, should find itself being cast in the image of reluctance and footdragging when it comes to working out the legitimate and constructive ways and means to accomplish peace through negotiations.

I have never said the disarmament talks would bring us peace, but I have said they could bring us a beginning in the search for peace. I am afraid that the Soviet Union will soon complete the tests of nuclear weapons it wishes to test for the next year or two. There is evidence to substantiate this observation. The Soviets have been making many tests at various stations in the Soviet Union. Soon they will have completed their tests. Then, with a kind of openness and a sort of international majestic gesture, they will proclaim they want no more tests, that they want to stop all tests. They may stop them unilaterally, which will leave us with our tests yet to be made in April and May in the West and in the Pacific.

I have heretofore said, and I repeat, the most important thing for us to do is to get the Soviets to the conference table to negotiate as to what they mean by disarmament with inspection. Make no mistake, it is possible for effective inspection to be conducted. The Subcommittee on Disarmament has been holding extensive hearings on the subject of inspection. The evidence is incontrovertible that inspection, properly organized, even under present arrangements, can be effective for all weapons save the smallest, and even those could be properly inspected were there to be an international inspection system, under which stations could be placed, let us say, 500 miles apart within the territory of the Soviet Union, Western Europe, Asia, and the United States.

Administration spokesmen are prone to argue the case of negotiations, summit talks and so forth, as if they were corporation lawyers, pointing out the weakness of the Soviet brief, but never appealing to the conscience of mankind and the great masses of people throughout the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has taken 16 minutes of the allotted time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was asked by the distinguished Senator from Colorado to respond to him, and I shall conclude my response because of his interest in the matter and my interest in it.

I say we are not going to win in this struggle with the Soviet Union by using the approach of a corporation attorney facing the nimble-minded, quick-witted, but also diabolically clever mentality of a man like Khrushchev. We are going to have to do better than we have done.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very clear and lucid presentation.

VISIT TO SENATE BY SENATOR VICTOR NEVERS CONSTANT OF THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, earlier today we were honored by a visit from several members of the legislature of one of the great nations of Western Europe. We were happy to receive them.

This afternoon, Mr. President, we are honored by the presence of a member of the legislature of the Republic of Haiti.

Haiti is one of our neighbors to the south, a land of friendly people, one of our most colorful neighbors. It is a land of great promise and potential.

Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to present to the Senate Senator Victor Constant, of the Republic of Haiti.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

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 constructions of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does some Senator desire to yield time to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield me some time?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for an interpretation regarding section 2 of S. 3414, which contains the provision which allows the Federal Government to match the State funds on a 70–30 basis.

I have in my hand the report, at page 19 of which there is an explanation of the matter in some detail. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee because of a somewhat peculiar situation existing in the State of Washington, which I have informally discussed with the Senator and with other members of the committee.

If a State desires to follow the course set forth in the bill, and if it becomes State policy, it will be entitled to its share, as I understand, of $400 million for accelerated construction.

Mr. GORE. To be matched on a 70–30 basis.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To be matched on a 70–30 basis. If a State such as the State of Washington decided it was in favor of the accelerated program and wished to participate in it, and if the State should proceed with a project of a highly controversial nature, much needed, such as a bridge which would finally connect up with the interstate highway a very short distance away, in the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee, under section 2, and using the 70–30 matching provision, could the State limit itself to one project?

Mr. GORE. The bill apportions to the States amounts determined by the formula written into existing law.

By this formula the share of the State of Washington in the $400 million would be $6,562,000, and this would represent 70 percent of the cost of projects which could be accomplished under this provision.

The committee has seen fit to recommend 100 percent transferability, that is, permission to the States to use the entire apportionment from this special economic stimulus of $400 million for 1 year, on either primary highways, secondary highways, or urban extensions of those systems.

Therefore, to answer the Senator's question, if a project is a part of the primary highway system of the State of Washington, or the secondary highway system of the State of Washington, or an urban extension of either, it is

within the purview of this bill for the State to apply and obtain approval and utilize the full amount on one project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I presume, from reading the report and some of the testimony, that this section, and the item of $400 million, were obviously placed in the bill to accelerate the program for the coming year.

It is provided, is it not, that if this plan were accepted and approved by the State of Washington and the Secretary of Commerce, contracts would have to be let prior to December 1, 1958, and all the funds would have to be obligated or contracted for within the year?

Mr. GORE. The exact provision is that funds shall be available for expenditure pursuant to contracts awarded by the State highway departments prior to December 1, 1958, which contracts shall provide for completion of construction prior to December 1, 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

One member of the subcommittee has suggested that, though the money must be paid in pursuance of a contract providing for completion prior to December 31, 1959, we should perhaps add a provision such as the following:

> Subject to delays caused by circumstances and conditions beyond the control of and without the fault of any contractor on such contracts, and delays created by acts of God.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that would be a wise suggestion, because it is difficult to have an exact cutoff date. Even though it is clearly the intention of the State to complete the project within the year, and it has let the contracts, there may be delays beyond the control of the State. I believe that the suggested provision would be wise.

Mr. GORE. This proposal is being circulated among the members of the subcommittee, and shortly we shall know their opinion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I read from page 19 of the report:

> These additional funds will be available for expenditure on the primary, secondary, or urban systems, without limitation as to the percentage to be utilized on any system, which would permit transfer or interchange of apportionments between these systems, and grant the States more flexibility in using the funds where need is greatest and in areas where unemployment is greatest.

I presume the committee had in mind that a showing of unemployment in a given area might be one of the criteria for approval by the Federal Government in this case.

Mr. GORE. I cannot say that the committee had in mind that that would be a criterion. This is really a statement of the reasons why the committee granted the 100-percent transferability, as between the primary, secondary, and urban extensions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to supplement what the able Senator from Tennessee has said in response to the interrogatories of the Senator from Washington.

The apportionment is made to the States on the basis of a regular scale, and 45 percent is apportioned for primary highways, 30 percent for secondary highways, and 25 percent for urban extensions. But once the State gets the money, it has complete freedom, with respect to its share of the $400 million, to decide where the money is to be spent within the State. So the determination of an economic condition would be wholly within the decision of the State.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Also, if the State decided to transfer or use the entire amount on a project which could be completed within a reasonable time—1 year, for example—the question of the economic situation would be at least a criterion for the State to decide.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. That is why the time element was introduced.

Mr. GORE. In other words, instead of this language in the report indicating a requirement that the State cite the economic condition as a criterion, it is rather a statement of the reasons why the committee has recommended 100-percent transferability.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But that factor would probably be cited by the State as a reason for its action.

Mr. GORE. It would certainly be a very good reason.

As I understand the able Senator, he is referring to the construction of a project, such as a bridge or abutment, on a State route in Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A State primary route.

Mr. GORE. Funds would be available therefor, as they would be available for a tunnel in Boston that was on the system, or an urban extension of a primary or secondary highway, or a bridge or abutment in Tennessee or South Dakota. The committee felt that the flexibility would aid the States in placing this money under contract at the earliest possible time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes from the time allotted in favor of the amendment which I offered some time ago.

The amendment which is now pending is one which would add a new clause to the law relating to public hearings for the location of segments of the Interstate System. The present law, in paragraph (c) of section 116, provides:

> Public hearings. Any State highway department which submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of or going through any city, town, or village, either incorporated or unincorporated, shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings or has afforded the opportunity for such hearings, and has considered the economic effects of such a location.

That provision was written into the Highway Act of 1956, I think, upon the motion of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, who felt that a town that was bypassed should have an opportunity to be heard before the new route was finally established.

Following its enactment, this provision has been observed by the State highway commissions, and many towns and communities have held public hearings. The conduct of those hearings for the benefit of towns and communities has aroused a desire on the part of ranchers and farmers for a like opportunity to be heard on the location of highways.

Consequently, following the request of some livestock associations, I am proposing that the present clause providing for public hearings for towns and small communities shall have added to it the words: "and any State highway department which submits plans for an Interstate System project shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings at a convenient location, or has afforded the opportunity for such hearings, for the purpose of enabling persons in rural areas through or by whose property the highway will pass to express any objections they may have to the proposed location of such highway."

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it not a fact that the Federal Highway Administration testified, as did various State highway commissioners, that the provision presently in the law, which requires certification of an opportunity for hearings having been afforded had not hindered the development of highways, but that that provision was rather welcome?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. They spoke very highly of the operation of the provision for public hearings, which is provided in the 1956 act.

Mr. GORE. The Senator's amendment would merely extend this provision to other groups, to give them an opportunity to have public hearings held. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator is correct. It is my conviction that this will be an effective provision and will save money. I know of one occasion in my own State of a road being constructed through some ranch country. Had hearings been held, the road would have been located differently, and it would have saved some money for the State and the Federal Government. The amendment would provide an opportunity for the people affected to be heard.

Mr. GORE. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield back his time?

Mr. GORE. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to call amendment No. 2 on the sheet I have distributed to Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

TITLE II. AMENDMENTS TO HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT OF 1956

SEC. 201. Section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, entitled "Highway Trust Fund," is amended as follows: In paragraph (c) (1) strike out the subparagraph (C) which reads:

"50 percent of the tax received after June 30, 1957, under section 4061 (a) (1) (tax on trucks, buses, etc.);"

and insert in lieu thereof:

"100 percent of the tax received after June 30, 1957, under section 4061 (a) (1) (tax on trucks, buses, etc.)."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. At the conclusion of my remarks, unless a Senator desires to speak in opposition, I shall yield back the remainder of my time and withdraw the amendment.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment at this time for the purpose of having in the RECORD a reference to this problem. This amendment for which, in the unanimous-consent agreement, under which the Senate is operating, an exception was made on the point of germaneness.

The Highway Act of 1956 contains two titles, the first of which is the Highway Act of 1956, and the second, the Revenue Act of 1956. As Senators who are familiar with the legislation know, the Highway Act of 1956 proposed to put the financing of the Interstate System and the ABC routes on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Title II created a highway trust fund, into which were placed certain revenues. It is now evident, with the increased cost of the Interstate System, that those revenues will not put enough money into the highway trust fund to keep the apportionments payable on a current basis without supplementary revenues.

At the same time, there is talk in Congress about a possible reduction in excise taxes. The Highway Revenue Act of 1956 placed in the trust fund 50 percent of the yield from the excise tax on trucks and buses. Should the current talk about a tax reduction result in a reduction of excise taxes, and, in particular, in the excise tax on trucks and buses, obviously the return from that particular excise tax going into the trust fund would be reduced by a proportionate amount.

Should the excise tax on trucks and buses be reduced by 50 percent, the revenue going into the trust fund from that source would be 25 percent of the total revenue.

In view of the fact that the principle of placing in the highway trust fund revenue from the excise tax on trucks and buses was established in the act of 1956, it seems to me that the principle would not be violated in any degree if 100 percent of that tax revenue were to go into the highway trust fund. If we were to provide for 100 percent of that tax to go into the trust fund, instead of 50 percent, then the trust fund would not be injured in the event the excise tax should be reduced by 50 percent.

I see on the floor of the Senate the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] and the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. BYRD], and the adviser to the Senate Committee on Finance, Mr. Stam.

I have placed this matter in the RECORD at this time in order to bring the situation to their attention, so that if an excise tax reduction should be considered by the Committee on Finance during the session of Congress, they will give consideration to what will happen to the highway trust fund in this particular respect.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I have suggested the removal or a reduction of the excise tax on trucks and buses. Since 50 percent of that tax has been earmarked for the highway trust fund, I have suggested that should the tax be reduced 50 percent, rather than 50 percent of the revenue from such taxes being allocated to the trust fund, the entire 100 percent should be so allocated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is, 100 percent of the returns.

Mr. POTTER. That is correct. The trust fund would receive the same amount it receives at the present time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is precisely what is proposed in the language of my amendment although I shall not press. The reason I shall not press it is that, while it is in order under the unanimous-consent agreement, I recognize that it is a revenue measure or an appropriation measure, depending upon one's point of view, and I feel that probably better results would be obtained if, with this notice, the proposal came to the attention of the proper committee of the House of Representatives, where revenue bills originate.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to assure the Senator that no other Member of the Senate is more interested than I am in having the excise tax removed from automobiles and trucks and parts. I concur in the expression of the Senator from South Dakota that the highway trust fund should not be penalized because of a reduction of excise taxes.

If the excise tax on trucks and buses could be reduced, the reduction should be made in such a manner that the trust fund would still receive the same amount of money. In other words, if the tax were cut by 50 percent, the whole 100 percent of the tax should be allocated to the trust fund.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have observed that the distinguished Senator from Michigan appreciates the precise problem which is here presented. I am glad to have his support for the idea as it is presented. The 50 percent of the excise tax on trucks and buses places in the highway trust fund, I believe, from $160 million to $175 million a year. Obviously, a 50-percent reduction in that amount would further weaken the highway trust fund.

Mr. President, unless there is further discussion, I withdraw the amendment and yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota yields back the remainder of his time. The amendment is withdrawn.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated 3-25-58-A and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, beginning with line 25, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 14 on page 20 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 11. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 111 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Reimbursement with respect to relocation of publicly and cooperatively owned utilities: Subject to the conditions contained in this section, whenever a State shall pay for the cost of relocation of publicly or cooperatively owned 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.

"(b) Reimbursement with respect to relocation of privately owned utilities: Whenever a State under State law is required to pay for all or any part of the cost of relocation of privately owned 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."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, reserving my right to the floor, I request the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Reserving my right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the quorum call will come out of the time allotted to the Senator from Texas. Does the Senator from Texas withdraw his request for a quorum call?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I withdraw my request for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The amendment I have proposed to S. 3414 is to section 11 (a). In effect, it is an amendment to the bill as amended by the Hruska amendment. It provides, in section (a), that in case there is a relocation of a publicly or cooperatively owned utility facility, the publicly or cooperatively owned utility will be reimbursed for all costs of removal at the same rate as provided in the 1956 law.

Section (b) provides that with respect to privately owned utility facilities reimbursement will be at the rate of 70 percent of the cost of removal, if the State is obligated to pay for it. Under

the Hruska amendment, private utilities will be reimbursed up to 90 percent if the State pays the cost. The question is not whether the State is required to pay, but if the State does pay the cost there will be reimbursement.

Under my amendment, private utilities would be reimbursed by the Federal Government only if the State were required to reimburse them.

The occasion for the amendment is this: In 1956 the highway law was amended to provide that if a State paid a utility company for moving its facilities, the Federal Government would bear 90 percent of the cost. After that, there was generally unlicensed brigandage practiced on the fund. The situation grew so alarming that the subcommittee presided over by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] wrote into the bill which was reported by the committee a provision to stop that practice; not to prevent the private utilities from being reimbursed for their relocating costs, but only if the States had to bear those costs.

What happened? After the 1956 act was passed, it was proposed in a number of States that the State serve as a kind of pipeline to let the private utilities go into the Federal Treasury and draw money out. New laws were proposed in 38 States in 1 year. In only 15 of those States did the proposals become laws. In 6 States such laws were passed, but the State Governors had the courage and the principle to veto them. I shall call the roll of the States which would not put up with the steal which the United States Senate is being asked to swallow.

Twenty-four States—half the States of the Union—within the past 2 years would not stomach what the Senate was asked to stomach last night; 24 States of the Union said, in effect, "No; it is immoral. It is wrong." The legislatures of 18 States said, "We will not pass such a law. We will not permit the private utilities to steal money from the public treasury and put it into their pockets, even though it be only 10 percent."

I call attention to the point raised last night by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], when he said that a mere 10 percent was not enough to require a State to contribute; that Congress ought to stop and consider the question further. He last night pleaded for a 30-percent payment by the States, so that the States would stop and examine and consider what was going on, before they determined that they would pay private utility companies. I call attention now to that plea by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia.

Eighteen States defeated the suggestion made last year that they be merely the agents to collect money from the United States Treasury and to give it to the private utilities. I want to read the roll of States whose legislatures rejected such a proposal when it was made by the private utility lobbyists:

Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Several States passed laws to authorize taking the money out of the public treasury and giving it to the private utilities. But in those States, six States whose legislatures passed such bills, the governors said: "No; we will not have such laws." These are the six States, the governors of which, vetoed such bills: Colorado, Kansas, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wyoming.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, how much time is allotted? Is it 30 minutes to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 30 minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. How much time has been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has used 5 minutes; he has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for a question, but only for a question, since my time is limited.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Texas.

In subsection (a) of the amendment of the Senator from Texas—it is the subsection entitled "Reimbursement With Respect to Relocation of Publicly and Cooperatively Owned Utilities"—I notice the following language:

> Subject to the conditions contained in this section—

I point out particularly the following language—

> whenever a State shall pay for the cost of relocation of publicly or cooperatively owned utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal-aid primary or secondary systems or on the Interstate System,

And so forth. Then I turn to subsection (b) of the Senator's amendment, which is entitled "Reimbursement With Respect to Relocation of Privately Owned Utilities"; and in that subsection I find the following language, which is quite different from the language of subsection (a):

> Whenever a State under State law is required to pay for all or any part of the cost of relocation—

And so forth. Would the Senator from Texas consider using in subsection (b) the same language he has used in subsection (a)?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No. The Senator from West Virginia has pointed out the difference between the two subsections, and it was my purpose to have that difference exist between the two subsections. The point to which the Senator from West Virginia has referred is the very basis of the difference, which is intentional.

Subsection (a) deals with the payment of governmental tax funds for the cost of relocation of publicly or cooperatively owned utility facilities, whereas subsection (b) deals with reimbursement for the cost of relocation of privately owned utility facilities, facilities of utilities which are organized or incorporated to make a profit, to make money for themselves. I point out that it is not legitimate for privately owned utilities to make money by obtaining it from the Federal Treasury.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield for a question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Texas well knows that if such reimbursement is not made to a privately owned utility, a new and higher base for the rates it charges the public will be established.

If the language of subsection (b) of the amendment remains as it is, no consideration at all will be given to States which have no law on the subject of payment to such relocation, with the result that the people of those States will be required to pay higher rates for the utility service, based upon the cost of moving the utilities. In that way, favored treatment will be given to the States which have passed laws dealing with such reimbursement or cost of relocation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, under my amendment a State would have to pay 30 percent of the cost of removal of the facilities of such a privately owned utility. I predict that in a short period of years not many States will dig down into their pockets to pay out 30 percent of that cost.

I point out that this situation developed mainly under the 1956 act, by means of which Uncle Sam was paying 90 percent of the cost.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Senator from Texas leaves the language of subsection (b) of his amendment as it is, there will be a discrimination in favor of States which have laws on the subject of reimbursement for cost of relocation, and a discrimination against States which do not have such laws.

In the case of States which do not have laws on the subject of such reimbursement, the amendment as it now stands would impose on them either the burden of paying practically the entire cost of the relocation of such facilities, without reimbursement; or the utilities would pay the cost and increase their rates to the people; whereas other States would receive reimbursement up to 70 percent of such cost.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the Senator from West Virginia argue the point he has in mind, but he should do so in the time available to those who oppose the amendment.

Inasmuch as only 30 minutes is available to Senators who join me in supporting the amendment, at this time I wish to proceed.

Mr. President, it has been shown that since the 1956 act was passed, 40 States have sought to amend the law. That shows that not more than eight States

had such reimbursement provisions or laws at the time when the 1956 act went into effect.

Yesterday evening, in response to questioning by the able junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], it was developed that the cost of these relocations amounted to approximately 3 percent of the entire $3 billion—in other words, approximately $30 million. That would be the cost of relocating the service roads and the facilities on the lateral rights-of way. Thirty million dollars is a tremendous amount of money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Texas has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, if there is an injustice, it is not in the case of the 40 States which do not have such laws. Instead, the injustice is in the case of the eight States which do have such laws. We should not ask the 40 States to pass unjust laws, simply because 8 States have laws which inordinately favor the private utilities. Under those circumstances we should not say that the other 40 States should provide that governmental tax funds should be taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers and should be used for that purpose.

Mr. President, out of whose pockets would such funds be taken? In the case of single persons, they would be taken out of the taxes paid by those who earn $70 a month or more, and who thus are required to pay income taxes. In the case of married persons who have no children, such tax funds would be taken out of the pockets of childless married couples earning $125 a month or more—$125 a month, or $1,500 a year. Such couples probably are paying income taxes, and therefore the taxes they pay would be used in part to make these payments for the cost of the relocation of the facilities of privately owned utilities.

Should the taxes paid by those persons be used in order to have a State pay to a private utility more than 70 percent of the cost of relocating its facilities?

Of course, if the right-of-way is owned by the utility, then, if such roads are to be built there and if the facilities located on the right-of-way are to be moved, the Government will have to condemn the land. In that case the Government will pay, not only for the land itself, but also for the cost of moving the facilities—every pole, every inch of pipeline which the utility already has constructed on that land—to the new location.

But if the land is owned by the utility, it will have been paid, in the first place, for the cost of establishing or locating its equipment there; such payment will have been received by it by means of rates fixed for the service the utility renders to the public. As I have said, if the utility actually owns that land, and if the land is taken by the Federal Government, to be used for these roads, the utility will be paid 100 cents on the dollar for all the land taken; that payment will be paid under condemnation proceedings, under the right of eminent domain. Under such circumstances, when land privately owned is taken for this governmental purpose, the owner of the land is paid, not only for the value of the land on a square-foot basis, but also for whatever investment he has made in facilities constructed on the land.

In short, full reimbursement will be received by a utility which owns land which is taken for that purpose, and the utility will also receive full reimbursement for the cost of relocating the poles or other facilities it has erected or established on that land.

It is only in the case of utilities which have established their facilities on publicly owned land that a request is being made to have the tax funds which have been obtained from the people used to make these payments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time the Senator from Texas has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have no prejudice against the utilities. We want them to render good service, and we want them to have financial structures adequate to enable them to give the people good service.

But what I object to is a largesse which would come out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

The utilities have had their rate structures based on charges sufficiently high to enable them to make a profit. But they say, "In addition, we want the Government to reach into the pockets of the taxpayers and get some money and give it to us."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me, in my time?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia will have to obtain time from the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have been advised that the time in opposition to the amendment is under the control of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then does the Senator from Tennessee desire to yield time to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Texas, in order that he may yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have used a considerable amount of the time available to those who favor this amendment. I would prefer to have the Senator from West Virginia use some of the time available to the other side.

Mr. GORE. Very well, Mr. President. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say that I have no quarrel with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] as regards 90 percent reimbursement, or whatever it may be, for the publicly owned utilities and cooperatives, and 70 percent for those whose facilities are privately owned.

But under subsection (b) of the amendment of the Senator from Texas—the subsection which deals with the privately owned utilities, I desire to point out that the subsection would require that there be a State law for such reimbursement, whereas the Senator from Texas knows that some States have no State law on that subject.

Therefore, in those States—including my own, so I am advised—there could be no reimbursement, and thus the cost would be reflected in the rate base of the utility, and consequently the people living in those States would have to pay a higher rate for the cost of removing the facilities, rather than to have it paid in connection with this roadbuilding program, with the result that a rank and raw discrimination would be made in favor of the States which have passed laws on this subject, as against those which have not passed laws on the point.

That is a fault I find with the amendment of the able Senator from Texas. If he could correct that language, I think it would strengthen his amendment very much.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that last year the legislature of his State considered such a proposed law, but would not enact it. The legislature of his State would not swallow it, but he is asking the Senate of the United States to swallow it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; I am asking the Senate of the United States to be fair on the subject. To make the reimbursement apply to all States—otherwise it should apply to none. The amendment would not only make certain States swallow it, but would make those States which wanted to protect their own people swallow something worse; because there would be 70 percent reimbursement for the States that had passed a local law, and not one cent reimbursement for those which had not, with the result that the people of those States would have to pay these higher rates for the cost of relocation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. A minority of the States have passed such a law. I predict they will repeal them. My State passed such a law. The Governor did not veto it. It was said, "We want it if the Federal Government wants it. Yes, we will let the utilities use us as pipelines if the Federal Government places a condition in the law." Some States have placed a condition in the law that they will collect only if Uncle Sam will be Santa Claus for the utilities, and that they will not pay it themselves.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Reverting to the fundamental principle, the Senator would penalize those who live in States which have not passed laws for local reimbursement. He would give to the States which passed such laws and I believe he said his own State had passed such a law——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I point out that my own State——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor, unless he desires to yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator, whatever State is involved, he is trying to say to people of States which have passed such a law, "You will get reimbursement," whereas he is saying to the people of States which have not passed such a law, "The cost of doing this shall be placed in the rate base of the utility, and the people will have to pay for it." That is what I am pointing out.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I should like again to refer to what was stated by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] last night. If the payments to the States were on the basis of 30 percent, there would not be an effort to pass such a law in 40 States in 1 year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the issue before the Senate was fully debated yesterday. Earlier today I made a slight correction with respect to the cost of relocation of utilities in the roadbuilding program. It applies only to the Interstate System as it presently exists.

Yesterday it was suggested the cost would be 3 percent of the overall cost, which would be $1,100,000,000. The fact is that the cost is closer to 1 percent. One percent of $37 billion is $370 million, but not even all of that amount is here involved. The only amount here involved, as the basis for a giveaway, if I may use that term, is 20 percent of $370 million, or $74 million, if all the relocation costs are attributable to private utilities, which they are not. So there is not any giveaway of $1 billion, or anything like it. The sum involved is approximately $50 million. But even that is a lot of money, and I think we should give some consideration to it, as I shall proceed to do.

Many States did change their laws after the passage of the Highway Act of 1956, but different conditions prevailed after the passage of that law from those which have prevailed theretofore. Let me call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in 1952 $25 million a year was allowed for the construction of the Interstate Highway System. Now that amount has been raised to $2 billion, which is an increase of approximately 80 times, or 800 percent. It is one thing for utilities, whether they are publicly owned or privately owned, to put up money for the construction of an Interstate Highway System at the rate of $25 million a year. It is another thing to deal with a crash program of $2 billion, which in 1960 will be $2.2 billion a year for the same purpose.

In addition to that, the Interstate Highway System, as authorized in 1956, provided for a different type of construction—4, 6, and 8-lane highways, with many cloverleafs—running the cost of relocation of utilities to a sum tremendously higher than it had been theretofore.

I think it is a sound process of reasoning that when different conditions arise they require different solutions. That is precisely what the State legislatures thought, and they changed their method of dealing with the problem locally.

There is also this to be said about payment of relocation of utility costs out of common funds rather than out of funds which would be taken out of the pockets of utility users. In many instances where the Interstate System will entirely miss communities, those communities will be freed of any costs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. On the other hand, cities located on the Interstate System will bear the entire cost. In my home city of Omaha, the cost to move waterlines, gaslines, and powerlines will be $2½ million. Neighboring cities which are not on the Interstate System will escape scot free from any cost whatsoever, although they will have as full and complete a use of the Interstate System as will the people of my home city. So there is that to be said for the propriety of figuring such costs as a part of the entire overall cost. I say we should ponder that fact again in light of the discussion which we had yesterday, and consider the issue as having been disposed of.

There is only one final suggestion I have to make, and it already has been offered by the Senator from West Virginia. It is not the private utility that pays the bill; it is not the publicly owned utility that pays the bill. They have their boards of directors and their officers, and that sort of thing, but we know that those who pay the bill are the ones who use the particular utility involved, whether it is by telephone, or by turning on a faucet, or by lighting an electric bulb. It is the people who use those facilities who pay the bill.

It might be said that private utilities have a reserve fund for meeting that sort of expense. The reserve fund comes only from the pockets of utility users. If the funds are used, they must be replenished, and they will be replenished from the pockets of utility users.

I shall vote in such a way as to assure that the utility users, the people themselves, shall not be wrongly charged for the improvement and installation of the Interstate Highway System, regardless of the type of utility which happens to be serving them.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. In our talk last evening I believe we were discussing the same subject matter. I assume we are discussing the same general issue?

Mr. HRUSKA. It is a different aspect, but the same general subject; yes.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to help make a record on the matter.

Are municipalities included within the provision of the amendment, as to the 90 percent for the cost of relocation?

Mr. HRUSKA. I would think so.

Mr. CARROLL. Are REA's included?

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Co-ops and all categories of REA's?

Mr. HRUSKA. Does the Senator mean under the bill as it now reads?

Mr. CARROLL. In the language of the bill, as it was amended last night.

Mr. HRUSKA. Surely. As I understand, that is true.

Mr. CARROLL. I observe on page 29 of the report an item relating to what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska explained. The State of Colorado, for example, vetoed a proposal to comply with the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. Six States did so. The States are Colorado, Kansas, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wyoming. By virtue of the veto, would the States be able to participate in the program?

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not know the nature of the bill or what it provided.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska to respond again to the question I asked with reference to the six States which vetoed compliance with the legislation? There were six States where compliance with this type of legislation was vetoed at the State level in 1957.

Mr. HRUSKA. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. CARROLL. Would those States be able to participate under the language of the bill, if enacted into law, following the terms of the amendment adopted last night?

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not know to what the State law was directed. There are State laws dealing with this subject. If the law which was considered required the State to pay, it would not make any change in the present system, because the present law requires a situation where the State does pay for relocation of utilities, irrespective of a mandatory or obligatory situation stemming from State statute.

If the statute involved was of that nature, it would not make any difference. The claim of the utility for relocation costs would be honored on the basis of simple, equitable principles.

Mr. CARROLL. Let us assume that there is no State law at all concerning the payment for the cost of relocation of private utilities. What would the situation be then?

Mr. HRUSKA. The utility would present its claim to the highway department. The claim would be considered on the basis of equitable principles. There would be allowances, and negotiations between the State highway department and the utility. Betterment would be allowed for in the cost of relocation, as would depreciation. A bill would be presented. When the proposal was completed as between the two of them, they would take it to the Bureau of Public Roads. The Bureau of Public Roads would go over it. The

Bureau would tentatively approve the bill, the allocation. The Bureau would carefully audit the costs, after the relocation work had been completed, and an allowance would be made as a part of the cost of construction to be participated in by the Federal Government in the same proportion as in the case of sections of cement, rods of steel, or hours of labor.

Mr. CARROLL. What percentage would that be?

Mr. HRUSKA. The proportion would be the same as would apply to the project. If it were a 90 percent project, the allowance would be 90 percent. If it were a 50 percent project, the allowance would be 50 percent.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, the bill would apply to all States, whether the State had a law or not? Is that the Senator's contention?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is true under the statute as it is presently effective. That is correct, according to my understanding.

Mr. CARROLL. It is with that fact in mind that the Senator presented his amendment last night, to have it clear on the RECORD, so that the pending legislation will be understandable to West Virginia, Colorado, or any other State. The mere fact that some States have passed a law and some States have not passed a law would not deprive any of them from participating under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. HRUSKA. Not if the State complies with the provision of the law, which is that when a State shall pay the costs of relocation reimbursement shall be on that basis. That is true, but the State has to pay the costs.

Mr. CARROLL. I am assuming for the sake of the discussion that the State makes no payment on the cost of relocation.

Mr. HRUSKA. Then the State will not qualify under the law. The law starts out by saying, "When a State shall pay." It says "when a State shall pay." If a State does not pay anything, I do not know why there should be reimbursement. Perhaps the Senator has a different idea as to reimbursement, but there cannot be a reimbursement until there has been a disbursement.

Mr. CARROLL. I understand that fact perfectly. I was thinking in terms of the utilities—either private, public, or REA—which may exist in a State where there is no State law providing for the State to repay the cost of relocation. If a utility had to relocate would payment to the utility be precluded, because the State has no such law? That is the purpose of the question.

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

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. CARROLL. Under the language of the bill as it appeared last evening, what would be the situation?

I have raised the point that if the language as used in subsection (b) of the amendment of the Senator from Texas is adopted, States which do not have a specific law upon the subject could never get reimbursement. The result would be that the State certainly would not pay for relocation if it were not going to be reimbursed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted to the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield additional time?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

In view of the language written into subsection (b), as I understand it, if the amendment of the Senator from Texas should be adopted, the utility users in those States which have no law would be saddled with a higher rate, whereas in those States which had such laws the people would be relieved from having that cost put into the rate base and from the higher rate which would otherwise result. That is the point.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is bringing out again the point I emphasized a while ago. Is it not true that the actual, final cost would be borne by the user of the utility, regardless of its ownership?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That would be true, unless there were reimbursement.

Mr. HRUSKA. Unless there were reimbursement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the estimated costs to relocate existing electrical facilities in Omaha, Nebr., of the Omaha Public Power District; the estimated costs of relocation of the Metropolitan Utilities District of Omaha; and the supplemental statement of E. C. Yokley, which appears on pages 626 and 627 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works relative to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958.

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

OMAHA PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT,
Omaha, Nebr., March 21, 1958.

MEMORANDUM TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS SUBCOMMITTEE CONSIDERING AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956—ESTIMATED COSTS TO RELOCATE EXISTING ELECTRICAL FACILITIES IN OMAHA, NEBR., DUE TO CONSTRUCTION OF THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS, MARCH 1958

The Omaha Public Power District of Omaha, Nebr., a political subdivision of the State of Nebraska, created by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, serving electrical energy to the following counties, Douglas (including Omaha), all of Sarpy, parts of Cass, Saunders, Dodge, Colfax, Burt, Washington, and Otoe.

The presently proposed Interstate System of Defense Highways in an area served by the district and necessitating relocation of its facilities are commonly referred to as Routes 1, 3, and 5. Route 1, in the location affecting the district, is at the south side of the city of Omaha, running generally east and west. Route 3 extends from Route 1 at the intersection of 30th and Grover Streets north to Dodge Street, and then north and east to terminate at the Missouri River at the foot of Capitol Avenue. Route 5 runs north from Dodge Street in the western part of the city to the north part of the city and then east to the Missouri River.

We herewith submit the estimated costs associated with the relocation of electrical facilities incident to the construction of these three routes of the Interstate System of Highways. These estimates are based on the present available data relative to location and design of the proposed highways.

Underground system	$605,000
Transmission system	33,000
Distribution system	484,000
Total	1,122,000

The customers of this publicly owned utility having paid their share of the costs of Interstate System Highways, through regular tax channels, should not be called upon to be doubly taxed therefor in the form of additional utility rates to pay these relocation costs. This principle was recognized by the Congress when it enacted what is now section III of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which section makes Federal funds available to the States for reimbursement of such costs. The provisions of that section should not be so amended as to diminish the rights of utilities to reimbursement for these relocation costs.

Respectfully submitted.

F. J. MOYLAN, *General Manager.*

MEMORANDUM TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS SUBCOMMITTEE CONSIDERING AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

The Metropolitan Utilities District, of Omaha, Nebr., is a municipal corporation created by the State of Nebraska serving gas and water to the city of Omaha and environs in Douglas and Sarpy Counties. The population of the area served is approximately 350,000 persons. The district is governed by a board of six directors elected by the residents of the district for terms of 6 years each.

The presently proposed Interstate System Defense Highways in the area served by the district necessitating relocation of its gas and water facilities are commonly referred to as Routes 1, 3, and 5. Route 1, in the location affecting the district, is at the south side of the city, running generally east and west. Route 3, as referred to in this memorandum, extends from Route 1 at the intersection of 30th and Grover Streets north to Dodge Street, and then north and east to terminate at the Missouri River near the foot of Capitol Avenue. Route 5 runs north from Dodge Street in the western part of the city to the north part of the city, and then east to the Missouri River in the vicinity of the water pumping facilities of this district.

We wish to present herewith the costs associated with gas and water facility relocations incident to the construction of these three Interstate System Highways insofar as such construction would be in the area of and affect the facilities of the Metropolitan Utilities District.

Before doing so, however, some assumptions must be indulged since the only basis for calculated costs is the presently available data relative to location and design of the proposed highways. Also it has been assumed that water and gas facilities will be permitted to cross these highways whenever necessary, and should this right be denied completely or even restricted, additional construction would be necessary beyond that contemplated in the costs hereinafter set forth. It has been assumed that mains undercrossing the Defense Highways will not need to be encased, but should this be required, additional costs would result.

We have endeavored to estimate the additional costs which would result from the inability to occupy marginal streets, if such would ultimately be the fact.

With the foregoing in mind, we submit the following estimated costs of relocating gas and water facilities necessitated by, and as a part of, said presently proposed Interstate Highway construction in and adjacent to Omaha, Nebr.

Cost of relocating or lowering mains along the route of the highway exclusive of mains in marginal streets for each of the designated proposed Interstate System highways

	Gas	Water
Route 1	$155,400	$168,010
Route 3	248,872	323,527
Route 5	32,650	91,965
Total	436,922	583,502

Additional but corresponding costs of relocating or lowering mains in marginal streets

	Gas	Water
Route 1	$25,120	$30,760
Route 3	228,660	207,600
Route 5	None	None
Total	253,780	238,360

Other costs, water: Relocating fire hydrants and abandonments, $24,000.

Other costs, gas: Relocating regulator stations and abandonments, $14,000.

Total estimated cost of relocating or lowering along the route of the 3 highways

Gas	$450,922
Water	607,502
Total	1,058,424

Total estimated cost of relocating and abandoning gas and water facilities along the route of the 3 highways, as well as in marginal streets

Gas	$704,702
Water	845,862
Total	1,550,564

The law requires the gas and water utilities accounts be kept separately. The foregoing expenditures applicable to the water utility and those applicable to the gas utility could not be borne by either from current revenues, and therefore public financing would be required. These costs would be in addition to working capital and normal construction requirements.

The district is just completing a 5-year $14 million water expansion program for which $12,500,000 of water revenue bonds were issued. The gas utility has likewise been engaged in an expansion program to meet the growth of the community and did, in 1956, issue gas revenue bonds in the amount of $1,600,000.

The consumers of these publicly owned utilities having paid their share of the costs of Interstate System Highways, should not be called upon to be doubly taxed therefor in the form of additional utility rates to pay these relocation costs. This principle was recognized by the Congress when it enacted what is now section 111 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which section makes Federal funds available to the States for reimbursement of such costs. The provisions of that section, if justice is to prevail, should not be so amended as to diminish the rights of utilities to reimbursement for these relocation costs.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF E. C. YOKLEY, VICE CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPALLY OWNED UTILITIES, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MUNICIPAL LAW OFFICERS, RE S. 3150

Secretary Weeks and Mr. Tallamy when they appeared before the Senate Roads Subcommittee on January 8 and 9, 1958, referred to an increase of approximately $10 billion since 1956 in the estimates for building the Interstate System. On January 9, 1958, Senator CASE asked Mr. Tallamy to what extent the cost of reimbursing utilities entered into the increase of estimates of the States for completing the Interstate System. Mr. Tallamy replied that the total increase in cost of utilities which also includes certain other costs to which he referred involves a 3-percent increase in costs.

In order to offer some clarification of the amount of utility relocation costs, I would like to call the committee's attention to the statement of John A. Tenbrook for the Edison Electric Institute (hearings before the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, on H. R. 4260, 1st sess., 84th Cong., p. 948), Mr. Tenbrook analyzed the study made by the Secretary of Commerce (H. Doc. 127) and found that total utility relocation costs were 2.5 percent of total highway construction costs. He further found that under existing laws and practices in various States two-fifths of this amount was presently reimbursed. Thus the amount of utility relocation costs involved in further provision for reimbursement was about 1.6 percent of total road construction costs. Since 1954, when the study was made by the Secretary of Commerce, the costs involved in relocating utility facilities, has not, according to any information I have been able to obtain, increased substantially. The $10 billion increase in the estimates of cost of constructing the Interstate System caused by increased costs of rights-of-way acquisition and other increased costs should not be considered as reflecting a similar increase in costs of utility relocation. In other words, if 1.6 percent of the total cost of constructing the Interstate System in 1956 represented additional utility relocation costs, the present amount of these costs should be less than 1.6 percent, in fact not much over 1 percent.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This has been a vexatious issue since I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works. We have attempted to deal with it repeatedly, but insofar as I am concerned we have never dealt with it satisfactorily.

I supported the provision contained in the law in 1956. As the junior Senator from Texas has said so ably today, certain States and interests have demonstrated a willingness to try—and with some success—to take advantage of the Federal Government under the provisions of the law.

The subcommittee made a recommendation this time which it hoped would remedy that situation. I was prepared last evening to support the amendment which was proposed, even raising the figure to 80 percent; but I learned that during my absence from the floor it had been raised to 90 percent. I joined the junior Senator from Colorado and voted against the amendment.

I believe that the amendment, as modified, would improve existing law, because, as the junior Senator from Nebraska has stated, he incorporated in his amendment, which the Senate adopted, a provision which requires, as a prerequisite to reimbursement by the Federal Government, the actual payment by the States of the cost of removal.

The junior Senator from Colorado raises a question about payment, and what would happen in the event a State did not have a law requiring it to pay. I submit that a State could not pay such costs unless it could do so lawfully. I can see that there might be an area in which a State might be legally authorized to do so, but not legally required to do so. But in no event could I conceive of a State making a payment for the cost of removal of the utilities unless it was authorized by law to do so.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. That raises a very important question, I believe. I use my own State as an example. I invite attention to page 30 of the report which indicates that in 1957, the Colorado Legislature passed a law in an attempt to meet the conditions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, but it was vetoed.

The question then arises, the State having no responsibility to repay such costs, to whom would the utility look to recover its costs? Take for example a private utility, a public utility, or an REA which may have relocation costs caused by a project of the Interstate Highway program. Where will it seek to recover its costs?

This raises the question as to whether or not the utility may use the State, under the provisions of the bill, as a conduit to present its claim and receive reimbursement under the Federal Aid Highway System.

Mr. GORE. I do not believe that could possibly occur, in view of the amendment adopted last night.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator mean that the State could receive payment?

Mr. GORE. I do not believe the State could receive payment unless it had paid such costs. As I understand, the provision is for reimbursement to the States for payments which the States have made.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is the plain language of the statute. It says "Whenever the State shall pay."

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] for raising this point. It is raised a little obliquely, it is true, but as I read the report, only 16 of the 48 States have laws which obligate them to pay relocation costs. Is it true therefore 32 States may not be able to participate in the program unless there is enabling legislation? Is that a fair analysis?

Mr. GORE. In that connection, I point out that it has long been the practice of the Bureau of Public Roads to reimburse the States for the Federal pro rata share of the cost of removing utilities in the case of States which paid such costs. There has never been a time, so far as I am advised, when all States were reimbursed, or when no States were reimbursed.

This is an unsatisfactory situation. I began by saying that this is an unhappy situation. It is a compromise

situation. I have not found any way to deal with it satisfactorily.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr CARROLL. Let me say to the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee that these remarks are only for the purpose of making a record. The questions are intended to be constructive, and in no way critical.

Mr. GORE. I understand.

Mr. CARROLL. I think the question which arises is very important to every State which does not have enabling legislation. I am confident that the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee and the committee will bring this question to the attention of the other body, and that it will receive full examination. If we need enabling legislation in Colorado, we want to know it. The same situation applies to the other 31 States I have mentioned. We should be able to draft provisions to give the necessary protection. Certainly it is not the intent of the committee or of the Senate to say that either private utilities, public utilities, municipally owned utilities, or REA cooperatives, shall not receive full consideration under the program.

Mr. GORE. I would prefer, even now, the provision recommended by the subcommittee; but I do not see how I could accept an amendment to reimburse States to the extent of 90 percent in the case of cooperatives, and only 70 percent in the case of privately owned utilities.

The Senator knows my predilections in the field of public power, if a choice must be made, but I do not believe that I could accept an amendment which would discriminate in that manner. As I see it, the Senate should fix the rate at 90, 80, 70, or 50 percent, and it should be equally applicable to all types of utilities.

Mr. CARROLL. I think the Senator misconceived the purpose of my suggestion. It was not in relation to the pending amendment, the so-called Yarborough amendment. I am speaking generally with respect to the amendment which was adopted last night, and its relation to the other provisions of the bill. We have already done that job.

The question now is presented a little differently. I am thinking about the provisions of the bill, and its application to 32 States.

Mr. GORE. The entire question will be in conference. The able Senator has made a fine contribution, and I am sure that all the conferees will profit by his contribution, and will undertake to improve on that which we have done. I hold that that which was done last night was an improvement over the present law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I concur pretty well with what the able Senator from Tennessee, the chairman of the subcommittee, has said. I merely call attention to the fact that the present law contains a definition of "utility." That definition was not disturbed by what was done last night.

I refer to subparagraph (b) of section 111 of the act of 1956, which reads as follows:

> (b) Utility defined. For the purposes of this section, the term "utility" shall include publicly, privately, and cooperatively owned utilities.

The law makes no distinction. It treats them all alike. The question of whether or not a State's utilities are left out is a decision to be made by the State, and not by the Federal Government. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas would not change that situation. He does not contend that the Federal Government should say to the State, "We will pay willy-nilly, whether the State pays or not."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired. All time in opposition to the amendment is exhausted.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Texas for a very forthright presentation of a proposal which could be of great benefit to about 32 States. It is true that the amendment goes a little beyond what we had previously discussed, but it has been very helpful to the junior Senator from Colorado. I wish to say to the junior Senator from Texas, whether his amendment prevails or not, he has rendered a great service in the debate, and it will be helpful not only to Colorado but to the 32 States of which I have spoken. I therefore desire to congratulate him for his splendid presentation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado. He has added a great deal to the debate by the incisive questions he asked last night and today.

Last night, in response to questioning by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado, certain estimates were given. The estimate was given that 3 percent of the cost of the $30 billion Interstate Highway network would be used up in the cost of utility relocation. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] stated that estimate was in error, and he put into the RECORD the statement of Mr. Yokley, at pages 626 and 627 of the hearings, on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958. Mr. Yokley stated, in the supplementary statement filed by him:

> In other words, if 1.6 percent of the total cost of constructing the Interstate System in 1956 represented additional utility relocation costs, the present amount of these costs should be less than 1.6 percent—in fact, not much over 1 percent.

I do not know how he could say that the percentage would go down with prices rising, but the distinguished Senator from Nebraska placed that statement in the RECORD.

Even if we took the minimum figure of 1 percent, on a $30 billion program, we would be paying out $300 million to relocate public utilities.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Texas is perfectly willing that of the $300 million there be at least a minimum of 70 percent paid to privately owned utilities and a minimum of 90 percent paid to those which are publicly owned. We are not talking about $300 million. We are talking about the difference between what is in the Senator's amendment and what is in the present statute. Therefore it is $60 million. That is a little different than the $1 billion which was suggested yesterday.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It would be $240 million under my amendment and $300 million under the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I say that we should at least save the $60 million. Therefore I say let us adopt my amendment and save $60 million.

Mr. HRUSKA. We would not save $60 million, because a part of it would go to the publicly owned utilities. Therein lies the difference.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 4 minutes?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Texas on his amendment. It has real importance for my own State of Illinois. Illinois is one of the 16 States which have passed State laws authorizing reimbursement for relocation costs. Ours is a permissive law, permitting the State highway authority discretion in providing reimbursement on the relocation of the utilities. In Chicago there is a public transit authority which owns the rapid transit system of the city. It will be subjected to great additional expense because of the Interstate Highway System. We also have in Chicago a sanitary district, which will be subjected to additional expenses. The city also distributes its own water supplies. Therefore there will also be an expense in connection with water mains.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas this question. On page 46 of the report there are comparative columns dealing with the existing law and the substitute language in the so-called Gore bill.

Am I correct in understanding that the existing law would provide for reimbursement on the approximate basis of 90 percent on the Interstate System?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The distinguished Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Texas is continuing this 90 percent reimbursement provision so far as the municipally owned and REA utilities are concerned?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is correct; by the amendment, yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The only application he is making of the amendment, which is proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], for the 70 percent reimbursement, is in the case of private utilities. Is that correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct. I confess that I can claim no originality with my amendment. The amendment is made up of either existing law or the Gore amendment.

Subsection (a) is taken verbatim from existing law. It applies it to public utilities. Subsection (b) applies the Gore amendment to privately owned utilities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So far as the Chicago Transit Authority and other publicly and cooperatively owned utilities in Illinois are concerned, the Senator from Texas is proposing a 90 percent reimbursement for all costs connected with the Interstate System. Is that correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct. The amendment, if adopted, would provide for 90 percent reimbursement for all publicly owned utilities and all cooperatively owned utilities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator. I shall vote for his amendment.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the Senator a few questions, if I may. To begin with, I should like to commend him for sponsoring his proposal and to say that I am inclined to favor it. With that introduction, I should like to say that there are several aspects of the situation which trouble me a little. The suggestion that there be a great amount of Federal reimbursement for a comparatively small rural electric cooperative which serves farmers at the end of the line has genuine merit. However, what disturbs me, candidly, is that there are some small privately owned utility companies, or comparatively small. I am wondering aloud, and I know that the Senator from Texas has a valid answer, as he has in connection with anything he sponsors. Here is what perplexes me a little bit:

Is it wholly fair to provide only 70 percent Federal reimbursement to a comparatively small private utility and 90 percent Federal reimbursement to a huge municipally owned utility such as the Los Angeles Power & Light Co., which serves millions of people and has great assets and a farflung distribution system? That is the only thing that bothers me to some degree about the proposal, and I should like to ask the Senator from Texas for his answer.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his question, because it brings up a point which should be clarified. In the case of the municipally owned utilities, it must be remembered that those utilities are owned by the people. They are not created for profit; they are not private businesses. They declare no dividends. They generally lose money, and the municipalities must tax the people in order to provide additional revenue.

The private utility, the Senator has mentioned, is a company which has been formed for the purpose of making a profit, and it has a special status because it is guaranteed the right to a fair return in its rate structure, to take care of losses. However, I do not agree with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] that the amendment would increase the rates, because in my opinion the small cities and towns affected will be the cities and towns of the future. They will grow up in the future just as in the past cities grew up along navigable rivers. Where there were no navigable rivers, the people built systems of canals. That is where the cities of the past thrived.

When the railroads were built, the canals dried up, the locks fell apart, and towns became ghost towns. The cities and towns that had depended on river navigation died, except those that deepened the channels in their rivers.

Even today towns located along railroads are dying, because the transportation now is transportation along our highway systems. New cities and new towns are growing up along our highways. They are great interior cities. They are cities like Indianapolis and Dallas. City after city is growing up along our great highway systems.

There will be a great increase in their business, and they will continue to grow. We are building the greatest transportation system on earth, and cities will grow up along our highways just as the great cities grew up along the grand canal in China when that country became the greatest empire in history, along with the Roman Empire.

So I think my amendment is fair. I propose nothing which will be unfair to the private utilities. This is not an antiutility amendment. It is a protect-the-taxpayers amendment. It is not against somebody. The private utilities are saying, "Give us a larger share." If they are legally entitled to payment under the State laws, and if the State pays them, they will get 70 percent, which is a pretty generous contribution when they are not owed anything. If they are owed anything, they will get compensation in a condemnation suit. If they own poles on their land, they will be paid for them dollar for dollar. They will not lose one red cent. Only those who have been operating on public land, on public roads, or public streets will not receive anything, because they have been operating on public land.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Texas for his observations. I could not agree with him more on that point. It is my general belief that the figure of 70 percent of reimbursement to private utilities is a fair amount. I am a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill. When the bill was originally considered, if I am not mistaken, provision was contained in the bill for a 50-percent reimbursement. I think it was on my motion that the amount was increased to 70 percent, and that that amount then was adopted and was contained in the bill which was reported to the Senate.

I ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if I am not correct.

Mr. GORE. I believe the Senator from Oregon is referring to an amendment I offered, to which he offered an amendment in the bill as originally introduced.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct. I offered an amendment to make the reimbursement 70 percent, and that figure was maintained and was accepted by the Committee on Public Works. Is that correct or incorrect?

Mr. GORE. I cannot quite trust my memory in that regard.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am reminded by a staff member that a bill was offered as an amendment by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], which suggested a 50-percent reimbursement by the Federal Government to the utilities which had relocated their facilities. I believe that it was on my motion in the committee that the amount was increased to 70 percent. This seemed a more fair ratio.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have only 3½ minutes remaining. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his question.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Texas for his answer.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Oregon for their work on the subcommittee and on the Committee on Public Works, which reported the bill. I think they reported a good provision. I have incorporated it into the section which I seek to have written into the bill. The committee reported a good bill, and I commend them for so doing. Without their work, we would not have a bill of this kind before the Senate.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the generosity and kind remarks and kind comments of the Senator from Texas, as does, I am certain, the Senator from Oregon, for whom I shall presume to speak in this regard.

The junior Senator from Texas is entitled to commendation for what he did. I believe it was largely as a result of his efforts and those of the junior Senator from Colorado and the junior Senator from South Dakota that the amendment which was adopted last evening was beneficially modified.

If the Senator from Texas would be willing to rest this matter with the committee of conference, his suggestions, his contributions, and the language of his amendment will be before the conference, and I shall be grateful for his contributions.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Is the Senator from Tennessee suggesting that if the amendment be withdrawn now and not pressed to a vote, he will take this position to the committee of conference and state it there?

Mr. GORE. I will take the point of view of the able Senator from Texas to the committee of conference and will present it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I think I have 2 minutes left. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a minute and a half remaining.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to make a statement, since a question has been raised, about the status of the laws in the various States at present. It has been mentioned that 16 States have passed laws providing for reimbursement. This information will be found on pages 28 and 29 of the committee report.

Of the 16 States which have passed laws, in only 1 State is reimbursement made to the private utilities on all State-maintained projects.

Of the other 15 of those States, 5 States reimburse the utilities if the projects are Federal aid projects. Five States reimburse the utilities if Uncle Sam will give them the money.

Ten more States reimburse the utilities only on the Interstate System.

Ten States have passed special laws as giveaways so as to get something for the utilities out of the $30 billion fund.

Six States provide for reimbursement, five of them on all Federal projects. Only one State will reimburse the utilities on State projects if Uncle Sam is not paying the cost.

Thirty-two States will not reimburse the utilities even if Uncle Sam is putting up the money. They include Nebraska, which rejected the proposal last year; and Colorado, whose Governor, Mr. McNichols, is to be commended for vetoing the bill.

Mr. President, this is not an anti-utility proposal; it is a be-fair-to-the-taxpayers proposal.

The State of New York is not an anti-utility State. New York considered and passed a law saying, in effect, "We will make reimbursement only to a municipal utility."

There is a fair distinction between private utilities and municipal utilities. Municipal utilities are branches of the government—the people's government. Private utilities operate for profit.

Mr. President, before yielding back the remainder of my time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD four telegrams I have received from municipalities which seek the relief provided in the amendment for municipalities.

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

AUSTIN, TEX., *March 25, 1958.*

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The League of Texas Municipalities representing 580 cities and towns protests strongly to section 11 (a) of amendments to the Federal Highway Act of 1956. This legislation will vitally affect 129 Texas cities and towns located on the Interstate System. Such an amendment relative to reimbursement of utility relocation will place an immediate financial burden on local publicly owned utilities and will produce unnecessary delays in the highway program since these cities are not in a position to accept the tremendous financial obligation involved, and neither in fact should be so expected.

A. P. MILLER, Jr.,
President, League of Texas Municipalities.

SULPHUR SPRINGS, TEX., *March 25, 1958.*

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Washington, D. C.:

Amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 could cause many municipal handicaps with special reference to expense of moving utilities. Section 11, subsection (a), availability of Federal funds for reimbursement to States has us worried. Please protect the cities in Texas that will be affected by this bill.

JOE DAN AVINGER,
Mayor.

SEGUIN, TEX., *March 25, 1958.*

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Relative to amendments to the Federal Highway Act of 1956, I would like to solicit your support in legislation that would give financial aid to cities which are compelled to relocate their utility lines in event a highway is constructed which would cause the removal of these lines.

The city of Seguin as well as many other cities in Texas own and operate their electric, water, and sewer facilities and due to the tremendous financial burden that we might have to share in this program we earnestly solicit your valuable help in authorizing the Federal Government to participate in the expense of the removal and relocation of these utility lines.

Congratulating you on the splendid work you are doing, I am, as ever, your friend.

ROGER W.,
Mayor, City of Seguin, Tex.

GREENVILLE, TEX., *March 25, 1958.*

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request that section 11 (a) of amendment to Federal Highway Act of 1956 be disapproved. The passage of this amendment will cost Greenville citizens several million dollars in the immediate future on utility moves.

GUY L. MCGRAW,
City Manager.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also that the portion of the report on the bill which begins with the last paragraph on page 27 and continues through page 29, concerning the status of the reimbursement laws in the States, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1407) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The committee has had the problem of reimbursement to the States for relocation of utility facilities under consideration for several years. 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 are used to participate to the same extent as if the property were owned by a private individual. If 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 participate in such costs. There remains the question, however, whether Federal-aid funds should be used to participate in the cost of relocating utility facilities where no vested property right is taken, and the utility is not entitled to compensation under State law. Where the utilities occupy the highway rights-of-way as a privilege and have acquired no vested interest in the rights-of-way, most States formerly required the utilities to bear the cost of relocating their facilities when such relocation was necessary to permit highway improvement.

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 some public land States, and expressly authorized the use of Federal-aid funds for reimbursement of the cost of relocating utility facilities, significant action has been taken 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 in 40 States. Such legislation was passed in 22 States, but was vetoed in 6 States, so it became law in 16 States. Under these 16 State laws only 1 State will pay the cost of relocating utility facilities on all State-maintained highways, 5 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.

The committee did not contemplate this drastic change in existing practices when the 1956 act was enacted, and realizes that the use of Federal funds for reimbursement to the States for this purpose will increase substantially, thereby reducing the amount of Federal funds available for construction of highways.

The committee recommends an amendment to section 111 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse a State from Federal funds for the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by construction of a project on any of the Federal-aid highway systems, whenever a State under State laws is required to pay for all or any part of such cost. Federal funds shall be used for such reimbursement in the same proportion as such funds are expended on the project, not to exceed 70 percent of such cost which the State is obligated to pay. Such reimbursement would be made only after presentation of satisfactory evidence to the Secretary of Commerce that the State has paid such cost from its own funds. These amended provisions would only apply to Federal-aid highway projects covered by formal project agreements executed by the Secretary subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

Under this proposed amendment, it was the intent of the committee that reimbursement to the States from Federal funds for utility relocations would be made only on the basis of State funds actually expended for such purposes, and not for funds paid, advanced, donated, or contributed, by or from any other source.

A summary of State legislative action with respect to the authorization of utility relocation costs is as follows:

In all, 40 States have considered legislation which would provide for payment by the State of the cost of relocating utility facilities during the 1956 and 1957 sessions. Of these, 39 were considered during the past year. Massachusetts enacted its reimbursement statute in 1956.

During the 1957 session:

(a) Such proposals were favorably considered in 21 legislatures; 15 became law—Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah; while 6 were vetoed—Colorado, Kansas, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wyoming.

(b) In 18 legislatures, such measures were either defeated, withdrawn, or not acted on: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

(c) The legislatures of Kentucky, Mississippi, and Virginia did not meet during 1957,

while no measures of this type were introduced in Louisiana (budget session only), Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, and South Carolina. In addition, studies of the problem of utility relocation and its cost were authorized in Arkansas, Michigan, and Minnesota. New York and Washington adopted laws which limited reimbursement to municipally owned facilities. Of all the measures proposed, regardless of final disposition, 38 related either to all Federal-aid highway projects or the Interstate System alone, while only those in California and Connecticut related to all State highways. Of the 16 relocation laws passed—

(1) Ten relate only to projects on the Interstate System—Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas. Five relate to all Federal-aid projects—Idaho, Massachusetts, Montana, New Mexico, and Utah. One relates to all State maintained highways—Connecticut.

(2) The laws of Massachusetts and Illinois give the highway authorities discretion in the matter of whether or not the utilities should be paid for relocating facilities.

(3) Nebraska and North Dakota specifically made reimbursement subject to existing contracts between the utilities and the State or local governments.

While only New Mexico and Texas provided that existing contracts are not a bar to payment, it is apparent from the language of the laws of the other 12 States that such contracts are not an obstacle to reimbursement. (Minnesota is now in the process of rewriting its existing utility contracts on this point.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works, if the amendment is withdrawn will the position of the junior Senator from Texas be stated in an unprejudiced way to the committee of conference of the two Houses?

Mr. GORE. It will be stated possibly with a little favor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Then, in the light of the statement of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I withdraw the amendment and withdraw the request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn, and the request for the yeas and nays is withdrawn.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "3-25-58-F" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 1, after the word "shall", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "except as provided in section 2 of this act."

On page 7, line 6, after the word "shall", insert a comma and the following: "except as provided in section 2 of this act."

On page 8, beginning with line 20, strike out all down to and including line 13 on page 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. (a) Immediate apportionment of $400 million of the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban authorization for 1960: Immediately upon enactment of this act $400 million of the sum authorized by section 1 of this act to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

On page 9, lines 14 and 15, strike out "authorized to be appropriated in section 2 (a) herein" and insert in lieu thereof "required to be apportioned by section 2 (a)."

On page 11, beginning with line 21, strike out all over to and including line 4 on page 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(h) It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress in the enactment of this section to make funds available for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary or secondary systems, including extensions of these systems within urban areas, for the purpose of immediate acceleration of the rate of highway construction on these systems.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the quorum call will be charged to the time of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. That is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBLITZELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. For what purpose?

Mr. KERR. In order that I may ask unanimous consent to have read an amendment which has been agreed to by the members of the committee present, and to see whether the amendment can be unanimously agreed to by the Senate. If not, we shall wait until the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky has been acted on.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, and that the time required shall not be charged to the time available to me, in connection with my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, in line 18, it is proposed to change the period to a comma and to insert the following: "subject to delays caused by circumstances and conditions beyond the control of, and without the fault of, any contractor on such contracts, and delays created by acts of God."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has conferred with me about the amendment. I believe the amendment is a good one, and should be included in the bill.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, I have submitted the amendment to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]; and the amendment has their approval.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his courtesy.

Mr. COOPER. I have been glad to cooperate with the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I had hoped that a larger number of Senators would be present at this time, because my amendment, if adopted, would materially alter the bill—in fact, perhaps more so than any other amendment which has been proposed, other than the amendment dealing with billboards.

I wish to have the Senators who are present understand the purpose of my amendment.

Section 1 of the pending bill provides the usual and normal authorizations for appropriations for the next biennial period: Section 1 provides that for fiscal year 1960, $900 million shall be authorized for appropriation; and for 1961, $900 million. As Senators well know, that is the usual manner of making appropriation authorizations in advance, for the next biennium.

Section 2 of the bill provides that a new and special appropriation shall be authorized for the fiscal year 1959, namely, $400 million.

The Highway Act of 1956 authorized the appropriation of $875 million for fiscal year 1959. The pending bill would authorize the appropriation of an additional $400 million.

I point out to the Senate something which has hardly been mentioned during the debate, namely, that the $400 million authorized by section 2 would not be paid from the trust fund established by the Highway Act of 1956. Instead, it will be paid from the general revenues of the Treasury—which means that in 1959 the budget will be increased by $400 million.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. In response to the point the Senator from Kentucky has made, let me say that 2 days ago, on the floor of the Senate, I interrogated the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. It was my understanding—and I was the

one who proposed the $400 million provision—that what the Senator from Kentucky has just stated is absolutely correct, namely, that the payment was to be made out of the general funds of the Treasury, and not out of the trust fund. But in our colloquy with the other members of the committee on the floor, the day before yesterday, that was not the general understanding of the members of the committee.

I have not been able to find in the bill, as it has come to the floor, any provision to indicate that this payment would not be a charge on the trust funds, instead of on the general funds of the Treasury.

Mr. COOPER. The funds which are authorized in section 1 for appropriation for the biennial period are required by the 1956 act to be paid from the trust fund.

The hearings show that a deficit is now anticipated in the trust fund; that is admitted. Yesterday evening, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] stated that he would vote against the bill, because there would be a deficit in the trust fund, and because a large part of the appropriations being authorized by this bill must be paid out of the general revenues.

I have also talked about this matter with officials of the Bureau of Public Roads. I can say to the junior Senator from New Hampshire that there is no question that the funds that would be appropriated as a result of the special authorization of $400 million, which is to be added to the existing authorization of $875 million, must be paid from the general funds of the Treasury.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I appreciate that assurance, because that was the intent. I talked with representatives of the Bureau of Public Roads, but I was not assured on that point. I had prepared an amendment to make sure that the funds would come from the moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

But if the Senator from Kentucky has settled that point, that amendment will not be necessary. So I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I understand that the committee included the special authorization for an additional $400 million appropriation in order to increase the letting of new contracts in the States on the ABC systems, and thus to stimulate employment, and the use of construction materials and equipment.

I assume that the committee's reason for adding $400 million to the authorization of $875 million for fiscal year 1959 was to make the bill an antirecession measure.

I will agree that highway construction is one of the best and surest methods of stimulating employment throughout the States and in every section of the States, and I approve that purpose. But I say that in this case, the provision of an additional $400 million is not necessary.

I give my reasons. My amendment would strike out that part of section 2 which would authorize a new appropriation of $400 million, but it would not leave the question of stimulating employment unanswered. Because, as a substitute for the special appropriation of $400 million, my amendment would advance for immediate apportionment to the States $400 million from the new authorization of $900 million for fiscal year 1960.

Instead of appropriating $400 million of new money, my amendment, if it should be adopted, would simply advance the expenditure of $400 million of the 1960 authorization, which would be made in the ordinary course of providing funds for the highway system in the next biennial period.

We know that after July 1 the entire $900 million can be apportioned, and must be apportioned before December 1958. All my amendment would do would be to advance the apportionment of $400 million of the total sum by a few months. It would serve exactly the same purpose as a special appropriation. The identical amount of money could be apportioned to the States under both the committee bill and my amendment. Each would provide funds for the same amount of new contracts, and each would put the same number of men to work. The only difference is this: The committee provision adds $400 million to the fiscal year 1959 budget; my provision does not add a penny.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. In the bill $400 million is provided, of course, as the Senator has stated, as a special fund, which, if it were not used by any State, would revert to the Treasury, and would not in any way interfere with the 50–50 funds of the 2 succeeding years. The point about the Senator's amendment I should like to be sure of in my mind is this. If, under his amendment, State X is unable, or for some reason does not see its way clear, to make use of the advanced funds on a 70–30 basis, so the funds are not used in the time specified and in the manner specified, does that State lose that amount of money on the 50–50 basis in the succeeding year, or can the funds be taken in the succeeding year on a 50–50 basis?

Mr. COOPER. My amendment would not change in any way the other provisions in the committee bill. It would maintain the 70–30 matching basis so far as the $400 million is concerned. It would maintain the special appropriation of $115 million in Federal funds to the States to help them match. It would maintain the requirement that the $400 million advance must be obligated in the time provided in the committee bill. It would not interfere with the full use of the $900 million authorized for fiscal year 1960, except to advance $400 million for immediate apportionment.

I should like to make it clear that all my amendment does is simply reduce the spending provided in the bill by $400 million, without in any way affecting the acceleration of highway work.

Mr. COTTON. I fear I did not make myself quite plain. That is exactly what disturbs me, because if the Senator's amendment leaves unchanged the present provision in the bill then any portion of the $400 million which is not used, or the use of which is not availed of by the States, will lapse. I believe the Senator's amendment means that the States should use the $400 million in advance, and if they do not use it, for any reason, they may lose it the succeeding year. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. No; the States would not lose the money at all. It simply means that if the States obligate the full apportionment from the $400 million that would be advanced in my proposal, within the time of obligation provided in the committee amendment, then they enjoy the 70–30 matching basis. If they do not, they go back to the 50–50 matching basis at the end of that period, for the unobligated amounts of the $400 million advance.

Mr. COTTON. I hope the Senator will forgive me if I seem unduly insistent. I direct the Senator's attention to page 9 of the bill, lines 18 through 21. It refers to the special $400 million now provided in the bill, and reads:

> Any amounts apportioned to a State under provisions of this section remaining unexpended as above provided on December 1, 1958, shall lapse.

If the Senator's amendment means that if the States can and do avail themselves of the 70–30 ratio, and obligate themselves and use it, they get it, and if they cannot so use it, the States are still entitled to the 50–50 matching basis in the succeeding year, so that they will not lose any of the regular appropriation, that is one thing; but if it means the States must draw the funds in advance and obligate them and spend them, and if they do not do so the funds are taken away from them in the succeeding years, on the 50–50 basis, then I think it ought to be corrected.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the point the Senator has raised. If my amendment should be adopted, and $400 million of the $900 million for fiscal year 1960 should be advanced for apportionment, and then a portion of that fund should not be obligated by a State, the Senator's question is, Would the unobligated funds be lost forever, or would they revert to the 1960 authorization?

Mr. COTTON. On a 50–50 basis.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has raised a proper question. If the Senator has any doubt about it—although I do not—line 21 on page 9 could be amended by inserting, in place of the words "shall lapse," the words "shall be apportioned in the way provided in section 1."

Mr. COTTON. I think that would be a distinct improvement.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer that as a perfecting amendment on page 9, line 21, to strike out the words "shall lapse" and insert in lieu thereof the words "shall be apportioned according to section 1."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the first place, may I say I doubt that the money would lapse.

Mr. COOPER. I do not believe it would lapse.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thought the Senator's amendment would provide for the elimination of subsection (d) and make the money available in the regular 50–50 proportion rather than on a 70–30 basis.

If the Senator leaves the subsection (d) in the bill, which provides for a 70 percent contribution by the Federal Government with respect to this amount of money, and also leaves in the authorization for an advance carried in subsection (e) I doubt that any of the money would be unobligated by the 1st of December 1958. With the modification put in as to December 1, 1959, I doubt that any money would fail to be expended by that time.

I think the modification the Senator now seeks to make could be properly handled simply by striking out the last sentence in subsection (d). After all, if the Senator's amendment is adopted, the money will be apportioned to the States.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator merely required it to be contracted for by the 1st of December 1958, that would accomplish the purpose of getting the work under contract. Why should the second sentence be there at all?

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There would be involved a forcing back to the general fund, to reapportion the money to the same State.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, without losing his right to the floor, let me say I agree with both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from South Dakota that little, if any, of the funds would lapse, because the States of course would have the incentive of obtaining funds on a 70–30 basis instead of a 50–50 basis.

That such would happen is by no means beyond the realm of possibility in the case we are considering. My amendment to the bill would provide an additional sum which could be used, and used at once, or which would go into the Treasury if not used. In this case the money would be handled a little differently. There would be a difference between using it at once on a 70–30 basis or letting it remain for another year, when it could be used on a 50–50 basis.

There are States which have quite a problem as to matching the Federal funds, particularly when the legislatures are not in session and funds are perhaps tight.

I cannot see how such a provision in the bill could do harm. In fact, it certainly could not do any harm. If the language represents poor workmanship or poor draftsmanship, it can be adjusted in the committee of conference. I cannot see how such a provision could do harm. I think we can improve the provision by stating it in plain language:

Any amounts apportioned to a State under provisions of this section—

If the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is adopted—

remaining unexpended as above provided on December 1, 1958, shall be available in the next year—

Or however it may be desired to phrase it—

on the regular 50–50 basis.

Then it would be in such form that "he that runs may read."

Then the States would have the option of speeding up the work on a 70–30 basis, or getting funds later on a 50–50 basis. I think that is rather important.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. COOPER. If the Senator will permit, I should like to complete my statement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I complete my comment on that matter?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the Senator's suggestion, specifying that funds shall remain with a State but be available after a certain date for use on the regular 50–50 basis, is constructive. The money should be available for the normal period of any apportionment on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, there is no point in continuing a long discussion of this matter. I am perfectly conscious and appreciative of the tremendous amount of work the committee has done on the bill, and of the merits of the bill which has been reported.

But I repeat, that in the debate, which has continued for 3 days, there has been hardly any notice of the fact that the committee bill provides for an increase in the Federal budget for fiscal year 1959 of $400 million for the ABC system, and I think without need. It is obvious, as I have said, that the purpose of adding $400 million was to combat the recession—to put people to work. Yet, in the same bill another appropriation of $900 million is authorized which will become available after July 1.

My proposal is simple: To strike the $400 million of new appropriations from section 1 and to substitute in its place $400 million of the regular authorization of $900 million, which would in any case be apportioned after July 1. It would simply mean that $400 million would be immediately apportioned, the States could immediately begin to make contracts, and men could be put to work. The effect would be exactly the same, so far as putting people to work is concerned, as the use of the special appropriation of $400 million.

The only difference between the proposal of the committee in section 2, and my amendment, is that my amendment would not add new obligations to the Federal Treasury. The committee proposal would add $400 million of new expenditures.

I shall address myself to a second point and then close. The bill has other implications. For the past 2 months we have talked about nothing in this Chamber except recession. I do not say that in criticism, but rather in approval, because we are all concerned about the recession and men and women who are out of work. However, until consideration of the pending bill, our action has been limited to accelerating work under existing appropriations.

A few days ago we adopted two resolutions which had been submitted by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. What was the theme of those resolutions? It was to express the sense of the Congress that public works expenditures and defense expenditures should be accelerated, from appropriations which had been previously made.

The housing bill dealt with loans rather than with new appropriations.

Likewise, the administration program thus far has been concerned with accelerating the expenditure of funds which have already been appropriated.

But in the pending bill we are embarking upon a public works program and making available new and additional appropriations, above the level of ordinary appropriations. I do not say that this should not be done if public works are to be the choice of the Congress, to meet the recession. But in the next few weeks we may be required to come to grips with the issue of whether we shall embark on a greatly expanded public works program, or whether to cut taxes.

One question which I raise is whether without considering our future course and choice, we should provide this special appropriation of $400 million, before it is actually needed.

I have not heard my proposal challenged. I have talked with officials of the Bureau of Public Roads about it. It would perform exactly the same function as the special appropriation of $400 million.

I have talked with members of the committee. They do not question that my amendment would meet exactly the same purpose as the committee proposed.

I have presented my amendment in the belief that we can properly strike $400 million from the bill. Later, if it should become necessary to appropriate additional funds, of course, the Congress could provide them. It seems to me that it is unnecessary to appropriate the additional $400 million at this time.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator feel that the appropriation of the additional money provided for in the bill now before the Senate would not only have a beneficial effect in stepping up employment, but would have a wholesale and good psychological effect?

Mr. COOPER. I wholly agree that the $400 million special appropriation, in the committee bill would permit the States to enter into new contracts, and put people to work. I do not deny that fact. What I am saying is that my proposal, which would advance the apportionment of $400 million of the $900 million authorized in the bill, would have exactly the same effect. The only difference between the two proposals is that one involves an additional charge

on the Treasury of $400 million, and my amendment would not add an additional penny to the obligations of the Treasury.

Mr. KERR. Is there the slightest doubt in the mind of the Senator from Kentucky that if his amendment were to be adopted and become law, either later this year or early next year the Congress would replace, in the 1960 apportionment, the $400 million which would be taken out of it by the Senator's amendment?

Mr. COOPER. That might be done. But it would not affect the total charge on the budget over a period of 2 years.

Mr. KERR. Does not this money come out of the trust fund?

Mr. COOPER. It comes out of the trust fund.

Mr. KERR. Does that affect the budget?

Mr. COOPER. No; that would not affect the budget.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator feel that psychologically the States would get the impression that, on the one hand, we were advancing them $400 million to speed up construction and to provide employment for constructive purposes, and, on the other hand, taking it away from them, so that realistically they would then have to reduce their plans for the fiscal year 1960 accordingly?

Mr. COOPER. I do not believe so. As the Senator knows, in section 1 of the bill there is an authorization of $900 million, to be apportioned to the States.

Mr. KERR. When?

Mr. COOPER. It could be apportioned after July 1.

Mr. KERR. For what fiscal year?

Mr. COOPER. For the fiscal year 1960.

Mr. KERR. But if the Senator's amendment were adopted, $900 million could not be apportioned after July 1, for 1960.

Mr. COOPER. The remainder, $500 million, could be apportioned.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. But the $400 million which could be apportioned now, and the $500 million to be apportioned after July 1, equal $900 million, exactly the same sum as though the total apportionment of it had been postponed until after July 1.

Mr. KERR. But it is not the same as $400 million for 1959 and $900 million for 1960.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has put his finger on the important point. What the committee has done has been to decide that it wished to add $400 million of new appropriations for the fiscal year 1959. The committee has decided that it wishes to spend that additional sum. Of course, that is a valid decision so far as the committee is concerned. What I am saying is that it would not add any more to immediate employment than the solution I have proposed.

Mr. KERR. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that, so far as immediate employment is concerned, employment for 1958 would be affected by the apportionment which would be available to the highway departments beginning on July 1, 1958?

Mr. COOPER. They would have $900 million, under section 1, which they could apportion.

Mr. KERR. But they would not have that if the Senator's amendment were adopted.

Mr. COOPER. Certainly they would. They would have $400 million, which could be apportioned before July 1, and $500 million to be apportioned after July 1.

Mr. KERR. I hope the Senator will withdraw his amendment. I feel that there is general agreement among Senators that the committee bill, so far as the stepped-up construction program authorized in it is concerned, should be approved; and I sincerely urge the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the Senator's position, but I am serious in the proposal I make. In my view the committee is calling for the expenditure of $400 million when I do not think it is required at this time. If it is required later, it can be authorized.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I am one of those who do not feel disposed, at the beginning of this period, when we do not know whether to be optimistic or pessimistic, to assume that in the fiscal year 1959 we shall be compelled to make additional appropriations. We shall be able to make that decision when we return after the first of the year, if conditions warrant it. I do not wish to add my prediction that we shall have to do it after the first of the year. So I am much in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the provision of an additional $400 million in the bill, to be apportioned to the States for use without restriction by the usual formulas pertaining to primary, secondary, and urban roads, to be used immediately on projects which will be completed in the near future, is the very essence of the bill.

It was my position in the committee that I did not like to see $1¾ billion dollars put into the Interstate System at this time. I happen to believe that we are a bit dazzled by this great Interstate System.

One thing is certain, and that is that putting extra money into the Interstate System would not have any immediate effect or impact on our economy. I regret that that was done, and that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Virginia was not adopted last night. I cannot help but feel that retaining in the bill the $1¾ billion of extra money to accelerate construction of the Interstate System, and then impairing the use of the $400 million for the ABC roads, is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

This money goes into the system where it will have an immediate impact. The highway commissioner of my State informed me that he could use this money and have the work begin within 2 months after the passage of the bill. It goes out into the States and can be channeled into the spots where it is most needed.

There is less money used in buying rights-of-way and less money used in engineering and in planning and in preparing, and more money goes into employment and into roads, in the ABC system than in the Interstate System by far.

That is one point in this bill that is important. I have steadfastly been against pump priming. I agree with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. We certainly should not rush headlong into any pump-priming projects. However, if there is one spot where the plans are all made and are no longer on the drawing boards, but ready to go, and where the money will have an immediate impact and put men to work on jobs that are not wasted, but in building the most necessary thing in this country, it is in the building of the ABC roads by the States.

I am not greatly upset by the amendment offered by the able Senator from Kentucky. He has in mind all the things I have just said. To a certain extent his amendment would effectuate the same thing. However, the fact remains that just as sure as we are sitting in this chamber today, when next year comes along and the States have used up a part of their apportionment on the very necessary ABC road projects, they will come to us, and we will give them back what we have taken or had them borrow in advance on this special program.

That being the case, it would seem to me, having put into the Interstate System—by borrowing from the trust fund and borrowing $2 million of outside money from the Treasury—all this money, which cannot possibly have an effect for all this time, the program of the additional $400 million is a reasonable and sensible one, and it should not be impaired—although it would not be ruined or seriously harmed—by watering it down and saying to the States, "You may borrow this money and use it now and take it out of your next year's apportionment." It is highly essential that the highway departments of the various States find the money. They can find it if they really want to. It is highly essential that they find the money and start work now, not sometime next year. That is all written in the bill.

If there is one place in the whole economy where I am ready to concede that the situation we are facing now makes it profitable and sensible to have some speedy work added to our present program, it is in the ABC highways of the various States.

For these reasons, I hope the amendment will not be adopted and that the provision as set forth in the bill will remain in it. I repeat, however, that in a measure the amendment of the

Senator from Kentucky is not aimed to defeat this purpose, but I think it weakens the purpose.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate contains one important amendment which was suggested by the able senior Senator from Kentucky. He appeared before the committee and testified. That is the provision which moves back from December 31, to July 1 the time for making apportionments of funds authorized for fiscal 1960. The committee agreed unanimously that this should be done.

I should like to say also that the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, in a letter to the Public Roads Subcommittee, suggested the necessity of accelerating immediately improvements to our primary and secondary roads.

The only difference between the provisions of the committee bill and the proposal of the distinguished and able senior Senator from Kentucky is that the committee recommends an additonal apportionment for 1959, where as the senior Senator from Kentucky recommends that $400 million of the regular apportionment for fiscal 1960 be used in fiscal 1959. Both would bring about the same amount of improvement and acceleration in fiscal 1959, but the difficulty of it, as I see it, is that we are now also providing for the regular apportionments for fiscal 1960 and 1961. Indeed, there is pending before the Senate a bill which the House of Representatives has already passed, to provide for the biennial apportionment for 1960 and 1961.

If we adopt the amendment, which would strip our regular programs for 1960, our committee would have to meet almost immediately and report another bill to provide for the 1960 apportionment. Our States, our counties, and our highway departments are geared to the regular highway program for which we have made regular authorizations and apportionments.

The pending bill contains the regular biennial apportionment and authorization, and it is the purpose of the chairman of the subcommittee to ask unanimous consent to substitute the pending bill for the House bill, thus placing into conference the accelerated program and the regular annual apportionments.

The senior Senator from Kentucky seeks primarily the same goal which the committee seeks. However, we do not feel that we can disrupt the regular program in order to provide for acceleration now. I believe our States would seriously object to it. I am sure they would prefer not to disrupt their regular program, and perhaps they would prefer no acceleration at all, if such acceleration were provided at the expense of the regular program for fiscal 1960.

I hope the Senator from Kentucky will accede to the unanimous view of the subcommittee, as I believe it to be, that we do not disrupt the regular programs for 1960 and 1961.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, before yielding back the remainder of my time, I should like to say to the Senator from Tennessee that when he was describing the purpose of my amendment, I was reminded of the young lawyer before the Supreme Court. When the Chief Justice finally took up his case and described the issues, the young lawyer said to the Chief Justice that the Justice had stated the case almost as well as he could.

The Senator from Tennessee has stated the case fairly. There is no distinction between the committee proposal and my proposal, except that mine would save the Federal Government $400 million. My proposal would have the same effect upon putting men to work at this time.

As the Senator from Tennessee has said, since this sum will be apportioned by July 1, anyway, it simply would mean that the amount would be apportioned 3 months earlier.

So I do not think it would have much effect upon the next biennial program of road construction. But that is the issue, and the Senate can vote on it.

Mr. KERR. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. President, I sincerely regret to have to disagree with the Senator from Kentucky. He was mistaken, though, in my judgment, when he said the amendment would have no effect upon the 1960–61 program. As the Senator from Tennessee pointed out, Congress traditionally and historically passes a highway construction bill each biennium, and they pass it for the biennium.

In both the House bill now before the Senate and in the committee bill which is before the Senate, provision is made for the regular highway construction work for the biennium.

The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky would take $400 million out of the program for the biennium; then, if the bill were passed, it would serve notice on the States that while they can step up their program immediately to the extent of $400 million, they would be on notice that in preparing for their program for the biennium, the program would have to be on a basis of $400 million less than that provided for in either the House bill or the committee bill, and on the basis of $375 million less than the regular apportionment for the fiscal year 1959.

So I again urge the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to withdraw his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from Kentucky will yield back the remainder of his time, I will yield back mine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has indicated that he would yield back his time. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield back his time?

Mr. KERR. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "3–25–58–E." I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD, without being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON's amendment is as follows:

At the proper place insert the following:

That the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 is amended by adding immediately following section 113 the following new section:

"SEC. 113A. Increased mileage for Interstate System.

"In the case of any State having a toll road, bridge, or tunnel which is approved by the Secretary as a part of the Interstate System under section 113 (a) of this act before June 30, 1958, the Secretary shall, upon application by the State, designate as part of the Interstate System other routes within such State which are equal in mileage to the length of all such toll roads, bridges, and tunnels within such State."

SEC. 2. Section 108 (1) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Increase in mileage: Section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), relating to the Interstate System, is hereby amended by striking out '41,000 miles' and inserting in lieu thereof '41,000 plus the total of all amounts designated as part of the Interstate System under section 113A of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956': *Provided*, That the cost of completing any mileage authorized by this subsection in excess of 40,000 miles shall be included in making the estimates of cost for completing the Interstate System as provided in subsection (d) of this section."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to grant each State having a toll road on the Interstate System an equivalent mileage to be designated as a part of the Interstate System, and thus to be eligible for 90-percent Federal aid.

The Federal Highway Act of 1956 changed the matching provisions with regard to the Interstate Highway System by increasing the Federal share of the cost of any such project to 90 percent, the remaining 10 percent to be paid by the States. Because of the incorporation into the Interstate System of State-financed toll roads, the States in which such roads are located are losing a large percentage of Federal aid for interstate mileage to which they would be entitled.

The practical effect of the amendment would be to add 2,254 miles to the Interstate System in 26 States. Twenty-six States at present have a certain mileage in toll roads. Kansas happens to have the third largest mileage of toll roads in the Nation. New York is first, and Pennsylvania is second.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the mileage of toll road facilities approved by the Secretary of Commerce as a part of the Interstate System.

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

Mileage of toll facilities approved by the Secretary of Commerce as part of the Interstate System under sec. 113 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956

State:	*Mileage* [1]
California	1.0
Connecticut	98.0
Delaware	4.1
Florida	42.5
Georgia	.8
Illinois	152.5
Indiana	156.9
Iowa	3.3
Kansas	186.6
Kentucky	40.2
Maine	60.1
Maryland	11.0
Massachusetts	123.0
Michigan	5.0
Missouri	4.8
Nebraska	.3
New Hampshire	13.9
New Jersey	49.9
New York	518.0
Ohio	174.5
Oklahoma	175.0
Oregon	.9
Pennsylvania	359.0
Texas	29.6
Virginia	43.6
West Virginia	.3
Total	2,254.8

[1] Mileage taken from Bureau of Public Roads release of August 21, 1957, and from table A-1a, p. 12 of Secretary of Commerce report of January 7, 1958 (H. Doc. 301, 85th Cong., 2d sess.).

Mr. CARLSON. Unless some provision is made to compensate the States which had the vision and foresight to construct these roads to assist in handling the ever-increasing volume of traffic, they will not receive their fair share of the funds voted by Congress for the construction of the Interstate System as approved by Congress in the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

Let us consider, for example, Kansas. What will happen to that State? First, on the almost 190 miles of highway which has been designated as a part of the Interstate System tolls are paid by those who travel a large part of the Interstate System in Kansas. This means, of course, that the motorist will be riding free on the Interstate System in adjoining States—Oklahoma and Missouri, for instance—while he will be paying toll charges when traveling in the State of Kansas on the Kansas Interstate System. Not only will he be paying tolls for traveling on the Kansas road, but he will also be paying a tax to build free roads in other States.

Furthermore, the citizens of Kansas who ride on the Interstate System and pay tolls to the State will have an additional burden to bear.

Second, unless there is some provision whereby an adjustment may be made for the mileage of roads which have previously been constructed on a toll basis, Kansas will not receive its proportionate share of the taxes collected for the construction of the Interstate System.

Mr. President, I was not on the floor on Tuesday of this week when a colloquy occurred between the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] in regard to the compensation to States which face the problem of toll roads in the Interstate System.

For the RECORD, I wish to read the comment by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], as it appears on page 5244 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, March 25:

Mr. GORE. I can say in all candor to the able Senator from Connecticut that in our discussion in the subcommittee there was general recognition of the equities involved, and the report so states. Since the request of the able Senator from Connecticut is joined in by the ranking minority member of the committee, who served with distinction as chairman of the committee, I will say that hearings will be held whether the administration submits a recommendation or not.

As I understand from the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and from the Senator from Pennsylvania, hearings will be held by the Senate Committee on Public Works, with a view to bringing about, if possible, an adjustment of some of these inequities.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. From the record, the Senator from Kansas will notice that the request of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], which was joined in by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], was that the hearing be held after the governors' conference has reported on this subject. The distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] indicated that that report would be made rather early.

In view of this colloquy and this request, I hope it will be agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that the hearing await the report by the governors' conference and, if possible, the report and recommendation of the administration on this point.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the statement the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has made.

Mr. President, it is not my intention to press today for adoption of the amendment.

In Kansas and in 26 other States which have toll roads, this problem exists.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall go a step further: If the report from the governors' conference and the recommendation from the administration will be forthcoming, or if either will be forthcoming, within a reasonable time, we shall wait until then. If not, a hearing will be held in any event, before this session is over.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, that is a very definite statement, and, of course, it is the only kind of statement the Senator from Tennessee makes. I appreciate very much his statement.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I appreciate my colleague's courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. President, I desire to commend my colleague for pointing out, as other Senators have pointed out for the RECORD, the situation existing in the States which have toll roads.

As has been so ably pointed out by my junior colleague from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], certain inequities certainly will inure to the States which have these toll roads; and as my colleague has pointed out, the situation is one which we should deal with in equity and in good conscience.

So I desire to commend the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I also desire to commend the Senator from Connecticut, who has just given assurances to the junior Senator from Kansas and to our State.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague, the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], in pointing out that this problem exists in our State, and our State is concerned with it.

When 190 miles of toll road have already been built, and when they meet all the specifications for as modern a road as can be built, then we do have a problem. I believe that our State and other States in a similar situation are entitled to some aid, if possible.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas has presented a problem which concerns any Member of the Senate who has served on the Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee. We recognize that before we finish dealing with the Interstate System problems, something should be done in regard to the toll roads, in the case of the States in which toll roads have been constructed.

Of course, the question applies, not only to toll roads, but also to other roads of the primary system which have been incorporated into the Interstate System to the extent that they meet the standards of the Interstate System.

The problem is a perplexing one.

I would not contend that at the present time it is handled in a manner which is entirely satisfactory. Something should be done. But these studies are under way, both by the Bureau of Public Roads and by the governors' conference.

We also have the problem of trying to construct the maximum number of miles of road with the funds available. We recognize that, in that connection, there is a tendency to use roads already constructed.

But certainly the States in which toll roads have been constructed are entitled to a special hearing on that subject. So I was glad to hear the Senator from Kansas raise the question in the reasonable way in which he has raised it this afternoon; and I was also glad to hear the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads [Mr. GORE] assure the Senator from Kansas that hearings would be held as soon as the reports are available—or sooner, if they

are not received before the end of the session.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in line with what the senior Senator from Kansas has said, I wish to state that I realize this problem exists not only in the case of the States in which toll roads have been constructed, but also in the case of all the States which are affected by the Interstate System.

With this assurance by the able chairman of the Roads Subcommittee [Mr. GORE], I believe that something will be done to do justice and equity in the case of these States.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, undoubtedly Congress itself will have to solve this problem, for it is a most difficult one.

As the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has stated, the problem relates not only to toll roads, but also to other roads which meet the specifications.

I believe Pennsylvania is second in the number of miles of toll roads. In addition, Pennsylvania has at least 100 miles of roads which have been incorporated or included in the Interstate System, and which meet the specifications.

I believe we are fortunate in having the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]—one, a member of the Democratic Party; the other, a member of the Republican Party; and both of whom serve on the Subcommittee on Roads and both of whom are very much interested in this matter—make these statements this afternoon. I am glad they have brought up the matter again.

However, I believe that in the long run the Congress itself will have to solve this problem, because it will be very difficult for the executive agency and the governors to arrive at a solution which will be agreeable and satisfactory to everyone. So probably in the long run the Congress will have to take the responsibility.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement which has been made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, whose State is second in the number of miles of toll roads. In that respect, the order is as follows: New York, first; Pennsylvania, second; and Kansas, third.

I am glad to leave this matter in the able hands of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas has withdrawn his amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which is identified as No. 1 on the mimeographed sheet which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, it is proposed to strike out subsection (d), in lines 4 to 15, inclusive, as follows:

(d) The Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 70 percent of the total cost thereof plus, in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, a percentage of the remaining 30 percent of such cost equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided,* That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, so far as I know, this is the last amendment to be offered to the pending bill.

This amendment raises a simple, clear-cut issue. I do not intend to use the entire 30 minutes available to me to explain the amendment or to defend it. In a very few minutes I shall be able to explain it and to state what it will do.

However, Mr. President, I believe that a quorum should be present in advance of the taking of the vote on the question of the final passage of the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call, and that the time required for it not be charged to the time available to either side, under the unanimous consent agreement. Thereafter, I shall explain the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The pending amendment proposes to strike from the bill subparagraph (d), on page 10. This is the paragraph which would establish a special privilege for the $400 million emergency fund for the ABC roads. The bill, as I think all Senators are now aware, carries a special provision authorizing $400 million for the so-called ABC roads—primary, secondary, and urban roads—that amount to be be available for immediate apportionment to the States.

The $400 million would be in addition to the regular apportionments for the primary, secondary, and urban systems. It would be available under certain special conditions, and is tailormade to provide jobs. The special conditions are, first of all, that it is immediately available for apportionment. Second, that it must be obligated by the States by December 1, 1958. Further, that it must be completely transferable as between the systems once the apportionment is made to the States. Finally, that a portion of the money may be borrowed from the Federal Government so that actually a State would have to put up only 10 percent of the amount provided by the Federal Government.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator's statement is correct, then the Senator from Oklahoma has misunderstood the effect of the amendment. If the Senator from Oklahoma understood the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, it would strike the 70–30 matching formula insofar as the extra $400 million is concerned, and that would then cause a State to revert to the matching formula of 50–50. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is precisely correct.

Mr. KERR. Subsections (e) and (f) being left as they are now, the States would be permitted to borrow 20 percent of the total, or two-fifths of their 50 percent matching requirements, and therefore they would have to put up 30 percent in order to have the benefit of the $400 million, instead of, as I just understood the Senators to say, the States being able to get the money insofar as cash is concerned, by putting up 10 percent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That would not be true unless something further were done to the other paragraphs of the bill.

Mr. KERR. What would not be true?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would not be true that the States would have to put up only 10 percent. They would have to put up 30 percent, in effect, if we did nothing to the other portions of the bill.

I thought I should address myself to the issue with respect to the $400 million, and whether we wanted to adopt a new formula for matching. The other group would have to be taken care of in conference.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. KERR. It could not be taken care of in conference, since it is not in the House bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Paragraph (e) would still be in the bill which will go to conference.

Mr. KERR. But there would be nothing in conference contrary to it. Therefore, the conferees could not give a greater benefit to the States than would be contained in either bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, that is true, although there could be some modification of whatever language was retained. The amount could be reduced downward.

I was trying to explain the bill as it is now before the Senate. The States would have to put up only 10 percent in actual cash, they could borrow 20 percent, which would constitute 30 percent, and that would be all they would be required to put up in order to get their

share of the $400 million, as that would be available to them on a 70 to 30 matching basis.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. KERR. The statement the Senator from South Dakota has just made sets forth what the situation would be if the committee bill were passed without the Senator's amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

The issue I am presenting is merely whether we should change the historical formula for the ABC roads. In 1916, when the basic Federal Highway Act was passed, the 50–50 principle was established, 50 percent to be paid by the Federal Government and 50 percent to be paid by the State. That principle has been retained during 40 years of roadbuilding with no exception, so far as the money of the Bureau of Public Roads is concerned.

The only time, so far as I know, when there was any change was when a 60–40 emergency fund was made available for the Interstate System. I am inclined to think those funds came out of PWA money, but I am not too sure about that. In any event, so far as the ABC roads are concerned, through the years they have been on a 50–50 basis, 50 percent to be paid by the Federal Government and 50 percent to be paid by the State.

During the WPA days, the Work Projects Administration did accept road projects and had a great deal of discretion as to such projects, as they did with other projects. The WPA had some road projects which might have been constructed on some basis other than 50–50. But, so far as the Bureau of Public Roads is concerned, they have operated on a 50–50 basis through the years.

So far as I know, the States have not requested any change in the matching formula. I do not recall any testimony before the committee that the States proposed any change in the matching formula.

If we are thinking of the pending legislation in terms of providing jobs, we might bear in mind the fact that if we keep the program on a 70–30 basis with respect to the $400 million, the States will have to put up approximately $170 million, which will provide a total of $570 million worth of road jobs. On the other hand, if the States have to put up an equal amount, or have to put up 50 percent, we will have the $400 million multiplied by 2, or a total of $800 million worth of road work.

The ABC roads provide more jobs per dollar than the roads of the Interstate System. I was talking with an official of the Bureau of Public Roads this morning, and I asked what would be a fair figure of the dollars necessary to provide a man year of work on an ABC road. The suggestion was made that $5,000 was a fair figure. Using that as the criterion, $570 million would provide about 114,000 man-year jobs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

On the other hand, the $800 million which would be provided if we had $400 million from the States and $400 million from the Federal Government would provide 160,000 man-year jobs, as compared with the 114,000 man-year jobs estimated under the 70–30 matching basis.

There is one further point I am sure Senators are aware of, which I should like to make before I conclude.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he goes to another point?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Using the estimate of the Senator as to the amount of funds required to produce a man-year of employment, which the able Senator said the Bureau of Public Roads representative submitted to him as to the ABC roads, and applying the $5,000 figure to the additional sums which will be placed under contract this calendar year as a result of enactment of the pending bill, we arrive at a total of 544,000 potential jobs.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, there is one final point I wish to bring to the attention of Senators. I do not think it needs emphasis from me.

Today the treasuries of the States are in better shape than is the Treasury of the Federal Government. If the Federal Government provides $400 million on a 70–30 basis, and then loans an additional 20 percent, the money will have to be raised by the Federal Treasury which now is borrowing money. Some of the States would not have to borrow money. The States are better able to provide the full 50 percent than the Federal Government is able to provide 70 percent, asking the States only for 30 percent.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I personally think the idea of using some money for work on the ABC roads is a good idea. Such work will provide the quickest means of employing people, in terms of roadbuilding. I should like to see the maximum benefit derived from such funds. I think the issue must be presented to the Senate, and that is why I have raised the question.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senate should express itself as to whether it wants to leave the historic 50–50 basis and go to a 70–30 basis with respect to the emergency $400 million.

Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Ohio and then I shall yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I understand it is the position of the Senator from South Dakota that it would not be good judgment to abandon the historic policy used for the building of ABC roads, under which the Federal Government has put up 50 percent of the funds and the States have matched the money with an equal 50 percent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it would be a dangerous precedent to establish.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is also a fact that now, while we are trying to reestablish the soundness of the national economy, a danger is involved in modifying the historic policies which have worked so well. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I agree with the Senator. I think we raise the probability that it will become easier to make a change the next time, and again and again, until finally the principle will have disappeared.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My fear, Mr. President, is that with the adoption of an Interstate System we establish hope in the minds of many people in the States that eventually the responsibility of the States will be completely ended and the responsibility for building highways will be taken over entirely by the Federal Government. We have presently 41,000 miles in the Interstate System. I fear that year by year the mileage will be increased, and year by year increased contributions will be asked for other parts of the highway system.

I think the position of the Senator from South Dakota is sound, and that we ought to be gravely concerned so as not to put the Federal Government completely into the building of the highway system. I say that because of the huge financial responsibility the Federal Government already has, without taking on in perpetuity new burdens and responsibilities.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator for his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield myself 3 additional minutes, and I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

I think the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has very clearly stated the purpose of his amendment, as he always does in his arguments before this body, arguments which are very fair.

If I understand the purpose and the effect of the amendment, I find myself in opposition to the Senator from South Dakota.

A special fund of $400 million is provided as something extra, over and above the usual appropriation for the primary, secondary, and urban roads, which was placed in the bill originally, as has been said—and it was discussed at length in the committee—for the purpose of speeding up or accelerating work, so that there could be added employment in the various States. In order to make the program attractive to the States, so that the States could go ahead and use the funds, it was provided that the money should be advanced to the States upon the basis of 70 percent to be paid by the Federal Government and 30 percent to be paid by the States, with the further right of the States to borrow against future allocations of Federal money for roads

known as primary, secondary, and urban improvement roads.

The most attractive feature of the whole bill, the one which permits so many States in the Union to avail themselves of the program, I may say to the Senator, is the very provision of the 70 percent payment by the Federal Government and 30 percent payment by the States. Unquestionably it is the best provision in the bill if we really seek to increase employment, and to give people the opportunity to work at this time. The system is different from the Interstate System in this respect: The so-called ABC roads, primary and secondary roads, are already planned. There is no necessity for delay for engineering and other preliminary work. The projects are ready to proceed.

I respect the opinion of the Senator very highly, but on the point of the States having more money available, I cannot agree with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the distinguished Senator from South Dakota yield me an additional minute?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield the Senator an additional minute. I should be glad to be more generous, but although the Senator is talking in opposition to the amendment, he is using our time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is very generous to yield me an additional minute. I shall try to close within that time.

It seems to me that the provision dealing with the primary, secondary, and urban roads, which are ready to go forward, is the best provision for immediate relief of unemployment.

Returning to the point of the States being better able to put up 50 percent, I cannot agree with that, because today many States have plans for this type of road. They are ready to proceed, but they do not have sufficient funds to match on a 50–50 basis to any considerable extent. If we leave the ratio at 70–30, more roads will be built in States where the unemployment situation is most acute.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from South Dakota refers to the 50–50 matching formula. Is that an inflexible formula, or does he consider reverting to the historic pattern, whereby the public-land States get a better matching deal than 50–50?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The 50–50 matching formula, as we speak of it, always gives credit to the public-land States.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator intend to follow that formula?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. That is not disturbed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from West Virginia wish additional time?

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the Senator could yield me 2 minutes, I should greatly appreciate it.

Mr. KERR. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Further upon the question of the formula of 70–30, I do not see any great danger in it. In 1956 Congress created the ratio of 90–10 with respect to the interstate roads. There is nothing unusual in creating a 70–30 formula. It would not be a dangerous precedent.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the bill itself retains the 50–50 formula with respect to the ABC system, and provides that immediaitely following the expenditure of the $400 million extra in the fiscal year 1959, the apportionment, for both 1960 and 1961, shall remain on the 50–50 basis?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think that is correct. As a matter of fact, the $400 million must be spent before December 1, 1959. It is in addition to and apart from the regular allotment for the primary and secondary roads.

The regular allotment of Federal moneys is on a 50–50 basis, and it so continues, as indicated by the Senator from Oklahoma, through 1960 and 1961.

I feel that if this amendment were adopted we would take from the emergency part of the bill the immediately helpful part of the bill, and the most attractive feature to the States.

It may be possible that some States could use a small part of the fund on that basis, but if we leave the 70–30 formula provision in effect, it will permit the States to expand broadly the roads for which they have already made preparation, and with respect to which they have met the engineering requirements. They are ready to go ahead and build, thereby providing new jobs.

So, with reluctance, I must oppose the amendment of the able Senator from South Dakota, because I feel that if it were adopted and we were to take out of the bill the 70–30 formula, we would destroy, in effect, the real helpfulness which would be afforded to the States throughout the Nation by the bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I agree entirely and wholeheartedly with what the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has said. He and the fine and distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] were on the committee when we formulated the provision which is now before the Senate.

In a moment I shall yield some time to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who was the author of the provision in the bill. After it was discussed and worked over, it had the unanimous approval of the committee; at least I understood it had the approval of every member.

Let me say to my good friend from South Dakota that I think the formula which is before the Senate is tailormade to provide jobs. Those are the words which he used to describe the situation which would exist if his amendment were adopted.

I say to him further that if his amendment were adopted, he would take the heart out of the emergency provisions of the bill. If his amendment were adopted, the bill would not be tailormade to provide jobs in Oklahoma.

I have talked with the distinguished Governor of Oklahoma and with the head of the highway department. They tell me that they are in a position to put up the 10 percent cash, as provided by the language of the bill now before the Senate, but that if they had to put up more than that, they would be unable to take advantage of their share of the $400 million additional for the ABC system, which, as the Senator from West Virginia has reminded us, must be under contract before December 1 of this year, and the projects must be completed—subject only to conditions beyond the control of the contractors, or acts of God—by December 1, 1959.

I sincerely urge and earnestly request the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who has labored so heroically on this bill, and whose hand is in it as much as is the hand of any other member of the committee, to feel gratification for the tremendous job he has done, and to withdraw his amendment in order that we may vote on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Any appeal made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, especially with the flowers which accompanied the last appeal, is difficult to resist.

However, I cannot, in justice to some other situations avail myself of that invitation.

I still think this section of the bill is tailormade to provide jobs. It is tailormade, first of all, because it provides emergency money, to the extent of $400 million, in addition to the regular ABC money.

It is tailormade, in the second place, because there is an incentive to get the program under way. The program is conditioned on its being gotten under way immediately. Otherwise, we would not have the $400 million provision.

It is tailormade to provide jobs because it has complete transferability. We wrote in a provision that the money, once apportioned to a State, could be used on the primary, secondary, or urban system, or wherever the State wanted to use it to relieve unemployment.

We do not have complete transferability with respect to other moneys. There is a 20-percent transferability. Here we have a complete, 100-percent transferability. If in North Dakota it were desired to use the apportionment on secondary farm-to-market roads, it could be so used. In Wisconsin, if the unemployment situation were particularly severe in Milwaukee, the allotment could be used for urban roads.

With respect to the State's ability to match, my attention was called to the fact that my arithmetic was a trifle inaccurate at the time the Senator from Oklahoma and I were discussing the two-thirds provision. The language in subsection (e) now reads:

Provided, that the amount of such increase—

Referring to the additional fund—

of the Federal share shall not exceed two-thirds of the States' share of the cost of such project.

If the State's share of the cost of a project is 50 percent, two-thirds would be 33⅓ percent. Therefore if the State borrowed 33⅓ percent out of the loan

fund, it would have to put up only 16⅔ cents out of every dollar. It would not be much different than putting up 10 percent. The State could qualify by putting up 16⅔ cents out of every dollar. Therefore I believe this would help the States to use the money and put it to work and create the maximum number of jobs. I agree with everything the distinguished Senator from West Virginia said with respect to the value of the ABC roads in providing jobs, and that they afford the quickest means of doing that of any public works construction program I know of.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I hope the Senator understood me to say that I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the idea that the ABC roads provide one of the greatest and quickest ways of bringing about employment. The $400 million goes to the ABC roads. That is the reason why the more help the Federal Government gives to the States on that program the more roads will be built and the more employment will result.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is a question whether we wish to abandon the 50–50 formula and go to the 70–30 formula.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, one of the most painful things about serving in the Senate is to observe Senators listening to the same speech repeated three or four times. I can see those signs of pain on several faces. Therefore, I shall not repeat the argument made by the Senator from West Virginia, with whom I agree completely, or the argument of the Senator from Oklahoma, with whom I also agree completely. I merely wish to emphasize one point. I believe that most of us who worked in the committee recognize, as the Senator from South Dakota recognizes and has so well expressed, that the heart of this whole bill is the $400 million fund for immediate use on the ABC roads. The heart of the fund is the 70–30 formula.

I have not heard this emphasized enough. I regret that the able Senator from South Dakota has seen fit to present his amendment, although I respect his feeling about amending the 50–50 formula. His amendment would not destroy it, but if the amendment is adopted, it would mean a bonus for the rich States in the Union, and it would be something held out before the eyes of the smaller and poorer States, who would be tantalized by something they could not get.

There is no doubt that it would be an easy matter for a rich State like New York or California or Illinois or Pennsylvania to provide the necessary money in order to avail themselves of their share of the fund immediately. I talked with the highway commissioner of my State, and he assured me that the State of New Hampshire could not do it. Besides, our legislature does not meet until next January. If the bill should be enacted in its present form, I was assured by the highway commissioner that he could start using the money within 2 months after the passage of the bill. If the bill should be enacted with the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota—and I am sure he offers it in the best of good faith—we in New Hampshire would not be able to avail ourselves of the money until the legislature meets next January, or even later, if we could avail ourselves of it at all. I am sure there are many other States in the same situation in which New Hampshire finds itself.

The purpose of the provision in the bill is to accelerate the program now, immediately, not next year, and to help the States that need help the most. The purpose is to build roads wherever they can be built most effectively and where we will get the most highway for the least number of dollars. Therefore I sincerely hope that the amendment will not be adopted. It would cut the heart out of the provision in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to make one more observation. If a State is thinking in terms of 10 percent, it certainly can put up 16⅔ percent. However, I have no desire to prolong the argument. If there are no further requests for time, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KERR. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 9821, the companion House bill, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration; that all after the enacting clause be stricken out and the text of the Senate bill, S. 3414, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the amendment be deemed to be engrossed and the bill as amended read the third time; that the time remaining on the question of the passage of the Senate bill be transferred to the House bill; and that the yeas and nays, previously ordered on the Senate bill, be deemed to be ordered on the passage of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before the Senate acts on the request, I wonder whether we might have a quorum call.

Mr. GORE. I withhold my request.

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.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in his state of the Union message to Congress on January 7, 1954, the President of the United States called attention to the need for a national highway system. On page 10 of that state of the Union message will be found a paragraph which sets forth the need for a national highway system, to which we are today giving final consideration.

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

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

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

To protect the vital interest of every citizen in a safe and adequate highway system, the Federal Government is continuing its central role in the Federal-aid highway program. So that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the Interstate Highway System, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half-cent decrease which otherwise will become effective April 1, and will maintain revenues so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken.

When the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations completes its study of the present system of financing highway construction, I shall promptly submit it for consideration by the Congress and the governors of the States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on January 22, 1955, in his message to Congress relative to a national highway program, the President of the United States again referred to the great need which existed to have an adequate and proper highway system. I ask unanimous consent that that part of the President's message to Congress on February 22, 1955, as it appears on pages 3, 4, 5, and 7 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

II. THE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

USE OF OUR HIGHWAYS

Highway transportation in the United States is provided currently by approximately 48 million passenger cars, 10 million trucks, and a quarter of a million buses, operating on 3,348,000 miles of roads and streets, which is by far the most comprehensive public transportation network in the world.

All forms of transportation are essential to the national economy, including waterways, railroads, airways, and pipelines and their continued functioning as complementary services under equitable competitive conditions is important. Representatives of the railroads have pointed out to us the competitive threat represented by improved highway facilities and increasing truck haulage. However, this Committee was created to consider the highway network, and other mediums of transportation do not fall within its province. This relationship between the several forms of transportation is under study by other Government agencies and special committees fully informed of these views.

In relatively recent years, the motor vehicle has come to occupy a unique place in America, not only because it is a major unit of transportation, but also because it is an intimate and seemingly indispensable part of our daily life. The bread winner uses an automobile to get to work; the housewife to shop; children ride in a car or bus to school, and the entire family relies on the automobile for many social and recreational activities. Privately owned passenger cars now in service could transport the entire population of the Nation at one time—with seats to spare.

The universal use of rubber-tired vehicles for transportation on a family-unit basis has resulted in the creation of large manufacturing, distributing and service industries. Highway transportation provides essential movement of people and goods; in addition, it has itself become a major element of the economy, generating directly or indirectly approximately one-seventh of all gainful employment, and accounting for about 14 percent of the total gross national product.

One out of every six retail, wholesale, and service businesses is connected with motor vehicles.

About 3 million miles, or 90 percent of the total, of the public roads carrying this traffic are rural highways, with the balance being streets inside municipalities. These figures have remained comparatively stable over the last two decades, increasing now at a very slight rate, because most construction of "new" roads actually is the replacement or betterment of existing facilities. A highway improvement program therefore is not designed to achieve more highways so much as it is to achieve better or more adequate ones.

HIGHWAYS DIVIDED INTO SYSTEMS

One of the principal characteristics of this road network is its classification into designated systems, for purposes of financing and management. Thus we have Federal-aid, State, county, township, and other systems, classified in accordance with the responsibility which those political jurisdictions have in the highway function. A street or road providing access to individual homes or farms obviously is of predominant local interest, whereas one linking together the principal population centers of a State is primarily of State and Federal concern. Traffic tends to concentrate on rather limited mileages of highways, so that some of these highways are required to carry heavier volumes than others.

With agriculture, industry, and our defense planning closely geared to motor transportation, Congress has recognized the national interest in a limited mileage of the principal roads by authorizing the designation of two Federal-aid systems, selected cooperatively by the States, local governments, and the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

In 1916 the basic Federal-Aid Highway Act provided for the sharing of highway construction costs between the States and the Federal Government, under standards mutually approved, and with the initiative retained by each State for choosing projects and carrying them out. The planning and development of the Federal-aid systems referred to above began in 1921. Federal funds share with State funds in costs of engineering, construction, and right-of-way acquisition on the designated systems while other charges, such as maintenance and policing, are entirely borne by the States and local agencies. It is proposed to continue this well established and very effective partnership in the enlarged program recommended herein.

The Federal-aid primary system as of July 1, 1954, consisted of 234,407 miles, connecting all of the principal cities, county seats, ports, manufacturing areas, and other traffic generating areas. In general, these are at the same time the main State trunkline roads.

In 1944, the Congress approved designation of the Federal-aid secondary system, which on July 1, 1954, totaled 482,972 miles commonly referred to as the farm-to-market system but which could equally be referred to as the market-to-farm system. It is composed of important feeder roads linking the farms, factories, distribution outlets, and smaller communities of our Nation with the primary system.

Responsibility for construction of these two Federal-aid systems traditionally has been shared in approximately equal amounts by the Federal Government and the States, in accordance with an apportionment formula in which land area, road mileage, and population are factors. But some sections of the primary system are more important than others, from the viewpoint of the national interest. Consequently, in 1944 the Congress authorized the selection of a special network, not to exceed 40,000 miles in length, which in the language of the act would be so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico.

The result was the creation of the national system of interstate highways embracing about 1.2 percent of total road mileage, joining 42 State capital cities and 90 percent of all cities over 50,000 population. The Interstate System carries more than a seventh of all traffic, one-fifth of the rural traffic, serves 65 percent of the urban and 45 percent of the rural population, and is the key network from the standpoint of Federal interest in productivity and national defense. Approximately 37,600 miles have been designated to date; the remaining 2,400 miles are reserved for future additions. This system and the mileage referred to are included within the Federal-aid primary system described above.

CIVIL DEFENSE ASPECTS

From the standpoint of civil defense, the capacity of the interstate highways to transport urban populations in an emergency is of utmost importance. Large-scale evacuation of cities would be needed in the event of A-bomb or H-bomb attack. The Federal Civil Defense Administrator has said the withdrawal task is the biggest problem ever faced in the world. It has been determined as a matter of Federal policy that at least 70 million people would have to be evacuated from target areas in case of threatened or actual enemy attack. No urban area in the country today has highway facilities equal to this task. The rapid improvement of the complete 40,000-mile Interstate System, including the necessary urban connections thereto, is therefore vital as a civil-defense measure. Responsibility for selecting the highway facilities needed for this defensive action has been delegated by Executive order to the Bureau of Public Roads.

III. WHY THE SYSTEM IS INADEQUATE

THE TRAFFIC JAM

Reduced to its simplest terms, the highway problem is this: Traffic has expanded sharply, without a corresponding expansion in capacity of roads and streets. As a result, a major portion of our facilities are seriously overcrowded. Moreover, this movement is faster and heavier than in previous years, and continues to increase.

Simple arithmetic illustrates the dimensions of the task. We now have more than 58 million motor vehicles registered—one for every 700 feet of every lane in both directions on all streets and highways in the Nation. This gigantic fleet traveled an estimated 557 billion vehicle miles in 1954, much of it concentrated on main arteries in urban areas which have become the expensive, hazardous bottlenecks referred to by the President.

The existing traffic jam is bad enough, but prospects for the future are even worse. Vehicle registrations are expected to continue their upward surge, reaching 81 million by 1965, an increase of 40 percent. Total highway travel of these 81 million vehicles will likewise continue to increase as we attempt to meet the transportation requirements of an expanding economy, probably to reach an estimated 814 billion vehicle-miles in 1965.

This Committee believes that these forecasts, carefully projected on the basis of all available data, are soundly conservative and represent the foundation upon which the Nation's highway improvement programs should be planned. Our population is expected to exceed 180 million by 1965. Our gross national product, which was about $357 billion in 1954, is estimated to reach $535 billion by 1965, an increase of almost 50 percent in the next decade, as recently reported by the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report.

HIGHWAYS IN THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The governors' report to the President pointed up sharply the importance of highways to the Nation's future economy in these words:

"An adequate highway system is vital to the continued expansion of the economy. The projected figures for gross national product will not be realized if our highway plant continues to deteriorate. The relationship is, of course, reciprocal; an adequate highway network will facilitate the expansion of the economy which, in turn, will facilitate the raising of revenues to finance the construction of highways."

Prewar, we did not hesitate to spend on the improvement of our highways sums ranging from 1.1 to 1.7 percent of our gross national product. Today, the need for further improvement is greater than ever. The sums needed to accelerate the program may seem high; they are not high in terms of what we have done in the past in relationship to our much larger and still growing gross national product.

The increasing use of our highways contributes materially to the growth of our national product, since industry and employment directly related to the highway transportation system and its byproducts account for about one-seventh of its total value.

Moreover, the improvement of our highway systems as recommended herein would reduce transportation costs to the public through reductions in vehicle operating costs competently estimated to average as much as a penny a mile. Based on present rates of travel, this saving alone would support the total cost of the accelerated program. It is further evidence of the desirability of undertaking highway improvement as a capital investment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a little while ago, in the course of the debate on the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] I stated, as I remember it, that the bill as reported to the Senate had the unanimous approval of all members of the Committee on Public Works. The Senator from South Dakota has reminded me that at the time he reserved the right to offer amendments, or otherwise, on the floor. I would not want the RECORD to fail to disclose that fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the

Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has proposed a request to discharge the Committee on Public Works from the further consideration of H. R. 9821. Has that request been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not. The request is the pending question. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the passage, as amended, of House bill 9821, to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the terms of the request, which I have not had an opportunity to read, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the House bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. At the conclusion of his statement, I shall be prepared to yield back the remainder of our time on the bill, if the minority will be agreeable to doing likewise. Then a yea-and-nay vote on the bill can be had promptly. No other yea-and-nay votes are planned for this evening.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, unless there are other requests for time.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to reserve 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy to vote for the bill. I should like to suggest for the RECORD several points affecting the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which the Honorable George Leader, our distinguished Governor, has asked to have stated, so that when the problem arises next year, these matters will be in mind.

First, it is the position of my Commonwealth that there should be full reimbursement to the States for all free and toll roads built by all States if the roads are fairly close to conforming with the Federal standards.

My Commonwealth has built a number of toll roads, expressways, and freeways at great expense. It is our view that we should be reimbursed for our initiative, and not be penalized.

Second, it is our position that the Federal highway program should be completed in 13 years, and that definite appropriations should be made by Congress under the law.

Third, if and when we get back to schedule and can look forward to completing the program in 13 years, we should take up the question of reimbursement. The question of reimbursement should not be permitted to decrease the amount of the appropriations which are being made to help overcome the current recession and to complete the 13-year program on schedule.

Finally, it is my hope that careful study will be given by the Committee on Public Works next year to the work done by the General Accounting Office to determine the equity of the needs formula. Under that program, the so-called Gore program, my State is penalized by being cut from 5.321 percent to 4.78 percent of appropriated funds. That was because Pennsylvania was more accurate in estimating the cost of her needs than were her sister States. The general average indicates that the cost is 9 percent across the country. In Pennsylvania, it is only 4 percent. One of our large sister States overestimated its needs on a cost basis by 20 or 25 percent and is, accordingly, getting a higher allocation.

I hope the chairman and other members of the committee will bear these facts in mind when, next year, the needs formula is reevaluated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday and today I received three letters from highway construction contractors in Ohio. Each of the three letters expresses the fear that because of further increases in the prices of materials, equipment, and supplies, and possibly new demands for increased wages, the cost of the construction will likely go up 10 percent a year.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee whether any of the suppliers or material men or labor representatives who testified urged the adoption of this program to stabilize the economy.

Mr. GORE. There was testimony urging the adoption of a vigorous highway improvement program not only for the purpose of building and improving highways, but also for the purpose of increasing employment opportunities.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the calculation that the bill will make available an investment which will hire 550,000 workers, did the Senator from Tennessee have in mind the present wage levels and price levels?

Mr. GORE. We calculated on the basis of the existing situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, the Senator did not anticipate that while Congress intended to stabilize the economy, it might in the next year be faced with a 10-percent increase in cost because of increased costs of wages and supplies?

Mr. GORE. On the contrary, the subcommittee requested the Bureau of Public Roads to make a survey of the experiences the States were having with respect to costs; that is, the actual terms of bids and contracts as compared with estimates submitted to the committee in January. We were pleased to have the report that, nationwide, the contracts are running approximately 7 percent below the estimated cost.

Mr. LAUSCHE. After I received the letters, I called officials of the State of Ohio. I was told by them that there is now sound, keen competition. I called one other contractor, and he said he was of the belief that there may be a demand for increased wages and increased prices.

Mr. President, I contemplate voting for the bill. But I will be a bitterly disappointed man if, at the end of 1 year, we find that, whereas we were trying to stabilize the economy and provide jobs, 10 percent of the amounts provided will have been expended for increased costs of materials, supplies, and labor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Senator from Utah is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill. I believe it provides for the kind of public works which can be fully justified in meeting the present recession. The Nation is a long way behind in its highway program and stepping it up can be justified as a matter of economics.

I believe Federal and State highway officials will do everything within their power to make this program successful. Fully justified expenditures will be spread out over the whole country where the most good can be done.

With respect to reclamation projects, lately there has been a definite tendency to offer bids well within the estimates; in one case, Glen Canyon Dam, the bid was nearly 20 percent lower than the estimate.

Of course, the program under this bill will not need go forward any faster than the funds are made available.

Many of us will be disappointed if the program under the bill adds to the spiral of inflation, although in that case something probably can be done by slowing down the rate of appropriations, or the construction schedule.

As the President has indicated and recommended, I believe the program is fully justified even though it may have in certain particulars gone beyond his recommendations.

The bill contains some provisions and authorizations of new appropriations with which I am not in full accord.

However, I have high hopes that the House of Representatives will scrutinize, in conference, the action taken by the Senate, and that it will be possible to remedy the defects which I believe the bill contains, and to reduce somewhat some of the authorizations for higher appropriations.

Mr. President, I think the passage of this bill will be a powerful stimulus to our economy.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time under my control, if the minority leader is prepared to do likewise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question before the Senate is on the final passage of House bill 9821, as amended.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

On this question 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 Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is 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.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent on official business attending the Interparliamentary Conference in Europe as a representative of the Senate.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is absent on official business of the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—84

Aiken	Hayden	Morton
Allott	Hennings	Mundt
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Barrett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Beall	Hoblitzell	Pastore
Bible	Holland	Payne
Bricker	Hruska	Potter
Bridges	Humphrey	Proxmire
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Revercomb
Carroll	Javits	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Scott
Church	Kennedy	Smathers
Clark	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lausche	Symington
Dworshak	Magnuson	Talmadge
Eastland	Malone	Thurmond
Ervin	Mansfield	Thye
Frear	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Goldwater	McClellan	Williams
Gore	McNamara	Yarborough
Green	Morse	Young

NAYS—4

Bennett	Curtis	Robertson
Byrd		

NOT VOTING—8

Bush	Flanders	Monroney
Capehart	Jenner	Murray
Ellender	Long	

So the bill (H. R. 9821), as amended, was passed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the title of the House bill is amended by substituting for it that of the Senate bill, and the Senate bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KERR, Mr. GORE, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 9821, as amended and passed by the Senate, be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have just closed debate on one of the most important measures we could possibly pass to help the unemployed.

This is a bill which will have a direct and certain effect upon jobs. It means that men will be put to work building the highways the Nation so badly needs.

The Senate owes a deep debt of gratitude to all the Members of this body for their patience and for the long hours they have spent during the time we were debating this important measure. The Senate owes a particular debt of gratitude to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], chairman of the subcommittee which held the long hearings, and to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for the fine work they have done on the bill.

As chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico acted promptly and expeditiously. And the junior Senator from Tennessee is one of the Nation's outstanding experts on this difficult field of legislation.

The passage of this measure is clear and unmistakable notice to the unemployed men and women of this country that Congress is determined to act and to help them. We are not going to stand idly by.

This measure strikes me as being of unusual importance in this situation. According to expert surveys, 90 cents out of every dollar spent on roads—aside from acquisition of rights-of-way—goes directly or indirectly into wages.

I congratulate all the Members of the Senate, and particularly the members of the Committee on Public Works, the junior Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from New Mexico, and their colleagues for this fine achievement.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I should like to know whether the minority members cooperated in bringing about the passage of this bill. Did the minority members, the Republicans, cooperate in bringing it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I said the entire membership of the Committee on Public Works. I would assume the Senator would realize that included the minority.

Mr. BEALL. The Senator was very emphatic about mentioning certain names. I wonder whether the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] was included.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator desires me to mention his name, I shall be glad to commend the Senator.

Mr. BEALL. I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I referred to all the Members of the Senate and expressed my appreciation to them. I express my appreciation to the Senator from Maryland again.

I referred to every member of the subcommittee, but I thought particular attention should be given to the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee, who probably spent more hours on the matter than any other Members of the Senate.

ATTACKS ON JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, while I was in Bonn, Germany, recently on business connected with NATO I learned the deeply shocking news that a Jewish community center in Nashville, Tenn., had been subjected to a dynamite attack. Two hours later a similar attack was made on a Jewish synagogue in Miami, Fla.

These two attacks followed two unsuccessful efforts to dynamite buildings dedicated to the Jewish faith in North Carolina.

The attack in Nashville was followed by telephone threats to a distinguished jurist, Circuit Judge William E. Miller.

I am glad that there was a quick and proper response from officials of the State of Tennessee and the city of Nashville. In both Nashville and Miami the Councils of Churches expressed the sense of outrage undoubtedly felt by all decent citizens.

This matter is now in the hands of the police. In Nashville the police are being aided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I am encouraged to think that the criminals will be brought to justice in both instances.

It would appear that these bombings are more than coincidental. The facts, in any event, must be brought fully to light. We cannot tolerate in this Nation vicious and violent attacks on any religion, whether it be Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or any other faith.

Beyond finding the immediate culprits in these cases and bringing them to justice, we must work without relenting to banish the underlying causes of such attacks—which are ignorance and hate.

As a member of the Christian community, I want to express my sorrow that anything like this could happen in America to our fellow citizens of the Jewish community.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not expect any rollcalls this evening, although there are some statements to be made, and we do want to consider a bill affecting colleges, Order No. 1427, H. R. 8268, when Senators are ready to consider it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1427, House bill 8268.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8268) to amend section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

CHICKEN IN THE POT AGAIN?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, first it was within the next 30 days—then it was by the middle of March—and now it is within the next 60 days or possibly the last quarter of 1958—that the present rapid decline in the national economy is supposed to level off.

Meanwhile, I submit that the administration, by its failure to deal promptly and vigorously with the business recession, has virtually nullified the Full Employment Act of 1946.

Mr. President, for 6 consecutive months official reports on the state of the economy have registered continuing declines in factory and mining output, sharp curtailment of oil production, heavy cutbacks in auto manufacture and an alarming rise in unemployment—while the administration has sat on its hands.

Furthermore, nothing in the latest reports of the Federal Reserve Board, the Bureau of Employment Security, or the Department of Commerce would seem to justify the administration's sunny optimism that within the next 60 days or at least by next fall things will get better—if they do not get any worse.

Mr. President, I am painfully aware that to a jobless worker with hungry mouths to feed this optimism about the future is a poor substitute for a regular paycheck. I do not believe that some 5½ million unemployed Americans—especially those who have exhausted their unemployment benefits—presently regard the exercise of their "right to suffer" as one of the joys of living in a democracy.

Mr. President, I would remind the administration that when the Congress passed the Employment Act of 1946, we declared it to be the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power.

The President stated recently, as he has on numerous other occasions since the recession began, that—

> This administration will continue to undertake, by Executive order or proposal to the Congress, any measures—including tax reduction if, after consultation with Congressional leaders, such action should prove desirable and necessary—that will assist health economic recovery.

These are reassuring words, but they are without meaning unless they are followed by bold action. And so far, the administration has failed to act, apparently waiting in the hope that the economy will eventually right itself.

Mr. President, it is with grave misgivings that I seem to detect in this just-around-the-corner attitude on the part of the administration, a close parallel with that of another day.

Indeed, I find an unhappily reminiscent ring in this passage from The American Past, by Mr. Roger Butterfield. Headed "Just Around the Corner" this passage describes that turbulent period in current history which has, I believe, come to be known as the roaring twenties, in these words:

> In October 1929 President Hoover declared: "The fundamental business of the country * * * is on a sound and prosperous basis." In January 1930 he said that there were definite signs that the Nation had turned the corner. In March he predicted that the high point of unemployment would be passed in 60 days. In May he announced: "We have now passed the worst and with continued unity of effort we shall rapidly recover." His words were brave but futile. The crash rolled on and settled dismally into the depression. The national income dropped from $85 billion to $37 billion, wages fell off $22 billion, 1 out of every 4 farms was sold for taxes. At the end of 1930 there were 3 million unemployed; by 1933 there were 15 million. Five thousand banks closed their doors. Private construction came to an end.
>
> But dividend and interest payments rose to an alltime high of $8 billion in 1931, and never fell lower than the level of 1928. Investors generally continued to collect; wage-earners and farmers bore the brunt.

Mr. President, any similarity between this tragic period in our history and the present time is, of course, purely coincidental. Nevertheless, on Febraury 12, 1958, President Eisenhower issued a statement in which he said:

> I believe that we have had most of our bad news on the unemployment front. * * * Every indication is that March will commence to see the start of a pickup in job opportunities. That should mark the end of the downturn in our economy, provided we apply ourselves to the job ahead.

By the first of March the lines of the unemployed were still growing longer.

At the halfway mark, on March 19, the Chief Executive stated—according to headlines in the Washington Post and Times Herald—that he saw the "United States not only shaking off the current economic recession, but also taking the road to ever higher levels of prosperity." The Chief Executive said, as he has several times before, that he would favor tax reduction if he felt it was necessary and desirable to bring about recovery. His associates have reported that he is not yet convinced that a tax cut will be necessary.

But on the very next day, March 20, the Washington Daily News reported:

> Labor Department economists predicted today that unemployment will show another increase this month, setting a new postwar record.

Meantime, carloadings were dropping from 689,226 a year ago to 539,057 in the second week of March. Layoffs are continuing in the automobile industry. Steel is operating at about 50 percent of capacity; and the seasonal pickup in employment normal for this time of the year has not materialized.

Mr. President, for my part I do not believe that we can talk ourselves out of a depression anymore than I have credited criticism from some quarters that we could talk ourselves into one. Personally, I would rather be known as a gloomy prophet than become a remorseful optimist—with the sufferings of some 6 million unemployed Americans and the hunger of their children on my conscience.

Mr. President, it is for this overwhelming reason alone that I state I am prepared to vote without further delay for a tax cut or for such other sound proposals as our leadership may recommend to put people back to work quickly, to lift the burden of debt from their shoulders, to restore their purchasing power, and to implement in other ways the Full Employment Act of 1946.

POSSIBLE CURTAILMENT OF AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO. RADIO OPERATION

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It was with considerable concern I read recently in the trade papers that the American Broadcasting Co. is contemplating the curtailment of its radio network operation.

Since its inception radio has been a vital agency for preserving our cherished tradition of free speech and for protecting and vitalizing the American system of free enterprise. Under this system of freedom the bad ideas get washed out, the good ones survive, and mankind goes forward.

Wherever freedom of speech exists, freedom of the air is an inseparable part of it and radio networks are able to maintain a free and open forum of discussion. More importantly, these networks speed the understanding of honest controversy by the whole people and accelerate the development of public opinion which guides national action.

The advent of electronic mass communications opened a new and swifter avenue to man's intelligence. It has augmented the established methods of communication by publication, thus enabling our citizens to become the best informed in the world.

The evidence of radio's influence is rather conclusive. Its implications are equally striking—and to the responsible

broadcaster, often sobering. For with him rests the control of what his listeners hear about their community, their country, and their world—things that, in the judgment of the broadcaster, at least, are believed to be worth hearing.

Today 53,300,000 American families own and listen to radios. Serving this vast audience are more than 1,000 network affiliates that draw upon 1 of the 4 nationwide networks for part of their daily program offering. The American broadcasting network serves 310 of these stations. In a typical week, the networks offer 1,100 different programs. Certainly the most varied bill of fare of music, news, information, education, entertainment and inspiration ever offered. Radio is not, however, exclusively a medium for entertainment and diversion. It is an informational media, peculiarly and favorably suited to the transmission of news, because it captures the essence of news, its immediacy, and the actual verity of its sound.

At a time when international crises are occurring with awesome regularity, it would be most unfortunate to diminish in any way the access of the American people to any source of information that might bear upon our national well being. In this sphere of intelligence, the essentiality of radio networks is more pronounced than ever, for no other medium provides more readily, news of the crucial events which are inevitably shaping the destiny of the world.

The American Broadcasting Co., the Columbia Broadcasting System, and the National Broadcasting Co. have all testified before the Federal Communications Commission that their radio network operations have long been unprofitable. That CBS and NBC are continuing these operations in the face of considerable economic imbalance is a tribute to their determination to serve the public interest. I doubt that ABC would want to do less.

I sincerely hope that the American Broadcasting Co., in a decision worthy of public admiration, will find it possible to continue its radio network's role as a vital link in the chain of man's knowledge and understanding.

THE PLIGHT OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas further yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on Senate bill 3194, dealing with the plight of small business.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

The small businesses of this country are in trouble. Last fall I participated with other members of the Small Business Committee in a study of the tax problems of small business. After a very intensive series of hearings the committee offered its findings and recommendations in Senate Report No. 1237. The committee stated as a basis for its recommendations the discrimination it found to exist within the Federal tax system. I feel that this tax discrimination has caused many of the problems which confront small business today.

Kansas is a State of small businesses. The economy of my State cannot be healthy unless its small businesses are offered an opportunity to prosper. At the tax hearing in Wichita, on November 22, 1957, the representatives of Kansas small business advised the Senate Small Business Committee on their needs. These needs are the same as those expressed by other witnesses in other parts of the country. It is my belief that we can assist the economy of the whole country by meeting the most pressing tax needs of small business.

S. 3194, the Small Business Tax Adjustment bill of 1958, is a bill which was proposed by the Small Business Committee to amend the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate discrimination within the tax system. It is a measure which follows the recommendations of the businessmen who appeared before the committee. It includes seven sections:

1. To permit a tax allowance for reinvestment.
2. To provide for individual retirement plans.
3. To allow installment payment of estate taxes.
4. To extend alternative methods of depreciation to used property.
5. To permit corporations to elect by unanimous agreement of stockholders to be taxed as partnerships.
6. To increase minimum accumulated earnings credit.
7. To clarify Internal Revenue Code interpretation.

When this bill was introduced in the Senate, I was in Kansas on official business, and for that reason was unable to join as a sponsor of this measure. I ask unanimous consent that I may be added as a cosponsor of this very important bill. I believe that its quick passage will permit small business to remain on the main streets of America.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, many observers have remarked that among the characteristics of American politics are the suddenness and completeness with which so many prominent leaders in national affairs pass from public consciousness. One notable exception, however, is Theodore Roosevelt, the 100th anniversary of whose birth will be celebrated on October 27, 1958.

As a student of Panama Canal problems over many years, I long ago recognized the preeminent part played by President Theodore Roosevelt in starting that great enterprise and have long pondered the steps whereby he rose to greatness.

It was most gratifying to read in the March-April 1958 issue of the Military Engineer, the bimonthly journal of the Society of American Military Engineers, an admirable condensation of Roosevelt's career, by Dr. Sidney Foreman, of West Point. Included in the same issue is the following biographical note of the author:

Dr. Sidney Foreman is Archivist of the United States Military Academy with additional duties as staff historian. Employed at West Point in various capacities since 1946, he has published a number of monographs on the Military Academy and is the author of A History of the United States Military Academy, published by Columbia University, where he took his doctor of philosophy degree. He is also professor of social sciences at Ladycliff College, Highland Falls, N. Y.

Mr. President, in order that Dr. Foreman's informative summary of the late President's career may be better known in connection with the Roosevelt Centennial, 1957–58, and find a permanent place in the proceedings of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the indicated article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

(By Dr. Sidney Foreman)

The 100th anniversary of the birthday of Theodore Roosevelt will be celebrated by the American people on October 27, 1958, as well as on other appropriate formal occasions in the course of the year. He will be remembered as the 26th president of the United States, having taken office following the assassination of President McKinley. Roosevelt was sworn into office on September 14, 1901, and served for the remainder of the term. He was elected in his own right in 1904, and served until the inauguration of William Howard Taft in 1909.

Popularly, there may be more inclination to recall Theodore Roosevelt as Teddy, the hero of the war with Spain, the politician who affected a broadbrimmed Army hat, and wore an expansive grin.

In some circles Roosevelt will be remembered as a prolific writer. Prominent for his literary narrative and historical works, he was one of the most popular authors of his day. His Hunting Trips of a Ranchman and Ranch Life and the Hunting-Trail, were widely read. His Naval War of 1812, the biography of Thomas Hart Benton, and the four volumes of The Winning of the West, placed him in the front rank of American historians, and won for him the presidency of the American Historical Association in 1912. His published books and articles numbered more than 2,000.

In the hearts and minds of Americans who were repelled by urban life and the evils of industrialization, the cult of the hunter-naturalist which Roosevelt represented in his writings struck a responsive chord. His expeditions into the African jungle in 1910 and into the unmapped interior of Brazil in 1914 were widely and dramatically publicized. In addition, Roosevelt's experience as a rancher, his hunting trips in the West, and his invitation to Geronimo to participate in the inaugural parade made him the idol of the devotees of outdoor life. Roosevelt's fondness for big game hunting gave rise, in a playful allusion, to the name Teddy Bear for the stuffed, plush toy bear. His support of Federal conservation legislation with Gifford Pinchot, head of the United States Forest Service, appeared to make possible an outdoor career for every office- and factory-bound American.

MILITARY SERVICE

Roosevelt was catapulted into the presidency by the reputation he won as a military man; a role which he found most attractive. Any judgment of his many-sided public life will necessarily have to take into consideration his career as a soldier.

In 1882, the year The Naval War of 1812 was published, Roosevelt was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the 8th Regiment of the New York National Guard. This experience presaged his active interest in both

the Army and the Navy. His years of service in the National Guard, which he left as a captain in February 1886, were later offered as a supporting justification for his request to organize the Rough Riders. His research in naval history established him as an authority on naval matters and was most useful when, in 1897, he became Assistant Secretary of the Navy. He then gave free rein to his expansionist convictions, as well as to his belief in the importance of larger naval appropriations and military preparedness. Roosevelt liked to summarize his reasons for this and other policies with short, pithy maxims. One of his favorites was, "Speak softly and carry a big stick; you will go far."

With Secretary of the Navy John D. Long, Roosevelt did all that he could to prepare the fleet for the war with Spain which he felt was inevitable. With this end in view, he used as much of the naval appropriation as he could for target practice. He also encouraged naval officers to take a more active part in determining the course of political events. It was on the afternoon of February 25, 1898, that Roosevelt sent the famous cable to Admiral Dewey—that in the event of war to "see that the Spanish fleet does not leave the Asiatic coast," and to begin operations in the Philippine Islands. These instructions laid the groundwork for the victory at Manila Bay.

Characteristic of Roosevelt's imagination and initiative was his recommendation, on March 25, 1898, after seeing pictures of a flying machine, that the Navy and War Departments explore the costs and military applications of this new apparatus.

After the *Maine* was sunk in Havana Harbor, Roosevelt resigned as Assistant Secretary of the Navy and offered to organize a regiment for the New York National Guard. But he changed his plans when Congress authorized three cavalry regiments to be recruited in the West, and Secretary of War Russell A. Alger offered him the command of one. Roosevelt accepted in April 1898, to serve as a lieutenant colonel under the more experienced Leonard Wood, and as a colonel when the latter was promoted. The new unit which Roosevelt and Wood organized was designated the 1st United States Volunteer Cavalry; the newspapers named the motley collection of recruits "The Rough Riders." Most of the men were cowpunchers from Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma; there were also a few college graduates. The unit was ordered on June 7 to leave for Cuba from Tampa, Fla., after a short period of organization and drill at San Antonio, Tex. Roosevelt's major concern was that the war should be over before he could get to Cuba and join the action. His first contact with the enemy was made when his regiment was landed at the village of Daiquiri on June 22, and ordered against Las Guasimas. In the action which followed, more Americans than Spaniards were killed. Whether or not Roosevelt's unit was caught in an ambush is not known. However, the regiment did continue to advance on Santiago.

The next military clash in which Roosevelt was involved took place at El Caney. In that area, Wood, Roosevelt, and the Rough Riders advanced against Spanish batteries. There has been some dispute over whether they charged up San Juan Hill or nearby Kettle Hill. But there has been none concerning Roosevelt's personal bravery; it was most conspicuous according to those who witnessed him in battle. "I waved my hat and we went up the hill with a rush," was the way he described the charge in his memoirs.

After the action was over in Cuba, many men became ill of yellow fever. When nothing was done about moving the men home, a group of career officers persuaded Roosevelt to draft a letter which was presented to Gen. William R. Shafter, the commanding general. When General Shafter callously refused to accept the petition, the critical press reported the incident in every part of the country. The War Department was embarrassed by the unfavorable publicity and the troops were quickly ordered home. This incident resulted in another personal victory for Theodore Roosevelt. For the rest of his life Roosevelt was deeply attached to the veterans of his regiment—the Rough Riders—and they to him. The charge at San Juan Hill and Roosevelt's intervention on behalf of the soldiers in Cuba were so widely publicized that the popularity he won led him to the governorship, the vice presidency, and finally to the presidency of the United States.

FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC POLICIES

His most important public contributions to American life were made as President. In that office, his outstanding achievements resulted from his efforts to adjust the Nation to a new role made necessary by the impact of the industrial revolution and the conclusion of the war with Spain. It was his decisive political action which led to the building of the Panama Canal, expanded the area of American commerce, and further united the Nation. Roosevelt defended his arbitrary moves against the Republic of Columbia with the words, "I took the Canal Zone and let Congress debate, and while the debate goes on, the canal does also."

Theodore Roosevelt further advanced American hegemony in Latin America by asserting the rights of the United States in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere republics. His goal was to rid the American continents of any European controls. This policy became known as the Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine.

But Roosevelt's concern also embraced Europe, Africa, and Asia. He did not hesitate to express American diplomatic interest in Venezuela, Morocco, or China. A major expression of this far-reaching policy was his influence in ending the Russo-Japanese War with the Treaty of Portsmouth, on September 5, 1905.

Rooseveltian domestic policies were restricted by Democratic opposition and by the hostile distrust of conservative, stand-pat elements in his own Republican Party. A number of successful domestic programs, however, were associated with the Roosevelt name. The most notable was his demand that the trusts—large industrial combinations—be placed under public controls. He also encouraged consumer protection by pure food and drug laws.

INFLUENCE UPON THE ARMY AND NAVY

President Roosevelt used his office to improve the effectiveness of both the Army and the Navy. For the Army, he encouraged the formation of the General Staff Corps, the Army War College, and the office of the Chief of Staff. He emphasized the need for a larger Army, and higher standards for enlisted and officer personnel. He also forcefully supported the modernization and physical reconstruction of the Military Academy at West Point. To encourage recognition of merit, as opposed to promotion for seniority alone, it was Roosevelt who promoted John J. Pershing from captain to brigadier general for his outstanding services against the Moros in the Philippine Islands.

Theodore Roosevelt urged similar reforms and physical growth for the Navy. A turning point in American naval policy was his approval of an agreement on February 24, 1903, giving the United States naval coaling stations in Cuba. In addition, he made the pioneer proposal that Congress make appropriations for submarines to strengthen the Navy's aggressive potential. And to dramatize the Navy's role of support for American political policy, he sent the fleet on a world cruise (December 1907-February 1909) to test its capacity for long-range operations.

Roosevelt was outspoken in favor of strengthening American defenses even before the outbreak of World War I in Europe. After the election of Woodrow Wilson, he took up the cudgels in an active campaign against the new President's policies. Roosevelt urged the American people to prepare militarily and to aid the allied powers. His speaking tour in the West was a crusade of enlightenment against pro-German propaganda. Roosevelt then begged for authority to raise a volunteer division and to command one of its brigades when the United States entered the war. His request was turned down. Although embittered by this denial, as well as the death of his youngest son in the service, he spoke and wrote effectively to whip up American support of the war effort. American help to France was so closely tied to the Roosevelt name that when the first American troops march through the streets of Paris on July 4, 1917, the Parisians shouted, "Teddy! Teddy! Long live the Teddies."

Rooseveltian policies created the organization and cadres in both the Army and Navy which led the way to the victories of World War I. On January 6, 1919, Theodore Roosevelt died in his sleep at the age of 61.

Theodore Roosevelt's birthday is well worth remembering in 1958 for his contributions to the national life and national strength of the United States. The record of his dedicated citizenship also should be recalled as an inspiration to the American people in the struggle for the survival of freedom in the world.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATION OF STAFF DIRECTOR OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, late yesterday afternoon a letter from the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary dated March 25, 1958, was received in the office of the Standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of which I am chairman, referring to the subcommittee the nomination of Gordon MacLean Tiffany, of New Hampshire, to be staff director for the Commission on Civil Rights.

Therefore, I announce at this time that the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee will hold a hearing on this nomination on Tuesday morning at 9:30 a. m., April 1, 1958, in room 104-B, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Section 105 (a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957—71 Statutes at Large, page 634—requires the advice and consent of the Senate to the appointment of the staff director of the Commission.

Mr. President, I do not intend to be a party to delay in getting the Civil Rights Commission into full operation, particularly since the life of the Commission is only 2 years from the date the act became law, namely, September 9, 1957. Already, several months have gone by. I am anxious to complete the hearing on Mr. Tiffany's nomination, and to get it before the full Committee on the Judiciary, so that the Senate may act as soon as possible.

PRAYER ON ANNUAL BROTHERHOOD NIGHT

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 25, 1958, I addressed a banquet held by a group of dentists in the District of Columbia, on annual Brotherhood Night. A very moving prayer was delivered on that occasion by by the Very Reverend Edward B. Bunn, S. J., president of Georgetown University. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRAYER FOR BROTHERHOOD, DELIVERED BY THE VERY REVEREND EDWARD B. BUNN, S. J., PRESIDENT OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, ON ANNUAL BROTHERHOOD NIGHT, FEBRUARY 25, 1958

Almighty and Eternal God, in the boundlessness of Thy paternal love, Thou has created all men to be Thy children. In Thy all embracing goodness, Thou does not regard the differences and the barriers which in their pride men have set up, between nation and nation, between races and classes, between rich and poor, learned and unlettered; but Thou does look only to this that every man is the object of Thy predilection and the handiwork of Thy power. Grant us then, Heavenly Father, in imitation of Thee to have regard not to those things which separate and divide us, but rather to that truth which unites us all in Thee. Give us grace to see in each of our fellowmen a child of God and treat all men accordingly. Thus may we, in peace, in mutual respect and in fraternal charity, fulfill the holy words of the Psalmist: "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethern to dwell together in unity." Amen.

FREIGHT RATE RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL CONVENTION OF YOUNG DEMOCRATS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. John R. Churchill, publisher of the Oregon Democrat, under date of February 5, enclosing a resolution adopted by the National Convention of Young Democrats, at Reno, Nev., with regard to freight rates.

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

THE OREGON DEMOCRAT,
Portland, Oreg., February 5, 1958.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was happy to hear of your able pleading before the Interstate Commerce Commission. Frankly, I am convinced that the freight rate question is one of the best campaign issues of the coming election. I am enclosing a copy of my freight rate resolution which was passed at the National Convention of Young Democrats, at Reno.

As long as distance costs have gone up scarcely at all, I see no justification whatever for penalizing distant shippers, just because percentage increases in rates are more easy to administer than any other method of increases.

With best regards.

JOHN A. CHURCHILL.

FREIGHT RATE RESOLUTION

1. Whereas the railroad freight rates of the past 10 years have been increased by the percentage method, to over 100 percent of the 1946 rate structure, and it is expected that the next two decades will witness an increase of at least another 100 percent; and

2. Whereas the percentage method of rate increases has discriminated unfairly against distant shippers, because the line-haul costs have not increased as much as terminal costs, and this discrimination has disrupted trade relationships between many parts of the country, obstructing the free flow of economic activity within the United States;

3. We urge that Congress direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to restore the dollars-and-cents rate relationships existing in 1946, and to make any future rate increases on a dollars-and-cents basis, based on actual increases in costs.

ADDRESSES, PRAYERS, AND PROGRAM AT KIWANIS BROTHERHOOD LUNCHEON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 27, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and I represented the United States Senate at the Kiwanis Brotherhood luncheon, given in Washington, D. C., by the Georgetown, D. C., and Washington, D. C., Kiwanis Clubs.

This was one of the most moving affairs of this type I have ever attended, and I am honored to make this request for the insertion in the RECORD of the program, the prayers, introductory remarks by Dr. Morton O. Alper, president of the Georgetown Kiwanis Club; address by Dr. Ali Amini, Ambassador of Iran; address by Mr. G. L. Mehta, Ambassador of India; and address by Dr. Everett Clinchy, president of World Brotherhood, president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

I ask unanimous consent that the program of the luncheon, the prayers, and the brief individual addresses by various participants, be printed in the RECORD.

In my judgment this discussion of world brotherhood should be of great interest to Senators, and I believe that this program should be made a matter of historic record.

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

PROGRAM

Presiding: Reid Wallace, president, Washington Kiwanis Club.

Entire assembly: First verse of America; pledge of allegiance.

Invocation: Dr. Norman Gerstenfeld, rabbi of the Washington Hebrew congregation.

Lunch.

Air Force hymn: Singing Sergeants, United States Air Force.

Prayer of brotherhood: Dr. Edward G. Latch, minister of the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church.

Introduction of honored guests: C. Vernon Hill, chairman, Kiwanis International support of churches committee.

Introduction of speakers: Morton O. Alper, president, Georgetown Kiwanis Club.

A Moslem Looks at Brotherhood: Dr. Ali Amini, Ambassador of Iran.

A Buddhist Looks at Brotherhood: Mr. U. Win, Ambassador of Burma.

A Hindu Looks at Brotherhood: Mr. G. L. Mehta, Ambassador of India.

Summation: Dr. Everett Clinchy, president of World Brotherhood, president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

The Lord's Prayer: Singing Sergeants, United States Air Force.

Benediction: Rev. Gilbert Hartke, O. P., Catholic University.

PRAYER BY EDWARD G. LATCH

O God, who hast made of one blood all nations of men; give us to know that Thou art the Father of all and that we, Thy children of every race and nation are brothers together. Let us not close the door of fellowship to any brother. Make us to remember that whatever we do to one of the least of these, our brethren, we do unto Thee, and by Thy great love help us to seek for all men everywhere the opportunity of fullness of life.

Pour out Thy Spirit upon us that there may be within us and without a fellowship where there is no east or west, no south or north, no bond or free. Deliver us from self-righteousness and foolish pride; deliver us from the desire to impose our wills upon others; deliver us from putting our trust in the military alone and neglect the demands of Thy righteousness, the ways of Thy mercy and the adventures of Thy faith.

O Thou who hast created the world and sustains it, who art from everlasting to everlasting, make us to know that Thou art God and that in Thee is our hope. Grant us the grace to repent our misdoings and to yield our wills to Thine, that Thou mayest heal all our diseases and redeem our lives from destruction. Bring us more and more into fellowship with our fellow man.

"In Thee there is no east or west,
In Thee no south or north:
But one great fellowship of love
Throughout the whole wide earth.

"Join hands, then, brothers of the faith,
Whate'er your race may be.
Who serves my Father as a son
Is surely kin to me."

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY DR. MORTON O. ALPER, PRESIDENT, GEORGETOWN KIWANIS CLUB

On behalf of the Kiwanis Club of Georgetown, and our parent club, Kiwanis of Washington, I would like to welcome our distinguished guests at the head table as well as our distinguished guests in the audience, for to us, all Kiwanians are distinguished.

It is fitting, that in observance of brotherhood, we should hear from representatives of the world's major religions, for nothing patterns the destiny of men or nations more than the philosophy that motivates them. Understanding and respecting the philosophy of others is the basis for all brotherhood.

For our part, we have come to realize that it is not so much a question of how a man believes, but that he believes. By the same token, we view with great concern a society that frowns on the practice of any faith. All too often, in such a system, the end can be justified by any means, and it is difficult to find common ground for mutual concepts of justice, ethics, and morality.

Time has shown that we must do more than sit and wait, and hope for the coming of a Messiah. We must translate our dreams into realities, our prayers into action, and strive to build a Messianic age, an age in which all men will come to realize their brotherhood and the fatherhood of Almighty God.

Our first speaker.

THE BASIS OF UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD IN ISLAM

(Address by Dr. Ali Amini, Ambassador of Iran, to the Kiwanis Clubs of the District of Columbia and area, February 27, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, as a Moslem, I think I should greet you all in the traditional Islamic manner by saying: As-Salamun-Alaikom. Translated into simple English, this Arabic phrase means, "peace be upon you." But the devout Moslem would add another phrase so that the greeting would mean, "Peace be upon you, and the mercy and blessings of God." The meaning, however, goes much deeper because of the significant word "salam" comes from the same root that has given Islam its basis for the universal brotherhood of man through submission to the will of God.

A glance at the pages of history would tell us how all this came about.

Prophet Mohammed was born in Mecca in the year 570 A. D., in one of the noblest Arab families, namely the Koreish family. But the Arabia of the early sixth century was a very unhappy land.

It was, as historians have called it, a land of intolerances and civil wars; and those who did not speak Arabic were considered to be absolutely inarticulate, unable to express themselves. Into such a society was the prophet of Islam born. But two decades after the prophetic call, this society was changed, and the teachings of Islam had brought about a revolution unprecedented in the annals of human history.

And what we see next is this:

Belal, an Abyssinian, becomes the Governor of Medina. Bazan, a Persian, is appointed the Governor of Yemen. A young freed slave, Zaid, is adopted by the prophet as his son. Soheib, a Greek convert, leads prayers at the very Mosque of the Prophet; and another freed slave, Osma Ibn Zaid, is supported as commander of the army. All traces of racial prejudice are forgotten, and the baseless theory of the supremacy of the so-called chosen race and language abandoned forever.

This revolution in human thought and society continued with the spread of Islam to other lands. Non-Arabs, mainly Persians, contributed to Arab grammar and wrote the first dictionary of the Arabic language.

Perhaps the best incident which illustrates this Islamic brotherhood took place in the year 638 A. D., at the fall of the city of Jerusalem.

As you know, the patriarch of Jerusalem had agreed to surrender the city to the caliph in person. Omar, the second caliph was not with the army. A messenger was sent to Medina to inform the caliph of the matter, and the caliph set out on the long 600-mile journey accompanied by a servant. Only one camel was available for the journey, and so the caliph and the servant rode it by turn. It so happened that when they reached Jerusalem, it was the servant's turn to ride the camel; and the caliph of Islam entered the city leading the camel on which his servant was riding.

The question is: How did such a great change occur in such a short period of time?

The answer is: Islamic brotherhood.

Brotherhood, the universal brotherhood of Islam, is not a statesman's or a reformer's dream. It is neither an ideal envisaged by the weak, nor is it a promise given by the powerful to pacify surging masses. It is a reality. It transcends political equality, or equality in the eye of the land of the land. It is equality in everything: from worship to economic equality and opportunity and privileges, including the sharing of scientific knowledge. On a higher plane, it is that kind of equality and brotherhood that are achieved through dedication to the service of God; and the most important way of serving God, according to Islam, is serving humanity.

Indeed, the Koran and the Traditions of the Prophet are most explicit on this point. The holy Koran (ch. 33, v. 52) says, "And verily this brotherhood of yours is a single brotherhood and Allah is your Lord God and Cherisher." Again, (ch. 2, v. 13) states, "Mankind is a single community and Allah has sent unto them prophets as bearers of good tidings and as warners against evil." At another place the holy Koran explains, "God has created you into different nations that you may know and appreciate each other," and the Prophet said, "The most pious among you is the noblest in the eye of God."

This conception of Islamic universal brotherhood is best expressed by the term "Ummat." Ummat does not mean nation, or follower, or a special community embracing a set of principles. Any person, from whatever race or country of origin or language becomes a member of the Ummat the moment he embraces Islam. Thus no Muslim is ever considered a foreigner upon entering an Islamic country. It means the complete fusion of interests, welfare, and happiness of all under the guidance and the suzerainty of Almighty God. This conception of equality and brotherhood is closely linked to the Moslem way of life.

Thus, Islam does not recognize a priest-class or in fact any class whatsoever.

In religious practices, the most learned man in the congregation leads prayers. In civil practices, the leaders must be chosen by the free vote of the population.

Again, in the spiritual sphere, Islam does not recognize any person to act as intercessor or mediator between man and God. This principle is another manifestation of the concept of human equality and brotherhood. All men are equal and brothers; and the spiritual privileges attainable by a human being in the eye of God rest upon his own efforts in serving mankind, which is the noblest way to serve God Almighty. Each individual has direct access to God.

Neither are non-Moslems denied this right. Islam bids all its followers to respect other nations and consider them as brothers. The holy Koran, in fact, even forbids Moslems to enter into useless and spiteful arguments with the followers of other faiths. Religion, according to Islam, is a deep personal relationship between man and God. Hence the Koran says, "There is no compulsion in religion."

Again, it is for this reason that Prophet Mohammed did not call Islam a new faith. The revelation, he said, is a continuation of what had been revealed previously to other prophets: Abraham, Isaac, Ishmael, Moses, Jesus, and other prophets. All these prophets and their God-fearing followers are to be respected and considered as brothers. Similarly, Islam forbids wars of aggression as such wars are not consistent with the principle of universal brotherhood. A Moslem is defined as a person from the harm of whose hands and mouth people are immune—one who does not harm anybody by word or deed.

It was to express this idea further that the prophet of Islam said: "All humanity is like a single body. When a part of the body is afflicted, all other parts—no matter how remotely removed—are likewise afflicted and share in the discomfort."

These principles of universal brotherhood propounded by Islam could be applied to modern society without any consideration for race, religion, or political beliefs. In reality, many of the accepted principles of modern administration and friendly political relations between the countries of the world are applications of Islamic principles. The ousting of war as a tool of national policy has been an Islamic principle initiated 13 centuries ago. The democracy of Islam outlaws all racial, religious, and other baneful prejudices. Islam categorically rejects the theory of the supremacy of one race over another. It rejects the false pretensions of the so-called master race of the chosen people. The manner in which the first four successors to the prophet were chosen is an example of democracy in action; namely, election to the rulers, rulers who are responsible to the people they rule and who obtain their powers from those under their administration through the free consent of the people.

To this, Islam gives a deep spiritual significance. It promotes human brotherhood to a higher level and unites humanity into a single community with one goal; namely, the worship of God through rendering service to man. Mere brotherhood is not considered enough. Let me explain this through a Persian story:

It is said that a man approached a wise man and said to him, "Sir, which is better—a brother or a friend?" and the wise man said, "It is better that the brother should also be a friend."

BROTHERHOOD AND WORLD PEACE

(Address by Mr. U Win, Ambassador of Burma, before the Kiwanis Clubs of the District of Columbia and area, February 27, 1958)

It is a pleasure and privilege to participate in your celebration for Brotherhood Week and I thank the directors and officers of the Georgetown Kiwanis Club for the kind invitation extended to me.

In this world there is enough money and material and there is no lack of intellect. Yet something is lacking. What is it? The answer is the spirit of brotherhood—the spirit of fellowship. This lack of the spirit of brotherhood and fellowship is the major cause of war. Apart from military conflicts, there are many other conflicts such as racial, economic, and even religious conflicts.

In a conflict, each side has its own conceit, but to hide it, both parties have their own nicely written labels such as "New World Order," "Coprosperity in East Asia," and "Civilizing the Backward Peoples." In almost every conflict each side blames the other, both parties claiming that they are right. They use even the names of religion to justify their actions. They will try to persuade God to take their side, but they do not seem to make any attempt to be on God's side. They claim that there is only one God but they forget that if there is only one God, there must be only one family of men. They treat one another not only as strangers but as enemies.

Since the end of the First World War, there have been many organizations called "international." Many authors have written on this subject of internationalism. Idealistic workers, hoping for a better future, have started many international movements. We had the League of Nations, founded in 1920, but it had failed to maintain peace. Why? Because most of these organizations have dealt with mere external and material adjustments. Too much attention has been paid to the material and too little to the spiritual side of life.

Then a Second World War, which is unparalleled in history for destruction, had ended. The world is still in a state of chaos and there is no peace and happiness. Again idealistic workers, lecturers and writers produced books and have restarted international organizations. These organizations will only be successful if the leaders can carry through their plans in a spirit of world fellowship and brotherhood. The peace which we all desire, peace in our hearts, and in our minds, peace between neighbors, and peace amongst nations is no miracle which is God's task to perform. It can only come about as the result of a reconstruction of thought, feeling and action by means of the spirit of fellowship and brotherhood.

In attempting to discover a form of appeal on which to base morality Buddhism does not appeal to any external authority such as a Deity, but to the natural desire of the human heart. Buddhists learn that certain actions such as selfishness, violence and laziness, tend to disorganize society and to cause unhappiness to its members. Buddhism teaches that misery and suffering are not the result of the wrath of God or gods, but are the consequence of man's ignorance of his own nature and of his surroundings. The chief defect of our economic system is the existence of useless luxury on one side, and unnecessary burdens on the other. The problem is to devise some scheme of protection and distribution which will make human life less burdened on the one side and less full of useless luxury on the other. By this, I do not mean the socialism that takes, but I do mean the socialism that gives. The Buddhist concept of socialism is the socialism of love, which can only bring about realization of world brotherhood.

The real spirit of brotherhood which is lacking in the world today, can be promoted through religion. Religion is an action of the heart, with the view to refining our nature and elevating us in the scale of human beings. Religion is not merely theory, but practice. The heart, like the body, becomes healthy and strong by physical exercise. No doctrine merely held in the minds as an intellectual belief has any driving force. No doctrine is of any value unless and until already applied. Religion is not confined to any one country or to any particular nation or race. It is universal.

The world has found itself as one body, yet the fact of physical unity and economic interdependence, though of no great value, is not by itself sufficient to create a united family. In this we require a human consciousness of community, a sense of personal interrelationship amongst men, the spirit of world brotherhood. To have the spirit of brotherhood, we must realize the oneness of the world, and understand that we are one family.

Life is a mighty wheel in perpetual motion. This wheel contains within it, numberless small wheels, corresponding to the lives of individual men, each of which has a pattern of its own. The great wheel and the small wheels; the whole world and individual men, are intimately and indissolubly linked. The whole human family is so closely knit together that every unit is dependent upon all others for its growth and development. The ideal that is placed before us, is to a mutual service and practical brotherhood. Mutual service is a perpetual call on humanity, for we are bound alike by the bonds of humanity.

Science proves that the fundamental structure of the human mind is uniform in all races. What differences that there are, are due to historical circumstances and stages of development. Without recognition of the oneness of the world for all in all its aspects, spiritual as well as social, economic as well as political, there will never be peace. The spirit of world brotherhood is the only logical basis of all true and high civilization and real world peace.

A HINDU LOOKS AT BROTHERHOOD

(Address by Mr. G. L. Mehta, Ambassador of India, to the Kiwanis Clubs of the District of Columbia and area, February 27, 1958)

Although religion has many complexions and dialects, it expresses the innermost urge of man for salvation or immortality, it stresses the supremacy of the spirit over matter, it proclaims the eternal verities of truth and peace, it teaches the value of compassion and renunciation. But while we recite verses from Scriptures, and sing hymns, we are apt to forget that these teachings and doctrines have to be translated day by day in practice by ordinary men and women. Unless we seek to practice these principles in our public conduct and private lives, religious doctrines have little significance or value.

Hinduism or the religion of the Hindus has been in its evolution so eclectic and all-embracing that it is not always easy to define. Although the Hindus worship many deities and have elaborate rituals and ceremonies, in its essence Hinduism is inspired by the concept of the oneness of all things, of gods as well as of sentient beings. In Hinduism, religion and philosophy have coexisted, and together they have encompassed some of the most abstruse thought that the human mind has been capable of.

Hinduism has striven to achieve a synthesis of mind and spirit and sought harmony in divergent and dissident elements. This underlying trend has influenced various schools of thought and many religious movements. Sufism, for example, was influenced by this philosophy. One of the renowned sages of the middle ages, Kabir, preached and practiced a religion which tried to combine the spirit of Hinduism and Islam. And the great Muslim Emperor, Akbar, endeavored to evolve a religion in which he wanted to combine the best of all—he had also a Christian priest near him. This Din-i-Ilahi, as it was called, was a characteristic example of the climate of India.

It is this fundamental concept of unity in diversity that leads the Hindu to believe that God is one but men follow different routes to reach Him. An ancient saying of the Hindus proclaims, "He is one but the sages describe Him differently." The Hindus, therefore, do not insist on conformity between different religions. Every man has a right to choose that form of belief and worship which most appeals to him. Hinduism, in this sense, is not a sect but a fellowship of all who accept the law of right and earnestly seek for the truth. Its conception of brotherhood includes not only human beings but all living creatures. The Bhagavad Gita (translated as Song Celestial) says "part of myself is the God within every creature" and a still more ancient sacred book of ours, the Eesha Upanishad, observes: "Of a certainty, the man who can see all creatures in himself, himself in all creatures, knows no sorrow."

From this conception are derived reverence for all life, tolerance, and compassion. I do not mean to suggest that as individuals or as a people we are not intolerant at times. But I do venture to say that the best among us from the ancient rishis to Gandhi have not only preached but sought to practice this virtue of tolerance. The Hindu thinker readily admits points of view other than his own and considers them worthy of attention. A Hindu, if he is true to his principles, believes that everyone who is following his own religious convictions, who is following his own Dharma, is treading the right path because no one is superior enough to show him a better way. All spiritual religions are paths of truth. There is no one uniform standard for the human race; whether one worships in a temple or tabernacle, a church or a mosque or synagogue, provided he does it sincerely and with humility and reverence, there is no reason why other people should try to deflect him from his course. Religion is a matter of conviction, not coercion.

The idea that mankind is one is enshrined in an old Sanskrit saying, "To the enlightened ones, the whole world is a family." India, in many respects, has been like a vast ocean in which many streams of races and religions have flown since times immemorial, and India has had the capacity of absorbing these varied trends, of assimilating them instead of rejecting them. If I may add in parenthesis, even centuries ago, people who were persecuted in other lands because of their religion have come over to India and India gave them refuge. Systems of thought have developed in India trying to harmonize various creeds and distill the essence of religion from the mass of doctrines and the gamut of rituals and ceremonies. The Hindus revere and worship Buddha. Christianity reached India nearly 1,900 years ago and there are over 10 million Christians of various denominations in India going to their churches and following their creeds. There are 45 million Moslems; and Hindus hold sacred not only the mosques and shrines of the Moslems but revere many of their saints as holy men.

It is this heritage of the imminence of the divine, the supremacy of spirit over matter which inspires countless men and women through the ages. May I conclude by reciting an ancient prayer of ours, recited on the banks of the Ganges and the Jumna and which has been used almost daily by millions for more than 3,000 years; for, it is as vital and ennobling today as when first uttered in the dim past.

"Lead me from the unreal to the real.
Lead me from darkness to light.
Lead me from death to immortality.
Peace, peace, peace."

ADDRESS BY DR. EVERETT CLINCHY, PRESIDENT OF WORLD BROTHERHOOD, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

On behalf of world brotherhood, I want to congratulate the Kiwanis Club of Georgetown on the success of this unique and meaningful event in celebration of Brotherhood Week. This occasion—when we have with us their Excellencies, the Ambassadors of India, Iran, and Burma, representing 3 great religions of the East, as well as Rabbi Gerstenfeld, Dr. Latch, and Reverend Hartke, of 3 of the faiths predominating in our Western World—symbolizes the growing yearning of us of all creeds, to know more about our brothers of the human race, and to understand the faiths by which they live.

This is also an occasion for us of the Western World, to be reminded that the concept of the brotherhood of man can be said to have originated in Asia, where it is a basic element in the great living religions. Because of this fact, Moslems, Hindus, and Buddhists in many cities of Southeast Asia have shown great interest in creating under their own leadership, committees and chapters of world brotherhood. These committees work with the leaders of their own educational institutions, religious groups, community, youth and business organizations, in developing educational programs to overcome prejudice based on differences in race, religion, and culture. We are very proud of the fact that world brotherhood has as members of its general assembly distinguished leaders of many different countries, religions, groups, and races.

Another reason for which this occasion today seems to me so important is that it is evidence of a deep and growing concern on the part of businessmen and men of affairs—Kiwanians—for things of the spirit and for the development of real friendship among all members of the great family of man. This is one of the most encouraging signs of our troubled times.

And now I want to bring you a message which one of our cochairmen, Paul-Henri Spaak, has sent us for Brotherhood Week: If one could organize a plebiscite in all the countries of the earth on the following question: "Are you in favor of world brotherhood?" the response would be a unanimous "Yes." How, therefore, can there be any doubt as to the power of an idea which lies so implicit in the heart of every man and woman in the world? Furthermore, if one considers history in its perspective, one perceives that brotherhood has won over to it,

peoples and continents formerly hostile or divided. In spite of appearances, the idea is making its way. It will do so all the more quickly, as it becomes apparent to all governments that war is no longer a solution to the problems of this time, and that from now on we must all live together or perish together.

BROTHERHOOD LUNCHEON: BENEDICTION, FATHER HARTKE

We give Thee thanks, Almighty God, for these, Thy benefits, which we have received from Thy bounty. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

FEBRUARY 27, 1958.

FARM LEGISLATION—LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT FROM SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to read for the RECORD a brief letter I have written to the President, and to have printed in the RECORD in connection therewith a statement by the Senate majority policy committee, concurred in by 42 Members of the Senate. The letter is very brief and reads as follows:

SENATE MAJORITY POLICY COMMITTEE,
March 27, 1958.

Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON has sent the following letter and enclosure to the President:

MARCH 27, 1958.

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

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing for your consideration a resolution adopted by the Senate majority policy committee and signed by 42 Members of the Senate majority. I commend it to your attention.

The measure to which it refers represents an effort by Members of both parties in the Congress to maintain the income and purchasing power of our farmers at a time when it is vitally important that we keep our economy at the highest possible level. It is my understanding that the Senate minority policy committee has also urged that the measure be approved.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Senate Majority Policy Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by the Senate majority policy committee. The statement or resolution refers to the farm bill, which is now at the White House awaiting the President's action.

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

SENATE MAJORITY POLICY COMMITTEE,
March 27, 1958.

Whereas net income from farming has fallen from $14.3 billion in 1952 to $11.5 billion in 1957; and

Whereas the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar has fallen from 47 percent in 1952 to 40 percent in 1957 during the same period that the Consumer Price Index has risen from 114.6 to 115.4; and

Whereas the drop in farm purchasing power has contributed directly to unemployment in manufacturing industries which depend upon agriculture for a substantial share of the market

Therefore, the Senate majority policy committee respectfully urges the President to sign into law the bill passed by Congress which would prevent use of the powers of Government to force farm income down below 1957 levels. We believe that this measure is an act of simple justice and would represent an important weapon in the battle against increasing unemployment.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Chairman; MIKE MANSFIELD; THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.; RICHARD B. RUSSELL; ROBERT S. KERR; CARL HAYDEN; THEODORE F. GREEN; JAMES E. MURRAY; LISTER HILL; ALLEN J. ELLENDER; JAMES O. EASTLAND; RUSSELL B. LONG; J. W. FULBRIGHT; JOSEPH S. CLARK; JOHN A. CARROLL; W. KERR SCOTT; JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY; FRANK CHURCH; ALAN BIBLE; STROM THURMOND; A. S. MIKE MONRONEY; HUBERT H. HUMPHREY; JOHN L. MCCLELLAN; JOHN F. KENNEDY; DENNIS CHAVEZ; HENRY M. JACKSON; RICHARD L. NEUBERGER; HERMAN E. TALMADGE; OLIN D. JOHNSTON; WARREN G. MAGNUSON; WILLIAM PROXMIRE; PAUL H. DOUGLAS; RALPH YARBOROUGH; JOHN SPARKMAN; SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.; STUART SYMINGTON; WAYNE MORSE; ESTES KEFAUVER; PAT MCNAMARA; JOHN STENNIS; GEORGE SMATHERS; ALBERT GORE.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D. C., there is being held the National Conference of Organizations on International Trade. The theme of the conference is Reciprocal Trade: The 1958 Imperatives.

More than 125 national and local organizations from every section of the United States are participating in the conference.

Representing industry, labor, agriculture, commerce, consumers, civic groups, religious life, our two major political parties, and all other phases of American life, the memberships of these organizations comprise the majority of the voting citizens of the United States.

As individuals and as organizations, the conference participants may disagree on many other issues. It is significant, however, that they are in agreement in support of an extension of the Trade Agreements Act, which is before Congress at this time.

It was my privilege to be one of the participants in the program of the conference this afternoon, under the chairmanship of Mr. Philip Cortney, chairman, United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, Inc.

The following speakers were participants:

The Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State; the Honorable James F. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor; the Honorable C. Douglas Dillon, Deputy Under Secretary of State; Henry J. Heinz II, president, H. J. Heinz Co.; and James S. Schramm, executive vice president, James S. Schramm Co., and a director of the National Retail Merchants Association.

I, too, had the honor to participate in the afternoon's program.

This evening, the President is to be the honored guest, and he will be introduced by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. Also present at the dinner this evening will be the Vice President.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the participating organizations and the names of the heads of the organizations be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ORGANIZATIONS PARTICIPATING IN THE CONFERENCE SUPPORTING RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM

American Association of Port Authorities, P. J. McCulloch, president.

American Association for the United Nations, Oscar deLima, acting president.

American Association of University Women, Dr. Anna L. Rose Hawkes, president.

American Cotton Shippers Association, E. F. Creekmore, president.

American Farm Bureau Federation, Charles B. Shuman, president.

AFL–CIO, George Meany, president.

American Merchant Marine Institute, Ralph E. Casey, president.

American Retail Federation, Rowland Jones, Jr., president.

American Seafood Distributors Association, Walter R. Meier, Jr., president.

American Veterans Committee, William R. Ming, president.

AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Stuart J. Satullo, national commander.

American Watch Association, Jean R. Graef, president.

Americans for Democratic Action, Robert Nathan, president.

Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, Harold Jackson, president.

Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, John J. McDonough, president.

Automotive Exporters Club, J. Theodore Wolfson, president.

Baltimore Association of Commerce, Martin B. Kohn, president.

Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church, Rev. Ralph W. Sockman, president.

Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, George Harrison, grand president.

Brunswick Port Authority, Joe Isenberg, chairman.

Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, Charles N. Diefendorf, president.

Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Claude W. Maloney, president.

Canners League of California, O. R. Hayes, president.

Catholic Association for International Peace, Harry W. Flannery, president.

Cedar Rapids Chamber of Commerce, L. P. Boudreaux, president.

Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, George E. Whitwell, acting president.

Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City, Cliff C. Jones, Jr., president.

Chamber of Commerce of the City of Newark, N. J., James E. Mitchell, president.

Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans Area, E. N. Rowley, president.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Philip M. Talbott, president.

Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, Joseph L. Block, president.

Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Edward Staley, president.

Committee for a National Trade Policy, George L. Bell, president.

Committee of American Steamship Lines, Solon B. Turman, chairman.

Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Warren Dywer, chairman.

Cooperative League of the United States of America, Murray Lincoln, chairman.

Dallas Chamber of Commerce, J. E. Jonsson, president.

Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce, Kenneth P. Morse, president.

Detroit Board of Commerce, Ross Roy, president.

Export Managers Association of San Francisco, R. A. Rothe, president.

Export Managers Club of Chicago, Charles A. Hofstetter, president.

Foreign Commerce Club of New York, Erwin Wedemann, president.

Foreign Trade Association of Southern California, Herbert H. Pierce, president.

Foreign Traders Association of Philadelphia, Charles M. Hentz, president.

Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, Clay J. Berry, president.

Friends Committee on National Legislation, Delbert Relogle, chairman.

Galveston Chamber of Commerce, Edward Schreiber, president.

General Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. R. I. C. Prout, president.

Georgia Ports Authority, Robert E. Frankenfield, chairman.

Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, Thomas M. Hennessey, president.

Greater Charleston Chamber of Commerce, W. P. Brennan, president.

Greater Erie Chamber of Commerce, K. H. Ishler, president.

Greater Muskegon Chamber of Commerce, Don F. Seygerth, president.

Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce, William C. MacInnes, president.

Houston Port Bureau, Nicholas Patton, general manager.

Houston World Trade Association, William L. Brewster, president.

Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, Harry T. Pritchard, president.

International Advertising Association, George E. Kendall, president.

International House, New Orleans, Joseph M. Rault, president.

Jacksonville Area Chamber of Commerce, Glenn Marshall, Jr., president.

Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Benjamin H. Chasen, national commander.

Junior World Trade Association of San Francisco, Richard J. Abbott, president.

Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade of the City of New York, Morton Morris, president.

Leaf Tobacco Exporters Association, C. M. Dozier, Jr., president.

League of Women Voters of the United States, Mrs. John G. Lee, president.

Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, George J. Badenhausen, president.

Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, George B. Gose, president.

Louisville Chamber of Commerce, Dillman A. Nash, president.

Maine Port Authority, Donald S. Laughlin, president.

Maryland Port Authority, Robert W. Williams, chairman.

Massachusetts Council of Retail Merchants, Daniel Bloomfield, managing director.

Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce, James Moulder, president.

Millers National Federation, G. S. Kennedy, president.

Milwaukee Association of Commerce, Lester S. Olsen, president.

Milwaukee World Trade Club, P. C. Foote, president.

Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, Felton Colwell, president.

Mississippi Valley Association, W. W. Hollowell, chairman.

Mobile Chamber of Commerce, George M. Hass, president.

Motion Picture Association of America, Eric Johnston, president.

National Anti-Dumping Committee, A. W. Horton, president.

National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Luigi Ligutti, president.

National Council of American Importers, I. Mark Bomba, president.

National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg, president.

National Council of Jewish Women, Mrs. Moise S. Cahn, president.

National Council of Negro Women, Miss Dorothy Height, president.

National Farmers Union, James G. Patton, president.

National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Miss Hazel Palmer, president.

National Retail Merchants Association, George W. Dowdy, president.

Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, Henry Clay Hofheimer, president.

Norfolk Port Authority, J. Rives Worsham, Sr., chairman.

North Atlantic Ports Association, James W. Davis, president.

Oakland Chamber of Commerce, Mortimer Smith, president.

Oakland World Trade Club, Jack O. Grounds, president.

Omaha Chamber of Commerce, Ralph E. Svaboda, president.

Overseas Automotive Club, E. R. Wyler, president.

Pacific American Steamship Association, Ralph Dewey, president.

Port of Beaumont, R. A. Coale, president.

Port of Detroit Commission, T. H. Browning, chairman.

Port Everglades, Nelson DeBan, chairman.

Port of New Orleans, Edgar A. G. Bright, president.

Port of New York Authority, Donald V. Lowe, chairman.

Port of Palm Beach, Billy B. Burns, chairman.

Propeller Club of the United States, Adm. T. P. Wynkoop, national president.

Rochester Chamber of Commerce, Sol M. Linowitz, president.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Alan K. Broone, president.

San Francisco World Trade Center Authority, Harry J. Boyle, chairman.

Savannah District Authority, L. C. McClurkin, chairman.

Seattle Chamber of Commerce, Irving S. Smith, president.

South Atlantic and Caribbean Ports Association, R. T. Spangler, president.

Synagogue Council of America, Rabbi Theodore L. Adams, president.

Tobacco Association of the United States of America, A. P. Thorpe, president.

Tobacco Associates, J. B. Hutson, president.

Toledo Lucas County Port Authority, W. W. Knight, Jr., chairman.

Traffic Club of Galveston-Texas City, M. L. Shupe, president.

United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, Philip Cortney, president.

United States National Student Association, Ray Farabee, president.

Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, Miss Lois McColloch, president.

United Church of Christ, Council for Social Action, Rev. Henry C. Kock, chairman.

United Church Women, Mrs. Theodore O. Wedel, president.

United World Federalists, Donald Harrington, president.

Washington Board of Trade, Howard C. Drake, president.

Worcester Chamber of Commerce, Richard N. Symonds, president.

World Affairs Council of Philadelphia, William L. Batt, president.

World Trade Center of New England, Ernest Henderson, president.

World Trade Club of New York, Robert J. Wynn, president.

World Trade Club of Seattle, Fred Becker, president.

Young Democratic Clubs of America, Nelson Lancione, president.

Young Republican National Federation, John Ashbrook, chairman.

Young Women's Christian Association of the United States, Miss Lilace Reid Barnes, president.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the program also lists the experts on trade policy, and I ask unanimous consent that the names of these experts be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EXPERTS ON TRADE POLICY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS

Charles P. Taft, general counsel, CNTP.

Lamar Fleming, Jr., president, Anderson-Clayton; member, Randall Commission; observer, GATT-Geneva.

Harry C. Hawkins, economic adviser, United States Council, International Chamber of Commerce.

Lynn Edminster, vice chairman, United States Tariff Commission, 1942–53.

Dr. Francis C. McIntyre, director, economic research, California-Texas Oil Co., Ltd.

Andrew J. Biemiller, director, department of legislation, AFL–CIO.

Bert Seidman, economist, research department, AFL–CIO.

Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Thomas C. Mann, Assistant Secretary of State.

George Dietz, director, international affairs, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Reuben Johnson, coordinator of legislative services, National Farmers Union.

Dr. Irene Taueber, Institute of Advanced Studies, Princeton.

Mrs. Richard Newman, League of Women Voters.

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Member of Congress from New Jersey.

Hon. RICHARD BOLLING, Member of Congress from Missouri.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of my remarks at the conference.

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

REMARKS OF HON. HUBERT HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF ORGANIZATIONS ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE POLICY

It is no secret that in recent weeks I have expressed some serious doubts that the reciprocal trade program can be renewed in this Congress without crippling amendments. This great conference today provides some hope that my doubts may be unwarranted. I wish to assure you that I have no desire in this important matter to be a true prophet. With your help, we may hope that a sound, constructive reciprocal trade program will be enacted this year.

It will not be easy, however. If I don't leave any other word here today, I want to

assure you that your opponents in this matter are doing their usually good job. The pressure is terrific. Those who have been working hard for a long time to destroy the reciprocal trade program are today working harder than ever. The high-tariff lobbyists are busy not only in Washington. They are active all across the United States. They are taking advantage of every difficulty which industry may be facing. They are almost gleeful that we have a recession at this time. They keep repeating over and over again this simple message, "Low-cost foreign labor threatens the jobs of American workers." Too many Americans are falling for this line, and they are letting us in the Congress know how they feel.

Make no mistake about it. The reciprocal trade program is in trouble today. But it need not be. If all the proper and sensible things that are being said today at this conference could be told to the American people, I am confident that they will start speaking out in support of—rather than in opposition to—the program.

The nature of the protectionist lobby has been clear for a long time. More than 40 years ago Woodrow Wilson declared: "Washington has seldom seen so numerous, so industrious and so insidious a lobby. * * * There is every evidence that money without limit is being spent to sustain this lobby. * * * Great bodies of astute men seek to create an artificial opinion and overcome the interest of the public for their private profit."

This warning against the protectionist lobby is just as important today. Its steady pressure on Congress has resulted in recent years in a series of amendments to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which have gradually altered the act from its true purpose. Protectionist devices have been added to the act, some, I regret to say, with the blessings of the administration. Others, even more serious, are again threatening the act.

Therefore I especially applaud this conference today. It has brought together men and women from both sides of the political aisle, from industry and from labor, from farm groups and church groups. Through these organizations we must counteract the deliberately concocted half-truths and untruths about our foreign trade program. Through these organizations we must make every effort to have the American people understand some simple economic facts of life. Let me list briefly for you a few of these basic facts:

1. The Communists are engaged in an economic offensive which in the long run may constitute a greater danger than all their sputniks and intercontinental ballistic missiles. As far back as 1952 their strategy for spreading communism shifted from military aggression to an economic and diplomatic offensive. It was Stalin himself who proclaimed the new economic warfare as the means whereby communism would eventually dominate the world. Last year Khrushchev stated frankly, "We declare economic war on you Americans." Every year the Soviet economic offensive is being stepped up. Whether it be the need for investment capital, requests for technical assistance, or negotiation of trade agreements, the Soviets have shown determination and skill.

Trade has been a primary weapon in the arsenal of this Communist economic offensive. Trade missions from the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the satellite countries have been busy, especially in the uncommitted countries of Asia and the Middle East. The number of trade agreements negotiated between the Communist bloc and other countries has more than doubled since 1953.

The tragedy is that at the very time the Communists are stepping up their use of trade as a weapon against us in the cold war, we are helping them by weakening our own most effective instrument for promoting trade among the free nations of the world. I do not doubt for a split second that the overwhelming majority of free and uncommitted peoples would prefer to trade with us. You cannot blame them, however, if our protectionist tendencies drive them to deal with the Russians instead.

2. A second consideration in our foreign-trade program is its importance for the continued economic and political well-being of the Free World. Nearly every nation in the non-Communist world needs to buy more products from the United States than we need to buy from them. If these other nations cannot sell goods for American dollars with which in turn to purchase American products, 1 of 3 things must happen. We must loan or give them the dollars that they need with which to buy from us; or, if they are caught in an inflationary situation, with consequent weakness to themselves and to the entire Free World; or, as we have seen, they are compelled to deal with the Communist bloc or to develop arrangements among themselves, such as the European common market.

A CHALLENGE AND AN OPPORTUNITY

Our people do not fully understand the importance to other countries of the products they sell to us. We are so big and so diversified in our production that we sometimes forget that other countries depend very heavily upon one or just a few products. Every time we invoke the escape clause, some nation or nations suffer. Some of our best friends—Norway, Sweden, Switzerland—have been among the nations thus affected. Imagine the howls that would go up in this country if because of the actions of some other country our entire economy were suddenly threatened.

Our friends abroad want to stand on their own feet. We have been glad to help them through the Marshall plan and other types of aid. But in the final analysis, their economic well-being will depend upon the growth and strengthening of the industries which they are best qualified to maintain. We must help them achieve such a goal.

3. A third consideration—one which the tariff lobby so conveniently forgets to discuss—is the importance of trade to American industry, American workers, and the American consumer. To listen to the tariff lobby, trade is a one-way street—there are low-cost imports flooding the American market, nothing more. But the United States not only imports, we export as well. In fact, our exports far exceed our imports. Last year's exports as reported total more than $20 billion, while imports were slightly more than $13 billion.

SEVEN BILLION DOLLARS PLUS

Of all the statistics being thrown around in this great debate on reciprocal trade, one stands out with a significance that dwarfs all others. But do the protectionists even try to explain what would happen to the 4½ million jobs dependent today upon American exports if they had their way with high tariff walls?

Far more workers would be affected by the cutback in exports than would possibly be affected by gradually increased imports. If this were understood, workers in industries whose products are sold abroad would be writing us in Congress urging that the tariff be lowered.

The American labor movement has again demonstrated its statesmanship and its understanding in backing the reciprocal trade program. This morning you heard a splendid address by my friend, President Dave McDonald, of the United Steelworkers. He put the whole problem in proper perspective when he declared that labor supports the program first and foremost because it is good for America and for the entire Free World. But then he pointed out so clearly that it is a simple matter of enlightened self-interest for millions of American workers.

Dave McDonald, like the great majority of labor leaders in this country, has thus demonstrated that idealism and practicality can go hand in hand. And he demonstrated this in a very concrete way when he discussed the trade adjustment program.

America owes a debt to President McDonald for the pioneering role he played, as a member of the Randall Commission, in developing the concept of trade adjustment. I have been proud to be associated with the program from the very beginning. In 1955 I offered a trade adjustment amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Act during Senate consideration of its renewal. My amendment lost then, but I'm hoping for success when I offer it again this year.

At the risk of seeming to inject a partisan note in this nonpartisan meeting, I cannot for the life of me understand the administration's failure to endorse the trade adjustment program—although there seems to be some disagreement among Government spokesmen. I'm pleased to note that Secretary of State Dulles, in his appearance before the Ways and Means Committee, endorsed the program in principle. But the two administration spokesmen who should be best acquainted with the needs of American industry and American workers—the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor—have reflected official administration resistance.

Only yesterday, however, the President was asked by John Herling of Editors' Syndicate whether he would support a trade adjustment amendment. The President indicated that he was not familiar with the proposal. This at least gives me some hope that when he does take a look at this important proposal he will give it his blessing—even though some of his Cabinet members have presumed to speak adversely for the administration on this subject.

Despite some disagreements with Secretary Dulles in the past, and despite my great fondness for Secretary Mitchell, I say in all candor that in this case I hope the President takes the advice of Mr. Dulles rather than that of Mr. Mitchell.

With all sincerity and good will I call upon the President of the United States to take a good look at the trade adjustment proposals. He should support it for two reasons. First, it is a proper and reasonable proposal for meeting the special problems of industries and communities and workers who are in fact affected by our trade policies. Since it is in the national interest that we aim to lower tariffs, it should be a matter of national responsibility to provide relief to those affected. The cost will be minimal—and the benefit to the program will be substantial. Secondly, the very fate of the Reciprocal Trade Act renewal may well depend upon clear evidence by the administration and the Congress that we do not intend to let a few communities, industries, or groups of workers pay the cost of a national trade program.

I am convinced that there are enough marginal votes in the Congress which could be affected by a trade adjustment amendment to make the difference between victory and defeat on the basic act itself.

The trade adjustment plan is not a labor measure—even though a labor spokesman did so much to develop it. It would provide assistance to business, in the form of technical assistance, special tax concessions and loans. Communities as such would be helped directly with loans, technical assistance and market research. Workers would be assisted with extended unemploy-

ment insurance, retraining, and transportation.

RECESSION

I want to warn against a particularly phony argument which is now being pushed in opposition to the reciprocal trade program. The current recession has of course made everybody concerned about unemployment levels. There is superficial logic and plausibility to the cry that this is certainly no time to increase imports and thus take away still more American jobs. But this is dangerous nonsense. This is the worst possible time to reduce international trade. If we do, we threaten the 4½ million jobs we have talked about.

It is well to recall that in 1934 when the late and great Cordell Hull first promoted the reciprocal trade program, the Congress adopted it as an antidepression measure—a measure aimed at encouraging United States exports of agricultural and other products.

There is evidence that during the recessions of 1949 and 1954 the liberalization of trade bore fruit. Our exports held up well—better than our economic activity as a whole. In the current recession, the story is the same. The current recession is a powerful argument for greater liberalization—not restriction—of our trade program.

As the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act makes its precarious way through Congress during the coming weeks, we should all be alert to the efforts being made to weaken and even destroy it. Everyone should be aware of our true national interest. The easy argument against foreign imports has prevailed too long. If it results in further weakening of our trade policy, we may all suffer gravely in the future. The Communists will make further inroads into the Free World as their trade offensive succeeds beyond their greatest hopes. Our alliances will break up on the shoals of trade antagonisms. Our own economy will decline and American workers will be out of work as other nations can no longer buy our products.

None of these things needs to happen, for the alternative is not injury to American industry and labor. Trade adjustment provides the means whereby the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act can be strengthened, not weakened. Only a strong trade policy will keep together a strong Free World and promote a continually rising standard of living for us all.

FAIR TRADE IN PERIL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, several days ago I spoke to the Members of the Senate about my great concern over the deterioration of fair trade enforcement and observance. At that time, General Electric, one of the major enforcers of fair trade, had announced that it was abandoning a long-established policy of fair trade merchandising. Contrary to the pronouncements of an opposition spokesman that "this was recognition that fair trade was actually unfair to consumer and manufacturer alike," the firm stated in a letter to its dealers and distributors that this development did not mean that the company had abandoned its belief in the principle of fair trade.

This, to me, is most significant. For, General Electric continues to maintain that it is convinced of the merit of fair trade. In a letter to its dealers, General Electric stated:

> Our conclusion has been dictated by circumstances beyond our control which have blocked our continuation of an effective enforcement program.

The circumstances to which General Electric referred are, of course, the mounting State court decisions which have either struck down or vitiated the effectiveness of State fair trade statutes. Following closely on the heels of this announcement came the decision of several other prominent fair trade manufacturers that they, too, were abandoning fair trade for much the same reasons.

Mr. President, last week, Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., announced that it, too, was being reluctantly compelled to abandon fair trade. Revere's announcement was made in a letter to its distributors and retailers in which the firm stated that it regretted to notify them of this action. The company further said to its dealers:

> You are aware of the steps our company has taken over many years and at great expense to maintain fair trade prices, as it was our belief then, and is our belief now, that this was and is the proper way to do business. Recently, strong adherents of fair trade have obviously found it necessary to change their position. Our own position in trying to maintain fair trade under such adverse conditions has become untenable.

Earlier last week Mr. Robert P. Gwinn, president of the Sunbeam Corp., and vice president of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, told an audience at a chamber dinner in Rockford, Ill., that fair trade is often wrongly attacked as "price fixing" and, indeed, fair trade has been greatly abused by its opponents as well as by many well meaning, but misinformed, people. Mr. Gwinn very succinctly gave my views on fair trade when he said:

> We feel frankly that the merchant who performs the service of marketing the product is entitled to a reasonable return, as is the case with fair-trade practices.

Following the announcement by General Electric earlier this month, predatory pricing practices lifted their ugly heads overnight in our metropolitan areas and led to a vicious price war almost unlike anything on the American scene since the period following the celebrated Schwegmann decision in 1951 and prior to the passage of the McGuire Act in 1952.

The ramifications of these developments are, indeed, widespread. For price wars permeate every strata of merchandising and spread quickly into every community in the land. As these nefarious methods spread some firms will engage in loss-leader operations in order to draw the consuming public into their stores and then saddle the less discriminating shoppers with items of sufficient markup to offset their losses or with substandard merchandise. This is the cutthroat competition which faces the small-business man—the specialty-store owner. Thus, the fairminded independent who through the years has been upholding the American tradition of fair play in the market place by selling good products at reasonable prices with reasonable returns to himself, now finds himself the victim of not only predatory pricing practices, loss-leader operations, but deceptive advertising and a number of other duplicities. The small-business man is not in a position to withstand such machinations. By the same token, neither is the small manufacturer and it is this segment of the business community—the independent wholesaler and retailer and the small manufacturer—about whom I am concerned.

In the March 20 edition of Home Furnishings Daily it was reported that in New York City "the small stores have almost completely stopped ordering the formerly fair-trade items because of the low prices prevailing in the big stores." One distributor was quoted as saying, "We sell only to the small stores. We are not doing any business on General Electric, Sunbeam, or Toastmaster." Another reported that the "average small dealer is in a state of shock." Following the price wars, subsequent to General Electric's announcement, the big stores and chains are said to virtually have stopped advertising the formerly fair-traded items. This situation obviously helps no one. Even some of the discount houses are finding this to be true. For example, in Philadelphia alone, recently four discount chains have gone into bankruptcy and another is presently undergoing reorganization proceeding.

As undoubtedly Senators have observed, some of the manufacturers who have abandoned fair trade are large enough to meet, for the time being, indiscriminate price cutting. For large manufacturers can protect their nationally advertised trademarked merchandise because they have the facility for acquiring capital necessary to establish a controlled system of distribution through such operations as integrated outlets and consignment practices. Obviously, such programs are beyond the majority of small manufacturers. Consignment and integration are both expensive and impractical for such small firms. But with the continuation of cutthroat merchandising practices, more manufacturers will be forced into undertaking such programs in order to protect their merchandise. For it has been borne out by previous experience, loss-leader sales have resulted in loss of public confidence in and loss of respect for the value of merchandise which is subjected to this treatment.

The logical ultimate conclusion of such developments is the elimination of the small specialty shops and the establishment of rigid distribution systems providing even tighter economic concentration at a time when it is least desirable.

Mr. President, we must not let this happen. The Congress must take affirmative action—and we must begin to move now. Under normal circumstances we could not afford to delay and especially today—during a period of recession, we dare not expose the small-business community to further decimation.

We have addressed ourselves to this problem before and come up with what we thought would be effective legislation only to find that it, at best, was only a stopgap measure.

We are not alone in working for a solution to one of the most basic and devastating problems confronting our Nation today. For legislators in 45 States have gone on record as favoring fair trade. Our dilemma is in finding a workable solution—equitable in its treatment to manufacturer, wholesaler, retailer, and consumer.

It is with this in mind that the Senate Small Business Committee is studying the overall fair-trade problem. The Committee's Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices, of which I am chairman, has planned hearings at which I expect to point up some of the underlying problems and which will assist us in ascertaining fully, discount house operations and their impact on our national economic stability and specifically on small business. An integral part of such hearings will be the status of fair trade.

A bill calling for a Federal fair trade law has been introduced in the House of Representatives. I have studied this bill closely, and I have met with a number of specialists in the field of fair trade to discuss the contents of this bill and its full ramifications, as well as other possible measures.

The deterioration of fair trade enforcement and its concomitant, the diminution of small business, is of the utmost concern to me. It is my feeling that it must be rectified and relief must be quick in coming if we are not to have our distribution systems destroyed and our merchandising practices sink to an alltime low.

At the moment I am not certain of the best approach. It may very well be that effective implementation by the Federal Trade Commission and the Justice Department of existing laws might prove of inestimable help. It may be that new legislation is required in the form of a Federal fair-trade law or a Federal anti-loss-leader law. Or, possibly a combination of the two may be required. But whatever the answer is, it must be found and acted upon and soon.

Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of Senators to two stories carried in the March 26 edition of Home Furnishings Daily concerning the plight of two firms, in opposite parts of the country, as a result of price wars which are rife throughout our Nation today. These stories are typical of many which are appearing in the press daily.

In New York, Sunset Stores announced that the firm will no longer carry housewares and electric appliances in its five Long Island branches. The reason given for this decision was competition from department stores and discount houses which have been using such items as loss leaders.

A coowner of the firm has stated that the recent price wars, following the decision by General Electric and other electric appliance manufacturers to drop fair trade, caused his stores on Long Island to sell General Electric irons at cost. He noted that department stores which carry a greater variety of goods are in a better position than a major appliance chain to use electrical appliances as loss leaders.

This situation does not differ appreciably from that which specialty shops—independent businessmen—are encountering throughout the country. For jungle type competition is either forcing them out of business or causing them to drop lines on which they can no longer expect a fair profit.

Across the land, in California, one of Los Angeles' major electrical appliance distributors, Horn & Cox, Inc., announced it is closing its doors after 40 years of operation. The firm's president observed that—

> Business conditions in general, and more particularly the unfavorable climate surrounding the traffic appliance and housewares distributing business, has prompted us to make this decision.

Reportedly the firm was concerned about declining profits, further aggravated by recent decisions of electrical appliance manufacturers to abandon fair trade.

Thus it was that another small business—one employing 57 persons—has been forced to abandon the fight for survival in a market place filled with predatory pricing practices.

Mr. President, these situations are not unique; they are representative of the problems confronting the American small-business community during a near-crisis period of recession.

The Senate Small Business Committee is addressing its attention to such problems constantly. We are hopeful that a study of discount house operations being conducted by the Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices will provide us with meaningful information upon which to predicate action to hold back the tide of business collapses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Home Furnishings Daily of March 26, 1958]

HORN & COX, INC., ENDING OPERATIONS AFTER 40 YEARS

(By Lester Gilbert)

LOS ANGELES, March 25.—It is the end of the trail for another independent southern California major appliance-electric housewares distributor here.

Horn & Cox, Inc., according to Ray Cox, president, is completing plans to cease a 40-year-old operation.

The distributor, under its original name of Herbert H. Horn, Inc., had hit a peak volume of $20 million a year with about half of that amount in the Admiral TV and white goods lines, during 1950–1951.

When Herbert Horn retired as president, the business was reincorporated in 1952 as Horn & Cox, with Mr. Horn as chairman and Mr. Cox as chief executive.

The firm then parted company with Admiral and concentrated on a specialized housewares operation supported by full-color catalogs.

In a letter to be sent to suppliers, the president observed:

BLAMES CONDITIONS

"It is with regret that we advise you that the owners of Horn & Cox, Inc., have decided to terminate their business.

"Business conditions in general, and more particularly the unfavorable climate surrounding the traffic appliance and housewares distributing business, has prompted us to make this decision."

Mr. Cox declined to elaborate on the "unfavorable climate," but sources close to the firm indicated management was concerned about declining profits, further aggravated by the recent decision of some manufacturers to abandon fair trade.

A spokesman for Horn & Cox explained, "The situation reminds me somewhat of a gambling session at Las Vegas. Some gamblers know when it is time to leave the table; others will stick it out, despite the negative turn of the cards. This is definitely not a bankruptcy proceeding."

Among lines carried by Horn & Cox are Servel, Eureka, Sunbeam, Toastmaster, Ekco, Bissell, Cory, Borg, and Delmonico high fidelity. Servel had been marked to move to RCA Victor Distributing Co. about April 1.

Inventory of Horn & Cox was favorable, according to Mr. Cox, and he explained it would be absorbed by manufacturers, with complete dissolution of the firm expected within 60 days.

At the time of the termination decision, the company employed 57, and Mr. Cox was confident these employees would be absorbed into existing operations here.

As for his own plans, Mr. Cox said he would first strive for orderly liquidation of the company, and then go on an extended vacation prior to considering his plans. Clarence Fink, vice president and general manager, said his immediate plans are indefinite.

[From Home Furnishings Daily of March 26, 1958]

SUNSET DROPS HOUSEWARES IN FIVE STORES

NEW YORK.—Sunset Stores has dropped all housewares and electric housewares in five Long Island branches, according to Joseph Rudnick, coowner.

Competition from department stores and discount houses on Long Island, which have been using such items as loss leaders, was given as the reason.

The major appliance-TV chain has dropped the products in its stores in Levittown, Massapequa, Commack, Hempstead, and Bay Shore. (In the Massapequa store, the stock of these products has been purchased by an employee who will continue to sell the items while operating a concession in the store.)

Sunset will continue to sell such products in its stores in Manhattan, Westchester, the Bronx, and Rego Park.

Mr. Rudnick said that during the recent price war, after General Electric and other electrics makers dropped fair trade, his stores on Long Island sold GE irons at cost.

He noted that department stores, which have a wide variety of soft goods to sell, are in a better position than a major appliance chain to use electric housewares as loss leaders.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8268) to amend section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, H. R. 8268, as amended by your committee, revises the definition of the term "unrelated business taxable income" contained in the 1954 code. The general effect of this revision is to accord the same tax treatment for income distributed with respect

to limited-partnership interests held by certain testamentary charitable trusts that is presently accorded income derived from dividends received by such trusts. The bill, as amended, excludes from the definition of unrelated business taxable income the income derived from a limited-partnership interest only to the extent that the income attributable to such interest is actually distributed. This provision is to be effective with respect to taxable years of trust beginning after December 31, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD. 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 Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SHORT PAID AND UNDELIVERABLE MAIL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1423, H. R. 7910. I do not expect any discussion or action on the bill, but I should like to have it made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7910) to revise the laws relating to the handling of short paid and undeliverable mail, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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 REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John F. Dyer, of Hawaii, to be seventh judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Calvin C. McGregor; and

George Harrold Carswell, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Florida, vice Dozier A. DeVane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ray M. Gidney to be Comptroller of the Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know that Mr. Gidney will be proud to know that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] presided over the Senate when his nomination was confirmed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

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.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today it was announced that in the 149 major industrial labor markets there are 70 areas of substantial labor surplus; that in January 1958 there were 45, and that in March 1957 there were 19. With respect to secondary labor markets there are 121 areas of substantial labor surplus today; as of January 1958 there were 72; and as of March 1957 there were 59.

Congress can no longer postpone action on unemployment compensation. Every week we delay, nearly 40,000 workers still without jobs are exhausting their rights to draw benefits. Hundreds of thousands of others are drawing benefits too small to enable them to pay their most basic bills. Other hundreds of thousands are drawing no benefits at all—only private charity or public relief. Unemployment continues to rise. Whatever actions have been taken thus far to bolster the economy or to create new jobs, nothing has been done for the unemployed worker and his family budget.

The alternatives are now clear; all the proposals are in:

First. We can do nothing—hope the States will act on their own—hope the recession eases—or hope to help the unemployed through various public-works schemes. If we adopt this attitude, we are ignoring a major problem and abandoning our direct responsibility.

Second. We can adopt one of several proposals for supplementing unemployment benefits through Federal grants. Such action, in my opinion, would fall far short of the real need to be met, while eliminating all hope for real, long-range improvement in the system.

Third. We can adopt the administration's proposal to extend eligibility periods by 50 percent, the cost to be repaid by the individual States or their employers. Such a proposal would do very little good and might do very great harm. Its adoption would mean the abandonment of any substantial assistance to the jobless in favor of a mere facade of action.

Fourth. Finally, we can and should adopt S. 3244—or possibly some modification thereof—the bill I introduced early last month with 17 other Senators. In this way we can bring prompt relief to our unemployed workers and at the same time make basic, long-needed, long-range improvement in our jobless-insurance system.

Let us examine the background under which these proposals have been made. The unemployment-insurance program enacted by Congress 20 years ago was intended to provide benefits to workers that were large enough and long enough to enable them to pay their rent, their grocery bills, and their doctor bills until new work could be found. It was intended to put back into the community at least 50 percent of the loss in wage payments.

But the tragic fact is that our unemployment insurance program today is too weak and outmoded to do the job. It replaces less than 20 percent of these lost wages. In some hard-hit areas, where benefit rights have been exhausted, it is putting back into the community as little as 10 percent of lost wages. The average worker finds his unemployment check to be only one-third as large as the pay-check on which his family depended, as did the merchants in his neighborhood. He cannot pay his bills; the merchants cannot meet their expenses; more cutbacks, layoffs, and shutdowns follow.

Twenty years ago, the unemployment-insurance program meant something. Most States paid a maximum benefit higher than two-thirds of average weekly wages, all paid more than 50 percent. But that ratio has declined in every single State, as legislation neglected to keep benefit levels up with rising wage and price levels. In no State today is the maximum as high as even 58 percent of average weekly wages, much less the 67 percent necessary. Unemployed workers today must somehow get by on benefits averaging less than $33 a week. In some States, the most a worker can get is less than one-third of the average wage in his State. The founders of this program intended that unemployed workers actively seeking a new job would draw a benefit equal to at least 50 percent of their own regular earnings. This is what the program once provided, but no longer does, anywhere in the Nation; this is what the President has each year requested the States to do; this is what they have been unwilling to do, just as they were unwilling to act on their own in 1935, for reasons of industrial competition; and this is what Congress must now provide.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the significant features of various State laws be included at this point

in the RECORD. The table shows the decline in maximum payments made in 1939 and 1957 as a proportion of weekly wages, duration of benefits by State, and the number of employees in each State who exhausted benefits during February.

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

TABLE I.—*Unemployment insurance under State laws, Jan. 1, 1958*

States and Territories	Average weekly benefit paid for total unemployment, January-June 1957	Maximum weekly benefit [1]	Average weekly wages in covered employment, 1956	Maximum weekly benefit as a percentage of average weekly wages		Duration of benefits	Total number of claimants February 1958 who exhausted benefits
				1957	1939		
United States	$28		$81				145,474
Alabama	20	$28	65	43	87	11.7-20	3,598
Alaska	37	$45 to $70 [2]	138	33	41	15-26	226
Arizona	26	$30	81	37	61	10-26	453
Arkansas	20	$26	55	47	95	10-18	1,496
California	29	$40	90	45	50	15-26	8,231
Colorado	28	$35 [3]	80	44	62	[3] 10-26	715
Connecticut	30	$40 to $60	86	47	56	8.6-26	3,259
Delaware	31	$35	90	39	58	11-26	531
Washington, D. C.	26	$30	77	39	59	11.5-26	665
Florida	21	$30	67	45	81	5-16	2,247
Georgia	22	$30	63	48	87	[4] 20	3,448
Hawaii	25	$35	62	57	85	20	181
Idaho	28	$40	73	55	82	10-26	1,041
Illinois	29	$30 to $45	90	33	56	10-26	7,177
Indiana	26	$33	85	39	58	5.6-20	6,391
Iowa	26	$30	74	41	67	6.7-24	1,442
Kansas	27	$34	76	45	66	8.4-20	1,236
Kentucky	24	$32	71	45	69	26	2,174
Louisiana	22	$25	72	35	90	10-20	1,134
Maine	20	$33	66	50	74	26	1,522
Maryland	27	$35 to $43	74	47	65	26	1,864
Massachusetts	30	$35 and up [5]	75	47	57	7.1-26	5,397
Michigan	34	$30 to $55	97	31	53	9.5-26	11,796
Minnesota	25	$38	79	48	62	18-26	1,627
Mississippi	20	$30	55	54	97	20	1,446
Missouri	22	$33	78	42	61	12.5-26	2,347
Montana	25	$32	75	43	60	22	784
Nebraska	25	$32	70	45	66	9.0-20	687
Nevada	32	$37.50 to $57.50	86	44	57	10-26	417
New Hampshire	23	$32	67	48	70	26	377
New Jersey	32	$35	87	40	55	13-26	8,577
New Mexico	25	$30	74	41	73	12-24	347
New York	30	$36	89	41	51	26	8,851
North Carolina	18	$32	60	54	89	26	2,903
North Dakota	27	$26 to $35	68	38	69	20	115
Ohio	32	$33 to $39	89	37	54	9.2-26	5,336
Oklahoma	25	$28	76	37	61	6.7-26	1,595
Oregon	31	$40	84	48	53	12.9-26	3,246
Pennsylvania	28	$35	78	45	60	30	10,975
Rhode Island	27	$30	70	43	70	7.9-26	2,222
South Carolina	21	$26	58	45	99	10-22	1,822
South Dakota	23	$28	67	42	69	5.7-20	268
Tennessee	21	$30	66	45	78	22	4,122
Texas	23	$28	75	37	65	8.0-24	5,224
Utah	29	50 percent [6]	74	50	70	15-26	324
Vermont	23	$28	68	41	66	26	214
Virginia	21	$28	66	42	74	8-18	3,075
Washington	30	$35	84	42	57	12-26	4,290
West Virginia	22	$30	82	37	59	24	1,386
Wisconsin	30	$38	83	46	55	10-26½	6,442
Wyoming	29	55 percent [6] to 55 percent plus $6	74	55	78	12-26	198

[1] Where 2 figures are shown, the smaller does not include dependents' allowances.
[2] $25 for interstate claimants.
[3] $44 maximum and 26 weeks uniform duration for claimants meeting requirements to show 5 years of steady employment.
[4] 22 weeks for workers who meet certain requirements to show steady earnings.
[5] $3 per dependent up to individual's weekly wage.
[6] Dollar maximum set each year as a percentage of the State's average weekly wage of the year before.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the table shows that in California in February more than 8,000 workers exhausted benefits, in Michigan almost 12,000, in Pennsylvania almost 11,000. In Texas and my own State of Massachusetts more than 5,000 persons were caught between the end of their unemployment insurance and the beginning of a new job. If unemployment continues, this exhaustion situation will worsen. I know in Massachusetts each week in March has shown a sizable increase in the number of persons who no longer can depend on unemployment compensation to tide them over until they find a job.

The question on which most of us now agree, then, is not whether the Congress should act, but how? Which proposal should we adopt?

EXTENDING DURATION

One approach, contained in the administration and other proposals, calls only for extending the duration of a worker's eligibility period. If he is not eligible in the first place—not covered or arbitrarily disqualified—this proposal does nothing for him. If his chief complaint is that his benefit is so low as to deny his family a decent standard of living while he looks for work, this proposal does nothing to meet that complaint. If he is eligible only for the minimum benefit period in his State—in some States less than 6 weeks—then the administration's proposal to extend this by 50 percent or 3 weeks will not be of much help. Even extending the period through the end of this calendar year is less helpful than assuring every unemployed worker a uniform 39-week period in which to find another job before his benefit rights run out.

REPAYMENT

The administration proposal is further handicapped by the insistence that the Federal funds thus expended be repaid, under the harshest of conditions. Employers in all States with constitutional or statutory prohibitions against accepting and repaying loans will be required to pay higher Federal taxes after 4 years, which their competitors in other States will not pay—thus increasing unemployment. States which are legally able to make repayment may be required to increase taxes or reduce benefits to do so—certainly there is no assurance that they will be in better position to make full repayment within 4 years.

If there must be a loan fund, why not follow the principle of the George loan fund earlier in effect—conceived by the late Senator from Georgia—which required the States to make repayment only when they were able to do so? But other Federal programs of aid—for agriculture, defense-impacted areas, hospitals, and all the rest—require no repayment at all. While some unemployment compensation proposals pending before the Congress call simply for so-called insurance checks to be doled out of the Treasury like so many relief payments—and this may be necessary for the immediate emergency, as our bill also provides—this problem should be met for

the future by adopting a far sounder course—by recognizing that each State's unemployment risk should be spread nationwide through the principle of reinsurance contributions and grants, as provided in S. 3244.

TEMPORARY SUPPLEMENTATION

A common fault of all the so-called supplementation bills which rely upon Federal funds to improve payment levels is their bypassing of the over $8.5 billion now held in State unemployment reserves—relatively untouched because State standards are so low. As a group of distinguished scholars headed by Professors Brown, Harbison, and Lester of Princeton recently put it:

> The shortcomings of our State-Federal system of unemployment insurance do not arise out of a lack of Federal funds, but rather out of a long-standing lack of Federal standards designed to strengthen the capacity of the system to protect our citizens in a period of heavy unemployment.

That $8½ billion should be flowing into our economy today—if we could get benefit standards up and coverage extended.

But whatever system of financing they employ, the great fault of all the proposals for temporary Federal supplementation is that they are just that, and nothing more. Such a proposal encourages the State legislatures to do nothing, as long as they know that Congress will bail them out every time there is a downturn. It encourages the Congress to do nothing on a long-range program, as long as they can provide a stop-gap, patchwork measure when the need arises. It ignores the role our permanent unemployment insurance system was intended to play, and establishes instead a precedent for falling back on temporary remedies whenever the system is really needed. It ignores the fact that the standards of the system even in a relatively mild recession have proven inadequate—it ignores real deficiencies which are apparent to all—and leaves the system in the same weakened condition as it was before.

Our bill, S. 3244, also provides for the immediate payment of these benefits to all unemployed workers, with the Federal Government making up the difference. This is Federal supplementary action, to be sure. But it is action which depends upon, instead of discouraging, long-range, permanent action by the Congress and the State legislatures.

THE KENNEDY M'CARTHY BILL, S. 3244

In short, Mr. President, I believe it would be a tragic mistake to embark on a mere Federal supplementation program geared to the present emergency. I am as anxious as any Member of this body for quick action on unemployment-insurance legislation. But I believe any program aimed at our immediate problem should carry with it a substantial strengthening of the system itself. The bill which I have introduced with 17 of my colleagues in the Senate has both of these elements.

S. 3244 has three fundamental purposes. It proposes a uniform benefit standard equal to 50 percent of the worker's average weekly income, the very standard the President has urged upon the States since 1953; it proposes the adoption of a uniform 39 weeks during which benefits may be paid, the same maximum applicable for many States under the President's new proposal; and it broadens the coverage of the law to include some 1.8 million workers who are not now covered, as the President has urged since 1953. But it is not temporary, and it does not rely on exhortations to the States. These are permanent additions to the Federal standards now on the books. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a table showing the impact of the enactment of S. 3244.

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

TABLE II.—*Impact of Kennedy bill (S. 3244)*

State	Basic weekly benefit levels [1]				Potential duration of benefits			State	Basic weekly benefit levels [1]				Potential duration of benefits		
	Average [2] benefit now paid	Average weekly wage in State	Maximum benefit now	Proposed maximum benefit	Weeks of duration now	Average weeks drawn by those exhausting benefits now	Proposed weeks of duration		Average [2] benefit now paid	Average weekly wage in State	Maximum benefit now	Proposed maximum benefit	Weeks of duration now	Average weeks drawn by those exhausting benefits now	Proposed weeks of duration
Alabama	$22.53	$65	$28	$43	11.7-20	17	39	Montana	$27.98	$75	$32	$50	22	22	39
Alaska	37.24	138	45-70	92	15-26	25	39	Nebraska	26.21	70	32	47	9-20	(3)	39
Arizona	26.69	81	30	54	10-26	19	39	Nevada	39.58	86	37½-57½	57	10-26	20	39
Arkansas	20.61	55	26	37	10-18	16	39	New Hampshire	22.54	67	32	45	26	25	39
California	31.39	90	40	60	15-26	23	39	New Jersey	32.27	87	35	58	13-26	22	39
Colorado	31.73	80	35-44	53	10-26	19	39	New Mexico	26.02	74	30	49	12-24	18	39
Connecticut	33.02	86	40-60	57	8.6-26	20	39	New York	31.40	89	36	59	26	26	39
Delaware	29.66	90	35	60	11-26	18	39	North Carolina	19.89	60	32	40	26	25	39
District of Columbia	26.67	77	30	51	11.5-26	19	39	North Dakota	26.73	68	26-35	45	20	20	39
Florida	23.66	67	30	45	5-16	12	39	Ohio	32.12	89	33-39	59	9.2-26	24	39
Georgia	23.39	63	30	42	20	19	39	Oklahoma	25.19	76	28	50	6.7-26	17	39
Hawaii	27.19	62	35	41	20	20	39	Oregon	33.87	84	40	56	12.9-26	21	39
Idaho	32.85	73	40	49	10-26	16	39	Pennsylvania	29.46	78	35	52	30	30	39
Illinois	30.13	90	30-45	60	10-26	19	39	Rhode Island	28.07	70	30	46	7.9-26	16	39
Indiana	27.89	85	33	57	5.6-20	13	39	South Carolina	21.91	58	26	39	10-22	18	39
Iowa	25.84	74	30	49	6.7-24	13	39	South Dakota	23.96	67	28	45	5.7-20	15	39
Kansas	27.74	76	34	51	8.4-20	17	39	Tennessee	23.46	66	30	44	22	21	39
Kentucky	24.84	71	32	48	26	26	39	Texas	23.92	75	28	50	8-24	14	39
Louisiana	22.93	72	25	48	10-20	15	39	Utah	30.23	74	37	49	15-26	21	39
Maine	21.73	66	33	44	26	(3)	39	Vermont	24.58	68	28	45	26	25	39
Maryland	31.09	74	35-43	49	26	15	39	Virginia	23.39	66	28	44	8-18	12	39
Massachusetts	31.23	75	35+	50	7.1-26	20	39	Washington	29.79	84	35	56	12-26	23	39
Michigan	35.23	97	30-55	65	9.5-26	18	39	West Virginia	23.75	82	30	55	24	23	39
Minnesota	27.39	79	38	53	18-26	22	39	Wisconsin	31.54	83	38	56	10-26½	(3)	39
Mississippi	20.97	55	30	37	20	20	39	Wyoming	31.06	74	41-47	50	12-26	15	39
Missouri	24.63	78	33	52	12.5-26	18	39								

[1] 9 States provide higher benefits for those with dependents: Alaska, Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, North Dakota, Ohio, and Wyoming. Nothing in the Kennedy-McCarthy bill would prevent these or other States from providing higher benefits for dependents.

[2] It is impossible to estimate exactly how much the average weekly benefits would rise under the Kennedy-McCarthy bill. This column is included to show how low actual benefits paid now are.

[3] Comparable data not available.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in short, under our bill, every worker would draw a benefit equal to at least 50 percent of his own regular earnings, up to a maximum of two-thirds of the average wages paid in his State. Every worker would be able to draw benefits for a uniform period of 39 weeks, instead of being cut off at the end of 5, 10, 15, or in many cases 26 weeks as he is now. Every legitimately unemployed worker would be eligible to receive his unemployment insurance payment, regardless of the size of his shop and without harsh and discriminatory eligibility requirements.

It is this kind of approach, I am convinced, that we need today to assist our unemployed—those receiving inadequate benefits, those who have exhausted their benefit rights, those unable to draw any benefits at all—men and women who have exhausted their inflation-eaten savings, who must conceal their pride and turn for assistance to their relatives, or to private charity, or to the public assistance rolls.

This is a nationwide problem. It ought to be met by the Congress, as the founders of the bill—the President's Committee on Economic Security in its 1935 report—originally intended.

FINANCING NEW STANDARDS

How will the new benefits be financed? S. 3244 would not change the basic financing provisions of the existing system. It would not increase the Federal tax of 3 percent. Nor would it decrease the 2.7 percent credit which employers are allowed against this Federal tax. It would permit States to continue to reduce rates under existing systems of experience rating if they so desired. The only amendment on financing made by S. 3244 would relax the existing standards by giving States the option to reduce the State tax below 2.7 percent on a uniform basis applicable to all employers in the State, instead of doing it on an individual experience rating basis.

The actual taxes collected from employers in the different States varies considerably. During the year 1957 the average employer tax rate throughout the United States was 1.3 percent. The average was as low as .5 percent in some States and as high as 2.7 percent in others. In some States most employers are excused from paying any tax; in others all pay 2.7 percent.

I ask that a table showing the status of the State unemployment reserves and the average tax rate on employers during 1957 be placed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE III

	Average employer tax rate, 1957 (percent of taxable payrolls)	Unemployment reserves Dec. 31, 1957
		Thousands
United States, total	1.3	$8,662,101
Alabama	1.1	88,368
Alaska	2.7	1,550
Arizona	1.3	58,718
Arkansas	1.1	44,727
California	1.4	998,922
Colorado	.5	76,903
Connecticut	1.2	248,478
Delaware	.8	15,088
Washington, D. C	.7	58,698
Florida	.7	93,621
Georgia	1.2	$151,888
Hawaii	1.0	23,077
Idaho	1.3	36,570
Illinois	1.0	500,574
Indiana	1.0	212,176
Iowa	.5	113,948
Kansas	1.0	86,088
Kentucky	2.0	121,045
Louisiana	1.4	152,871
Maine	1.6	45,537
Maryland	1.0	116,642
Massachusetts	1.6	317,790
Michigan	2.0	295,025
Minnesota	1.0	113,488
Mississippi	1.7	34,602
Missouri	1.0	226,562
Montana	1.3	43,816
Nebraska	.9	39,766
Nevada	2.0	19,720
New Hampshire	1.6	24,999
New Jersey	1.7	439,803
New Mexico	1.2	40,643
New York	1.7	1,355,730
North Carolina	1.4	182,207
North Dakota	1.4	10,223
Ohio	.7	618,636
Oklahoma	1.0	53,868
Oregon	1.4	41,894
Pennsylvania	1.5	346,771
Rhode Island	2.7	31,390
South Carolina	1.1	75,013
South Dakota	.9	14,179
Tennessee	1.7	91,572
Texas	.7	301,247
Utah	1.3	40,420
Vermont	1.3	16,928
Virginia	.5	92,894
Washington	2.3	204,348
West Virginia	1.0	67,625
Wisconsin	1.1	259,172
Wyoming	1.1	16,276

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is impossible, of course, to estimate what the tax rate would be in any State if S. 3244 were enacted, for tax rates depend not only on the benefits but on the amount of unemployment in the State. However, it has been estimated that the average tax rate in the United States which is now 1.3 percent would rise to between 1.7 percent and 2 percent if the bill were enacted.

S. 3244, as previously mentioned, also contains a reinsurance provision to assist States whose reserves are drawn down because of heavy unemployment. If such a State imposes a maximum tax and still finds its reserves below a safe minimum, it is eligible for Federal grants to assist it in making benefit payments. This system of reinsurance precludes an onerous tax burden falling on employers in any State where unemployment is excessive. The cost to the Federal Government of the program for the period until all States have complied with these standards, by no later than July 1, 1959, has been estimated at about $1.5 billion.

To those concerned about the cost of these standards, I wish to offer the following reminders:

First, these standards reflect, as previously described, the recommendations of the administration, which I am confident would not impair the solvency of any State fund or impose a heavy tax burden on any employer.

The point I am attempting to make is that this proposal would make obligatory the standards which the President himself has been urging upon the States since 1953, but which no State has adopted in full since that time, partly because of the competitive features of taxation between one State and another, which makes a State very reluctant to increase, unilaterally, its State tax, unless every State does the same thing.

Second, these standards would raise benefits to the same proportionate level, or percentage of payroll, at which they were maintained during the 1930's, at which time the costs of the program were certainly manageable.

In other words, the proportion of benefits to wages is substantially below what it was 18 or 19 years ago, when the program was first put into effect.

Third, it is clear that under this bill no employer will pay more than the normal 3 percent to the Federal Government—the same is not true of the administration's proposal, under its harsh provisions for repayment.

Fourth, under S. 3244 a system of nationwide reinsurance would offer State reserves more protection from depletion than they currently enjoy.

Fifth, State reserves are currently so high, and average tax rates so low, it is clear that adoption of these standards would not be paid for wholly by increased taxes—and such increase would still fall far short of the standard 2.7 percent as a national average.

CONCLUSION

Our concern, therefore, should not be over the cost of such standards to our State systems, but over the cost of unemployment and inadequate unemployment benefits. These are costly, and dearly so, in terms of living standards, purchasing power, relief rolls, productivity, and community morale and security.

The Senate should be given the opportunity to vote on whether it favors improved benefits to our unemployed workers, or whether it is opposed to such benefits. The issue is clear, the standards are reasonable, the time is critical. Let us demonstrate to the unemployed and to the Nation that we have not forgotten these basic principles of our society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unemployment Confusion," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 21, 1958.

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

UNEMPLOYMENT CONFUSION

As national unemployment grows, unemployment compensation must grow with it. This fact has involved the Eisenhower administration in planning a still-undefined improvement in the jobless insurance program.

The need for improvement in the midst of an economic slump is not arguable. The number of unemployed is 5,173,000 and seems to be rising in a season when it should be falling. Nearly 3 million workers are receiving unemployment benefits. But these benefits replace only a third of the wages the workers lost, whereas the 1935 unemployment compensation law intended benefits covering at least half of wages lost.

The worst of the situation is that many unemployed are drawing no benefits at all. Either they are not covered by the program, which exempts employers of fewer than 4 persons, or they have exhausted their benefits, which run usually to 26 weeks, or they were disqualified by inconsistent State laws.

Missouri currently pays a maximum benefit of $33 weekly for 26 weeks, up to a total of $858. Twenty-two States pay more.

Five years ago President Eisenhower urged the States to extend both the payments and their duration. Not one State has met the standards requested. The States would argue that they do not have the money. They receive an incentive grant from the Federal Government, which usually covers administrative costs. But the insurance reserve from which benefits are paid is based entirely on employers' payroll taxes. (These range up to 3 percent of the first $3,000 of a worker's earnings. Under the usual State formula, if the insurance reserve fund grows larger than necessary, the tax rate falls, and if the reserves become inadequate, the tax rises.)

Clearly most States will not legislate larger jobless insurance programs without more Federal aid. Recognizing that, Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and 16 other Democrats last month introduced a bill to establish the standards sought by the President.

The Kennedy bill would increase average benefits until they represent half the worker's lost wages, and would extend the benefit period to 36 weeks. The Government would make reinsurance grants to cover the cost.

This week President Eisenhower told eight governors that his advisers are working on a new program. The trouble is that the governors left a White House meeting in complete confusion as to what the program would be, and who would pay for it.

Governor Knight, of California, understood that when a State exhausted its insurance reserves, the Government would grant it more money from the Federal administrative fund. But an administration official said

later that the Government would offer loans, not grants. He said the States could repay the loans as their reserve funds were rebuilt in better times, or even increase the employers' tax.

If the slump is to be of short duration, the States probably could repay the Federal loans without a tax increase. A tax increase makes no sense in a recession, when taxes should, if anything, be reduced. If the slump should last longer than now anticipated, however, the Government would have to reconsider the whole idea of repayment by the States.

Right now Congress is marking time, waiting for an administration proposal, and holding the Kennedy bill in case the administration delays. But at this moment of confusion, one thing is surely plain: Rising unemployment and declining purchasing power cannot be permitted to continue without a better unemployment insurance program.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 31, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 27, 1958:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Ray M. Gidney, of Ohio, to be Comptroller of the Currency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Job 28: 28: *And unto man God said, Behold the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.*

Almighty God, may all the thoughts of our minds and the meditations of our hearts always be guided by the counsels of Thy Holy Word.

We earnestly beseech Thee to bestow upon us the wisdom which fears the Lord and the understanding which departs from evil.

Grant that our lives may be radiant with a sense of Thy presence, grateful with an appreciation of Thy providence, and joyous with an assurance of Thy love.

Inspire us with an intense desire to hasten the dawning of that better day when there shall be a new birth of Thy gracious spirit in the soul of mankind, transforming evil into goodness, hatred into love, and selfishness into service.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday to file a privileged report on the Department of Agriculture, Farm Credit Administration appropriation bill, fiscal year 1959.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

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, as we attempt to juggle the economy at home and to alleviate—even abolish—want at home and throughout the world, might we not do well to ponder a simple truth, pointed up very well by Kenneth W. Follitt in Christian Economics back in 1955?

There are certain truths which are true no matter how much the world may question, or deny them.

In the economic realm for instance, you cannot legislate the poor into freedom by legislating the wealthy out of it. You cannot multiply wealth by dividing it. Governments cannot give to people what they do not first take away from people. And that which one man receives without working for, another man must work for without receiving it. And nothing can kill the initiative of a people quicker than for half of them to get the idea that they need not work because the other half will feed them, and for the other half to get the idea that it does no good to work since someone else receives the rewards of their labors. Closing one's eyes to these facts will not change them one iota.

Federal aids at best are incidental. Our intention should be to build confidence, not tear it down by strictly politically inspired scare forecaster. Further, Federal aid can hurt not help by further Government spending, which will imbalance the budget, cause deficit financing, and further inflate the currency. Real tax cuts are needed, for cuts that are based on reduced Federal spending, not more, so that our Nation lives within its income. Finally, we can talk ourselves into economic trouble if we are irresponsible.

SENIOR BAND OF THE LYNN, MASS., PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS

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, I am proud of the championship senior band of the Lynn, Mass., public high schools, which comes from the district that I have the honor to represent. It has been designated by Gov. Foster Furcolo to be the Massachusetts band at the Cherry Blossom Festival.

In a letter to Band Director Matthew G. Mazur, Governor Furcolo sent his best wishes for the band's success. The group will play with other bands from all the States on Saturday at the Jefferson Memorial. After that, it will march in the festival parade.

We know that it will make an excellent impression because it is a colorful and well-drilled group of young musicians. They are sure to win honor and prestige for our Commonwealth.

The people of Lynn are almost as enthusiastic about the school band as the youngsters themselves.

This will be a wonderful event in the lives of the youngsters that will more than repay them for the long hours they have practiced to become the best high-school band in Massachusetts.

This will also be an educational experience for the deserving youngsters and they will be conducted on a tour of the Capital and its historic buildings and monuments that will inspire them with pride in the traditions and the accomplishments of our Nation.

It was my pleasure to greet them today here at the Capitol, and to see the starlight in their eyes as they enjoy this great adventure.

For they and other youngsters like them are the ones who will build the greater America of tomorrow.

Congratulations to all the members of the Lynn public high schools band for their skill and their spirit.

ADJOURNMENT FROM APRIL 3 TO APRIL 14, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 303) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, April 3, 1958, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 14, 1958.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Allen, Calif.	Dorn, S. C.	Powell
Baring	Engle	Radwan
Boggs	Gordon	Rains
Buckley	Grant	Reece, Tenn.
Burdick	Gwinn	St. George
Celler	Hébert	Scott, Pa.
Chiperfield	Holifield	Shuford
Clark	Holland	Seminski
Coffin	James	Taylor
Colmer	Kean	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	Krueger	Thompson, La.
Curtis, Mo.	Morrison	Vorys
Dies	Passman	Willis
Diggs	Pillion	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SOIL BANK CONTRACTS IN COUNTIES BROUGHT INTO COMMERCIAL CORN AREA

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10843) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the mangers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1559)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10843) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 114 of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this section—(1) no person shall be ineligible to receive payments or compensation under an acreage reserve contract for 1958 by reason of the fact that the corn acreage on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for corn if the county in which such farm is located is included in the commercial corn producing area for the first time in 1958; (2) no person shall be ineligible to receive payments or compensation under an acreage-reserve contract for any year subsequent to 1958 or a conservation reserve contract by reason of the fact that the corn acreage on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for corn if such contract was entered into prior to January 1 of the first year for which the county is included in the commercial corn producing area: *Provided*, That the foregoing provisions of this sentence shall apply only to a farm for which an "old farm" corn allotment is established for such first year. For purposes of this provision, a contract which has been terminated by the producer under the program regulations by reason of the fact that the county in which the farm is located was included in the commercial corn-producing area for the first time in 1958, and which is reinstated, shall be deemed to have been entered into as of the original date of execution of such contract.' "

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10843) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

As passed by the House, the bill exempted from the cross-compliance provisions of section 114 of the Soil Bank Act for 1958 only, farmers in the 38 counties which were placed in the commercial corn area for the first time in 1958.

The bill also exempted from the same compliance provisions, with respect to corn, any conservation reserve contract heretofore or hereafter entered into, if such contract is entered into before January 1 of the first year for which the county is included in the commercial corn area.

The Senate amendment was identical with the House bill with respect to conservation reserve contracts.

With respect to acreage reserve contracts, however, the Senate amendment made the date January 1 applicable. This would have had the practical effect of exempting in 1958 only farmers in new commercial corn counties who had signed winter wheat acreage reserve contracts. It would not have given any exemption to farmers in these counties who signed acreage reserve contracts for cotton, rice, or tobacco.

In lieu of the Senate amendment, the conferees have agreed upon a substitute which combines the provisions of both the House bill and the Senate amendment.

The substitute adopts the House provisions with respect to acreage allotment contracts for 1958 and adopts the Senate provisions with respect to acreage allotment contracts in any year subsequent to 1958.

There is no change in the provision respecting conservation reserve contracts.

The language followed is that of the House bill with the insertion on page 2, line 2, following the word "under", in the bill as reported to the House, of the words "an acreage reserve contract for any year subsequent to 1958 or."

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read down to and including line 3 on page 13 of the bill.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OSTERTAG: On page 13, after line 3 and before line 4, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

"To increase the general supply fund established by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 630g), $15 million."

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to restore to the independent offices appropriation bill and in particular to the General Services Administration $15 million for the general supply fund. Permit me to call your attention to the fact that this is not a spending item. This does not mean we are appropriating more funds to be spent by the General Services Administration or any other agency but rather it is merely to increase the supply fund or the capital of the supply fund by $15 million. In other words, this $15 million will remain within the supply fund either in goods or in money.

Mr. Chairman, in increasing the general supply fund of the General Services Administration by $15 million it will raise the total amount of the Fund to $93 million instead of the existing $78 million as the fund is currently capitalized. This is necessary in the interest of efficiency and economy. It has been pointed out to the committee that during fiscal year 1959, the sales from the inventory of the fund will amount to $302 million. That is during fiscal year 1959. This is an increase in sales from the inventory of $38 million. This added capital will bring about better management and bring about an increase in the turnover of from 2½ to 3 times each year.

There are two principal reasons for this amendment. One is to meet the need for an increase in the inventory. The main reason there is the fact that the General Services Administration through the supply fund has taken over the management of furnishing supplies to the military, and more particularly to supply the Air Force or support the Air Force on a worldwide basis, particularly with reference to common use

items. I understand the Air Force will acquire over $8 million in supplies this next year of common use items on a worldwide basis. The other reason for the increase is that $7 million will be required to furnish supplies and equip 16 new motor pools, which have been provided for under Public Law 766 of 1954. This development will reduce the total number of cars to be used by agencies throughout the Federal Government. This, too, will achieve a great deal of savings and economy, and it will bring the total equipment of cars in the motor pool to a value of some $18 million. Because of this increase in business and because of this increase in the general operation of the supply fund, there will be a need to carry an additional $1,800,000 in the accounts receivable. So all told this increase of $15 million in the supply fund will bring about greater efficiency and greater economy. This adjustment is necessary to provide the elbowroom essential to an orderly operation in the purchase of supplies for Government agencies.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Is it not also true that it would permit the general supply fund to take cash discounts on a lot of things that it does not have the funds available for now?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Absolutely.

Mr. TABER. And that will save a great deal of money; will it not?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes; I believe that to be true. In the committee report the reason given for dropping the $15 million from the budget was that the agencies should make their payments much more expeditiously and with greater speed. The average turnover, or the average time lapsing between the purchases and payments today is 45 days, and they tell me that is a good record and cannot be improved to any substantial degree.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I should like to know whether this amendment has the support of Franklin Floete, the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes, this $15 million of course, was requested not only by the General Services Administration, but it was approved by the budget. May I remind you again that this is not appropriating money to spend but merely to increase by $15 million the capital in the general supply fund? I trust that my amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, with 5 minutes reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I would not support this amendment if it involved spending $15 million. I am anxious to reduce the funds authorized to be spent by this bill. The amendment is simply an effort to provide additional capital to enable the General Services Administration to operate the supply system of the Government in a more efficient and economical manner. I am particularly concerned because of my interest in the motor pool operation. It is out of this fund that GSA finds the money to finance the purchase of automobiles which it uses in the motor pools. It will be used to finance an additional 16 pools that GSA expects to establish during the next fiscal year. As I pointed out yesterday in general debate, the motor pool operation has proved that it will save the taxpayers substantial sums of money. The actual amount of money saved in 1958 will be $3,170,000; and in 1959, $4 million annual savings is projected.

It seems to me it would not be wise for us to impair the capital in the supply fund, which is used to finance a $300-million-a-year operation. As I have pointed out, and as the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] stated, the amendment does not involve spending any money at all; it simply provides much needed additional capital which will enable General Services to do a better job of purchasing and handling the vast quality of supplies and personal property used by the various agencies and departments of the Government. Restoration of this item of capital will not cost the taxpayers a single dime but will enable substantial savings to be accomplished over the years.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind but what this $15 million should be written back into the bill. It is easy to arrive at a conclusion that that should be done when you understand the purpose of it. General Services Administration is one of the great buyers that serves other departments of Government, and the Congress has placed that responsibility upon the General Services Administration, with the result that they buy for the military, they buy for various other departments of Government, and save the Government a great deal of money. Mr. Floete has discussed this matter with me not later than this morning. I think every one on the committee recognizes Mr. Floete as a good business man and that he is doing a remarkable job. We can increase the efficiency and this Department can take their discounts, which is important. In the end it does not spend a dollar from the spending standpoint. It is only giving a revolving fund sufficient money for a high-grade businessman in government to properly handle the business that comes to him, and that is brought to him by Congress.

There is no question in my mind about it and I hope that the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the subcommittee, might accept this amendment because there is not any question but what they have tightened the time for these services up to 45 days. It used to be 65, then 55, and now it is 45 and they have reached the limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, it is not easy to disagree with my distinguished colleagues on the subcommittee. When we marked up this bill there was no disagreement. There is no question about what is involved here. I would be the last individual to want to cripple the operation. There is not a penny involved in the day-to-day operation of those motor pools.

Mr. Chairman, let us see what is involved here. When they appeared before the committee we asked the General Services Administration: "Why do you need this additional $15 million?"

What did they say? They said, "Why, these agencies whom we supply will not pay their bills on time. They owe us $39.1 million today and if they would pay their bills on time we would not need a nickel."

I said, "Suppose the committee writes the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and asks him to ride herd on the agencies and make them pay their bills on time, would that relieve the situation?"

Why should they not do that? They have the money. It has been appropriated to every agency and it should not take more than 5 days. Yet they are taking 45, 50, and 60 days.

What did the General Services Administration say? "O. K., that will get the job done."

What did we do? We wrote the Director of the Bureau of the Budget like we said we would and asked him to request the agencies to pay their bills on time. They already have the money. Why should GSA have to wait 45 days for the $39 million the agencies owe?

The Director of the Budget sent us a copy of a letter to other agencies about 5 o'clock yesterday afternoon. I will read it, Mr. Chairman:

To the Heads of Executive Departments and Establishments of the Government:

Each agency head should take immediate action to expedite payment of bills owed the general supply fund, and to assure that future bills are paid promptly, so that procurement to replenish the stock of the fund will not be delayed.

Mr. Chairman, they do not need this $15 million. All they have to do is to get a little action and have the agencies pay their bills on time. These agencies of the Government have the money now.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The chairman is basing his position——

Mr. THOMAS. I have not misstated a fact so far, have I?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am not aware of any misstatement.

Mr. THOMAS. All right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The chairman is basing his contention on the whole question of payment of the bills on the part of

the agencies to the General Services Administration.

Mr. THOMAS. I know my friend wants them to do that.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The purpose of the amendment and the need for the $15 million is not related to the time involved in the payment of bills. The point is the GSA expects to increase their sales over a period of the next year some $38 million, including $6½ million in Air Force overseas support. They are expected to equip 16 motor pools which will take $7 million in capital funds to do the job. These are the principal reasons for the added $15 million for the general supply fund as provided in my amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me give my friend the figures. We have 12 stores. That is where the big expense is; that is where the big volume is done. During this fiscal year they will sell $147 million worth of merchandise. And that is quite a bit. They have about $80 million in the fund now. Next year they want to go up to $163 million. They expect to increase their sales $16 million in the 12 stores, and yet you want to put $15 million extra capital in the fund to take care of $16 million of sales. Gentlemen, we do not want to cripple them. We want them to have a little business judgment, and I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. OSTERTAG) there were—ayes 49, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law; and not to exceed $50,000 for expenses of travel; $7,293,000.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California: On page 13, line 9, strike out "$7,293,000" and insert "$7,333,000."

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I almost hesitate to offer this amendment because I am not asking for millions, not even one million. I am asking for a mere $40,000 to be added to the operating expense for the National Archives and Records Service so that we can start the project to compile, preserve, and publish the records from the 1st to the 15th Congresses. The records of the Continental Congress have been published under the Minutes of the Continental Congress, but it was not until 1817 that they began to keep a record of the Congress as we know it today. It was known then as the Annals of Congress until about 1870 when it took the form of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For the first 30 years of this Government then there is no formal record available of what the Congress did. There are documents in the Archives; there are documents in the Library of Congress, and there are documents in other depositaries some of which have found their way into university libraries and into historical societies throughout the country. These irreplaceable records can be lost and destroyed, and the longer we delay their publication the harder it is going to be to get the complete documents together, to preserve a continuous record of this Government from the date of its founding in 1789 until today. We must plug to gap between 1789 and 1817. The work will take about 6 years to complete. It is one of the projects recommended by the National Historical Publications Commission on which I have the honor to represent this House. On that commission there is also a Member from the Senate, as well as the House, and 8 distinguished historians drawn from throughout the country.

Now, what are we asking for? Less money per year than it costs to publish the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for 3 days. Yesterday I went to the Public Printer and I said, "How much does it cost to publish the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for one day?" He said, "$81 a page." There are 240 pages for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I hold in my hand. This RECORD is of the day before yesterday and it cost about $19,500 to print and preserve for the future. The one of yesterday will cost as much, and the one today will cost as much. We are asking for approximately $40,000 to start this project.

True, it is going to take about 5 years. But I submit, should not these records be made available to you and to me and to the historians of the country?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. There is some dispute as to who should do this work. The Clerk of the House maintains that these papers under the reorganization bill—and I have the authority for that if the gentleman wants me to read it—really come under the control of the House of Representatives, and particularly its agent, the Clerk. These papers are not subject even to a writ of duces tecum by the court. So there is some dispute as to who should do this work.

The committee thinks it is a matter of great historical importance and it ought to be done, but I wonder if the gentleman would withdraw his amendment so that we may put the funds under the contingent fund of the House and then have the Speaker direct that it be done through his office.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would have no objection to that as long as we have some assurance that the work would be done.

Mr. THOMAS. Then we will keep everything straight.

Mr. MILLER of California. May I say to the gentlemen that we are preserving the papers of the Presidents. We are getting universities, public foundations to do this work. There is over $1½ million going into that now. All I wanted to make sure of is this. I just want to make sure that the money will be available and that the work will be done.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Under those circumstances I suggest to the gentleman that he withdrew his amendment, let us put this item under the Contingent Fund of the House in the proper bill, and we will all get behind it and push it through. I assure the gentleman we will help.

Mr. MILLER of California. If my good friend will assure me of that, I shall be glad to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC UTILITIES SERVICE

For necessary expenses of transportation and public utilities management and related activities, as provided by law, including not to exceed $60,000 for expenses of travel; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals; $1,800,000.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time because of an exchange yesterday with the distinguished gentleman from Texas. This is to be found at page 5483 of yesterday's RECORD. I find this report coming out in the name of all of us. It says, "We are fighting the depression." There is not anyone here who is not concerned about the economic health of this Nation. Surely there is not anyone here, from either party, who can take full credit or place discredit on how we can go about solving the economic problems in this country. We are all interested. I make to you a nonpartisan plea.

I say to you frankly we are not in a depression. I submit to you if we had a vote on the floor of this House today on whether we are in a depression right now, we would have a resounding majority saying, "No, we are not," no matter what the bellwethers may be. Yet this committee report says, and the gentleman yesterday substantiated it—I wanted to hear it from him—that we are fighting the depression. I say we are using the wrong language, and wrong language from this Congress is most dangerous to the Nation's economic health.

First of all, let me tell you why we are not in a depression.

Savings are at an all-time high. Income in February of this year was the highest February in the history of the Nation.

As to employment: Let me give you a few figures. Unemployment at this time is 5.4 million out of a work force of 67 million. That is about 7.6 percent of the working force of this Nation. In 1950 President Truman said that "a certain amount of unemployment, say, 3 to 5 million, is supportable. It is a good thing that job seeking should go on at all times. This is healthy for the economic body." In 1950 we had 7.6 percent and no one proclaimed this a depression—4,800,000 out of a total work force of 63 million unemployed in our

economy. In 1954 and 1955 we had a recession scare. We did not get rattled and we came out of it to go on to new heights. Slow downs in growth are a part of normal growth in a free enterprise system.

After 6 years of the New Deal we had 20 percent of the people unemployed, 10,400,000 out of a work force of 54 million. The New Deal principles did not work in solving unemployment.

Incidentally, let me say that when the civil construction acceleration bill was before us last week, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, said that we did not want to cause alarm to the public and certain words were stricken from the bill, if you recall, to establish correct perspective in the current economic situation. I protested at that time. The gentleman assured me this was not doubletalk of any kind. Last week it was an alleged recession to some, now the gentleman from Texas says we are in a depression. All right. If this is to be considered a depression, which I maintain it is not, we are still going about curing it the wrong way. Do we have economic problems? We certainly do. We have a terrific debt, we have staggering taxes. So if we are going to cure the recession, if that is what it is, and I maintain it is only a readjustment, normal, and usual in free enterprise, if we are going to cure it we are using the wrong cures. We are using the New Deal method of spending public money. This is not the way to get a tax cut, and a tax cut is always one way to help. I am glad so many now accept this truth which they did not under the "tax, tax, spend, spend, elect, elect" philosophy. Now, we should build confidence. We cannot do it always by passing another law, but we can scare people into a depression. Would anybody here do that for political gain? I hate to think so. I merely say to the gentleman from Texas and all my colleagues it is wrong to put out a report at this time saying we are in a depression. We are not in a depression. I am putting in the RECORD every day a little story, The Story of Free Enterprise, less than 300 words, trying to prove to you what I think are the lessons and axioms of this Nation's greatness. Lessons we should never forget.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Yesterday under questioning the Secretary of Labor acknowledged that the number of unemployed today was exactly the same percentage as the number of unemployed at the time the gentleman mentioned, 1950, 7.6 percent. We did not then say we were in a depression, we did not then say it was a great national crisis, we did not then say it was a tremendous emergency, that we must do something. Why are we saying it today? That is what I want to know, and that is what I asked him.

Mr. ALGER. I cannot answer the gentleman, for I don't know what's in the minds of the other gentlemen, but now I direct the question to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], whom everybody in this House respects: Does the gentleman think we are now in a depression, as the committee report states?

Mr. THOMAS. My distinguished friend from Dallas has made a very capable speech, and he has convinced me all the more that we are in a very serious depression.

I can construe the gentleman's words to mean but one thing. Does the gentleman mean he does not need that big $24-million building for Dallas? If the gentleman does not, let him say so. Does the gentleman mean they do not need that big building there to help things out?

Mr. ALGER. Does the gentleman want me to answer that?

Mr. THOMAS. I am asking the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. Let me put it this way, and I will put myself in the same position I have taken ever since I have been here. Yes, I will give up the project in Dallas, along with all my colleagues at this time, in the spirit of tightening the belt, as we said at the time the sputnik went up and there was talk about how we would meet the Russian challenge. I will do that, expecting to cut taxes and reduce the debt within a balanced budget. I will gladly give up that project. This project means a good deal to Dallas, but not so much that we are not interested more in cutting taxes, but only in a legitimate way, and that is by first cutting Government spending. Further, this building is proposed for definite reasons such as consolidating Government offices. It is not intended as a make-work project. If, I say to my colleague, others will give theirs up, certainly I will. It is popular on the floor, of course, to attack those Members who are unwise enough to make such a politically foolish statement, I suppose, as I have made. This is not and should not be a political move. I am speaking for the people back home who will give up things costing Federal money in order to cut taxes.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the gentleman want to cut unemployment, too?

Mr. ALGER. I think the picture in Dallas, Houston, and the rest of the Nation, as I have just said to the gentleman, is not nearly so serious as some represent it to be.

Mr. THOMAS. Almost the next thing to a serious, fatal illness is to have the breadwinner of the family without a job.

Mr. ALGER. I would answer the gentleman by saying the Government is not set up to take care of each and every family in this Nation. We cannot through laws in this body secure the future of everyone. We can redistribute the wealth, we can all go broke, take away from those who have and give to the have-nots. This is not actually the function of government. I would say, rather, there are other ways we can help. We can give people back their tax money and let them buy shoes, and so forth, instead of us in Congress redistributing the taxpayers' money.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he is well aware of this fact.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I will gladly take all the time that the Members of this body will permit me to have in order to answer the gentleman's question or other questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines except in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rather hate to say anything at the present time because my remarks might be thought to be directed at our chairman whom I admire greatly and who I think is one of the great Members of this House who has rendered great service. However, I had thought if time permitted this morning that I would say something hoping that it might have some influence on the conferees when this bill leaves the House, if it does leave the House, without the proviso being stricken out which would prevent the building of 34 post offices at a cost of $55,820,000—all of which could be let between now and July 1 under the Lease-Purchase Act.

If we are entering a recession as some of you say, or if we are in a depression, I shall have to return to the remarks offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] yesterday. Mr. TABER said if we are in a recession, we are certainly pointing the gun in the wrong direction if we stop the lease-purchase construction when hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent in getting ready to build these Federal buildings that will employ thousands of workers. In the past, construction costs were so high contracts could not be let. Now we are able to get plenty of bids at reasonable rates of interest that will employ thousands of people and get the job done quickly. Yet, this Congress that says it is afraid of a recession will not permit us to keep this proviso and put these 34 Federal buildings, under contract between now and July 1. I do not think on second sober thought you will want to take the responsibility of wrecking the lease-purchase program and prevent the construction of this program, which is needed and will give employment to thousands of people.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman referred to post-office buildings, and I am sure the gentleman means multipurpose public buildings; does he not?

Mr. VURSELL. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, let me go a little bit further. I do not recall any Republican on the floor of the House in 1950 saying

anything about a terrible, tragic depression that was enveloping and encompassing this country and wanting to start a crash construction program all over the United States and going further into deficit spending. I do not recall any Republican on this side of the House saying that. And we had a work force of 56 million people at that time, and we had 4,800,000 people out of work. Truman was President then. What did he say? None of you criticized him. I have searched the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD back to that time, and I find no criticism from any of the Democratic leaders of President Truman. He said, let me quote what he said then, "It is a good thing to normally have 3½ million to 5 million people out of work, looking for jobs. It is healthy for the economy of this country." Is that not what he said? Of course, that is what he said.

Yet, here we have in 1957 a work force of 67 million, and we have had a rolling broad expansive prosperity enveloping the land for the past 4 years. Now we have had one of the worst seasons that we have ever had to keep men out of the fields and to keep men out of the shops these past 3 months, and these conditions are with us right now, together with the normal slack in employment.

Due to this seasonal slack, high inventories, and other conditions, there has come a slowdown in business and about 5 million people are unemployed. A less number percentagewise than the Truman recession of 1950.

Of course, unfortunately the Korean war broke out June 26, 1950, and turned the Truman depression into a wartime Democrat prosperity and increased inflation.

We had a slight recession under President Eisenhower in 1954, but we beat it back with a tax cut of $7¼ billion, followed in 1955 and 1956 with the greatest peacetime prosperity this Nation ever witnessed.

Our overall economy is sound and we still have 60 million people employed. The people own many more billions in savings today than back in the Truman depression in 1950.

Now some of your Democrat leaders want to throw the budget out of balance; you want to recklessly appropriate and spend billions and billions of dollars for public works; crash programs; and go back to deficit spending and increased inflation with which you have been so familiar in the past.

The Democrat leaders of this Congress are trying to make the American people lose confidence in the President and his policies. They are trying to take over and run the executive department of the Government, and you know it just as well as I do. I think it is about time that we quit trying to talk this country into a depression. Some of the Democrat leaders tried it in 1954, some of the leaders of the Senate particularly, and they were not able to do it. It is time to quit trying to talk the Nation into a depression and restore full confidence in this Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, $11,800,000, to be expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this act.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of oratory in this House as to whether or not we are in the midst of a depression or recession. I would like to quote the remarks of the distinguished leader—if he is not the distinguished leader of the Republican Party, I wish somebody over there would correct me—the present occupant of the White House, President Eisenhower, who recently had a press conference and called this situation we are presently facing "a depression." That word so appeared in the official transcript of the press conference.

I would like to go a little further and tell my colleagues on the Republican side—

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I do not yield at this time.

Mr. MARTIN. For a correction. Did he not correct that himself?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. DINGELL. To go a little further, I would like to tell the distinguished minority leader and some of his colleagues the situation that does face this country. In the city of Detroit we have 305,000 people out of work. In the State of Michigan we have 415,000 or 420,000 out of work. This is about 15 to 18 percent of the work force. Detroit is not the worst city in the country and Michigan does not lead this country in unemployment, but there are many other States and many major cities, represented by members of the Republican Party, which are in worse shape than my own State and my own city.

I would like to point out to the distinguished Members on the Republican side that we are now faced by another problem of workers who have been drawing unemployment compensation and are now going off the rolls. From the remarks we have been hearing recently, this lack of increase in unemployment compensation is a sign of prosperity. That is patently false, because what is really happening is that those workers are moving off faster than they are going on, but they are going off because they have exhausted their benefits at the highest rate in history.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a friendly question?

Mr. DINGELL. I will yield for a friendly question, but I would like to finish my explanation here first.

I would like to point out to my dear friends and colleagues in this House that as early as the first of February we were informed that there were 45 major cities in this country—and this is by the Secretary of Labor—which had unemployment in excess of 6 percent. Since that time all agree the situation has worsened considerably.

I would like to point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that since this time even these major cities find that this—I believe the phrase is Eisenhower prosperity—has increased substantially since then and that today we have States like Oregon, Washington, Montana, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and other States now facing unemployment at the rate of about 14 to 15 percent. One thing to be remembered about this is that the way figures are handled the extent of unemployment does not show up in them.

And I want to point out to my colleagues that a part of the real unemployment that does not show up in the statistics is the partial work week, people working maybe 2 or 3 days a week, maybe 1 day a week. I had a constituent write me, saying that it was not unemployment, but they were just starving to death slowly. They let the men work just enough so that they cannot draw unemployment compensation.

What does this mean? It means that the workweek has dropped from 40 hours to less than 38 hours. This is a loss of over 2 million man-hours per week, or, put another way, is equivalent to another 2 or 3 million unemployed, over the official figure of 5.2 million—a figure which is now almost a month old and which does not, by official admission, include large numbers of those actually unemployed.

These are not my figures; they are put out from official sources, from the present administration, if you please.

What we of the Democratic Party say to our brothers on the other side of the aisle is this: Join with us, help us to have a vigorous, strong, intelligent program to combat this situation.

I know my colleagues on both sides recall 1929. Those days, we hope, will not return; we do not say they are here.

It is our hope that our brothers on the Republican side of the aisle will help us with public-works programs, will help us with extension of unemployment compensation and other vigorous programs for the restoration of full and complete prosperity to all.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon, who is sincerely and genuinely concerned with the problem of umemployment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I wanted to say to my colleagues that I am completely in accord with what the gentleman from Michigan has told us, for Oregon finds her economy in very bad shape. We have had, over the past several months, the highest unemployment of any State in the Nation.

We are now in the unenviable position in the State of Oregon where unemployment has reached the very high rate of 12 to 13 percent. In certain sections of the State, I am advised it is expected to reach the rate of 28 percent. This means that in those sections of the State one salary earner out of every four would be unemployed. The many unemployed and countless individuals who have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits find little comfort in the words of my colleagues on the other side

of the aisle who look at the situation through rose-colored glasses and call it a healthy economy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman said about unemployment in Detroit undoubtedly is true, but who brought it on? Who is responsible for it?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. What I wanted to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], is whether he does not agree with me that one well-known citizen from Michigan, Mr. Walter Reuther, has now proved that he can price the product out of the market, and the men whom he purports to represent out of their jobs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is just what Walter Reuther has done. There are troubles enough over in the 4th Michigan District, but we are sympathetic with the unemployment situation in Detroit and Wayne County for it affects us as well, because many of our people work in industries which are suppliers for the automobile industry. When there is trouble in Wayne County or elsewhere there is trouble in our District. The trouble in Wayne County is that they have now exhausted much of their unemployment compensation. But before that Reuther enforced a wage scale which was the highest for any specialized group in the State. They forced the price of the product ever higher. The industry went along. Many workmen went ahead and spent their money, not only spent it as they went along but entered into contracts for future payments they cannot now, with higher living costs, meet. Now they want people in other sections of the State who were a little thrifty, who saved part of what they earned, to help them out now that they have exhausted their resources, and are unemployed but it works an unjust hardship on those who have been thrifty.

What is Reuther doing about it? You know he has access to high places here in Washington. What is Reuther's organization doing but increasing the dues of the workers created by money to diminish unemployment. If Reuther has his way no one who is unemployed can get a job unless he does two things: one, joins a union—two, pays an initiation fee and thereafter monetary dues and assessments—payment of which lessens his ability to meet the increasing cost of living. Why did they want to take Reuther on at the White House when they had banished McCarthy? They kicked McCarthy out, but at least we knew what McCarthy was and what he was doing. He was against the Communists. He may have been rough but he was against communism—that the people knew—Reuther does not like our form of Government—he has created and fostered class feeling—set one group against another. But we find Reuther's organization doubling the dues wanting to get a cut out of further unemployment compensation. Money collected from workers to be used to further his political ambitions. I dislike to see any further aid we give the unemployed go first through Reuther's hands so he can pocket some of it in the form of increased dues, use some to elect his rubber stamps to Congress.

We would be pretty dumb, would we not, if we fell for that kind of a program.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $275,000 for expenses of travel; not to exceed $350 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $115 million to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than $30,250,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for high-school science and mathematics teachers.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER: On page 21, line 21, strike out the period and insert the following: "*Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated by this paragraph $40 million shall be available for grants to institutions of higher learning for basic research, of which not less than $1,700,000 shall be used for social sciences research."

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, survival was, not long ago, a question for a single person, a single family, or nation. Today, with our fearful weapons, survival is a question for all humanity to consider together. Are we smart enough to survive in spite of our deadly inventions? I do not know. I wish I did. I do know that the most promising road to a solution, or part of a solution, lies in basic research in human behavior.

My good friend, the very able gentleman from Texas, and his hard-working Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices convincingly expressed their agreement with this proposition. The bill before us steps up support of basic research from $16¼ million—fiscal year 1958—to $40 million, a $23¾ million increase.

My amendment does not increase the amounts appropriated by one penny. It does not change the amount the National Science Foundation has earmarked for basic research. All that I am trying to do is bring the increases for social science research in line with the increases for biological and medical sciences and for mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences. In line, that is, percentagewise, not dollarwise.

The bill itself does not make allocations in these three categories, but the National Science Foundation sets forth its summaries of obligations by the three programs on page 269 of the hearings. Here are the figures:

Biological and medical sciences: From $7.8 million in 1958 to $19.5 million in 1959, an increase of $11.7 million.

Mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences: From $7.8 million in 1958 to $19.5 million in 1959, an increase of $11.7 million.

Social sciences: From $600,000 in 1958 to $850,000, an increase of $250,000.

In short, the sciences having to do with how to improve our physical well-being and prolong life and the sciences dealing with inanimate matter were increased almost 3 times, but the sciences having to do with human behavior were only increased about 40 percent.

My amendment would increase the $850,000 to $1.7 million, the additional $850,000 coming out of the other two programs, the two that do not deal directly with human behavior. The result would be that all programs will be increased almost 3 times, although social science basic research would still be less than one-tenth as much in dollars as either of the other two programs alone, less than one-twentieth of both of the other programs together.

Passage of this amendment would not reflect on the distinguished committee. The matter never came up before them. By earmarking an additional $850,000 for basic research in the fields of human behavior, this House would simply tell the National Science Foundation that we thought this increase necessary and proper. The foundation could spend more, under the amendment, but not less for basic research in the social sciences.

But can the National Science Foundation use the additional money for social science research? Most emphatically yes. In the current fiscal year, with $600,000 in funds allocated for this program, $3 million could have been used for qualified projects.

Will we survive? If we do, it will be because we learned more than we know now about human behavior. And if we are to learn more, we must make a far greater effort in basic research in psychology, sociology, economics, political science, and other disciplines having to do with human behavior. I know these are relatively new sciences, with a good deal of fakery, charlatans, and jargon. But I know also we have highly competent persons in the National Science Foundation and the only way we will improve these sciences is through more basic research by responsible, qualified men and women.

In 7 years the National Science Foundation has spent $27.4 million on mathematics, physical, and engineering sciences; $26.6 million on biological and medical sciences, but in this same period only $1.2 million on social sciences, its program beginning in 1954 with $57,000.

Will we survive? With our tensions and conflicts, our misunderstandings and our fears? The nonbehavioral sciences are highly important for our national welfare, but not—I submit—more important than the behavioral sciences. If I had my way, this House would this morning approve a Manhattan project type of program for basic and applied research in the behavioral sciences, for the dimensions of the effort should match the urgency of the situation. Here we are, on March 27, 1958, in a world which

for the first time in its history can destroy all or most of humanity in 24 hours. There are thousands of nuclear weapons, most of them ready for instant detonation, and all in the hands of human beings about whose behavior we really know so very little and what we do know, in terms of error-proneness or slippage, is not encouraging. What about these custodians of our nuclear weapons? What about the men who give them orders? What about the policies governing those men, policies which in our country come from the people through this Congress?

It boils down to the old question of survival of the fittest. Are we fit if we do not use the knowledge we have accumulated about human behavior and if we do not push forward the frontiers of our knowledge in political science and economics, for example? I would rather be here advocating that the entire $40 million be spent in the area of human behavior on the crash basis of the Manhattan project that brought forth the atomic bomb. Now that we have the bomb, how are we going to keep it from destroying us, all of us in the world of 1958, anno domini?

Are we going to find the answer in biology, whether developmental, environmental, genetic, metabolic, molecular, or what-have-you? I think not. Are we going to find the answer in astronomy, chemistry, earth sciences, engineering, mathematics or physics? I think not.

The answer to survival, if indeed we have time and I intend to act as though we do, lies in human behavior. If our sciences of human behavior are not good enough, then we had better hurry to improve them, just as we improved our nonbehavioral sciences to produce the atom bomb. We ought to spend $40 million, and a lot more, to use the human mind and its products to meet head-on the human behavioral problems brought on by the atomic bomb.

But that is not my amendment today. That is something for other legislation and other hearings. I only ask for a modest increase in the allocation for the social sciences basic research program, $850,000, so that it will have an increase comparable percentagewise to the increases in the other programs. No additional appropriation is involved. No questioning of the committee's judgment is involved since this never came up in hearings and is not in the bill at any point. What is involved may be the answer, or part of the answer, to the question before us as never in the world's history: "Will humanity be able to survive its deadly inventions." If ever there was a time to open the throttle on basic research in human behavior, the time is now, this very hour and the opportunity is yours on this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and to the entire paragraph end in 5 minutes, with the 5 minutes 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 Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the general purpose as expressed by our friend, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER], is an admirable one, and I cannot say anything but something nice about our friend. He is a gentleman and a scholar, but the amendment ought to be defeated because the committee gave the National Science Foundation every penny in this field that they asked for. If they wanted any more money, they would have asked for it. We gave them about a 200 percent increase over what they had last year. That is a pretty good increase.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. PORTER. My amendment does not require any additional money at all.

Mr. YATES. It does for social sciences.

Mr. PORTER. It merely says they should allocate more money to that branch.

Mr. THOMAS. You did not increase the amount of the budget.

Mr. PORTER. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not intend to give that impression. What you want to do is to earmark certain funds that they asked for. You earmark twice as much as the National Science Foundation asked for social science research and which is already in the bill. Let us let them run their own business in this field. As I say, the gentleman is doing some advanced thinking and we have to admire him for it. He is brilliant and capable, and we all like him, but if the Foundation wanted more money for this purpose, they would have asked for it. After all, what we are trying to do in this bill is to train scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and chemists to forge ahead of Russia. Now, let us tend to our job right here. This amendment ought to be voted down, and there is nothing I can say further. I ask the Committee to vote it down on the theory that if the National Science Foundation wanted any more money, they would have asked for it. We gave them 100 percent of what they asked.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

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 directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER of New York moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WARNING NO. 8

Mr. MULTER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our economy is fast approaching a crisis. Unemployment increases. Prices and costs go on up. The hungry get hungrier and the rich get richer. Note the following from the front page of today's Wall Street Journal:

Leading banks of New York City are expected to report March quarter gains over a year ago of 8 percent to 10 percent in net operating earnings. Upturns in this range are looked for despite reductions in loans to business and generally lower lending rates. Such increases would compare with a 15 percent jump in after-tax earnings of major New York City banks for the initial 3 months of 1957 over the like 1956 period. Though commercial, industrial, and farm loans of these banks are down $200 million since the start of the year, their total loans have gone up $350 million.

The House Banking and Currency Committee continues to fiddle while our economy burns.

Since January 1958 our distinguished House Banking and Currency Committee has devoted its fine talents to perfecting a bank bill written by and for the bankers so that they can make more money by the free use of the depositors'

money, including that of our Government.

Yes, that committee has announced hearings to begin after the Easter recess to deal with our urgent economic needs. I hope the country can wait.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Friday, March 28, to file two reports, the first on a joint resolution, providing for advance procurement of "Supplies and materials" and "Equipment," and the second, an additional report relating to the general government matters appropriation bill, 1959, now pending on the Union Calendar, with reference to committee recommendations on the Civil Rights Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order.

CORRECTION OF COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the report to accompany the bill (H. R. 2767) amending 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, certain corrections should be made.

Page 19: Paragraph 5 should follow paragraph 6, immediately preceding the quotation from Mr. RAYBURN.

Page 21: Line 10, "and so forth. I also said:" is a part of the quotation from Mr. McCORMACK.

Page 25: Line 26 should read: "Partly because of publicity given their candidacies by the eastern press."

Page 31: Lines 26 and 27 should read: "True, the first amendment does state that Congress shall 'make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press' but none is so."

Page 33: Appendix A is an excerpt from remarks of the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 5, pages 5713–5721.

These were all mistakes of the printer. I ask unanimous consent that the report be corrected in accordance with the facts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I 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. 11645) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

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 consideration of the bill H. R. 11645, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I have again the privilege of bringing before the House of Representatives the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Labor Department for the eighth time as chairman of this committee, and as a member of the committee for the past 12 years.

May I say, first, that we have enjoyed good relations in this committee for some time. I certainly appreciate the wonderful support and cooperation that has been given me by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], who has served on the committee for 5 or 6 years now. Without his support I do not know what we would do.

We have a new member on the majority side, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. Certainly he has performed splendid work, and I take this opportunity to compliment him on his attendance and on his rapid grasp of the subject matter of this bill, and also to thank him for the help he has given me. Then, of course, there is the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking member on the Republican side, whose experience and judgment we all admire. We are honored and are glad to have him on this particular subcommittee. He has been a great help. Then the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has been a most conscientious and hard-working member. We appreciate the understanding, help, and cooperation that he has given us in bringing to you this bill. While we have had some minor differences of opinion, I think this can be called a unanimous report from the Committee on Appropriations. Of course, without the support of these men, it would be very difficult for any chairman to do a decent job. But, on top of that, and I think I bragged a little bit a year ago and a couple of years ago also, but I want to brag a little bit again and say I believe that we have on this subcommittee the best clerk that you can get for this particular kind of job. Certainly, he stays on the job the year around. Without his advice, it would be very difficult for us to report to you a bill of the magnitude that we have before us today.

Mr. Chairman, there are not many changes in the present bill. We have appropriated $3,177,366,781 for 1958. The budget estimate for 1959 is $2,973,737,181. We are presenting to you a bill for $2,961,862,181 which is $215,504,600 below 1958 and $11,875,000 below the estimates that we had presented to us. But, of this amount $1,853,200,000 is in three items:

Unemployment compensation for veterans, unemployment compensation for Federal employees and grants to States for public assistance. There is not much we can do about those since the basic legislation sets mathematical formulas for the expenditure of these funds. As we say in our report we doubt that this will be enough money to carry the load in 1959 and that the administration will have to come forth with a request for supplemental funds.

In the Department of Labor, we made very few changes. We allowed just six new positions in the Secretary's office.

We are still dissatisfied with the progress made in the program for employment of older workers. We certainly hope they will do a better job in the coming year.

In the Office of the Solicitor, we gave them just what they asked for.

In the Bureau of Labor Standards, there is a small increase of $10,000 and that is all for expenses of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Of course, the report shows that we gave the Solicitor $200,000 more than the budget estimates. I thought that ought to be brought out.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct. There is $200,000 more than the budget estimate, so far as direct appropriations are concerned. But, a year ago we approved the sum of $200,000 to be taken from the highway trust fund, and that was again requested for 1959. Because of the parliamentary decision which was made on the Treasury-Post Office bill 3 or 4 weeks ago, that these funds are not authorized by the basic legislation to be expended from the trust fund, we included that amount as an addition to the direct appropriation. So the Solicitor will not have any more funds but they will all be from direct appropriations, so the gentleman is correct that the table in the report shows a $200,000 increase.

Then, in the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training we are doing the same thing this year that we did a year ago. A year ago the request was made to add to Bureau of Apprenticeship the words "and training" and expand the program into the training field. Our committee thinks it is a good thing to expand the programs of vocational education and other fields of training. But, a year ago there was, to put it mildly, a lack of cooperation between the vocational educational people and the apprenticeship people, and as a result we said in our report that we were not opposing expansion of activities in this field, but we would expect them to work out their differences and practically told them that when they did, we would approve this appropriation request. We found out this year prior to the markup of the bill that a meeting of the minds between

the apprenticeship people and vocational educational people had not occurred and as a result we have denied the additional $300,000 and again deferred this expansion of the Bureau of Apprenticeship.

In the Bureau of Employment Security, the only item about which there is any controversy is the appropriation for grants to States for which $329,300,000 was requested. We have cut this $24,300,000.

The budget for grants to States was based on the assumption that there would be an average of 2 million insured unemployed in 1959. The committee has made it quite clear that the amount in the bill is aimed to provide just for the workload used as the basis for the budget. So if insured unemployment substantially exceeds an average of 2 million we would expect a request for supplemental funds to take care of that additional workload. But if insured unemployment does not exceed an average of 2 million then we will expect them to live within the amount provided.

For 1958 Congress has appropriated $292,814,000 and this was based on the assumption that there would be an average of 2 million insured unemployment as was set forth in the justifications and the verbal testimony on the recent request for $33 million in supplemental funds—all of which was granted. However, events since that appropriation was requested indicate that the unemployment estimate for 1958 was too low and the average will be about 2.2 million instead. But no additional funds are being requested.

It boils down to this—for 1958 there is $292,814,000 and the insured unemployment will average about 2.2 million; and for 1959 the committee is recommending $295 million to handle an even 2 million insured unemployment, and has included a $10 million contingency fund so that if the workload goes up they can fall back on that until supplemental funds are made available. So the facts are that the committee is recommending a slight increase in funds for slightly less workload.

We told the Secretary of Labor at that time that we did not think their statistics on insured unemployment were realistic figures. This budget was prepared as of last October, and since that time considerable economic change has taken place. We invited him to give us some more up-to-date estimates even after the hearings so that some of these appropriations might be on a more realistic basis, but he did not do so. So we took him at his word and allowed funds on the basis of what he said the unemployment would be.

The committee set forth in its report some of the difficulties it has had in securing up-to-date estimates of needs for those programs effected by the unemployment situation. The report refers to my letter to the two secretaries and their replies. I think to be fair to everyone concerned, the full text of these letters should be made a part of the record. They are as follows:

MARCH 11, 1958.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The appropriations subcommittee on the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare will likely meet either Tuesday or Wednesday of next week to make its decisions on the appropriations to recommend for fiscal year 1959.

As you will recall some of the subcommittee members were surprised, at the time of the hearings on your budget, that no revisions had been made because of the very significant changes in our economy since the President's budget was formulated. Even further significant changes have taken place since the time of those hearings. In view of the ever-increasing seriousness of this situation, and in view of the recent interest that both the President and Vice President have taken in this matter, I will be even more surprised than I was at the time of our hearings if you have no proposals to bring the budget requests for your Department more nearly in line with current realities. I feel certain that any such proposals you now have would be very helpful to the subcommittee in its deliberations next week.

We will appreciate receiving your further recommendations on the 1959 budget by next Monday afternoon, March 17.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. FOGARTY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, March 14, 1958.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter of March 11, 1958, extending to us the opportunity to make any desired amendments to the 1959 budget prior to action by your subcommittee on March 18 or 19. The President has also asked me to express his appreciation for your letter to him dated February 21, relating to the hospital construction program.

The President has today signed and transmitted to Congress an amendment to the 1959 budget for grants for hospital construction, increasing the budget estimate from $75 million to $121.2 million. This will permit initiation of hospital projects at the same rate as authorized in the current fiscal year.

As was pointed out in our testimony, there are two items in our budget which are sensitive to a downturn in the economy. These are "Grants for public assistance," and "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance." The situation as it relates to these items has not changed significantly since our appearance before your committee. We feel that it would be unwise to revise the budget estimates at this time on the basis of the limited experience since the estimates were developed. It is quite possible that the budgets for these items are underestimates of requirements but we do not believe that we can prepare a firm estimate of requirements at this time. To avoid a series of amended estimates we believe it wiser to defer submission of budget revisions until we have a better basis for projecting requirements. This delay will in no way affect our ability to meet demands which may develop in excess of our earlier projections.

In addition, we are currently considering certain small amendments to the 1959 budget which will permit the initiation on a limited basis of programs related to the self-help and self-care provisions of the Social Security Act. Unfortunately, there is insufficient time to complete the various review steps on these amendments prior to Monday, March 17, the date referred to in your letter. If these items are formally approved, they will be transmitted as soon as possible.

I hope that this information will prove helpful and timely to your committee in its consideration of the department's 1959 budget.

Sincerely yours,

MARION B. FOLSOM,
Secretary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, March 15, 1958.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY: Thank you for your letter of March 11 giving us an opportunity to revise the 1959 appropriation estimates for the Department of Labor.

On the basis of information available at the time of our testimony before the committee, we believed that our estimates were sufficient to meet the workload contemplated for fiscal year 1959. We have given your invitation very serious consideration and have reached the conclusion that it would be somewhat premature to attempt a sound revision at this time. So little time has elapsed since our hearings that we could not, with any confidence, justify a new estimate based on an economic situation that has not crystallized sufficiently to permit firm predictions for fiscal year 1959. It appears that the estimates for the Bureau of Employment Security as well as several items in the Bureau of Labor Statistics are less than the minimum necessary for 1959, but how much less we are not prepared to say.

We believe that the best approach to this problem is to wait until we have the advantage of experience closer to the beginning of the fiscal year to which the estimates apply before attempting a revision. Following this thought, we believe a much more effective job can be done if our revised estimates are submitted in time for consideration by Congress as close to final action as possible.

We appreciate your interest and help in obtaining the funds necessary to conduct the activities of this Department. Your offer of an opportunity to revise our estimates assures us of your continued interest. Our suggestion for a different timing in no way diminishes our appreciation of your action and we hope that it will meet with your approval.

Sincerely yours,

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

Because of the dispute last year over the Mexican farm labor program, we have added some language to the bill that would require the farmers to pay for all of the expenses of furnishing Mexican farm labor. It appears from last year's debate that there is no doubt that this represents the majority opinion of the House.

We allowed the Bureau of Labor Statistics an increase of $132,000 over the amount appropriated for 1958, which includes $20,000 for printing the 1959 edition of the Occupational Outlook Handbook, and $100,000 for improvement of statistics in the areas of wholesale and retail prices.

We approved the budget request for the Wage and Hour Division. I, personally, thought we should be appropriating much more funds than that. The Division conducted a compliance survey during the past year to determine the extent of noncompliance with the minimum wage and hour laws. While this compliance survey did not cover 100

percent of the business establishments covered by the law, it revealed that minimum wage underpayments amounted to approximately $19 million, and a total of 600,000 employees were underpaid by about $64,100,000 under the overtime provisions. While the survey indicated that underpayments totaled over $80 million just in those establishments included in the survey, actual compliance activities found violations totaling $15,200,000. Thus it is obvious that the Wage and Hour Division is not doing much more than scratch the surface in actually locating violations and, if the results of the survey are valid, the goal of securing compliance is still a long ways off. Both Secretary Mitchell and the Acting Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division assured the committee that the budget request would enable them to do a good compliance job. The committee will expect a better report of accomplishments next year than was presented in this year's hearings.

We found fault with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, also because of the lack of action on the problem of aging. It seems to the committees that, if these Departments cannot really accomplish something in this field with their current legislation and current programs, then they should come forward with something new. We gave the Food and Drug Administration just what they have for this year, which is not keeping up with the recommendation made by the Citizens Committee that was appointed by Mrs. Hobby when she was the head of that Department, but is all that the present administration requested in the budget.

We allowed the budget, or very near the full budget, request for Freedmen's Hospital, Gallaudet College, for the items under Howard University, and vocational education.

In "Grants for library service," we increased the figures of the budget from $3 million to $5 million, the same as we did a year ago. The Library Services Act was signed into law on June 19, 1956. A request for the full annual authorization of $7,500,000 for fiscal year 1957 was sent to Congress. It was after the beginning of the fiscal year that this request was made, and in view of the fact that it was also a new program, it appeared unlikely to the Congress that the full amount could be utilized. As a result, $2,500,000 was appropriated. Future events proved the Congressional judgment to be correct; however, the amount appropriated for 1957 did enable the States to start a base program upon which to build in the following fiscal year. In the budget for 1958, when it was obvious that the States could use more funds, the policy was reversed and only $3 million was requested. This committee recommended the appropriation of $5 million which was approved by the Congress. These funds are being fully utilized, and the effective and much needed program envisioned by the basic legislation is now in being. No reasons for seeking to cut this program back in fiscal year 1959 were presented to the committee except the catchall that it is in conformity with the overall budget policy.

We did not have any request before us for appropriations for school construction in impacted areas, since extension of that program has not yet been acted upon by Congress. We have cut the amount requested under this head $100,000, but that is the amount for the Housing and Home Finance Agency for inspection of buildings and other technical services. We believe they can do a good job with the $750,000 allowed.

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Education we allowed $7,800,000, an increase of $800,000 over their appropriation for 1958.

This has been one of the most neglected activities in the Federal Government for years. As late as fiscal year 1955, this country was spending less than $3 million on this Office which was established to "promote the cause of education throughout the country." While charged with one of the greatest responsibilities of any agency of our Government, it was receiving little attention.

In its report on the bill for fiscal year 1956, this committee stated:

> The committee feels very strongly that we ought to have an Office of Education that is effective, and one that the educational authorities all over the country would have pride in and would look to for leadership and for assistance in their problems.

Beginning with fiscal year 1957, considerable progress has been made toward this goal. A real cooperative research program has been inaugurated that is receiving strong support and a high degree of cooperation from the schools. The Office of Education deserves considerable credit for its leadership in the programs of research in the educational problems of the mentally retarded and cerebral palsied and in the field of speech and hearing defects. While this was being accomplished the whole Office has been built up to a level where it can come closer to rendering the services that the educational system needs and must have if the Nation is to keep abreast of the changing conditions nationwide and worldwide.

During the past several months the Nation's attenion has been called more forcibly to the fact that we cannot afford to be complacent. If we are to maintain a position of leadership it is more and more being recognized that education must keep up with the times. The increase allowed will provide for a continuation of the going programs and for some progress in the fields of highest priority. The committee will expect that there be no diminution in efforts to provide a really effective program in the fields of the mentally retarded children and speech and hearing defects.

For grants for vocational rehabilitation, we gave them what they asked, and we raised the allotment base from $53 million to $56 million.

For many years this program achieved commendable results, but on a rather small scale. It is to the credit of Secretary Hobby that she strongly endorsed and had a large part in starting what was invisioned as an expansion of this program to its full effectiveness. This was based not only on a recognition of the great humanitarian values of the program, but also on the knowledge that for every dollar spent on this program the Federal Government gets back over $10 in taxes. Secretary Hobby's goal was to expand the program to the point that about 200,000 people would be rehabilitated each year by about 1960. Progress has been made in the last 3 years; however, even if that progress were continued it is doubtful that the goal would have been reached in the time period originally contemplated. The committee was therefore quite surprised that the budget not only failed to include any provisions for encouraging a more rapid expansion of the program, but actually recommended a restraint on progress by including in the proposed appropriation language the same figure of $53 million as the base for making allotments to the States. The committee has increased the figure to $56 million which will enable those States, who have continued to increase their own appropriations, to receive the full amount of Federal funds to which they are entitled under the formula in the basic Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. Will the gentleman go back to that item on school construction? Authority for Federal assistance in impacted areas has expired. It is my recollection that there is a rule pending before the Rules Committee at this time that would extend that authority. Then what would be the gentleman's suggestion as to how we can proceed from there?

Mr. FOGARTY. It will then be up to the administration to send us a request for funds. It would be referred to this committee and would be acted on in a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. AVERY. A supplemental appropriation later in this Congress.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. The first item in the Public Health Service is "Assistance to States, general." Here there has been a decrease of $592,000 from the amount appropriated for 1958.

We approved the exact amount or made only very small reductions in grants and special studies, Territory of Alaska, for the construction of the mental health hospital in Alaska, control of venereal disease, control of tuberculosis, control of communicable diseases, sanitary engineering activities, and grants for waste treatment works construction.

For "Grants for hospital construction," we approved the full amount of the revised request of $121,200,000. The original budget request for this purpose was $75 million. It was difficult for the committee to determine whether the primary reason for the recommended reduction was simply to conform with some high budget policy, or the belief that the program had accomplished its purpose to the point where a reduction would be in keeping with the original objectives. This question was resolved in no uncertain terms by the table which appears on pages 172–178 of the committee hearings with the Public Health Service.

This table shows that the States are prepared to proceed with a program approximating $1,300,000,000 if the Federal Goverment would appropriate $500 million on a matching basis under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act. There are some members of the committee who would prefer that additional funds were appropriated for this purpose, and there are members who would likely prefer that less were appropriated, but, judging by the great number of communications received by the committee, there is little doubt that the revised estimate of $121,200,000 more nearly conforms with the public opinion on this subject than did the original request of $75 million.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of a more appropriate place to make this sad announcement to the House of the untimely death of one of the outstanding leaders in this field.

Dr. Cronin took over administration of the Hill-Burton hospital and medical facilities construction program in June 1949, when communities throughout the country were just completing their first hospitals with Federal aid.

He was known throughout the medical and hospital professions for his vigorous promotion of the high standards of both construction and medical care envisioned by the creators of the Hill-Burton legislation. He constantly urged local and State health services to join forces with the medical profession in long-range planning of medical facilities and in maintaining the highest standards of hospital care. Time after time he was cited by Members of Congress for his outstanding administration.

The success of the program has also received international attention. Representatives of other nations are frequently sent to Washington for consultation with the Hill-Burton staff.

To date, more than 3,750 projects have been completed or approved for construction. They include nearly 600 new general hospitals built in communities where the people never had a hospital before; also, more than 650 health centers. The total cost of all Hill-Burton projects exceeds $3 billion. The Federal share is about $960 million.

Dr. John W. Cronin, Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and Chief, Bureau of Medical Services, died suddenly of a heart attack Wednesday, March 26. He was stricken at his office in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare soon after presiding at a meeting of his staff. His age was 52.

Dr. Cronin was widely known for his outstanding leadership of the Hill-Burton hospital and medical facilities program. His writings have been published by leading hospital and medical journals. He entered the Public Health Service in 1932 as an intern at the Staten Island, N. Y., hospital of the Service. From 1949 to 1956 he was Chief of the Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities, where he administered the Hill-Burton program. On November 1, 1956, he was promoted to the rank of Assistant Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medical Services.

As Chief of the Bureau, Dr. Cronin was responsible for the administration of the Public Health Service hospitals, the Indian health program, the foreign quarantine service, the Hill-Burton program, nursing and dental resources, and the medical services of several Federal agencies including the United States Coast Guard, Bureau of Prisons, and the Foreign Service of the State Department.

He was awarded the Founders Medal of the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States in 1953; and an honorary degree of doctor of science from Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in 1955. He has been a trustee of the American Association of Public Health Physicians, and was a vice president of the Association of Military Surgeons and a member of the board of governors of the American College of Surgeons. He was a fellow of the American Psychiatric Association, American College of Surgeons, American Public Health Association, American Medical Association, American College of Preventive Medicine, and a diplomat of the American Board of Preventive Medicine and Public Health.

Dr. Cronin was born in Springfield, Ohio, June 15, 1905. He graduated from Miami University and received his medical degree from the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine.

He is survived by his widow, a daughter, Virginia May, and a son, John W. Jr. The Cronin's home is at 5528 Trent, Chevy Chase, Md.

In hospitals and medical care, we gave them an increase of $421,000 over the budget request and an increase of $331,000 over the amount appropriated for 1958.

This increase is for the purpose of doing something for the leprosarium down at Carville, La. I made a trip down there this last fall and found that some of the conditions were deplorable.

To improve the morale of our doctors and to get some of the answers to this disease, we have allowed $91,000 for starting a research project in that hospital, and we have allowed $121,000 for 10 small dwellings for married couples both of whom have Hansen's disease. We also included $210,000 to replace some buildings that were declared obsolete just after the First World War. That is how bad their condition is. Altogether we have given them an increase of $421,000 over what the President recommended.

It was disappointing that the administration did not request any additional funds for the professional nurse training program under this appropriation, or for the practical nurse training program under the vocational education program. Just one indication of the need is that there has been a 100-percent increase in hospital admissions since 1940 but only a 50-percent increase in professional nurses. I would have, personally, preferred that some increase be made in both of these appropriations.

We allowed the budget request for the Foreign Quarantine Service and also the Indian health activities. For construction of Indian health facilities we allowed $750,000 over the amount requested, but it is a slight decrease from the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. The increase above the request was earmarked for construction under Public Law 151.

Now we come to the National Institutes of Health. Last year they had $211,183,000. This year they asked for $211,183,000. We raised the request by $8,200,000, and we disallowed the request for authority to use almost $7 million in order to increase the overhead allowance to 25 percent. Thus, we are allowing about $15 million more for research for next year than they have this year.

As my colleagues in the House know, I have consistently advocated sound and sustained growth in the support of medical research through programs administered by the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md.

I know of no time, in my nearly 14 years of continuous association with the committee which recommends funds for these programs, when I have found more reason to feel proud of the progress that is being made in this field.

There are two reasons why all of us can share in this sense of pride.

First, it is now abundantly evident that increasing and stable support by the Federal Government of an important segment of the Nation's medical research effort is established as a matter of national policy.

Second, it is abundantly evident that our investment in medical research pays rich dividends, both humanitarian and economic, in the form of dramatic advances against disease.

We have before us an annual appropriation bill. We in Congress know that the processes for yearly review of Federal activities, associated with the setting of fiscal levels for these activities, are perhaps the primary means for assuring that the programs of Government reflect the views of the people as mirrored by their elected representatives. We also know that Government programs and their annual appropriations must be viewed in context if they are to be acted upon with wisdom and understanding.

In the case of medical research and related activities of the National Institutes of Health, the context must extend back to the close of World War II. It was then that the forces leading to the medical research programs embodied in the bill that is before us were beginning to take shape.

I shall not attempt to trace the development of these programs since that time. With strong public support and with an ever-expanding horizon of research opportunity, the National Institutes of Health has become a dynamic and responsible custodian of the taxpayers' funds for medical research.

Today, it supports almost 40 percent of all the medical research being done in this country, including grant support of nearly 7,000 research projects in medical schools, universities, and other research centers. It provides about $40 million for fellowships, training grants and other awards designed to increase trained scientific manpower for research and related careers. It provides $30 million in matching grants to assist in the

construction of research facilities. And it conducts an extensive and highly productive research program in its own laboratories at Bethesda and in the field.

Thus, in acting upon the appropriation bill before us, we are acting upon programs that are basic to the health and so to the happiness and productivity of the American people.

The people have seen, as you and I have seen, the benefits of medical research applied in practice.

The people believe, as I believe, and as I am sure you must believe, that the national interest will not permit support of medical research to be cut back.

The recommended action of our subcommittee seeks to fill in some deficiencies in the administration's proposed 1959 National Institutes of Health program and to provide for some extremely modest increases for certain aspects of research in cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and other fields. The total recommended increase—from $211.1 million to $219.3 million—is a clear demonstration of the committee's belief in orderly rather than explosive growth in these programs.

I spoke earlier of pride in the accomplishments of medical research. The record of the hearings before our committee is replete with substantiation of such accomplishments. I commend to you, if the materials have not already come to your attention, the reports on the highlights of research progress for each of the Institutes and the discussion and prepared statements of each of the Institute directors. They document progress which is evidence in itself of the relentless, step-by-step attack on disease by the men and women of science.

I commend to your attention also the inspired and challenging remarks of the non-Federal scientists, research administrators, and private citizens who appeared before our committee voluntarily to give us their views on the accomplishments, problems, and future directions of medical research.

These are items which, because they are in the record, have the capacity to speak for themselves.

Implicit in the record, but nowhere stated in so many words, is the inescapable conclusion that we have come far enough along the road in the support of medical research to be able to see, or perhaps to sense, the contour, the dimension, and something of the essential nature of the goals toward which the road we have elected to travel leads. And I, for one, feel both stimulated and refreshed by the sight of our objectives. After a decade of travel in which, although there have been signposts along the way, the journey has been primarily an act of faith, it is rewarding indeed to have evidence that at least some of our destinations are in sight.

We allowed $57,423,000 for the Cancer Institute. This is $1,500,000 over the request and $1,021,000 more than appropriated for 1958.

A few years ago a test for cancer involving study of cells was an experimental laboratory technique. Now this cytologic test is being used for mass screening in 10 centers throughout the Nation. The technique is approaching the point where it can be used as a routine public health diagnostic procedure. At the moment, this test is used for cancer of the uterus, but studies are now in progress to determine whether it cannot be effectively used on a large scale to detect in the early stages cancer of the lung, bladder, bowel and prostate gland. With the methods of treatment now available, a simple and accurate method of early diagnosis would save many thousands of the more than a quarter of a million people who die each year from cancer.

On an even more advanced level of diagnosis, it appears possible that the presence of a cancer in the body may cause identifiable changes in certain components of blood. Considering the rate at which medical science has advanced over the past 10 years, it is plausible to believe that in the decade ahead simple, accurate tests for cancer, such as a blood test, may make the early detection of cancer simple and be usable as a routine tool of the physician and public health worker.

On a more fundamental level, testimony before the committee by scientists most competent to judge makes it clear that current research is pointing with increasing clarity toward the probability of a close link between viruses and cancer. The scientific story, as recounted by expert witnesses, involves a close connection between viruses and the determination of heredity, between nonliving large molecules and organizations of these molecules into particles that have properties of life, between growth-control mechanisms involving large molecules like those which join to form viruses and the uncontrolled growth characteristic of cancer. Dr. Wendell Stanley, a Nobel prize winner for his virus studies, has said:

> I believe the time has come when we should assume that viruses are responsible for most, if not all, kinds of cancer, including cancer in man, and design and execute our experiments accordingly.

If some forms of human cancer are found in fact to be caused by viruses, it is not fantastic to look ahead to the day when a vaccine against some kinds of cancer may be available.

The committee will expect that a considerable portion of the increase provided for this Institute's research program be spent in this field.

Finally, the committee notes with satisfaction the solution of many difficult problems associated with the cancer chemotherapy program, and the discovery of many leads that should be exploited. Part of the increase for this Institute should be used for support of this program.

The committee included $40,397,000 for mental health activities which is $2,700,000 over the amount requested and $1,180,000 over the amount appropriated for 1958.

The Nation's billion dollar annual bill just for care of the mentally ill continues. The tragedy of mental illness for those who are stricken and for their families continues. With the spectacular and continuing advances in those diseases with a clear physical origin, it is obvious that the relative importance of mental illness will continue to increase over the years ahead. This is not defeatism, but the realism required if the problem is to be attacked most productively.

The first attack is through research, and here results continue to be encouraging. Beginning with the tranquilizers, a long series of drugs has appeared. Some of these energize mental patients who have fallen into a stupor; others actually produce temporary insanity. For the first time in the history of man, the possibility of isolating the specific body reactions involved in the production of abnormal mental states appears possible. This exciting prospect calls for a research program as intense as can be mounted by the trained people available, and extended as rapidly as new investigators can be produced.

The committee has not been persuaded that the existing program in psychopharmacology operated by this Institute is fully effective. More vigorous, imaginative, and diversified approaches are called for. It does not appear, for example, that there has been a strong and effective effort to enlist the aid of the pharmaceutical industry. The committee trusts that this program will be more vigorously administered during the coming year. Research on such matters as why and how the new drugs work might well be more effectively stimulated, and the feasibility of systematic screening on a more adequate scale should be explored.

The committee will expect that approximately $1,300,000 of the increase provided will be spent in increasing research on schizophrenia above the level contemplated in the budget. The committee lends full support to all approaches to this problem that are sanctioned by competent scientific advice, for this disease is one of the most terrible afflictions of man and one of the most costly to society.

The social, medical and economic problems created by alcoholism continue to grow in importance. It is claimed by competent authorities that alcoholism ranks fourth amoung American public health problems, yet very little is being done in an effort to find the causes. Medical research in this field has been and still is practically nonexistent. The committee will expect that a real research program into the basic medical factors involved in this problem be initiated and is earmarking $700,000 of the increase in the appropriation for this purpose.

The committee is convinced that the key to a successful long-range research program is the production of more competent investigators—not only psychiatrists but the full team of highly specialized people required for study of mental illnesses. For this reason, the committee is earmarking $700,000 of the increase for the training program.

It is clear to the committee that, despite the large and effective training program of the National Institute of Mental Health, action to produce the required group of trained people—psychiatrists, psychiatrically trained physicians, sociologists, psychologists, and psychiatric nurses—is inadequate. The

committee has seen little evidence of the kind of bold thinking and action that will be necessary to meet the personnel shortages. As one specific approach, the committee wishes part of the increase to be devoted to a more vigorous pilot project for providing basic psychiatric instruction to physicians.

We are recommending $36,212,000 for the Heart Institute. This is $1,500,000 over the request and $276,000 over the amount appropriated for 1958.

Of the advances in any field of medicine over the past decade, none are more inspiring than those in diseases of the heart. Three areas of inquiry have impressed the committee as showing progress that promises well for the future—the causes of atherosclerosis, the causes of strokes and studies of anticoagulants. It will be expected that the increase provided will be spent mainly in these fields.

In every year, significant new facts bearing upon atherosclerosis come to light. The knowledge that was new a few years ago, such as the involvement of cholesterol in atherosclerosis, now seems elementary. They are on the track of the specific set of body defects which result in faulty handling of fat in the body, ultimately resulting in the formation of plaques of cholesterol in arteries. Given adequate support, these lines of investigation will continue to bear fruit.

Strokes are related to atherosclerosis. The plaques of cholesterol in arteries often cause the formation of blood clots. These clots circulate in the blood stream. They can clog vessels in the brain causing strokes, or in the heart, causing coronary thrombosis. It is therefore a scientific task of first importance to stop the formation of clots in the blood stream and to dissolve those already formed. The so-called anticoagulant therapy with such drugs as dicumarol is well established. Such drugs are quite effective in preventing clot formation, although they can and are being improved. A new advance is the discovery of drugs derived from molds which will attack and dissolve clots already formed. If this research lead works out, and the evidence now is favorable, thousands of people will have a new lease on life.

High blood pressure is a disease which will, except for relatively few individuals, be controllable within a few years. A number of highly effective blood-pressure-lowering agents are already available, and new ones are discovered every year.

A major continuing need in the heart disease field is fast and accurate assessment of the full effects and side effects of various drugs through controlled study of large population groups. The possibility of moving drugs quickly from the laboratory to general use should be fully exploited.

It is becoming increasingly evident that heredity is a very important factor in heart disease, especially in atherosclerosis. In the opinion of the committee, too little attention is being given to research in this field. It will be expected that a portion of the increased funds be utilized in this area. Of course, the importance of heredity is far from limited to this Institute's field of interest. Consideration should be given to the establishment of a training program, or programs, for geneticists in order to develop the qualified manpower to follow up the many leads that have been developed that indicate heredity may have an important role in many medical problems.

Just a few days ago I was discussing the activities in the field of heart research with Dr. Paul Dudley White, one of the leading heart specialists of the world. I was so impressed by this discussion that I asked Dr. White to put his throughts in writing for me, which he has done. I think his letter will be of considerable interest to many others, as it has been to me. I will therefore place it in the RECORD for their benefit.

BOSTON, MASS., *March 24, 1958.*

Congressman JOHN FOGARTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FOGARTY: I am writing to summarize some of our discussion about the need of research and training in the cardiovascular field today.

We have not yet reached the saturation point or plateau in the use of needed funds for the development of our knowledge. The particular fields in which I have been especially interested of late and which are inadequately supported and which, incidentally, apply not simply to cardiovascular disease but to diseases of many other parts of the body, are mainly twofold.

In the first place, many of us doctors have long been aware of the great importance of the recognition of the role that heredity plays in the predisposition to diseases of one kind or another. This is quite clear to us practitioners of medicine, but it has never been adequately investigated either in practice or in theory, and little or no research has been done about it. It is still true that "one man's meat is another man's poison" and that one man is much more likely to get coronary heart disease under the same circumstances than another man or that one woman is much more likely to have high blood pressure under the same circumstances than another woman, almost wholly due to inherited tendencies which are of all characters—chemical, physical, biological and otherwise. Not only do we need to study the families of our patients more intensively and to educate the people at large to keep personal records of family health for the sake of their descendants and to have doctors keep better family histories of their patients, but we also need to utilize many more expert geneticists than we have at present. We know a lot about the heredity of racehorses and dogs and hogs, but very little about the heredity of man.

The other main topic that has interested me particularly of late years and which looms now as of ever increasing importance is that of epidemiological research or a study into the cause of disease. This applies strongly to diseases of the heart and blood vessels. After we find out who the candidates for high blood pressure or coronary thrombosis may be, how can we protect them? What factors are there which are important in the causation? How important is diet and how important are the various items of the diet, that is, the fats of different sorts, the proteins, and the carbohydrates? How important is exercise or the lack thereof? How important is nervous stress and strain? How important is the habitual use of tobacco and alcohol? These environmental factors or agents need to be studied. The surface has only been scratched. We must go to other countries as well as to different parts of our own in order to get adequate information. Very little financial support has been rendered by anybody as yet for epidemiological studies in comparing populations outside the United States of America with members of the same race and country who have migrated to the United States. Studies made like this outside the country may be of greater importance to our own citizens than some of the studies that have been restricted to the United States of America. There has been too much fear of spending money abroad in any research and great opportunities have been missed, but now it is clear that something of this sort needs to be done. Pioneering has just begun in the last few years in such studies as a comparison of the Italians in southern Italy with the southern Italians living in Boston, of the Japanese living in southern Japan with the southern Japanese living in Hawaii, and most recently, with the Greeks living on the island of Crete in an olive oil population with Cretans living in the United States of America. Such studies are difficult, complicated, and expensive, but they need to be done. In my own experience, it has been necessary to seek small sums from many sources in order to begin these essential researches.

I have mentioned but two aspects of cardiovascular research and training of great importance today which as yet have been hardly recognized and certainly inadequately supported. I strongly recommend that funds be allocated for these purposes.

May I add also that, in addition to the increase of knowledge that can come from these international epidemiological researches, two other advantages accrue: First, through the development of international teamwork in these studies a coordination of definitions and technics which are fully comparable can follow the researches themselves; and secondly, there is the establishment of international friendly relations which have been very striking. For example, in the research carried out in Crete and Italy in which I was recently involved, we had among the very able members of our team, a Japanese professor, a biochemist from Yugoslavia, a doctor from Finland, a cardiologist from France, an internist from England, and several Italian, Greek, and American scientists. One of our present aims is to add to such teams some doctors from behind the Iron Curtain. A little over a year ago, several of us in a visit to Moscow presented this problem of health to our medical colleagues there and it was evident that in such studies we could combine energetically to face a common enemy.

Certainly some of the additional money that is being asked for this year can be very wisely spent for these two purposes, not only in cardiovascular disease but across the board.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL D. WHITE.

P. S.—We physicians interested in the vital field of preventive medicine as well as in advances in diagnosis and treatment are highly appreciative of your vigorous support of measures to improve our public health.

P. D. W.

The bill includes $6,543,000 for dental health activities. This is $250,000 over the amount requested and $113,000 over the amount appropriated for 1958.

After the magnificent and classic research on protection of teeth against decay by fluorides in water, the dental research program is moving into new areas. Given the increased funds appropriated by Congress, the scope and variety of dental research has grown rapidly. The committee has been particularly impressed by studies showing that many dental defects are hereditary, studies using the electron microscope indicating the precise way in which tooth

decay attacks tooth enamel, and studies of the chemical composition of saliva in persons with and without dental caries.

The committee is confident that, with proper financial support, the fine progress over recent years will continue.

For arthritis and metabolic disease activities we have approved $21,092,000, an increase of $500,000 over the request and $707,000 above the amount appropriated for 1958.

In addition to arthritis, this Institute deals with the whole range of metabolic diseases such as rheumatism, gout, diabetes, ulcerative colitis, ileitis, and peptic ulcer. These fields, in past years have been considered forbidding and barren because of their difficulty, and the fact that many of them seem, like cancer, to be bound up with profound life processes.

But with the enthusiasm of leaders in this field during recent years, and with the provision of research funds, progress has come. New workers with new approaches have entered these fields. Key discoveries, such as the effectiveness of cortisone in arthritis, have opened up wide and productive areas of study. A new test for rheumatoid arthritis, involving the clumping of blood cells, has been discovered. The family of drugs to which cortisone belongs—the steroids—has been combed productively to produce new drugs more effective than cortisone but without the harmful side effects.

Real progress is being made in the perfection of oral drugs for diabetes. At the present time no drug is available that is as effective as insulin injections, but we are much closer to that point than we were a year ago. The many thousands of sufferers from this disorder have reason to hope that a simple pill will soon displace the necessity for the frequent and disagreeable injections now necessary for most of them.

The total number of illnesses given professional medical attention in the United States is about 280 million per year. Circulatory diseases account for about 55 million, the largest number in any one disease group, but diseases of the digestive tract are in second place with some 40 million. It is hard to understand why the field of gastroenterology has been so neglected by those who administer our medical research programs. In the face of the statistics set forth above, the medical research funds allocated to this field total only slightly more than 1 percent of the total.

Diseases of the digestive tract do not have the dramatic appeal of such things as cancer and heart disease. However, when one considers the fact that 1 person out of every 10 will, sometime during his life, have a peptic ulcer, the practical need for doing something in this field is certainly obvious. However, it is not only being slighted in the research field but in the training field as well. There are 84 medical schools receiving training grants from the National Institutes of Health, but only 12 of them are receiving funds for training in gastroenterology.

The committee is of the strong opinion that we are doing far less in this field than is warranted by the facts and will expect that the increased funds provided in the bill will be used for this purpose.

The committee approved $17,997,000 for allergy and infectious disease activities. This is an increase of $500,000 over the request and $597,000 over the amount appropriated for 1958.

The burst of productive research in virology, based upon advances made in fundamental studies on such problems as growth of viruses in test tubes, is producing and will continue to produce practical findings. The Salk vaccine is at hand. Additional vaccines for upper respiratory infections have been prepared, and others will be developed. Scientifically, influenza has been conquered and protection of the population is now a public health problem.

As these studies proceed, the fundamental links between disease fields become more evident. The blood cell clumping test for arthritis originated as a test for trichinosis. The relationship of viruses to cancer has been noted. The mechanisms of immunity are essentially problems of protein chemistry and thus related to the composition and reproduction of viruses.

As further evidence of the unity of disease studies, cystic fibrosis—a disease of children, because few with the disease live to become adults—is in all probability a metabolic disease. There is some genetic, inherited defect that prevents the production of enzymes necessary to digestion of food, and that produces the other bizarre and pitiful symptoms of this disease. But while the disease is fundamentally metabolic, it can at the moment be treated only by very large doses of antibiotics. The antibiotics stave off the pneumonias to which children with cystic fibrosis are peculiarly susceptible. For some time to come, it will be necessary to study the reactions of these children to antibiotics. There are, however, other and more significant puzzles—why, for example, it occurs rarely in Negroes and never in oriental races; why such a wide array of symptoms that cannot be related to each other should exist. It appears that this disease is more important than diabetes, poliomyelitis or rheumatic fever as a cause of death among children in this country. The committee expects the facts on incidence of this disease to be determined, and firm plans for a research attack through a cooperative effort among the Institutes to be developed during the coming year. It is the committee's desire that a portion of the increase provided in the bill be devoted to research in this field.

For neurology and blindness activities we have approved $21,977,000, an increase of $1,250,000 over the request and $590,000 over the amount appropriated for 1958.

As was the case in arthritis and metabolic diseases, research in neurology and sensory disorders was conducted on an entirely inadequate scale until the National Institute for Neurological Diseases and Blindness was established. The increase in appropriations for this Institute invigorated all aspects of research and training in these neglected areas. The research of those already at work was more adequatedly financed. Opportunities for the long and expensive training required of research workers were broadened. For the first time, scientists could plan studies hitherto impossible because of lack of funds.

One such area of study stimulated by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness relates to diseases and disorders arising from the time of conception to 24 hours after birth, or the socalled perinatal period. It is becoming clear that many more infant deaths, congenital malformations and other defects than had been suspected are the result of conditions affecting the mother during pregnancy. A national program of research on this problem involving close collaborative research among 12 institutions which deliver 32,500 babies per year is now in progress. The original plan called for a program involving 46,000 deliveries per year in 15 institutions. The additional funds provided for this Institute are intended in part to enable this important research to reach the level originally planned.

While stressing the perinatal study because of the urgency of reaching the planned levels, the committee wishes investigations relating to such diseases as multiple sclerosis, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy and Parkinson's diseases, together with the studies fundamental to all neurological diseases, to be intensified. Finally, the committee is not entirely satisfied with the status of research on sensory disorders, including sight and hearing, and expects greater effort to be expended in these areas, both in the laboratories of the Institute and in the laboratories of grantees, during the coming fiscal year.

Now we come to the dental health building. The American Dental Association and for that matter dentists all over the country have a strong interest in the construction of a research building out here at Bethesda. It has been authorized for 10 years, but we had to amend that and authorize a larger expenditure a couple of years ago because costs had gone up due to the delay in getting this built. We have included the amount of $3,700,000 to construct this dental research building out at Bethesda, starting in the fiscal year 1959.

We allowed the budget request for St. Elizabeth's Hospital and most of the items in the Social Security Administration.

Grants for maternal and child welfare were increased $1 million over what they had in 1958 and what was requested for 1959 in recognition of the greater needs as the number of children in our population keeps increasing.

We allowed the request of $150,000 for planning the White House Conference on Children and Youth, which will be held in 1960.

We allowed the full request for the Office of the Commissioner. We think Commissioner Schottland is doing a really good job.

We allowed the National Labor Relations Board what they had in 1958,

$9,384,800. This is $600,000 less than the request.

The National Mediation Board was allowed all that they asked for.

National Railroad Retirement Board: We gave them what they asked for and put a little language in our report to indicate our disagreement with certain findings of the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office. After exhaustive hearings the committee was convinced that the military service credits due the railroad retirement trust fund under the law should be allowed.

There is a slight reduction of $48,000 for the Federal Conciliation Service.

Referring to the United States Soldiers Home, we found considerable fault with the Bureau of the Budget because they were cutting down the allowance for meals from 93 cents to 88 cents a day. These funds have no effect on the Federal Treasury. They are paid from a separate fund supported by fees paid by the soldiers who wear the uniform of this country and we thought it was completely unjustified on the basis of the trend in food prices, so we allowed an additional amount to restore this cut and also to renovate a building so that they can properly house the men.

Mr. Chairman, we have a good bill before the committee today. The committee has taken into consideration the needs of the various departments, and in those areas where we have allowed increases we think they are well justified, and we think the cuts are equally well justified.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. I want to commend the gentleman on the way he has conducted the hearings. Of course, he has been a member of the committee for a number of years and he knows the details and the workings of the departments that come before the committee to have their budget approved. He knows every detail in this bill. The gentleman from Rhode Island certainly has reason to be proud of the work he has done in connection with research into the causes of disease. I was thinking that since the gentleman from Rhode Island has been a member of this committee he has seen tuberculosis brought under control, he has seen smallpox and malaria practically eliminated, he has seen the development of the antibiotic drugs and he has seen the discovery of vaccines for polio and influenza.

When I first became a member of the committee some 6 years ago it was just starting to direct its attention to the control and elimination of chronic diseases.

I know the chairman of the subcommittee must be proud of the fact we found real breakthroughs in the cause of cancer, heart trouble, and mental health. They told us before our committee that in the last 3 or 4 years more progress has been made in the case of those particular diseases than in all the history of medicine. While the scientists have done the principal work, the appropriations that the gentleman from Rhode Island has fought for has sparkplugged these programs. It is something the gentleman can be very, very proud of. It is something that will live long after we are gone and forgotten.

The gentleman should be proud of the fight he has made to do something also about retarded children. He initiated that program. He was responsible for having the Office of Education and Public Health Service set up a program in this field that has really produced results. I am proud to have served with the gentleman from Rhode Island on this committee and I wish to compliment him, for he has done an excellent job in conducting the hearings in this subcommittee and bringing forth this bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I, too, should like to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for the fine work he has done and also for the bill he presents to us today. I should however, like to ask a question with reference to the National Labor Relations Board and the amount appropriated for that agency. The budget request, I notice, has been cut by some $600,000. As the gentleman is well aware, the National Labor Relations Board has been behind in its work for some time. This has been of concern not only to labor but also to management throughout the country. Would the gentleman tell the committee at this time how the figures were arrived at and why the cut?

Mr. FOGARTY. We decided to give them what they have to operate on in 1958. This is not a cut under what they have for the current year. We do not think things are going to be much worse in 1959 than they were in 1958, in fact, the administration says they will be much better, and we thought they could get along with the same amount of money.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have never been contacted by anybody who wants to cut it. Everyone I have talked to feels that the National Labor Relations Board should receive more money and should get rid of its backlog as soon as possible. I understand the gentleman's feelings. With the amount of money that has been appropriated and with the contemplated raises in pay, actually, the net result would be a reduction in force for the National Labor Relations Board if it receives the same amount of money that it got last year?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, that could be said about every other agency of the Government that will be operating on the same budget that they have this year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I call the gentleman's attention to the language on page 6 of the bill dealing with some kind of arrangement between the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department in connection with postage. Is this going to be an additional contribution to the Post Office Department's deficit or just what is involved here?

Mr. FOGARTY. The only thing we do here, instead of giving them the franking privilege, we appropriate funds for the cost of handling the mail under this program.

Mr. GROSS. It is not a substantial amount of money.

Mr. FOGARTY. No. There is no increase of consequence over former years.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, and Welfare, because he has done a wonderful job. I wish also to pay my respects to all the members of this hard-working subcommittee. On page 20 of the committee report you say:

> The committee will expect that approximately $1,300,000 of the increase provided will be spent in increasing research on schizophrenia above the level contemplated in the budget.

First of all, as I understand, this is the first time in the history of this appropriation bill that specific funds were earmarked for this purpose.

Mr. FOGARTY. We are earmarking $1,300,000 to try to put more emphasis on this particular problem of schizophrenia. We appreciated the testimony of the gentleman who appeared before us with one of his highly respected doctors from Connecticut and some interested people from New York, telling us about this problem. It is the largest problem in the mental-illness field, and we have earmarked funds for the first time for work just in this field.

Mr. MORANO. I congratulate the gentleman. I think it is laudable action that you have taken. Can you tell me what the 1958 appropriation or actual expenditure of funds was in 1958 for this field?

Mr. FOGARTY. We are spending $8,454,150.

Mr. MORANO. What was the actual expenditure, if you have it, for 1957?

Mr. FOGARTY. In 1957 it was $5,712,000.

Mr. MORANO. That is to say, specifically allocated for the purpose of research in schizophrenia?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right, and for 1959 they had $8,500,000 budgeted for this and the additional $1,300,000 will make $9,800,000 available just for schizophrenia.

Mr. MORANO. I thank the gentleman. I want to again say how important this matter is and that it is so vital that we attack this problem. We have made many strides in all other fields of research, the cause and cure of polio and various other diseases.

Mr. Chairman, in the past few decades the world has been amazed and heartened by the advancements made by medical science in the techniques and formulas for curing, arresting, and preventing many terrible diseases hitherto believed incurable.

We have seen great progress made in the treatment and the prevention of tuberculosis. The death rate from this disease has declined steadily throughout the years due to extensive research. Many other diseases, including polio, have been conquered to a great extent. Great strides have been made by researchers and scientists in their valiant battle against cancer.

It is proper now that we turn our attention to another disease—one of the world's most prevalent—and one which has received little attention.

Schizophrenia is the disease, a mental affliction which is one of the costliest, one of the most widespread, yet one of the most neglected diseases of all presently known to man.

Mr. Chairman, a move has risen now to control and conquer this terrible mental disease. I am proud that the proponents of this movement are residents of my district.

Recently, Dr. Stanley Dean, noted psychiatrist, of Stamford, Conn., and Mrs. Helen G. Rockefeller, of Greenwich, Conn., appeared before the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare of the House Appropriations Committee.

Their eloquent pleas were sympathetically received by the distinguished committee which was impressed with their thorough knowledge of the subject.

During this hearing I expressed the hope that the committee would see fit to earmark funds for schizophrenia research.

I was deeply gratified this week to hear that the committee fulfilled this hope. I quote from the committee report:

> The committee will expect that approximately $1,300,000 of the increase provided will be spent in increasing research on schizophrenia above the level contemplated in the budget. The committee lends full support to all approaches to this problem that are sanctioned by competent scientific advice, for this disease is one of the most terrible afflictions of man and one of the most costly to society.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

MUCH-PUBLICIZED EXPANSION PROGRAM OF FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SUDDENLY HALTED BECAUSE OF OVERALL BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare has again done its usual outstanding job in behalf of the American people in reporting out this bill, but as the report itself so clearly establishes the President and his budget advisers have made the task extremely difficult by the timidity of their budget proposals.

Time and again through the report on this bill we find mention of the fact that human needs and the Nation's needs have been made secondary to purely budgetary considerations to an attempt to make the budget look good.

As the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] knows, I agree wholeheartedly with his philosophy, that on programs which so directly affect the health and safety and well-being of the American people, the important thing is not to make the budget look good from an accounting standpoint but to make the programs work properly.

I am particularly concerned about the treatment accorded by the administration to the Food and Drug Administration in the budget for the coming year. As the gentleman from Rhode Island recalls, I have been working as hard as I know how ever since coming to Congress in 1953 to build up this agency to the level required if it is to do an effective job in protecting the American consumer from adulterated or misbranded or fraudulent foods, drugs, and cosmetics. It has been a very discouraging battle during most of those years because of the attitude of the Eisenhower administration.

Four years ago, when I tried to get more funds appropriated for the Food and Drug Administration than the budget recommended, the White House insisted instead that we permit a comprehensive study of the agency to see whether it should be expanded or reduced in size. It was not sure whether this agency did a worthwhile job or not. It suspected that it was an agency setup to persecute business or something of the sort.

The comprehensive study was undertaken by an outstanding Citizens Advisory Committee appointed by Secretary Hobby. It included some of the top men in industries subject to the food and drug laws. And it was the opinion of that outstanding committee that the Food and Drug Administration urgently required a three- to fourfold increase in funds and facilities in order to do its job effectively in protecting the health of the American consumers. That report came out 3 years ago in 1955.

When I tried to get funds appropriated immediately to begin carrying out those recommendations, the Budget Bureau refused to go along. Nothing was done for a whole year. But last year and in the current fiscal year we were able to get some help on this from the administration and a modest start—but just a start—was made toward carrying out the recommended expansion program. The Eisenhower administration basked in much-publicized glory over its role in beginning the expansion program.

But now the expansion program is to be stopped completely. The new budget contains language implying there will be some expansion in the agency, but it is misleading. The expansion program has been sacrificed to what Secretary Folsom acknowledges are overall budget considerations.

Instead of the $12 million which I believe is needed to continue the very modest expansion program begun 2 years ago, the bill before us provides only $9,300,000 for the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal 1959. This is exactly the same amount appropriated last year. Thus it is a standstill budget.

The Committee on Appropriations reports that it is at a loss to understand why the recommendations of the Citizens Advisory Committee have been discarded by the President for the coming fiscal year. So am I.

The hearings of the subcommittee disclose that the Food and Drug Administration, acting on Budget Bureau orders to hold down and cut all corners possible, nevertheless felt it needed as a very minimum $11,530,000 for the coming year if it was to continue to grow at a rate that would enable it in the next 8 or 10 years to meet its responsibilities to the public adequately and effectively.

An appropriation of $11,530,000 would enable it to increase its personnel by about 22 percent. That is a very slow rate of expansion when it is remembered that the Citizens Committee called for a threefold to fourfold increase within 5 to 10 years.

But the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare felt the economy orders of the Budget Bureau required him to cut back on the Food and Drug Administration's proposals, and so he recommended a budget for it of only $10,980,000, or at most a 15-percent increase in personnel.

The Budget Bureau, acting in the name of the President, apparently felt that out of a $73,900,000,000 budget we could not afford a single extra penny for the Food and Drug Administration, and so it cut the recommendation of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare all the way back to last year's figure of $9,300,000. Then it added in $110,000 for a special study on radiation hazards to be undertaken by the Food and Drug Administration at the request of civilian defense, and thus gave the impression it was actually raising the Food and Drug Administration's budget by $110,000.

The Committee on Appropriations has disallowed the $110,000, not because it opposes the radiation study but because it feels that all of the many civilian-defense items disguised throughout the budget in the funds of various and assorted Government agencies should be consolidated under one heading. I have no objection to that.

The only reason I mention the item of $110,000 here is to make clear that the House is not cutting the appropriation requested for the Food and Drug Administration for the actual operating expenses of that agency. We are providing the full amount the President recommended for the regular work of this agency.

I am deeply disturbed over the failure of the President to carry out the recommendations of his Citizens Advisory Committee for further expansion of the Food and Drug Administration. As Congressman FOGARTY commented in the hearings, the need for this work is obvious. It affects all of the people of our country.

Can we permit this agency, which protects us—or tries to protect us as best it can—from unsafe or contaminated or filthy or adulterated or misbranded foods, drugs, and cosmetics to be treated as a stepchild of our $74 billion-a-year Government?

Secretary Folsom testified in the hearings that—

> The overall budget consideration led to this matter rather than any situation specifically related to food and drug activities.

Is the overall budget consideration more important than the health of 172 million Americans?

Commissioner Larrick testified that the Food and Drug Administration cannot be static if it is to keep pace with developments in the industries subject to the law.

It must build its resources in terms of people and facilities to meet this challenge on behalf of its clients, the consumer and the industry—

He testified.

How can these resources be built, how can all of us be adequately protected, on the stand-still budget we are now considering? We are increasing funds for medical research in many fields—cancer, mental health, heart disease, and arthritis, to name a few—and we propose to spend more than $250 million on these activities—to fight these major enemies of our people. I know it will be money very wisely spent.

But while we spend millions upon millions to find the cure for cancer, for instance, is it not possible we are letting cancer-producing substances slip through in foodstuffs or cosmetics because the Food and Drug Administration lacks the few extra dollars it needs to do its job right? Because of a loophole in its basic authorizing legislation, the Food and Drug Administration has an exceedingly difficult job to begin with in policing the products sold under its jurisdiction, and to uncover dangerous chemical additives. This disadvantage, when coupled with inadequate funds and personnel, makes its job almost impossible. Yet we depend upon it to protect us from unwholesome food, dangerous or untested drugs, quack remedies, fraudulent devices, misbranded products, and a whole host of things which should not be sold and used.

We cannot afford to economize on the funds for such an agency any more than we could afford to economize on funds for the FBI or the Secret Service.

The $12 million which I urged be appropriated for the Food and Drug Administration would have meant an increase about the equivalent of the cost of test-firing one intercontinental ballistics missile. That is all it would represent in dollar terms. But the White House and the Budget Bureau refused to see any urgency or importance in it.

Mr. Chairman, I have decided not to attempt an amendment from the floor to increase funds for the Food and Drug Administration in this bill, because it is my understanding this entire bill will probably go through without amendment. I sincerely hope the Senate will provide such an increase, in which case our conferees would be free to accept without a possible adverse House vote to tie its hands.

There is no doubt that the increased funds are needed, if this agency is to perform its vital functions in behalf of the American people. As I said, I sincerely hope the bill as finally enacted will recognize that fact, even if the President and his Budget Bureau apparently do not.

Mr. BLATNIK. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely pleased to see that this bill includes $45 million for grants for waste treatment works construction. This amount, which is 10 percent less than the total authorization provided for in Public Law 660, will be allocated, as I understand it, on the basis of $50 million thereby insuring that all communities which would otherwise qualify for a grant under a $50 million appropriation will not be denied such a grant under the $45 million appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, the treatment plants construction program under Public Law 660 has been a tremendous success during its 2 years of operation. As of February 28, 1958, a total of 913 projects costing an estimated $361,676,946 have received Federal grants totaling $75,709,104. In other words, for every $1 in Federal grants the local communities have spent $4.80—almost a 5 to 1 return on the Federal grant. I doubt if any other Federal grant in aid program can boast this record.

Another impressive aspect of this program, Mr. Chairman, is that 94 percent of the projects are located in communities with populations of 50,000 or less. Sixty-five percent of all projects are in communities with populations of 5,000 or less and 49 percent of the projects are located in communities with populations of less than 2,500. In addition, over three-quarters of the Federal grants already made were to communities of 25,000 or less. To acquaint the Members with the activity and progress in their own States, Mr. Chairman, I include the following table showing the number and eligible costs of projects approved and the amount of Federal grant offers, by State and status of construction:

TABLE I.—*Cumulative summary showing the number and eligible costs of projects approved and the amount of Federal grant offers, by State and status of construction, as of Feb. 28, 1958*

State	Projects								
	Total approved			Under construction			Completed		
	Number	Eligible costs	Federal grant offers	Number	Eligible costs	Federal grant offers	Number	Eligible costs	Federal grant offers
Total	913	$361,676,946	$75,709,104	395	$184,668,775	$35,718,511	80	$10,657,842	$2,681,891
Alabama	12	11,692,474	2,124,647	3	3,035,477	498,100	1	395,883	117,863
Arizona	12	3,470,371	1,040,399	3	1,324,732	397,420	1	239,266	71,146
Arkansas	25	6,026,352	1,363,513	7	1,057,716	274,122	1	62,666	15,809
California	24	8,721,256	2,275,333	21	7,611,256	1,942,373	2	527,200	158,160
Colorado	18	5,101,012	1,260,916	10	3,354,520	819,653	2	74,232	19,638
Connecticut	6	4,928,515	1,173,865	3	2,713,935	530,865			
Delaware	5	2,280,168	654,896						
District of Columbia	2	6,279,928	362,500	1	5,904,928	250,000			
Florida	17	6,210,446	1,761,379	4	2,173,142	613,960			
Georgia	15	6,755,883	1,638,271	4	1,946,685	505,026			
Idaho	9	4,495,986	1,035,836	3	402,517	117,099			
Illinois	20	8,728,618	2,169,528	16	7,800,030	1,910,115	1	428,245	128,473
Indiana	17	12,015,436	2,057,125	11	3,127,042	854,645			
Iowa	29	9,367,061	1,702,278	15	5,529,929	977,819	3	290,349	67,248
Kansas	28	6,254,079	1,477,085	16	4,698,013	1,135,905	11	880,896	207,680
Kentucky	17	8,598,661	1,590,386	3	3,509,449	418,001	2	1,416,947	242,941
Louisiana	19	6,011,938	1,711,529	12	3,561,768	1,024,627	1	113,133	31,239
Maine	3	980,230	294,069	1	116,230	34,869			
Maryland	14	6,763,785	1,483,406	4	1,749,809	393,775	2	1,498,477	392,925
Massachusetts	11	5,521,703	1,242,968	2	769,791	230,937	2	133,127	37,420
Michigan	26	9,134,180	2,590,926	16	5,740,646	1,593,218	1	134,366	38,505
Minnesota	20	6,649,201	1,852,700	7	2,545,909	695,613			
Mississippi	11	3,313,479	646,060	4	596,377	178,943	2	84,542	24,979
Missouri	39	11,447,734	2,113,207	20	7,272,698	1,001,017	4	376,278	46,498
Montana	12	2,287,995	583,710	3	508,792	144,305	2	50,998	14,144
Nebraska	24	5,583,491	1,315,087	5	1,583,778	449,081	2	40,739	9,030
Nevada	2	491,000	147,300						
New Hampshire	6	1,252,649	375,795	2	353,500	106,050			
New Jersey	13	15,972,711	2,216,269	9	6,048,939	1,365,453			
New Mexico	19	4,345,498	1,232,023	5	1,407,277	400,988	2	180,887	41,866
New York	32	27,798,184	3,683,660	10	14,703,768	1,119,610			
North Carolina	25	11,658,434	2,526,540	12	7,994,453	1,449,206			
North Dakota	40	2,551,364	748,807	13	771,035	238,587	8	425,473	104,572
Ohio	32	15,622,142	3,202,337	20	12,510,301	2,343,095	3	1,166,598	336,594

TABLE I.—*Cumulative summary showing the number and eligible costs of projects approved and the amount of Federal grant offers, by State and status of construction, as of Feb. 28, 1958*—Continued

State	Projects								
	Total approved			Under construction			Completed		
	Number	Eligible costs	Federal grant offers	Number	Eligible costs	Federal grant offers	Number	Eligible costs	Federal grant offers
Oklahoma	24	7,707,989	1,700,995	15	6,135,562	1,292,573	3	281,335	56,421
Oregon	20	4,384,518	1,127,004	8	2,497,201	564,044	5	449,263	132,590
Pennsylvania	22	18,000,569	3,406,135	12	10,245,976	2,013,142	1	273,728	69,822
Rhode Island	6	1,980,580	581,177	4	1,216,580	352,177			
South Carolina	17	4,465,414	1,306,468	4	549,486	151,698	2	184,423	54,255
South Dakota	24	2,529,780	542,418	8	637,910	164,506	5	114,490	29,948
Tennessee	15	9,235,074	2,252,799	6	4,829,236	1,070,920			
Texas	40	13,754,373	3,354,500	15	7,988,549	1,653,007	2	161,510	44,813
Utah	6	11,194,776	1,071,601	5	11,022,062	1,019,787			
Vermont	3	1,937,700	450,310						
Virginia	31	10,649,349	1,612,373	17	6,072,747	710,734	2	58,240	16,646
Washington	27	5,264,008	1,400,838	11	1,971,908	585,060	6	550,636	161,622
West Virginia	9	4,837,004	1,179,599	5	2,237,704	608,305			
Wisconsin	35	7,848,325	1,946,350	15	4,752,277	1,092,834			
Wyoming	17	2,874,929	699,875	3	436,255	130,455	1	63,915	9,044
Hawaii	2	1,001,964	294,792	1	165,000	44,792			
Puerto Rico	11	5,698,630	1,127,520	1	1,485,880	250,000			

The construction program under Public Law 660 has stimulated the greatest treatment plant construction activity in our history. Since the enactment of the law an increasing number of States have registered record treatment plan construction activity. In a survey recently completed it was shown that the number of States in which a record amount of treatment plan construction was begun has greatly increased since the enactment of Public Law 660. In 1952 four States had a record construction year. They were Delaware, Massachusetts, Mississippi, and South Dakota. In 1953 five States had a record year—New Mexico, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, and Wyoming. In 1954 only three States—Arkansas, New Jersey, and New York. In 1955 again four States—Michigan, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and West Virginia.

Then, suddenly, in 1956, following the enactment of Public Law 660, the number of States have a record treatment plant construction year jumped to 13—Alabama, Colorado, District of Columbia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nevada, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia. And in 1957, as the impetus of the Federal program really began to be felt, 19 States had a record year—Arizona, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin. An impressive record, Mr. Chairman, and every indication points to another record year for an ever-increasing number of States in 1958 and beyond.

And yet, Mr. Chairman, we find the President, in his budget message, anticipating that this will be the last year funds will be requested to carry out this important and needed program. The President, it seems, has taken the recommendations of the joint Federal-State Action Committee lock, stock, and barrel regarding this program. Even before this joint committee made its first report on December 5, 1957, one of the President's administrative assistants wrote me on November 1 that:

> The joint Federal-State Action Committee, composed of Federal and State representatives, has recommended that State and local governments assume responsibility for construction of water treatment facilities together with two other important programs.

Mr. Chairman, this letter was written a full 2 weeks before the joint committee met in Washington to reach decisions on pending proposals and on the procedure for preparation of an initial report for submission to the President and governors. Prior to November 1 the joint committee held only two meetings. The first, on August 9–10, 1957, in Hershey, Pa., was for the purpose of identifying—in the committee's words—First, functions that might be assumed to a greater extent or wholly by the States; second, tax sources that might be relinquished by the National Government for possible use by State and local governments; and third, emerging problems that require attention by the various levels of government. According to the committee report:

> This was done in preliminary form, and staffs were given instructions on the preparation of position papers on the identified problems.

At its second meeting in Chicago on October 3–4, 1957, the committee reached agreement on several functional and revenue proposals and directed the staffs to prepare position papers on a number of additional proposals. It was not until November 14–15, 1957, that the committee actually reached any decision on pending proposals but on November 1 the White House obviously had. It would seem, Mr. Chairman, that the construction grant program under Public Law 660 was the target of this committee from the beginning. And it received encouragement from the White House. For instance, on October 4, obviously while the committee was meeting in Chicago, the President said in a press conference that this program should be repealed and the function returned to the States. He couldn't think of one single other example when reporters asked him specifically for an example of a Federal function which should be returned to the States except this one. Obviously, the joint committee and the White House—which has always opposed this program—worked hand in glove on this one. And finally, before the recommendations were even considered by the governors' conference they were included in the President's budget message.

The President and his joint committee would have us believe that treatment plant construction activity would not be curtailed if the Federal grant program were repealed because, in return for certain tax rebates, the States would assume the financial responsibility of assisting communities now performed by the Federal Government. They would have us believe, further, that the tax resources returned to the States would be somewhat greater in amount than the cost of the functional responsibilities returned.

This is one of the most deceitful and misleading propositions this administration has ever come up with. What they did was figure out the total volume of telephone business in the Nation, split it up State by State, tax 40 percent of that and compare that amount to the total amount the Federal Government contributes to the States and communities under certain grant programs. They determined, for instance, that the total receipts under the 10-percent Federal phone tax amounted to $370 million, of which 40 percent—or $148 million—would be returned to the States if they would assume certain functions such as assisting local communities finance treatment plants and vocational education. This looked good until the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, under the chairmanship of Mr. FOUNTAIN of North Carolina took a closer look and determined that under the joint committee's plans the highest-income States would receive more in rebates than they now do in grants, while the lowest-income States would receive far less. This fact was never brought out by the joint committee and we should be indebted to Mr. FOUNTAIN's subcommittee for calling this fact to our attention.

The net effect of the joint committee's plan, Mr. Chairman, which the President agreed to before it was agreed to finally by the committee itself, would result in the Federal Government giving up $148 million of revenue in exchange for an

assumption of the States—which is not provided for—of $85.5 million in grants. A loss of $62.5 million to the Treasury without 1 cent of tax reduction for the people and no assurance whatsoever that the States would assist the communities in financing treatment plant construction. Thus far the administration has not submitted suggested legislation to carry out the joint committee's recommendations. In his budget message the President said he would, and in anticipation of this, hints that next year he will not request funds for the treatment plant construction program under Public Law 660.

Knowing the good sense of this House, Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the joint committee's recommendations, if and when they are submitted by the President in bill form, will be soundly defeated. Therefore, we must think in terms of continuing the present program and improving on it where it needs improvement rather than repealing it.

In 1956 I introduced H. R. 9540, a bill which became Public Law 660, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. When this bill was under consideration it was clearly brought out by the testimony of many witnesses, and by the facts at hand, that this Nation was facing a very serious and very important problem of water pollution. It was shown that this problem, which is accelerating at an alarming rate, was caused largely by, first, a backlog of needed sewage-treatment works caused by the virtual cessation of such construction during World War II and the Korean conflict; second, an unprecedented and unpredicted population and industrial growth; third, obsolescence of existing treatment plants; and fourth, a rate of construction too low to meet these increasing needs.

House Report No. 2190, which accompanied H. R. 9540, stated:

> A great deal needs to be done to control municipal and industrial pollution. It is estimated that projects to meet the present backlog of needs for sewage-treatment plants and intercepting sewers would cost in excess of $1.9 billion. During the period 1955–65 the cost of replacing sewage-treatment facilities reaching obsolescence is estimated to total $1.72 billion. Sewage-treatment requirements of an increasing population during the 1955–65 period are estimated to cost an additional $1.71 billion. This is a total cost for municipal pollution-abatement needs during 1955–65 of about $5 billion.

The present Federal construction grant program for municipal sewage treatment plants has been in actual operation for about a year and a half and two fiscal year appropriations, totaling $95 million have been passed. During this period, this kind of program has been proved to be very effective and workable, and to stimulate communities to take action. In spite of an increasing economic recession and one of the most unfavorable municipal bond markets in many years, contract awards for sewage treatment works in 1957 totaled more than $350 million. This amount exceeded the previous 5-year annual average by nearly $100 million.

Effective as the present program is, the level of sewage treatment plant construction is not nearly high enough. In 1955 it was shown we needed to spend over $500 million annually for the next 10 years if the municipal problem is to be met. Translated into 1957 dollars that would amount to $550 million annually. Since actual contract awards for 1957 were only $350 million, it can be seen that the present grant program is able to support little more than half the job that needs to be done and that we are still falling behind. Further, the limitation of one grant to municapilities banding together in a joint project is acting as a deterrent to the solution of sewage treatment problems in our rapidly growing metropolitan complexes.

In H. R. 9540 I proposed grants of up to $500,000 for each project and appropriations of $100 million a year with an aggregate of $1 billion as the amounts necessary to do the job of cleaning up the municipal pollution problem. These amounts were cut in half. It is not surprising to find from subsequent experience, therefore, that the present limited grant program is stimulating only about half the level of construction that is necessary. And, we are still doing only half a job in an area where we need desperately to do a complete and thorough job.

I am, therefore, today introducing a bill to expand the existing construction grants program for sewage treatment works, by increasing the Federal participation and liberalizing eligibility requirements, as I originally recommended when I first introduced the program in 1956. Although the existing program has been a great success, Mr. Chairman, that success has been limited due to certain deficiencies in the existing grant program. These deficiencies are:

First. Grants for any one project are limited to $250,000. This limitation provides little or no incentive for larger communities to begin construction.

Second. The total appropriation authorized for each fiscal year is only $50 million which will not support the rate of construction needed.

Third. Municipalities and intermunicipal agencies proceeding in the construction of a joint project are limited to one grant. This discourages joint projects and encourages separate projects. Such procedure is often wasteful and prejudicial to good planning for solution of already serious problems in metropolitan areas and their fringes.

Fourth. The allocation formula permits unobligated funds to lapse in those States and Territories where pollution-control needs are not great in proportion to population and per capita income.

My bill would cure these deficiencies mainly by returning to my original proposal made in 1956 which was based on existing needs and which we knew to be required if the municipal treatment plant backlog was to be dealt with effectively. My bill also makes certain technical changes permitting cities to band together for intercity plants and a reallocation of unexpended funds.

The main features of my bill are as follows:

First. Raises amount of any 1 grant to $500,000. This amount will provide a definite stimulation for constructing the larger municipal projects.

Second. Will increase each fiscal year appropriation authorization to $100 million, and the aggregate to $1 billion. This level of funds will support the needed rate of construction if the municipal pollution problem is to be met.

Third. Will permit municipalities to band together in constructing joint projects without penalty of loss in grants, and encourage such planning where this approach is advantageous, particularly in metropolitan complexes.

Fourth. Will permit the reallocation of unobligated funds in any States among those other States having projects awaiting availability of grant funds.

I emphasize one point in particular, Mr. Chairman. This bill is not a greatly expanded version of the existing program. It is merely a return to my original proposal which was based on needs and the financial capabilities of the Nation's hard-pressed municipalities. I said then that the watered-down version of the bill which finally passed could do only half a job and that is exactly what experience has shown us to be true. While great progress has been made under the existing program it is only half the progress which could have been made had we stuck to the original amounts contained in my bill. This bill I am introducing today merely restores the program to what it should have been all along and what was originally recommended.

Aside from the fact that an expanded treatment construction program is needed to protect the Nation's water supply from further pollution and waste, Mr. Chairman, additional employment will be provided by doubling the program which could serve as an excellent antirecession remedy. Here is a natural area of activity where there is a need for increased Federal participation because of the scope and nature of the problem which will also provide jobs and payrolls to many thousands of workers.

The distinguished chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, Mr. CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, recently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD data showing the estimated impact of sewage treatment plant construction under Public Law 660 based on both the $50 million appropriation and my proposed $100 million yearly appropriation. The data showed that under the present $50 million allotment, $250 million worth of treatment-plant construction is being stimulated. Doubling the Federal share, as I propose, to $100 million as was originally provided in my bill 2 years ago would stimulate an estimated $500 million in projects—or exactly double the present stimulation. Under the present program it is estimated that construction payrolls total $75 million. Doubling the program would double this payroll as it would the estimated man-years of labor.

Mr. Chairman there are 9,377 municipal treatment plants needed in the country today. The construction of these plants will provide jobs and increased payrolls throughout the country. It will

also insure to future generations an adequate supply of clean fresh water.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the bill which we are considering today providing for appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare is perhaps one of the most difficult appropriation bills upon which we act in each session of Congress. We on the Appropriations Committee realize that we are dealing with very sensitive areas, particularly in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If we have erred in the markup of this bill, we have erred on the side of generosity. If such errors are to be made in the markup of any appropriation bill, perhaps it is best that they are made in this bill where the benefits accrue to the individual citizens of the United States.

Today the House of Representatives will approve the appropriation of $1,823,900,000 to pay the 1959 Federal costs of operating our State and county welfare programs. State welfare programs, although administered by local government, are financed in a large part by this bill. These matching programs contribute not only to the grants of individual recipients but also the cost of administering county and State programs. As a member of the subcommittee handling these appropriations, several facts stood out as we considered the 1958 welfare program. For the first time in the history of this country, less than 60 percent of our population is in the productive age groups of between 19 and 60 and physically able to work. More than 40 percent are below 19 and over 60. Never has there been such a large portion of our population made up of young and elderly people and such a low proportion in the so-called productive age group. One out of 20 people that ever lived in the entire history of mankind are alive today. This simple fact has a profound effect upon our Government and its welfare programs.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], for whom I have great admiration and great respect, has discussed this bill today in detail. The gentleman from Rhode Island has an intimate knowledge of the operations of the Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, having served on the subcommittee handling the appropriations for these Departments for the past 12 years. Eight of these years he has acted as chairman of this subcommittee and has had the responsibility of presenting this appropriation bill to the Congress. I have enjoyed my association on this committee with Mr. FOGARTY and with the other majority members, Mr. DENTON, of Indiana, and Mr. MARSHALL, of Minnesota. In my first session of Congress, I had the opportunity of serving on the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee with Mr. MARSHALL and was indeed pleased when he was assigned to our subcommittee handling the HEW-Labor appropriations in this 2d session of the 85th Congress.

The minority side of the committee is represented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who is the senior member on the Committee on Appropriations on the Republican side and myself. There is no Member of Congress for whom I have greater respect and admiration than the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. He is recognized by every member of our committee on both sides of the aisle as the leader in the fight to establish some degree of fiscal responsibility in the operation of the affairs of our Federal Government. He is the leading foe in this Congress against deficit spending, not only in words but by action and vote. Mr. TABER started his service in this Congress before I was born. His energy, his thoroughness, and his effectiveness constantly amazes me.

OVERALL FIGURES HEW-LABOR

It might be well for us to look at a few of the overall figures in this HEW-Labor appropriations bill for 1959. The Department of Labor receives an appropriation of $382,446,800 in this bill. This is the direct appropriation and does not include funds which are transferred from various trust funds. This compares with a budget request made for the Department of Labor in the amount of $408,032,600, or a reduction of $25,585,800 in the request placed before the committee by the Department and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The total appropriation for the Department of Labor in this present fiscal year is $430,217,600. Therefore, the appropriation in this bill is $47,770,800 below the appropriation authorized for the current fiscal year, 1958.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

In considering this reduction, it is important for us to understand where it was made. Our committee reduced the amount of funds made available for grants to States in the Bureau of Employment Security by $24,300,000. The Department of Labor had asked for a total of $329,300,000 in this particular area. It is my belief that this cut which was made by the committee is a phony cut. The savings which are set forth in our committee report of $24,300,000 in the grants to States, although they show up as a savings in the bill itself and in the committee report, will certainly have to be made up in supplemental appropriations during fiscal year 1959. I wish to register my concern over the fact that this reduction is merely an estimate by the subcommittee of the amount of funds needed for grants to States in this program for 1959. I believe the estimate of the Department of Labor to be more in line with what actually will be needed. For that reason, I believe we will face a supplemental in this particular item.

The other two big reductions in the amounts of money being made available to the Department of Labor come in the areas of unemployment compensation for veterans and unemployment compensation to Federal employees. The unemployment compensation for veterans was reduced by $42,800,000. Nineteen million dollars is being made available for this program in 1959, as compared to $61,800,000 in 1958. This program is being phased out and the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Labor were accepted by our committee. A reduction of $15,600,000 in the unemployment compensation to Federal employees is carried in this bill. The appropriation in 1959 is $27,800,000 as compared with $43,400,000 in fiscal 1958. In the appropriation for unemployment compensation for Federal employees our subcommittee accepted the estimate of $27,800,000, which was submitted by the Department of Labor and the Bureau of the Budget.

Last year when the Department of Labor appropriation bill was considered by our committee, the Bureau of Apprenticeship asked for an increase in appropriations in the amount of $300,000 to expand their program in the field of training. A similar request was made this year for the Bureau of Apprenticeship. Last year when this bill was considered on the floor, I read into the record letters from the director of vocational education of Wisconsin, and also many letters from individual vocational school directors throughout Wisconsin. There was real concern last year in Wisconsin that the Bureau of Apprenticeship was getting into the field of vocational education, and the committee deferred the possible expansion of the Bureau of Apprenticeship program until it had more conclusive evidence of whether or not this concern was well founded. This year I have gone over this program very carefully with the vocational people in Wisconsin and have been assured that they do not have the same concern which they expressed last year. I include at this point in the RECORD a letter which I received from the State director of vocational education, Mr. Clarence L. Greiber:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
STATE BOARD OF
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Madison, February 15, 1958.

The Honorable MELVIN LAIRD,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your secretary has undoubtedly told you that I telephoned your office on Monday when I was in Washington to attend a meeting of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education. I regret very much that I did not have an opportunity to see you at that time because there were several matters that I wanted to discuss with you.

You may recall that I addressed a letter to you on March 13, 1957, a copy of which is attached for your convenience. In this letter I stated that the State Board of Vocational and Adult Education and the local schools of vocational and adult education have always cooperated with the U. S. Department of Labor in the apprentice program.

There was some misunderstanding at that time, however, regarding the use of an appropriation of aproximately $300,000 which appeared in the budget of the Bureau of Apprenticeship for training purposes. The designation of these funds for training purposes gave the impression that the Department of Labor was planning to launch a training program in vocational education.

Representatives of the Department of Labor have advised us that the responsibility of the Bureau of Apprenticeship is in the field of promotion and not specific training. Meetings have also been held between representatives of the U. S. Office of Education,

the Bureau of Apprenticeship, and the American Vocational Association regarding the specific responsibilities of these agencies. Plans are underway at the present time for the development of a cooperative agreement between representatives of these respective agencies in which the specific responsibilities of each department will be outlined.

In view of the fact that the Bureau of Apprenticeship has positively stated that they have a responsibility in the promotion of apprenticeship and training and not in the training of skilled workers, I want you to know that the questions which I previously had in this matter have been properly resolved.

I will be looking forward to seeing you the next time you visit in Madison. With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

C. L. GREIBER,
State Director.

This was among many letters which I received from vocational people in Wisconsin who have changed their position on this particular appropriation. The experience that I have had in Wisconsin however was not shared by other members of our subcommittee and for that reason the start of the proposed expansion of the Bureau of Apprenticeship training program has been postponed until a mutually satisfactory and integrated program in the broad field of vocational education and training is assured.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the budget estimate for this fiscal year which was presented to our committee was $2,550,724,581. The bill which is before us today contains an appropriation of $2,565,080,581 or an increase over the amount requested by the Department and the Bureau of the Budget of $14,366,000. The greatest portion of this $14 million increase will be found in the appropriations made to the National Institutes of Health which were increased by $11,900,000 by our subcommittee. This increase of $11,900,000 includes $3,700,000 for the construction of the Dental Research Building at the National Institutes of Health. The actual increase in research activity over and above the 1958 budget amounts to about $5 million in the National Institutes of Health. This is brought about in view of the fact that it would cost $3½ million over and above the 1958 appropriations to NIH to carry on research at the same level in 1959.

POOR BUDGET PROCEDURES

When Secretary Folsom appeared before our committee, he pointed out that the 1959 budget is about $50 million over the 1958 budget. There appears on pages 13 and 14 and on pages 382 and 384 of our hearings an attempt to show how the Bureau of the Budget's bookkeeping can come up with the 1959 budget being a decrease of $76 million when actually as the Secretary said, it is an increase of some $50 million.

Another example is in the field of the so-called reserves for savings. The original apportionment of the 1958 appropriation to the Dental Health Institute was made by the Bureau of the Budget on August 7. This represented a withholding of funds Congress had appropriated and the Department had requested, on July 25, to be apportioned. The Department appealed on August 13 and a revision was made by the Bureau on August 19. Since funds appropriated by Congress were still being withheld, the Department again appealed on August 20. A second revision was made by the Bureau of the Budget the same day. This action was again appealed by the Department on September 13. The Bureau of the Budget revised the apportionment again on September 20.

The final reserve for savings was $1,000 out of an appropriation of $6,430,000. It would be interesting to know how many thousands of dollars it took to make this savings.

Another example is brought out on pages 232 and 233 of the Department of Labor hearings where an unrealistic ceiling was placed on what the Bureau of Employees' Compensation was allowed to estimate would be paid to injured Federal employees, just to make the budget look better.

Why the Bureau of the Budget spends so much time on such things when prompt attention cannot be given to important matters is a complete mystery.

Nor is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare without blame in this field. The justifications of the Office of Education indicated that they planned to add 11 positions to their international activities in 1958 that were not included in the 1958 budget presented to Congress last year. The Children's Bureau was given funds in their regular appropriation for 1958 for 2 positions for advance planning for the White House Conference on Children and Youth. The 1959 budget contains a request for a separate appropriation for this purpose but no adjustment was made in the regular appropriation, with the result that funds were budgeted for the same purpose under both appropriations. Another example is requests for funds to reduce lapses, or the total savings resulting from unfilled positions, to a normal level. In one instance that was checked in detail the committee found that lapses had been over twice the claimed normal level every year for the past 10 years. When questioned about this on one appropriation a statement was furnished for the record showing that every year had abnormal conditions.

RESEARCH OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

The research work which is done by the National Institutes of Health is indeed outstanding. Medical research in this country has proceeded with vigor and we all can be gratified to have played a part in bringing about sound growth of medical research in the United States. Certainly we are the leading country in the world in this particular work. Before going into a detailed review of the progress made by the National Institutes of Health, I believe it is well for us to give some consideration to the overall research work being carried on by all Government agencies. During these hearings I questioned the witnesses at great length in order to determine whether there was, in fact, any real duplication of research effort by our Federal Government. I am sure that Members of Congress are interested in keeping this at a minimum. I would like to include at this point in the RECORD excerpts from the committee transcript concerning the research budgets of the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation:

TESTIMONY OF DR. JAMES A. SHANNON, DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NIH COMPARED WITH OTHER RESEARCH BUDGETS

Mr. FOGARTY. I thought we were at least going to hold the present level or show a little progress. I find that we are going back and not ahead.

How does this budget compare with other budgets, like agriculture, or any of these other departments?

Dr. SHANNON. I can furnish those figures for the record, Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. FOGARTY. Without giving us the firm figures, are these other departments faring better? Are their budgets up or are they down like this one?

Dr. SHANNON. The departments that support research in what can conventionally be called the life sciences, are agriculture, AEC, National Science Foundation, the Veterans' Administration, and the Public Health Service.

Mr. FOGARTY. Take, for instance, the National Science Foundation. I know their request is way higher than it was in 1958. I don't remember the figure.

Dr. SHANNON. Their budget request, allocated to the biological sciences programs comparable to ours went from around $8 million in 1958 to about $20 million in 1959.

Mr. FOGARTY. From 1958 to 1959?

Dr. SHANNON. This is the budget request.

Mr. FOGARTY. For the National Science Foundation?

Dr. SHANNON. Yes, sir. This is the figure their budget officer gave our budget officer.

Mr. LAIRD. Is that for grants to medical colleges?

Dr. SHANNON. Yes, sir, in that it includes grants to medical schools. I do not have the program breakdown. I am speaking about those funds that are allocated to biology and medicine or the more inclusive term, "biology" in their terminology. The latter term includes biology in medicine.

Mr. SIEPERT. But it is completely a grant program.

Dr. SHANNON. Agriculture, which is a combination of a grant program and direct operation, went up from about $99 million in 1958, I believe, to $111 million in their budget proposal. AEC went from approximately $38 million in 1958 to $43 million in the 1959 budget. This is a combination of AEC direct and grant operation.

For instance, AEC is bringing in their new hospital in Brookhaven; this probably appears in the budget for the first time. There will be a sizable quantity of money devoted to this direct operation. It will also provide an increase in grant operation.

The VA, which runs a more modest program, almost exclusively in its own hospitals, has increased in the present budget from approximately $8.7 million to $9.3 million. Our budget is presented as essentially constant.

Mr. FOGARTY. Your budget isn't constant. It is a reduction.

Dr. SHANNON. It is in fact a reduction in the substance of research; yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. I think this is a pretty important line of questioning. Are you going to develop this a little further?

Mr. FOGARTY. You may proceed. I think we will develop it, and we might as well do it right now.

NIH AND NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. LAIRD. Dr. Shannon, I know that in many cases request for the same type of

grant is made of you and is also made of the National Science Foundation. There have been cases where you approved the grant and also the National Science Foundation has approved a similar grant for the same type of work.

Dr. SHANNON. This is true.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you think there is any sound basis of trying to get the grants to these medical schools in one area and have a central clearing committee between the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation?

Dr. SHANNON. There is, Mr. LAIRD, a central clearinghouse of information. When the National Science Foundation acts on a proposal, they know that the proposal is also being made to NIH; and when NIH acts on such a proposal, they know it has been submitted to the National Science Foundation. This is accomplished through information obtained through the Biomedical Exchange. This fact is taken into consideration. There is an area in biology taken very broadly which is normally closely related to our operation and others more closely related to the NSF objectives. Then there is an area of overlap.

There always will be. One cannot sharply demarcate the two areas. Not infrequently we will have the National Science Foundation say, "This is closer to your operation. Will you consider this grant?" Or our committees will say to the National Science Foundation, "This is close to your operation. Will you consider this grant?"

If no clear distinction can be made, then both will consider the grant, since the terms of the grant are essentially the same in the two agencies. The payment then would be negotiated between agencies and the grantee as to who will support the grant.

Mr. LAIRD. When you take the overall budget breakdown of these figures and the amount of grant money made available to medical schools and for medical research, it does show an increase in this budget when you take the National Science Foundation money into consideration. Of course, we can't assume that the full request that was made for the National Science Foundation will be approved, but, assuming that it is approved, you come up with a much increased figure.

EXPERIENCE WITH PREDOCTORATE FELLOWSHIP

Dr. SHANNON. May I speak to one of the occurrences, historically, that causes me to question whether this type of analysis is a perfectly vivid one. Historically, we had a somewhat comparable situation when NIH and NSF both were supporting predoctorate research fellowships. It was concluded as a matter of policy that this was an area more attuned to the long-term objectives of the National Sciences Foundation than to NIH. We dropped the item from our budget. It was picked up in the National Science Foundation's budget.

When it came to the awarding of predoctorate fellowships where the award of the fellowship is in consideration of all requests, based upon performed merit, without regard to program needs the 200 predoctorate fellowships which had been given by the National Institutes of Health in order to encourage scientists to enter areas of shortage in the medical sciences were replaced by a very minor increase in the predoctorate fellowships given in the life sciences by the NSF. I don't recall precisely how many.

Dr. VAN SLYKE. I can't recall. It was in the order of magnitude of 8 or 10.

Mr. FOGARTY. I remember that.

Dr. SHANNON. As a result of this experience, we returned to this committee 2 years later and said we would like to reinstitute our predoctorate fellowship because the National Science Foundation by the nature of its operation was not satisfying our need.

In that sense, were I sure that the National Science Foundation would cover our needs in the general grants area—would cover the needs and were developing the field of physical biology, would cover our needs in the field of gastroenterostomy, our needs in the field of allergy and infectious diseases—I would look upon the total funds going into biology and medicine and be quite happy with our joint programs.

WAYS NIH AND NSF RESEARCH IS COMPLEMENTARY

Basically I believe that the National Science Foundation serves an essential function in the physical sciences and in a portion of the biological sciences that cannot be touched upon by our program. Prior to the establishment of the NSF, there was no Federal agency that had support in the life sciences, save that portion which was more or less, directly related to the National Institutes of Health and, incident to that relationship, was related directly or indirectly to this committee for the information desired on federally supported research in the field of medicine. There are many fields of university endeavor that bear a remote or transential relationship to our activities and I would hope the NSF would give serious consideration to support of and training in these areas. I would hope further that they would broaden their program that relates to the educational process on both the graduate and undergraduate level, since from these programs will come a better educational process and indirectly more competent personnel for the many scientific programs supported by the Government. The NSF has further undertaken the shoring up of our educational structure in the secondary-school level. This, too, is an activity in science that can be done only by the NSF and I would hope that the Congress sees fit to support this program. The NSF, too, has begun the development of science textbooks for use primarily in the secondary school. I have seen one of these recently in the form of a preliminary edition of a physics test. The development of texts adequate as a guide to secondary schools in regard to adequate teaching at both levels is of vital importance. In other words, Mr. LAIRD, I would say that the NSF has a mission of tremendous importance to perform and one which, if properly presented, would in no way reflect on the position which has been viewed as that of the NIH.

I feel that if the NSF can clearly present their mission, as I believe they have the capabilities of doing, they should receive greatly increased support from the Congress. In line with this general belief, I have had discussions with Dr. Waterman, director of the NSF, and I feel the impact of their program in the fields of our general responsibilities is such that I will be glad to join with him in support of his justification for support before the Congress.

POSSIBLE DUPLICATION BETWEEN NIH AND NSF

Mr. LAIRD. This all may be true, Dr. Shannon, but in the recent hearings of the NSF by the subcommittee covering their appropriations several of the members of that subcommittee mentioned to me that the justification of their programs seems to coincide with many areas contained in your own justification. I can understand the important role of the NSF. On the other hand I feel that the intent of the NSF is not clear in that their justification would appear to indicate that their activities are inclined toward the areas and responsibilities that are normally yours. If that is true, I think it can only lead to confusion and unwise duplication of effort. Would you care to comment on this?

Dr. SHANNON. Mr. LAIRD, I have not seen the NSF budget justification except as outlined in excerpts from the President's budget. Our budget officer contacted the budget officer of NSF and was informed that certain NSF items included in the President's budget carried a substantial increase in funds and that this would be reflected in substantial increases in funds in the field of biology. As I stated before, that type of expansion could impinge upon our activities.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. LAIRD, I am glad that this line of inquiry has been established by you since I believe it is our responsibility to look thoroughly into areas of apparent conflict and overlap. I believe further that we must have a clear interpretation of the NSF budget. It is my understanding that the same division of the Bureau of the Budget is responsible for the appropriations of the NIH and for the NSF. If it is agreeable with you, I can instruct the staff to obtain a statement from the Bureau of the Budget that describes the general rationale of the Bureau and their review of the budget of the NSF and budget of NIH. We should know what guidelines have been used in the construction of these two sections of the President's budget.

Mr. LAIRD. That is a good idea and I would like the staff to get that in time so that it can be printed in the hearing record, if that is possible. I feel that when these appropriations finally come before the full committee we should have clear ideas as to any possible areas of conflict between these appropriations and those of the NSF. I would again express my belief that the areas of medical research and the areas of sciences upon which developmental aspects of medical research must depend can best be contained in a single set of appropriations and I think it should be in those of the NIH. I was seriously concerned with the comments from the members of the subcommittee for the NSF appropriation and am convinced we should seek to clarify the situation.

I will look forward with interest to the statement by the Bureau of the Budget.

The statement from the Bureau of the Budget follows:

CONSIDERATIONS IN THE PREPARATION OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AND NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH BUDGETS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1958.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In compliance with an informal request from a member of the committee staff, there is transmitted herewith a statement comparing the funds for research for the National Science Foundation and for the National Institutes of Health as requested in the 1959 budget.

I trust the attached statement will serve the purposes of your committee.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Acting Director.

COMPARISON OF THE 1959 RESEARCH BUDGET OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AND THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

ROLE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION IN THE LIFE SCIENCES

Under its organic act the National Science Foundation is authorized and directed to support basic research in mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences. With this extension of the Science Foundation to fields of research participated in by other Federal agencies, it became apparent that further clarification of policy was desirable to avoid possible overlapping interests. Executive Order 10521 of March 1954 further spelled out the role

of the Foundation as being "increasingly responsible for providing support by the Federal Government for general-purpose basic research" but assuring that "the conduct and support by other Federal agencies of basic research in areas which are closely related to their missions is recognized as important and desirable * * * and shall continue."

Basic research by definition is the search after new knowledge for its own sake—knowledge which forms the foundation for future scientific and technological advances. It is best performed under circumstances which permit the scientist freedom in the research that he desires to pursue. Any influence which may tend to unduly bias a scientist in basic research may have a detrimental effect on the fruits of his investigation. For this reason, basic research scientists favor multiplicity of research support, feeling that any significant concentration of resources in a single agency, either public or private, may restrict the avenues of investigation which may be open to them because of the influence which the availability of money plays. It is argued, therefore, that a significant proportion of money should be available from an agency which is not tied to a mission so that basic researches may have a place to go for support simply on the basis of submitting a sound idea for the pursuit of new knowledge for its own sake. The importance of the National Science Foundation as an agency which supports nonmission related basic research is recognized by the scientists of the Nation and reflected in the numbers of proposals submitted to the Foundation for support which have risen in value from $20 million in 1954 to $60 million in 1957 to an estimated $80 million in 1959.

The National Institutes of Health has increased its support of basic research substantially in recent years—in recognition of the need for a strong foundation of fundamental research in the life sciences to support advances in medicine. Nevertheless, despite these increases, there has been no significant diminution in the proportion of proposals for research in the life sciences coming to the National Science Foundation for support. In 1954, 47 percent of the proposals received by the Foundation were in the life sciences and this percentage has generally continued through to the present day, as the following table indicates:

	1954	1955	1956	1957	Estimate, 1958	Estimate, 1959
Value of proposals received	$19,480	$24,828	$36,280	$58,200	$70,000	$80,000
Life sciences	9,189	13,496	17,445	28,060	33,600	38,400
Physical and other sciences	10,291	11,332	18,835	30,140	36,400	41,600
Percent life sciences of total	47	54	48	48	48	48

OVERLAP IN RESEARCH SUPPORT

One way to examine the role of the two agencies is to look at the kinds of institutions which receive support from each agency. The primary support of the National Institutes of Health is to medical schools and hospitals. The Science Foundation, on the other hand, directs most of its funds to graduate schools of arts and sciences in universities and colleges. The following table indicates the distribution of research grants awarded in fiscal year 1957 by type of institution:

	National Institutes of Health		National Science Foundation	
	Value of grants (thousands)	Percent distribution	Value of grants (thousands)	Percent distribution
Medical and related schools	$43,725	57	$1,083	7
Other university schools and departments	13,810	18	12,608	83
Hospitals	12,732	16	21	
Private foundations and other miscellaneous recipients of grants	7,275	9	1,466	10
Total	77,542	100	15,268	100

It will be noted that the Foundation reports 7 percent of its grants in 1957 to medical schools. These funds are all devoted to research in the preclinical departments where the research is of a basic nature related to that performed in departments of chemistry, biology, etc., in schools of arts and sciences.

It is inevitable that some degree of overlap will exist both in terms of the institutions receiving grants and in the substance of the research supported, inasmuch as both the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation administer their programs on the basis of awaiting the submission of proposals from researchers. Some scientists, in order to insure continued support, file applications with more than one agency. However, an administrative mechanism exists so that in the final analysis a scientist is not supported more than once for any single research project or program. This is through the machinery of the Biosciences Information Exchange operated with joint agency funding under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution.

FUTURE SIZE OF NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

There has been real concern expressed to me, by individuals carrying on medical research and engaged in the practice of medicine, over the possible growing size of the National Institutes of Health. They have expressed to me a feeling that in research much is lost in carrying it out on too large a scale and that perhaps more can be accomplished through decentralization. During the hearings I questioned the witnesses at some length about this particular problem and would like to include at this point in the RECORD certain comments which were made by the officials of the National Institutes of Health:

TESTIMONY OF DR. JAMES A. SHANNON, DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, AND DR. JOHN R. HELLER, DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

MOST EFFECTIVE SIZE OF RESEARCH UNIT

Mr. LAIRD. Doctor, I am interested in finding out whether research work on cancer cannot be more effective if carried out by smaller units rather than large research installations like we have out at Bethesda.

Dr. HELLER. We need them both. There are many, many things in cancer research which need the teamwork of a big organization, where you have biophysicians, geneticists, chemists, and others working almost elbow to elbow. On the other hand, there are many individuals who work best as lone wolves, and who, working in a particular field, can be more productive when they are in a small institution.

Mr. LAIRD. I have visited some of the research projects that are supported by the National Institutes of Health. I visited the University of Wisconsin this past year. I went through the cancer clinic and observed work that is being done. I was very impressed with the spirit that was exemplified by the people working there. They had about one clerical employee for the whole clinic. They were not interested in annual leave, or vacations, or anything like that. They had a tremendous spirit that was connected with their research work and it impressed me greatly.

I asked them why they had such a spirit about their work. Their answer was that they were working together as a group and that in research that was the most important thing. It seemed to me that maybe some of this spirit is destroyed if you put too much emphasis on large research installations, such as we have at National Institutes of Health.

Dr. HELLER. May I say, Mr. LAIRD, that you have an extraordinarily good group under Dr. Rush, Dr. Van Porter, and others in the University of Wisconsin. They do a very fine job. They are particularly efficient in the use of biochemical procedures and research. I will submit to you that while the National Cancer Institute is one of the largest organizations in the world engaged in cancer research, our little groups in the Cancer Institute work in a similar fashion and frequently pay no attention to such things as hours, leave, or anything else, so that it is the sum of a number of items. It is a team approach, but when I refer to the fact that we need both, such things as a very extensive research library is an absolute necessity to some groups working in a specific area, whereas some other individual who is working in another area does not need the resources of the library to the same advantage. By the same token, an individual working in a highly refined field, say of electromicroscopy, may need the services of a biochemist, geneticist, and a physicist, which he may not have available if working in a small organization.

Once the small group starts adding all these personnel it soon gets to be a large one. There are room and need for both types.

EVALUATION OF CENTRALIZATION OF RESEARCH

Mr. LAIRD. Does this concern you? I am interested in getting at the root of this thing. Does it ever concern you that your whole research activity could become too large and too centralized?

Dr. HELLER. We have talked about this for hours. It has concerned us all, as when the association gets too large to be effective, just as it worries me sometimes that I no longer am a physician who gets on the physician's end of the stethoscope and worries about this particular patient.

Mr. LAIRD. This question isn't of a critical nature. I am trying to find ways of making the best use of the money that we make available. How can the best job be done?

Dr. HELLER. We constantly are searching for this kind of thing, Mr. LAIRD. One must realize that a big organization attracts the sort of people who work best in that large organization, and by the same token people who work best in a small organization naturally gravitate to that. There is a common feeling around cancer workers generally that an organization consisting of about 30 to 40 people is an optimal one to do specific jobs, such as either biological research, biochemical research, or what have you. An organization, however, that is undertaking all aspects of cancer research is going to have to be of necessity larger than that to be most effective. We are concerned about this.

We work with it daily. We consider it in the awarding of grants, as to whether they have a resource of a biochemist, in or-

der to do successful prosecution of the research. It is quite an involved picture. There is no easy answer to it.

Dr. SHANNON. May I comment on that more generally, Mr. LAIRD? The problem of size is one that not only involves the National Cancer Institute, in fact it involves all of our large institutes. That the Cancer Institute is our largest in no way sets it apart from our other institutes.

First may I say we need both large and small groups—a large institution has certain advantages that cannot be found in the small institution. One of the more important advantages is that it permits the development of specialized skills, addressed to a categorical problem, without at the same time fostering the deterioration of the excelence of these skills. Let me be specific: When a Department of Surgery undertakes a problem in cancer, or the Department of Medicine undertakes a problem in cancer, it will shortly find that it will need a biochemist, perhaps an organic chemist or, perhaps a physicist, to round out the group and cope with what otherwise is a very complex problem. As soon as one of these basic science investigators moves into the surgical environment where he has no day-to-day contract with colleagues within his own profession, he begins to become decreasingly less useful as a physicist or a biochemist.

When the research group is expanded—and there is no magic number to the size of the group, so that it becomes of sufficient size to have more than a single specialized physicist, or biochemist, interchange between individuals derived from a common discipline is possible. You then have the ability to have highly trained specialists with a general orientation and a general appreciation of the problems of cancer addressed to in the field of cancer without a consequent loss of the advantages of professional services in that area.

This has led, in the physical sciences, over many, many years to the establishment of the research institute concept, instead of the very small group.

The second factor of outstanding importance is that in this day and age of instrumentation, it is not economically feasible to place full modern instrumentation at the disposal of the small group. In this day an organic chemist, in order to work effectively must have an infrared spectrophotometer costing $25,000, and he must have a recording spectrophotometer for U–V costing $17,000, and many other costly instruments.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you have this equipment in each of your labs?

Dr. SHANNON. No. They are available as a service, so multiple chemists can have access to them. In the older days an organic chemist would run through a reaction. It would take him the better part of 2 or 3 weeks to work up the reaction mixture in order to determine whether a specific reaction had in fact taken place. This could only be determined by isolation and demonstration of structure. At the present time an organic chemist will run through the reaction, which could be for the development of what is called a functional group. He can smear the reaction mixture on a slide, put it in the infrared spectrophotometer and in one hour determine whether his reaction is good. If his reaction is good, the mess is discarded and he starts again. He has thereby saved himself some 2 or 3 weeks. Consequently when one considers the tremendous advances that have been made in instrumentation, it is an important factor in establishing a need for larger groups.

Finally, there are certain areas, such as genetics, or general biology, that are not exclusively related to cancer, yet without the skills that are available through these specialists, we know that the long-term solution of the problem of cancer cannot be found.

We don't employ a geneticist to come to the National Cancer Institute to work on a cancer. Literally, a good man would not come. On the other hand, we ask him to come with the mind open relative to where his researches will go in the future. We find that within a relatively short time, when he begins to see the opportunity to make significant advances in the field, without in anyway losing his professional standing in his own field, he is making a contribution in the field of genetics applicable to the field of cancer.

All of this comes under the general category of research leadership, and the larger the institution one has, then the more is superior research leadership required.

We feel very proud of our operation at Bethesda largely because we have superb research leadership. There is a difference between research direction and research leadership. What I say in relation to the Cancer Institute could be said for the Heart Institute and so on down the line. This is a general philosophical question.

Mr. LAIRD. In other words, you think that there is an area here that needs to be constantly reviewed?

Dr. SHANNON. Yes, sir. Absolutely, sir.

The following is testimony by Dr. John W. Knutson, Chief Dental Officer of the Public Health Service, regarding the dissemination of research results and the size of dental research projects:

DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS

Mr. LAIRD. How do you get the information from your research teams out to practicing dentists?

Dr. KNUTSON. The practicing dentists, more so than any other professional group, belong to their national organization, the American Dental Association, which publishes a journal made available to each one of its members.

I mention this because this is an important avenue through which the practicing dentists keep informed of changes and improvements in technical procedures and also in new research planning.

In addition, our people, as well as others, discuss these matters before dental meetings, scientific meetings of dentists. At these meetings they have table clinics as well as scientific lectures and demonstrations. In other words, there is a variety of methods for keeping the practicing dentist informed of the new procedures.

In addition to that, each of the dental schools carries on what they call continuing education courses of various types to enable the practicing dentist to keep abreast of the new information that is becoming available.

Mr. LAIRD. What kind of coverage do you think you have among practicing dentists? Take as an example the dentists in my Congressional District.

Dr. KNUTSON. That is a question, sir, that I do not think I can answer very specifically because I really do not know how well the dentists read their journals, how well they attend their professional meetings. I say this, in spite of the fact that dentists have a rather excellent record for attendance at meetings.

The Chicago midwinter meeting, for example, which was just held, is an example. Usually 10,000 to 15,000 dentists come to this one meeting. This is a large proportion of dentists when we consider that we have a total of about 80,000 practicing dentists in the country. For 10,000 to 15,000 to attend one meeting is a large turnout.

This is a central meeting. Then there are State meetings and local meetings. I would say among professional groups their performance is well above the average.

Mr. LAIRD. Research is a good thing if it is actually put into practice, but I should think it would be very important if we are going to spend money on it, to make sure it was reaching the people who can use it.

Dr. KNUTSON. I agree. One of the responsibilities of your State health department is also to help the professional groups to disseminate this knowledge and to do what they can to foster its early application.

It is also one of the jobs of our regional dental consultants and people in our regional offices to see that this information is gotten out and is used as soon as possible.

PROPORTION OF GRANT AND DIRECT RESEARCH

Mr. LAIRD. What percentage of your research is actually done at the National Institute? Your total budget for fiscal year 1958 is $6,430,000. What percentage of the actual research work was done here at the National Institute?

Dr. KNUTSON. Of that money $2,825,000 was for research grants. The research program at our Institute is a little over $1 million, $1,228,000, to be exact, so that twice as much money goes toward research grants, for research in other institutions, as is used in our own program.

In addition there is approximately $1 million going outside to the universities and other institutions for training programs, that is in addition to the $2,825,000.

Mr. LAIRD. Don't you think a better job could be done if more of your research were decentralized?

Dr. KNUTSON. This is a question that is relative, of course, to the total amount spent in this area. I would say that the dental research going on at our own Institute is something that I am very proud of. I think this program has developed in the past 3 to 4 years into an outstanding program and one which in my opinion is comparable with any research effort that is going on out at the National Institutes of Health.

I think Dr. Arnold, the Director of the Dental Research Institute, has done an outstanding job. What I am saying, in effect, is that certainly not too much research is being done out at the Institute because what is being done there is being done so well, and it is being done by perhaps the finest collection of dental research workers in the world.

Mr. LAIRD. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

USE OF GRANTS TO SUPPLEMENT GRANTEES SALARIES

A practice has grown up on some of the grants which have been made to the National Institutes of Health by placing professors at certain schools in the United States on a 9-month pay period rather than a yearly pay period and supplementing their salaries through grants from the NIH. This program of course was never intended for this purpose and our committee this year developed a considerable amount of testimony on this practice. Parts of the testimony are as follows:

TESTIMONY OF DR. JAMES A. SHANNON, DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH AND DR. JOHN R. HELLER, DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

Mr. LAIRD. Last year we talked briefly about the use of some of your grant money that was being channeled into paying professors' salaries and research salaries in some of the medical colleges around the country, by changing the professors to a 9-month basis, and then giving them summertime work. This was being used as a salary gimmick. Your funds were being used to give faculty salary increases.

Are these applications gone over pretty carefully by the National Institutes?

Dr. SHANNON. They are gone over very carefully. This is one of the items, as I recall, that is on either the National Institutes agenda or the Cancer Institute's agenda this year.

We are disturbed. By saying we are disturbed, we are a little apart from the general stream of governmental practices. The convention of supplementing salaries developed during World War II under the operations of the Office of Scientific Research and Development via the contract mechanism. This has been carried on, by Defense very extensively and I believe by the AEC.

We question the advisability of the mechanism. We have looked into it. We are going to have further serious discussions with our councils and I think the possibility is very strong that some of our councils will recommend to the Surgeon General that either this be disallowed, or at least be the subject of discussion with the medical schools and universities. I would not wish to prejudge the council's action, but maybe Dr. Heller might tell Mr. LAIRD the background of the decision to put this on the agenda for discussion.

Dr. HELLER. This particular point has been raised on several occasions, and as new members come on the Council, it almost invariably is raised, and several were quite disturbed to find in the several applications what appeared to be a supplementation of salaries, and they didn't feel that this was quite appropriate for some universities and it was not fair to other professors in the universities, and in general was simply a little foreign to their concept of university status, so much that it is to be discussed at our Council to talk it through, and to find the pros and cons.

Dr. Allen, who is director of the Research Grants Division, has been quite active and concerned with this problem as well.

Mr. LAIRD. Most universities and schools that are involved in this are required to make full disclosure on this matter before the grants are made; are they not?

Dr. HELLER. There is no question of that.

Dr. SHANNON. This is completely aboveboard.

Mr. LAIRD. They notify you they will change a professor over from a 12- to a 9-month basis, and he is going to be paid by the grant, or through the grant procedure for the 3-month period?

Dr. SHANNON. They don't notify us in that way. There is no formal notification that now he will go from a 12- to 9-month basis. The convention developed during World War II. In fact, the ordinary academic employee is viewed as being employed during the teaching period; if he wishes to take other jobs, consulting work or the like during the summer, it was primarily his responsibility. If on the other hand he chose to stay at the university and devote full time to research, then it was possible for him to be put on grant support covering his 2 or 3 months' research activity.

Actually, I don't believe that a formal issue on this has ever been drawn. As I say, the mechanism has been in use now for more than 15 years, characteristic much more of Defense than ourselves—I am not saying that they are more blameful—but I would like to generalize a little bit more. The use of this device is just another example of the inability, at least in my opinion, of universities and medical schools to expand the stable base in the support of their hierarchy due to the drain on their own limited resources in helping to meet the costs of the research supported by Federal funds. It is a position of weakness rather than strength. I am perfectly certain the universities do not want to do this. On the other hand, in competition for scientific personnel, where salary is one of the factors of competition, this has ended up as one of the factors that determines whether an individual will stay or not. This is a sizable amount of money when you pay salaries at a professorial level.

Mr. LAIRD. Those schools that have been paying a 12-month basis are certainly put at somewhat of a disadvantage in competing for this scientific personnel, if another school will put them on a 9-month basis and let the National Institutes of Health pay the salary through a grant for 3 months, aren't they?

Aren't you in fact contributing to this problem?

Dr. SHANNON. I don't believe that in general any of the schools will say "We pay for 9 months," as opposed to another school which says "We pay for 12 months."

It is conventional that the academic summer is free for the professor to do with what he will. I know when I was in New York University——

Mr. LAIRD. Were you in teaching or in research?

Dr. SHANNON. Well, as a matter of fact, at NYU my teaching responsibility was limited to about 6 months a year, and I could go where I would for the remainder of the year. It was assumed that I would be profitably engaged in research, and whether I was in Maine, or England, or Sweden, which were some of the places in which I worked, this was quite in accord with university policy because this was where my work brought me. There was no compulsion for me to report to the hierarchy within the university as to how I proposed to spend my summers and what I proposed to do. It so happened, I got very little vacation during this period and it was essentially a 12-month work year, but what I am emphasizing is that there was no compulsion for me to clear with the university hierarchy as to whether I should become profitably engaged. I believe these are the terms of employment that most universities have today.

Mr. LAIRD. You feel all universities should go over to this system?

Dr. SHANNON. No, sir. I think a university professor's job is a full-time job and his responsibility is primarily to the university and not anything else. I think his total salary should come from the university. This happens to be my personal opinion. I think this device, the universities themselves permitting professors to obtain outside compensation, weakens the structure of the university. I am completely against the practice and I am just aghast that the universities across the country, so many of them, will permit it. This is a personal opinion. What I want to say is that this is none of National Institutes of Health or Public Health Service doing, although we are participating in something that basically I don't like.

Mr. LAIRD. It was new to me. I had been asked some questions about it. I couldn't answer the questions very well. I discussed it a little with you last year.

Dr. SHANNON. I have talked to Dr. Perkins, our under secretary, about it. He comes to us as you know as the president of Delaware University.

Mr. Perkins is disturbed with this practice though he does assure us this is common university practice.

HEW PROGRAMS TOUCH LIVES OF EVERY AMERICAN

As a member of the committee submitting the report on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, I should like to express my strong support of the committee's actions and recommendations and urge that the House approve them. I am intimately aware of how the programs of these agencies touch the lives and welfare of every American, dealing as they do with a host of activities ranging from unemployment compensation to such things that shall shape our future as education and medical research.

You, too, of course, are well aware of what these Federal programs mean to each and all of our citizens. You will know that our committee is making this appropriation recommendation after the most careful consideration of many influencing factors. As the report states, for illustration, the general economic condition and high unemployment rate have been taken into account in coming to our decisions.

Yet I am not, of course, standing as a proponent of the bill merely because I am sure that the committee has wisely and well taken into account all pertinent considerations. Rather, I am urging the bill's acceptance because I believe that it sustains certain activities as they should be during the coming fiscal year and, more importantly, strengthens certain others that vitally need strengthening. There are many areas in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations that I could comment upon, but I shall restrict my remarks largely to discussing the increases proposed for the National Institutes of Health, which will provide for a modest but significantly important expansion of medical research.

I am sure that you know as well as I the benefits that this humanitarian research is already bringing us. Hardly a day goes by without their being reported in the daily press, bringing us heartening news of dramatic, life-saving new operations or of discoveries of new knowledge in such fields as heart disease or cancer. Our committee also received, not only during the hearings, but also throughout the year, detailed reports on the advances on the many fronts of the life sciences which are aided through the National Institutes of Health appropriations.

We know that the past decade has not only seen growth and expansion in medical research, but also has witnessed unparalleled advances in the contributions of science to life. Here let me say how striking this is in contrast to some other fields of research where the purpose is not primarily the uncovering of knowledge for the improvement of health. By this I do not mean that we should relax our efforts in any field of science. Particularly, we cannot relax and must greatly step up all of those activities in, for example, the physical sciences that will contribute to preparedness and defense. I do want to point up, however, my belief that we can and should progressively strengthen the field of health research which, even aside from humanitarian benefits, is also indispensible in the total picture of national defense.

REDUCTION OF DISEASES AND IMPROVEMENT OF HEALTH

The medical research progress of recent years demonstrates how we are becoming a stronger Nation through reduction of disease and improvement of health, a fact that we may sometimes overlook or take for granted. We have seen many diseases conquered or drastically reduced almost without realizing it. The list is too long to cite, and to make the point I need only to mention the victories of the past over such illnesses as smallpox, typhoid, diphtheria, typhus, yellow fever, and other infectious diseases. During the past decade, equally drastic advances have been made as

medical science has brought to wide application many new things, such as the sulfonamides or sulfa drugs, the antibiotics, and the hormonal agents. What they have helped achieve is extraordinary: The death rate from pneumonia cut 50 percent; influenza, 77 percent; acute rheumatic fever, 66 percent; syphilis, 56 percent; and tuberculosis, 50 percent.

Among other striking illustrations of progress are:

The development of vaccines for the prevention of polio, influenza, and upper respiratory infections.

Discovery and wide use of a wide array of chemical weapons useful against high blood pressure.

Dramatic improvement, through new techniques, in surgery for many things, as, especially, that to correct congenital heart defects and hearts damaged by rheumatic fever.

Development and application of a test for early diagnosis of a form of cancer in women, permitting treatment before it is too late.

Discovery of a family of drugs permitting startling advances in the management of mental illnesses.

Development and widespread use of an inexpensive public-health measure that is reducing tooth decay and that can cut it in half.

A number of findings that have reduced the death rate among mothers and children and also reduced certain of the diseases arising from complications during pregnancy and at birth.

Progress of this kind proves, I think we will all agree, that the planned use of a portion of our national resources for medical and biological research is a wise investment, one that returns both human and economic dividends. I think, too, that we can be sure that further discoveries will continue to flow from this research and make possible even greater disease conquests than we have heretofore seen. During our recent hearings we learned of exciting and recent findings in areas in which research may be bringing us close to such victories. Take the case of cancer, perhaps the most dreaded disease of our times. While, rightfully, no scientific authority could guarantee a timetable for discovery, it is apparent that they do feel that significant breakthroughs may not be far off, perhaps either through the chemotherapeutic attack or through new knowledge about viruses and cancer that could lead to vaccines for prevention.

It is this kind of promise that can be sensed in the major disease research fields—cancer, heart disease, mental illness, arthritis, neurological illnesses, dental diseases, and others—that leads to the conclusion that raising rather than reducing the appropriations for this work for next year is, as I have said, a very wise investment.

The increased funds that we have been appropriating to the National Institutes of Health programs for research in the past several years have, we believe, been well used. Medical research has shown that it has the capacity for growth and expansion and yet maintain a high quality of scientific validity. I would mention here that, in the opinion of a number of authorities, America is today the leading nation in this field, and that we can well be proud of the progress we are making in the medical and biological sciences in this country. Here, far from being behind others, we are at the forefront.

This is yet another reason I believe we should modestly expand next year's budget for medical research.

Actually, the word "expand" is perhaps misleading and suggests more than is reported in the proposed bill for appropriations. Let me explain.

We were confronted with the fact that, by providing the same amount for 1959 as for 1958 and by earmarking a portion of this for research overhead or indirect costs, this would have in effect meant a real reduction in the substance and amount of medical research that could be carried out in 1959. Yet we also found solid evidence that the medical schools and universities where these research studies are done not only could well utilize additional support but really must have it if they are to institute, even minimally, new studies needed to exploit and explore the highly promising new leads being uncovered in many fields. The research scientists and the administrators of these research centers can and will do this, and we would be shortsighted, I believe, if we failed to make it possible, because we would be postponing progress to some degree or, at the least, slowing down its rate of achievement.

We found that we could expect, for 1959, not very much new research investigative work to be supported if the level of appropriation was fixed at the same figure as for 1958. Funds committed necessarily for continuation of studies already under way simply cannot by chopped off, because they are sound and involve several years of investment; thus activation of new research projects would be greatly curtailed. We felt, therefore, that we could not expect medical research to hold its present level of progress and provide some stepping up of its pace, in view of the needs and opportunities, if we recommended precisely the same figure for research as last year.

Moreover, as our committee report states, the Congress has for several years supported the National Institutes of Health programs at levels each year that have made possible an orderly and highly productive development of research in the major diseases. We have not been wrong in thus providing for growth; we shall be consistent with our past record, which has received the strong approval of the American people and American medical science, if we this year see to it that appropriate maintenance and strengthening of medical research is provided. This is the basis for the recommendations of our report, ground upon which we all can unite and stand firmly.

The amount we have recommended for strengthening the research attack is allocated among the Institutes' programs in such a way as to allow the seizing and developing of opportunities for progress in program areas which today seem mostly fruitful and likely to produce the greatest dividends. The total amount of the increase is $8,200,000. I shall not detail how this is apportioned among the Institutes; I believe our committee report clearly and dramatically shows this and illustrates the areas of high promise in cancer, mental illness, heart disease, and the other fields which the additional moneys would aid.

DENTAL RESEARCH BUILDNG

I would mention that we recommend also that funds be appropriated this year for construction of a dental research building at the National Institutes of Health. We have recommended $3,700,000 for this building, which was authorized by the 80th Congress and for which, so far, planning funds only have been appropriated. From the evidence, planning has been completed, construction could be undertaken soon, and the building is badly needed, present space facilities of the National Institute of Dental Research being severely inadequate. We believe that we should provide these funds, and the dental profession strongly supports this conclusion. I would only add that, in research in oral diseases as in other fields, lies the best hope of reducing the burden and we all well know what an enormous economic cost is caused each year by tooth decay and other dental illnesses.

In summing up, I would say that the funds proposed in the report represent our best judgment as to how to provide for 1959 both balance and growth among the programs which the appropriations sustain. The entire health program of the Nation, for example, is growing upon a number of structures. Among the major of these are research, training, and public health activities. While these do not have to be sustained or broadened or extended at precisely the same rate and at exactly the same point in time, there should be balance among them. Research is a good thing if it is actually put into practice, but it is important to make sure that its applicable knowledge is reaching people who can use it. Thus, research cannot but have ties to training and public health—and they, as well, to research.

If there is no balance among such areas, and if they do not grow in relation to each other, the national health endeavor is not merely disharmonious, it is not soundly based and becomes less effective.

In our recommendations, we have considered these matters and thought of them in context with other problems, such as the needs in education and welfare programs, and in relation to the total state of the Nation. Our proposals reflect this thinking and insure, I feel, the best balance and growth we can provide at this time.

ANSWERS THROUGH RESEARCH

To return for a moment to the field of medical research for which we recommend the major, though actually modest, expansion in terms of dollars, I would like to say that my underlying philosophy for this is belief in progressive, balanced growth rather than explosive increase. Getting answers through research first requires expanded scientific manpower.

Then, it takes expanded research facilities—and we are again this year providing, as you know, for this construction as established by the Health Research Facilities Construction Act. Yet additional trained investigators cannot be immediately doubled, any more than facilities can be doubled all at once; so increases for research itself must depend upon and keep pace with increases in trained manpower and in facilities.

Thus, in providing for some increase in research itself this year, we have also provided for some growth in research training among the Institutes' programs, maintaining balance in growth. We have, furthermore, keyed the growth and development of the three components of research—the work, the men, and the facilities—to the general needs and the potential for growth of the medical schools, universities, and other research organizations that make up America's resources for research in the life sciences. But these considerations have not caused us to forget another; that there can arise special areas of need—where need is combined with available resources and timely opportunity. In such areas greater and faster growth may be implemented by increases which, without such a combination of factors, would not be indicated. Such areas of opportunity might be mentioned, for illustration, as the chemotherapy of mental illness, and the drug or the virus approach to cancer. Our appropriations proposal, then, does not overlook such potentials.

In conclusion, I would say that, overall, the research attack on disease as an entity appears today to be at that stage where its steady, progressive expansion, plus the development of special segments of particular opportunity, is the formula for the greatest human benefits to be achieved in the shortest possible time span. This kind of expansion, it should be mentioned, has been responsible for the great advances which medicine and medical science have thus far made.

This kind of expansion is what we propose in the committee report. I urge your support for it. I submit that adoption of the proposal of the report offers a guarantee to the people of the kinds of medical research, public health, and other programs that each of us in Congress can and should wholeheartedly support.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I shall be happy to.

Mr. AVERY. I would like first to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin on the very fine statement he has made. This is a very extensive program that costs a great deal of money and, as the gentleman has so well pointed out, it is a program that probably reaches more individuals in the United States than any other program operated by the Federal Government, this field of medical research.

I wonder if the committee explored the extent of any coordination in medical research between the Veterans' Administration hospitals and the Public Health Service?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes. Of course, we do not handle that particular appropriation; that item was in the last bill we considered.

Mr. AVERY. I understand that.

Mr. LAIRD. But we certainly are well aware of the work that has been carried on by the Veterans' Administration, and that question was the subject of discussion with the witnesses who were charged with responsibility for the program of the Public Health Service. We went into that.

Mr. AVERY. Then the gentleman in his own mind is convinced that there is as much cooperation and coordination as would be possible between two separate agencies in this field of medical research, between the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. LAIRD. I think there is very close cooperation—our committee insists on this.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. HASKELL. I wish the gentleman would clear up for me what he meant when he spoke of decentralization of research; did he mean to take it away from the National Institutes of Health and spread it out among different schools?

Mr. LAIRD. It is most important that you have the proper environment for research. I think that in many of our colleges and universities throughout the United States we have that proper environment.

When I speak of decentralization of research I am speaking of the proper environment which exists in some of our colleges and universities throughout America, bringing them more into the program and perhaps not continuing to expand the plant in Bethesda, Md.

I do not want the gentleman to think that all of the important work on cancer is done at the NIH at Bethesda. I do not know whether the gentleman is familiar with the fine work done at the University of Wisconsin and at other schools and clinics throughout America.

Mr. HASKELL. Yes, I am.

Mr. LAIRD. Similarly fine work is done in other universities and clinics in various fields of research. They have hospital facilities available and are able to carry on this work. I was not trying to criticize the program as it presently exists out at Bethesda. I simply raised the question as to how much larger the program can get at this one institution. Dr. Shannon, who is Director of the National Institutes of Health, is also concerned with that same problem.

Mr. HASKELL. Did the gentleman put in the RECORD what Dr. Shannon said?

Mr. LAIRD. I will do that. It will appear in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for a very fine and thought-provoking statement.

I wish to congratulate the committee for inserting $750,000 in the appropriation to implement Public Law 151 passed last year. This is to provide for construction of Indian hospital facilities jointly with the construction of State and local facilities. Indian health facilities are a national responsibility.

Providing these funds now is sound and economical. Where new local hospitals are presently under construction, as in the case of Lander, Wyo., to which I called the attention of the committee at the time of my appearance, this action will make possible a better plant for less money if the construction of joint facilities is finally determined to be the best solution to the problem.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, as usual, the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has done a tremendous job on this bill. I am particularly interested in the amount contained in the bill for the Hill-Burton hospital construction funds. Illinois is badly in need of hospital construction, and now we will be able to go forward with a better program with the money contained in this bill. The President had cut his budget request to only $75 million for the entire country. Illinois would have received less than $2 million for hospital construction from Hill-Burton funds. The director of the Illinois department of public health, Dr. Roland R. Cross advised me that if the amount allocated to Illinois was not increased, only four hospitals could be built next year. He also informed me that Illinois has a long list of high priority projects that need attention. I had urged the President and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to request additional funds. I am certainly happy that the bill contains $121,200,000 for this purpose and I want to thank the able chairman and members of this subcommittee for their hard work and foresight in allowing this amount. The $75 million was entirely inadequate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, serving on the subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations is an interesting and rewarding privilege. Our able chairman, Mr. JOHN FOGARTY, is as considerate and fair to his colleagues as he is diligent in the duties of his chairmanship. The atmosphere of the hearing room is a pleasant one, largely because of the courtesy and consideration he extends to the witnesses before us.

The other members of the subcommittee—Mr. DENTON, Mr. TABER, and Mr. LAIRD—are all known to the House as conscientious workers. They are well-informed and their searching questions revealed a genuine interest in the work of these departments. It is a real privilege to serve with them.

When our chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], asked me to serve on this subcommittee, I was well aware of the difficulty of filling the place so ably held by Mr. Lanham before his death. This realization continued to impress itself upon me as our hearings progressed. His service, his kindness, and his interests were repeatedly referred to by witnesses. Over and over again, I was impressed by how far-reaching and wide these interests were. He was a man of great heart and great love for his fellowman and he concerned himself deeply with these programs so intimately affecting human welfare.

AFFECTS EVERY HOUSEHOLD

Indeed, this subcommittee deals more closely and more widely with human problems than any similar group in the Congress. If the proper concern of man is man, then no committee more completely devotes itself to purely human interests than does this subcommittee. We deal with the health and education of children, with the problems of working people and retired people, with the age-old fight against disease and suffering. There is hardly a household in America which is not directly affected by the decisions we must make today. A sympathetic and searching interest in human affairs is something that grows on members who work day in and day out with some of the great humanitarian programs in which our people cooperate through their Government.

I recall the eloquent pleas made in behalf of health programs in this chamber by the late Frank Keefe of Wisconsin during my first term in the Congress. He has been lauded many times for his great humanitarian work. It does not detract from these efforts to say that Congressman FOGARTY has advanced this crusade so effectively that our subcommittee is more often called the Fogarty committee than the Labor-HEW Subcommittee. This is properly so. In the years to come, the achievements of our chairman in promoting health and medical research will be recognized as one of the great contributions of our time to the welfare of the American people. Those who will benefit from advances in the cure of heart ailments, cancer, and mental illness will be grateful that the people of the Second District of Rhode Island sent JOHN FOGARTY to Congress.

UNANIMOUSLY REPORTED

The Committee on Appropriations brings this bill before the House with the unanimous approval of the members of the committee. Like all legislation, this is a compromise bill. All of us would like to see some items in the bill which are not included. Others would like to see programs increased. And some, while interested in purposes of some programs, feel that they could be carried on with less expense.

One of the greatest handicaps in dealing with this bill, it seems to me, is the change in policies and conditions since the budget was prepared. Many items are unrealistic. For example, what is gained by cutting the meal costs at the Soldiers' Home? No one seriously believes that the cost of meals per person will be less in the next fiscal year than in this fiscal year.

Those who framed the budget last fall were not aware of the extent to which unemployment would grow this year. As a result, there is renewed interest in construction items as public works projects.

HOSPITAL CUTBACK

The budget we received drastically reduced funds for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act. Whether the time has come to cut back hospital construction is questionable under any circumstances. In the light of present conditions, it certainly should not be done. The Budget Bureau has recognized this fact and has sent a supplemental request for an amount equaling last year's appropriation of $121,200,000.

Is this the pattern to be followed throughout the budget? If this policy is to be extended, might not other items in this bill receive similar treatment? The Congress of the United States must appropriate the money; that is our responsibility. We do, however, feel that the Bureau of the Budget can be valuable in providing accurate information and reasonable guideposts to assist in keeping expenditures in line with revenues.

I am not one to quarrel with the Bureau of the Budget as such, but I do feel that these rapidly changing policies and widely fluctuating requests place an unreasonable burden on the Congress and detract from the useful services of the Bureau of the Budget.

HOW MUCH FOR LIBRARIES?

Another example of the continually changing policy is the rural library services program. First, we had a request for $7½ million from the Bureau of the Budget. A year later we had a request for $3 million, but appropriated $5 million because of the interest evidenced by the States. With the exception of two States, the State legislatures had acted upon State programs based in good faith on the Federal act. Now the Bureau of the Budget comes forth with a request for $3 million for the 1959 program. The committee has again increased this amount to $5 million in the bill before you to insure some degree of stability. We are aware, however, that with increased interest in the development of library services in the States there will be States which will be unable to receive the full amount of Federal funds they had a right to expect when they promoted the program in good faith.

State interest and willingness to cooperate can best be illustrated by the fact that 36 States participated in the first year, 1957, and contributed $4,224,000 in State and local funds. In the present fiscal year, a grand total of $9,983,000—almost double the Federal appropriation—is being contributed in State and local funds.

FISCAL ZIGZAGGING

In other words, the Bureau of the Budget asked for $7½ million for fiscal year 1957 when it was known that the States could not immediately obtain enabling legislation and appropriations to participate. As soon as the States acted and made funds available, the request was reduced to $3 million. This is precisely the kind of fiscal zigzagging that makes it difficult for the Congress to know where the Bureau of the Budget and the administration stand from day to day. Yet, we are supposed to accept these figures as guideposts in making appropriations.

It is also interesting to note that these reductions are made at the very same time new proposals are being advanced to encourage able students to take a greater interest in education. A reduction in rural library service is obviously inconsistent with this purpose since we know that many of the students who drop out of school live in rural areas. Certainly library service is one useful tool that can be helpful in stimulating interest among talented children.

TRAINING FOR JOBS

The committee saw fit to reduce the amount for the apprenticeship and training program of the Department of Labor by $300,000 below the budget request. This was a disappointment to me since I personally feel that this is a worthwhile program. Perhaps I feel more keenly about this as a result of my work on the subcommittee on Department of Agriculture appropriations. The present policy of the Department of Agriculture seems to be to improve the per capita income position of farmers by encouraging them to take advantage of nonfarm income.

If middle-aged people are to find work in industry, they will need technical training to prepare them for the jobs which are requiring more and more skills. A man who uses a hammer becomes a more skilled worker by learning the proper use of the square. It also means that he will be in a better position to earn the wages necessary to support his family. He becomes a more valuable employee and his improved income, of course, is reflected in the taxes paid to the Government.

Modern industry recognizes the value of trained workers who can do the job without accidents and without a waste of time and material.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the reduction in this important program is a disappointment to me. In view of what has happened since last fall, the funds for this program could well be increased and the money would be well spent. All of the training activities of the Department of Labor—so important to industry—cost only $3,600,000. Compare this with the similar training programs in a number of other departments.

HOW MUCH UNEMPLOYMENT?

In questioning witnesses from the Department of Labor, it was often necessary to refer to the unemployment situation. Again and again, we found that it is exceedingly difficult to get firm figures on unemployment. The Bureau of Employment Security can tell us how

many people are drawing unemployment compensation but this is by no means the total of unemployed. For example, in mid-February the Bureau of Employment Security showed 3,130,000 unemployed receiving compensation while the Bureau of the Census estimated 5,173,000 total unemployed. This figure on total unemployment, however, is also deceptive since it fails to include those working shorter shifts, fewer days, or alternate weeks. Almost every member knows of plants operating 2 or 3 days a week. Neither does it include farmers living on subsistence farms and working in towns who are now unemployed. When they are employed they are called part of the working force; when they are unemployed they are called farmers.

ESTIMATES UNREALISTIC

The conflicting estimates and generally inaccurate figures make it difficult to know just what funds should be made available for various programs. This is reflected in our report on the bill in which it is pointed out that the estimates of insured unemployment presented to us were so unrealistic it is impossible to base appropriations on them. The budget request was based on the assumption that the number of insured unemployed would average about 2 million. We have been unable to obtain a current estimate from the Secretary of Labor so it is necessary to accept the budget figure with the full knowledge that more funds will be needed when the figures are brought up to date.

Another instance of the need for improvement in statistical information was provided in the testimony on the activities of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In the report, it will be noted that your committee made special mention of the need for repricing the city workers' family budget as estimated by this Bureau. This important study was first recommended by the subcommittee during hearings on the 1946 budget and it was issued with some regularity until 1951. The statistics are now 6 years out of date.

FAMILY BUDGET REVISION

The purpose of this study is to have an expert judgment on the minimum requirements for healthful living for the family of the average worker in overalls. It is our understanding that, as a result of other Bureau studies and private studies, this family budget can be brought up to date at relatively little expense.

The obvious value of such information in determining national policies in many areas affecting the family prompted the committee to instruct the Department to accomplish the job with the funds recommended in the bill.

The present cost-of-living index does not always reflect some of the increased costs of special significance to the workingman. One example of this occurred in our hearing when I asked if recent price increases had been greater on clothes commonly worn by most working people than for clothes worn by white-collar workers. A subsequent study of the subject bore out my hunch that the costs had increased disproportionately for work clothes.

WORK CLOTHES UP

"The facts would seem to indicate that you are quite correct," Commissioner Clague replied in a letter later and supplied Department figures which showed:

Work trousers have increased 5.7 percent since 1955; rayon slacks only 1.7 percent.

Work shirts have increased 5.7 percent since 1955; business shirts 1.1 percent.

Work shoes have increased 12.7 percent over 1955; street shoes only 8.6 percent.

Overalls had gone up 5.1 percent and work gloves 3.2 percent. No comparable items were listed for overalls and gloves.

We don't know any reason why this difference between work clothes and dress clothes should be so great—

Said the Commissioner.

This instance does serve to illustrate the importance of obtaining accurate statistics on what it costs the city worker to live since his purchasing power is important not only to retail business but to agriculture.

While it is often said that food purchases are the last to decline in periods of unemployment because the family must eat, what the family is able to buy certainly has an effect on many segments of the economy.

INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

In our hearings on this bill, it was reassuring to note the improvements being made in Indian health activities. We have by no means solved this problem but at least the groundwork has been laid. We should be grateful to the dedicated people in the Public Health Service who are devoting themselves unselfishly to the improvement of Indian health. This is a problem of great magnitude and any attempt to gloss over it would be untrue and would certainly be unfair to our colleagues in the Congress. While there are many, many instances in which I could be justifiably critical of redtape and bureaucratic bungling, I will not do so here. Dr. Burney, the Surgeon General, is being made aware of these criticisms and suggestions. The committee has a high regard for Dr. Burney and he will receive our wholehearted support in strengthening the weak points in this program. We believe that more is to be gained by cooperation than by widespread publicity that can only create misunderstanding and undo some of the good work that has been done.

There have been significant accomplishments and they deserve our attention. Here in the words of Dr. James R. Shaw, Chief of the Division of Indian Health, is part of that record:

We have accomplished this: Tuberculosis was our most important problem. There has been a 30-percent drop in new cases, from 560 cases per 100,000 Indian population in 1954 to 400 cases in 1957. That is for the United States only.

DROP IN TB DEATHS

There has been a 25-percent drop in United States Indian tuberculosis deaths from 1954 through 1956.

There has been a 57-percent drop in the tuberculosis death rate among the Alaskan natives where it was exceedingly high when we took over. It was 208 per 100,000 population, and it is down to 89 per 100,000 in 1956.

There have been fewer TB hospital cases leaving against medical advice or without leave, from 39 percent in 1955 of the TB admissions down to 23 percent in 1957.

There is no longer any waiting list for tuberculosis hospital beds. We can hospitalize TB patients on a current basis.

We have established a TB register to follow patients, record their treatment, and to follow up the exposed members of a family and other contacts.

INFANT DEATHS DOWN

Infant deaths have dropped 17 percent since 1954 through 1956, from 65.5 per 1,000 live births to 54.6 in 1956.

Accidents and heart disease have now replaced tuberculosis as the most common causes of death. Tuberculosis now occupies seventh place, where formerly it was much higher.

We have uncovered a real serious focus of trachoma, a serious eye infection, which was thought under control, but our survey showed evidence of it running as high as 25 percent on some reservations, and we have designed a program to attack that.

In a crippled children program, which had been neglected to a great extent, the case finding has increased, and it has been strengthened through arrangements with the State crippled children's programs. This is particularly true for the Arizona Indian child who is not included in the Arizona State program.

We now have 10 Indian hospitals accredited under the hospital accrediting program.

Hospital admissions, PHS and contract, are 32 percent higher now. In 1955 there were 50,143; in 1957 there were 66,455.

PATIENT LOAD UP

The average patient load in the hospitals is 13 percent higher. It shows 3,710 in 1955 to 4,205 in 1957.

Patient-days of care are 13 percent higher, 1,354,000 in 1955 to 1,535,000 in 1957.

Outpatient services have increased 33 percent, from 496,836 to 657,474.

Births in PHS hospitals increased 10 percent.

Activities in health centers, outpatient services, have increased 29 percent.

Dental clinic treatments and visits have increased 34 percent from 1955 to 1957.

Field health services have been extended on a regularly scheduled basis to 70 additional stations where no services had been in existence. This gives us 175 health stations where there is some full-time health activity.

In Alaska, 75 native villages have been covered in the chemotherapy program for tuberculosis and other medical services; 41 for sanitation services.

We now operate 13 school health centers at Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding schools.

Expansion of services through the communities has increased from $5,500,000 in 1955 to $8,600,000 in 1957.

Services through contracts have increased 60 percent, but we should remember that the costs of operating have gone up.

The practical nurse training schools have increased in Albuquerque from 45 to 90 students and at Mount Edgecumbe.

NEED HOSPITAL ACTION

The committee feels that the construction program for Indian hospitals needs to move at a more rapid pace. In addition to the regular construction program, we are making available $750,000 to activate the program contemplated under Public Law 151 of the 85th Congress. This will enable Indians to cooperate in providing facilities under the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, there are so many items in this bill that directly affect the daily lives of every citizen of the United States that I wish we could examine more of them in greater detail. The four volumes of hearings bear witness to the care with which we studied each request and attempted to evaluate the past performance in each program. The long hours of hearings were made less tedious by the realization that we were working on programs important to people in their personal lives. Witnesses appeared for many of the great American organizations devoted to humanitarian purposes. They represented a cross section of American life but they held in common a genuine and abiding interest in the welfare of people. In times marked by bitter controversy and disagreement, it is refreshing to find so many varied groups sharing a deep-rooted concern for improving the lot of the suffering and impoverished in our country. There is rightfully disagreement about the best way this can be done, but most important is the fact that we are agreed upon the need for doing it. So long as this is true, we will be able to work together in finding the best means possible.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the very able chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and his committee upon the excellent job they did in increasing the grants for the library services from $3 million provided in the President's budget request to the $5 million figure contained in this bill. It is a very important program to my State of Idaho.

I am sure no one would deny the sustained benefits that stretch out across America from this far-reaching and rewarding program. The benefits of this program are already evident in Idaho, where more than half of the population is without library services of any kind, and about 70 percent of the people have inadequate service.

The Federal funds the State has received under the Library Services Act have made possible the hiring of a State librarian and an extension librarian, with a staff of 8 full-time employees, compared with a previous staff of 4. They are providing technical assistance, advice and guidance to local libraries and groups working to improve present library service or to establish service where none now exists. A recent 2-day conference and workshop in Boise attracted more than 150 people to plan for the extension of library services in the State.

Other concrete accomplishments include:

The purchase and processing of more books in the past 6 months than in the previous 2 years.

An exhibition bookmobile now on the road.

A monthly publication which keeps program participants informed and enthusiasm high.

An allocation of Federal funds to three district libraries on a Federal-State matching basis.

The publication of revised Idaho State library laws; a compilation under way of statistical information on libraries; the establishment of interlibrary loan service with Pacific Northwest libraries, and the purchase of educational films on library services.

With such giant strides made, and with the whole program receiving wide public support, it would be heartbreaking to have it seriously cut, and the momentum lost.

Frankly, I had hoped the full $7,500,000 of authorized funds would be appropriated—perhaps the other body, the Senate—will increase the library services appropriation figure to this amount, and if so, I trust the House conferees will see their way clear to agree to the increased figure.

Mr. Chairman, we pride ourselves on being the most prosperous and progressive country in the world—the country which offers the most abundant and satisfactory living. In my opinion, we must continue to provide adequate funds each year during the life of the Library Services Act so we can keep America moving toward the goal of library service for all of our people. We must make it possible for every American to borrow and read good books for enlightenment, for education and for pleasure.

GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

I would also like to comment on another section of this bill before us—the section relating to the grants for hospital construction, a program which is administered by the Public Health Service.

I feel that the President's original request for $75 million for this program was totally inadequate, and I am glad to see that the bill as reported contains the amended budget request—$121,200,000.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the time to curtail hospital construction. There are too many areas with substandard hospitals and without hospital facilities at all. And we need the jobs that hospital construction would provide to help stem the recession.

There is a tremendous backlog of requests for hospital construction grants in Idaho. Some of the communities have floated bond issues to raise matching funds for community hospitals, while private hospitals have put on heavy money-raising drives. They are ready to go—as soon as Federal assistance is available. Earlier this session when it appeared that Hill-Burton funds would be cut in the 1959 appropriation bill by some 40 percent over the 1958 bill, there was consternation in the State.

I hope, therefore, that the full $121,200,000 will be appropriated—in fact, I should like to see the amount considerably increased, both to help meet the demand for grants and as a recession-fighting measure.

I want, also, to commend the committee for increasing by $750,000 the budget request for Indian health facilities. This is still a decrease of $6,000 over the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1958.

I sincerely hope that the shortcomings in this program can be corrected by the Public Health Service. The need for improved hospital facilities for Indians—including more and higher standard hospital beds, is desperate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL].

Mr. HASKELL. May I ask the gentleman from Rhode Island about this hospital survey construction appropriation. I see that it is about at the same level as last year. I thought, from the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, that there was an increase.

Mr. FOGARTY. The original request, at the time we held the hearings on this bill, was $75 million. The administration cut it back from $121 million to $75 million. Subsequent to that we received a supplemental request from the President asking us to raise it $46.2 million, which we did, which brings it back to the level of 1958.

Mr. HASKELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I guess probably I am kind of an old fossile; I am never satisfied with the amount of money that is carried in a bill. I have to be a little bit careful at times when I make a fight on things, but I do feel as though I owe it to the country to tell what I thought about some of these things.

In this hospital construction deal there will be about $100 million left unobligated at the end of this fiscal year, and the reason the budget cut the thing down to $75 million was because the States and the localities and the people involved did not raise the required amount of money. Generally we appropriate money that cannot be used, but here is a case where we probably have to do it because the Congress will not agree to anything else.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Just as a matter of information, the gentleman says there is $100 million unobligated.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman means the contracts have not been let, but I take it those funds have all been allocated to various projects?

Mr. TABER. After a fashion. But this matter of allocations is like the allocations we used to have to appropriate money for under foreign relief. There is nothing firm. I think there is no question that my statement is correct.

Mr. GARY. I was not questioning the gentleman's statement, but there has been so much confusion over the terms "obligations" and "allocations," I merely wanted to know if these funds have actually been allocated to particular projects.

Mr. TABER. Maybe after a fashion, but as I understand it they are not obligated until the localities have raised

the money that they set out to raise and in many other cases they are not allocated then.

Mr. GARY. I am sure the gentleman is correct. I was not questioning the correctness of the gentleman's statement; I was just trying to get the full significance of it.

Mr. TABER. The law is in such shape that the purposes for which a hospital primarily is set up for, cannot be taken care of. Of course, that is something that the Committee on Appropriations cannot get into, cannot change. But it is so fixed that a tremendous proportion of the hospitals that would get a grant under this would have to be practically the same as an old-folks' home, for chronic patients; that is, with the majority of the beds to be used for chronic patients. The purposes hospitals have always been built to take care of do not seem to count; those things they are needed for most particularly being obstetrics, traumatic injuries, broken bones, and so forth, sudden and erratic attacks of disease. Those are particularly avoided in the matters for which they will allocate money. But those are the things the hospital is fundamentally needed for. So if you want to build a hospital that is going to be any good in your community, you cannot get any grant from this kind of a setup.

I am making this statement because of experience that I have had in connection with it in my own district. I know if that is going to continue there must be some change in the situation so we can get back to building hospitals that will do some good to the public, instead of providing hospitals to take care of matters that can be taken care of in other ways, such as in old-folks' homes.

The figures on practically every single Institute under the National Institutes of Health have been increased over last year, some of them quite considerable in a percentage way. Frankly, I felt that we were getting as good results without the increases.

I am not going to offer any amendments because I recognize that the majority are in favor of more money regardless of whether it is needed or not for these particular activities, but I am calling attention to it because I think we ought to get to the point pretty quickly where we can ease off on some of this major reasearch activity.

The whole bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is $14,356,000 above the budget. It is brought down below the budget as far as the whole bill is concerned because of the reductions that were made in connection with the allotments of the States in connection with the administration of some of the activities in the Labor Department.

I think that is about all I care to say today on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses

For expense necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; $6,219,000, of which $6,093,400 shall be derived by transfer from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund, and of which $1,145,800 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 4 line 13 starting with the word "of" and continuing through the word "and" on line 16. I am not objecting to the provision to provide for the $6,093,400, but rather the way in which it is being provided.

On page 4 of this bill dealing with appropriations to the Bureau of Employment Security in the Labor Department line 14 reads as follows:

$6,093,400 shall be derived by transfer from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund.

There is no provision in substantive law authorizing the transfer of any sums from the unemployment account except to the account of a State in the unemployment trust fund, which State has applied for and been certified as eligible to receive an interest-free repayable advance for the purpose of replenishing its depleted reserve account.

The Federal unemployment account is commonly referred to as a State's loan fund. There is no valid basis for the transfer of these funds from the unemployment trust fund to take care of the expenses and salaries of the Bureau of Employment Security. This transfer contravenes the intent and purpose of the provision for the loan fund to assist the States which are in financial difficulty to continue to make benefit payments.

The Federal unemployment account is in no manner analogous to the OASI and railroad retirement trust funds, which trust funds specifically earmark all tax collections for crediting to the trust funds and specifically authorize a transfer out of these trust funds of amounts necessary to defray the cost of the OASI and railroad retirement administration.

An examination of section 904 (h), which establishes the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund, and of sections 901 and 902, which provide for the computation of any positive balance which is to go into the trust fund, and of section 903, which provides for the crediting of the positive balance to the trust fund, and of section 1201, which provides for the making of advances out of the Federal unemployment account, and of section 1202, which provides for the crediting of certain tax collections directly to the Federal unemployment account, will clearly disclose that there is no provision whatsoever for the use of funds in the Federal unemployment account except for the single and sole purpose of making repayable interest-free advances to the States.

Mr. FOGARTY. We concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under the act of July 12, 1951, as amended, $1,550,000, to be derived by transfer from the farm labor supply revolving fund: *Provided,* That reimbursement to the United States under agreements hereafter entered into pursuant to section 502 of the act of July 12, 1951, as amended, shall include all expenses of program operations except those compliance activities separately provided for herein.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. DENTON. Is the gentleman raising the point of order to the whole section?

Mr. POAGE. It is really to the provision that relates to the transfer from the farm labor supply revolving fund.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the whole section entitled "Salaries and Expenses, Mexican Farm Labor Program," lines 1 to 10 on page 9, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, we must concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, which point of order did the Chair sustain?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustained the point of order made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] directed to the entire section beginning on page 9, lines 1 to 10, inclusive.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, $7,332,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments? If not, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FORAND] having assumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, 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. 11645) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE ERECTION OF A NATIONAL MONUMENT SYMBOLIZING THE IDEALS OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I 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. 8290) to authorize the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy in the fulfillment of the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1029), an act to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 33]

Allen, Calif.	Cooley	Hosmer
Bailey	Curtis, Mo.	James
Barden	Dawson, Ill.	Jarman
Baring	Dies	Kean
Barrett	Diggs	Kilburn
Boggs	Dorn, S. C.	Krueger
Bolling	Engle	Magnuson
Brooks, La.	Flood	Morrison
Buckley	Gordon	Passman
Burdick	Grant	Patman
Celler	Gwinn	Pillion
Clark	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Coffin	Hébert	Radwan
Colmer	Holifield	Rains
Rivers	Taylor	Widnall
St. George	Thompson, La.	Willis
Scott, Pa.	Tollefson	
Sieminski	Vorys	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 367 Members have answered to their names.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING THE ERECTION OF A NATIONAL MONUMENT SYMBOLIZING THE IDEALS OF DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the consideration of the proposed legislation, H. R. 8290, on the grounds that it does not conform to, and is in fact violative of, Public Law 742, of the 83d Congress, volume 68, part I, United States Statutes.

Section 2 of Public Law 742 provides as follows:

> SEC. 2. It shall be the function of the Commission (National Monument Commission) to secure plans and designs for a useful monument to the Nation symbolizing to the United States and the world, the ideals of a democracy as embodied in the five freedoms, speech, religion, press, assembly, and petition, sanctified by the Bill of Rights adopted by Congress in 1789, and later ratified by the States. Such plans shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts, and thereafter submitted to Congress for legislative authorization.

Mr. Speaker, I emphasize the importance of the language which provides that such plans shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior and each of the Commissions authorized by law as participants in this venture, and thereafter submitted to Congress for legislative authorization.

On January 9, 1958, Mr. David E. Finley, chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, testified before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I quote from the transcript of this hearing, page 20, the following colloquy as pertinent to this point of order:

> Mr. MILLER (the gentleman from Nebraska). And you are not in a position now to take a definite stand as to whether you approve the suggested monument until you have your meeting?
>
> Mr. FINLEY. We have approved the concept or sculptural decorations of an open-air monument, but we have not approved the details of the design and could not do that until we get them from the architect.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent from Mr. Finley's testimony at the recent committee hearing that the Commission of Fine Arts has never approved the plans for the monument, in accordance with the act of August 31, 1954, and is continuing its study of the proposed monument.

It should also be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that no representative of the National Capital Planning Commission appeared at the January 9, 1958, hearing before the House committee. This Commission did submit a letter of the date of January 9, 1958, to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee from which a member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], inserted one paragraph in the transcript from which I quote the following:

> The Commission (National Capital Planning Commission) expects that the plans for the monument when further developed will be referred to it for more definitive action.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is abundantly clear that the legislation proposed for consideration at this time, H. R. 8290, does not conform to and is in violation of Public Law 742 of the 83d Congress, for the reason that Public Law 742 provides and makes mandatory that plans must be approved—there must be a meeting of the minds—of the legally constituted agencies and commissions and thereafter, and only thereafter, shall these plans be submitted to Congress for legislative authorization.

I would call your attention to the fact that Public Law 742 does not provide for agreement in principle, approval of general concept, or rendering ideas.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] had this this to say, and it is to be found in the transcript of the hearing of January 9, 1958:

> The original bill certainly makes it absolutely necessary that these two bodies (the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission) be taken into consideration before construction can be commenced, and unless that agreement is arrived at, then we certainly will have to amend the bill to provide for such cooperation.

If the act of August 31, 1954, is complied with and not violated by premature enactment of H. R. 8290, no such amendment is required.

Mr. Speaker, I insist that Public Law 742 specifically requires agreement as a precedent to legislative action, and I respectfully ask that my point of order be sustained in the interests of legal and orderly legislation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The occupant of the chair has been here a long time. He has never had the conception that one Congress could tie the hands of a later Congress and the Chair does not believe so in this case. If that doctrine were followed, then it would mean the Congress could pass a law saying, "This law shall not be touched for a number of years." Another Congress comes in and has a different idea. The Chair thinks each Congress should have the opportunity to work its will. Because somebody or some commission or some board was not heard before some committee does not seem to the Chair to have any bearing on the problem we have before us this afternoon. Furthermore, the House has already adopted a special rule for the special consideration of this bill. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

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 consideration of the bill (H. R. 8290) to

authorize the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy in the fulfillment of the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1029), "An act to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes," with Mr. ROONEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what we propose to do here this afternoon, that is those of us who sponsor this particular piece of legislation, is in conformity with the objectives spelled out by learned men—and men held in high repute in the United States—such as the following.

Judge Learned Hand has written of the project as follows:

A FITTING PORTRAYAL

We hope by a fitting portrayal of outstanding instances in which those who have gone before us staked all upon the eventual justification of that belief, that we shall fortify our own acceptance of the risks at which they did not flinch. For, make no mistake, the battle is not won: Nor will it ever be won. Each generation must decide how far it will seek refuge in eternal and immutable verities rather than grope its way through the tangle of human passions and human credulity. It is our hope that these walls by their beauty and splendor will reaffirm in those who visit them the faith of their predecessors, and inspire them with a resolve not to prove truant to their example.

The great Gen. Omar N. Bradley lends his support. The New York Times lends its support. The great leader of our Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, lends his support. Dr. Milton E. Eisenhower lends his support. So what we are proposing to do here this afternoon is in keeping with the serious thoughts of many of our great leaders.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the legislation which is now before this committee is a bill which comes before us in conformity with the provisions of Public Law 742, which was approved August 31, 1954.

The purpose of H. R. 8290 is to grant authority to the National Freedom Shrine Foundation, a nonprofit corporation, organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, to erect a monument as contemplated by Public Law 742, 83d Congress, without expense to Federal Government. The monument is to be constructed in accordance with plans approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts. It is necessary for Congress to give legislative authorization to the construction program. Stated another way, the bill has two purposes: First, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the National Freedom Shrine Foundation for the purpose of erecting a monument, and, second, to secure legislative authorization by the Congress of monument plans which have heretofore been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts. The report on H. R. 6455 which became Public Law 742 carried the following provision:

In urging approval of this proposed legislation, the Department of the Interior emphasizes that the tract described in the bill is the last available land in a line formed by the Capitol Building, the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln Memorial. The Department therefore feels that any monument erected on the site should be in the public interest and in accord with plans for the beautification of Washington, D. C. The Department feels that this aim can be attained by appointment of an impartial commission to decide on a suitable monument.

Public Law 742, 83d Congress—the authorizing legislation for the appointment of the commission for the development of plans and designs for the monument—provides definitely and specifically in section 3 of said law for the site upon which the monument is to be built and the setting aside of certain land areas for such purpose.

We do not have before us this afternoon the question of whether or not this site is to be used for this purpose. That has already been decided by section 3 of the act, which reads:

Said monument shall be located on federally owned land within the George Washington Memorial Parkway adjoining the north boundary of Arlington National Cemetery west of Arlington Ridge Road and south of Arlington Boulevard on the heights overlooking the Potomac River. The monument, upon its completion, shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

This section sets aside for the particular purpose of a site for the monument the land area known as a part of the Nevius tract which belongs to the United States. Such section also states that the monument upon its completion shall be administered by the Secretary of Interior. In other words, at the present time we are not involved in the consideration of whether or not this particular piece of land is to be used for this specific purpose. That decision was made 4 years ago.

Section 4 of Public Law 742, 83d Congress, reads as follows:

Said monument shall serve as an international shrine and a continuing memorial to the principles of the five freedoms and to all peoples and nations who have contributed to the establishment, promotion, and defense of those principles in the preservation of democracy throughout the world. It may include an appropriate structure or structures to house cultural displays and exhibits or symbolic features of national and international significance designed to accomplish the objectives of section 2 of this act.

This section provides for the kind of monument that is to be constructed and the particular use which is to be made of it.

The other provisions of Public Law 742, 83d Congress, authorize the appointment of a commission to make certain studies and to report back to Congress with the plans considered and approved by the governmental agencies designated in section 2 of said law.

Acting in conformity with the provisions of Public Law 742, 83d Congress, the National Monument Commission was organized in 1955. Since its organization the following Members of the House have served on the Commission by appointment of the Speaker: the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Smith; the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Aspinall; the gentleman from Washington, Mr. Westland; the gentleman from Wisconsin, the late Mr. Smith; the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. St. George; and the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Jones.

Serving at different times with these Members of the House were the following Members of the other body: United States Senator William Kerr Scott, United States Senator Richard Neuberger, United States Senator George H. Bender, United States Senator John Sherman Cooper, and United States Senator Gordon Allott.

Serving with the group above mentioned were the following men from civilian life: Mr. Spencer T. Olin, of Illinois; Mr. Don Belding, of California; Mr. Thomas H. Barton, of Arkansas; and Mr. Hugh Moss Comer, of Alabama.

During the early part of 1957 the National Monument Commission gave its approval to designs and plans which were delivered to the other agencies of Government from which Public Law 742, 83d Congress, demanded approval. The National Capital Planning Commission approved such plans on April 5, 1957. The President of the United States approved such plans on May 15, 1957. Thereafter on February 6, 1958, the National Commission of Fine Arts approved the plans which have been forwarded by the National Monument Commission to the Speaker of the House. The Secretary of the Interior approved the plans on February 25, 1958. The United States Senate approved such plans when they passed S. 2363 on August 23, 1957.

The designs and plans as approved by the other agencies of Government and the other body are contained in this brochure which I hold in my hand. Such plans call for a monument of beauty and especially fitting for the purpose to which it is to be dedicated. The committee report on H. R. 8290 states:

As planned by the Commission, the freedom shrine will depict American history chronologically, stressing the continuity of events and the manner in which the ideals and aspirations of one generation have affected and inspired the next. It is contemplated that the walls of the structure would portray, on their granite surfaces, impressive inscriptions of great distinction, imperishable phrases chosen from our past, and, in high relief, groups of figures, episodes, and events of our Nation's history. Starting with the age of discovery, the monument plan includes in chronological order around the interior walls, a succession of sculptured figures in groups depicting, in a narrative manner, the highlights of our Nation's history. Adequate space would be reserved upon the monument walls for similar treatment of future historic events and persons in order that future generations may add to the history of our way of life in this proposed freedom shrine.

Present plans provide for a monument the walls of which will be 81 feet 6 inches high, 131 feet wide and 378 feet long. The walls are to be of a thickness of approximately 6 feet and the outer and inner wall coverings are to be made of granite or marble. Upon its walls will be depicted the country's history. There is to be no roof over the edifice. The interior court is to house sculpturing which will be in keeping with the sculpturing to be done on the walls. Particular attention is to be given to setting forth the principles of the various freedoms as enumerated in the Bill of Rights.

Sufficient parking space is to be provided for visitors and will be provided in such a manner that it will not destroy the beauty of that part of the Mall or the area surrounding it. Outside landscaping will be provided for so that the west end of the Mall will become a matter of beauty in keeping with the various other installations placed in the Mall west of the National Capital.

Mr. Chairman, with the passage of this legislation and approval by the President of the United States the Secretary of the Interior will become the guardian of the interests of all the people in this great memorial to the American way of life. He will see to it that the contributions are protected and spent wisely and effectively. He will see to it that those who are placed in charge of the construction activities discharge their responsibilities honorably and ably. He will see to it that the Federal Government is not requested to expend Federal funds on construction operations. I sincerely believe that all people are fully protected and that someday—not perhaps in your time or my time—what we provide for here today shall become one of the really great monuments and inspirational shrines of all times.

The budget which is proposed for the construction of this great monument is broken down into two phases:

	1st phase, 15 months	2d phase, 36 months
Foundation proper	$405,000	----------
Plumbing	90,000	----------
Electrical work	180,000	----------
Roofing, waterproofing	180,000	----------
Court treatment	540,000	$1,260,000
External landscaping, ground treatment	90,000	----------
Parking area	90,000	----------
Basic walls—granite or marble	3,690,000	----------
Sculptoring	----------	7,245,000
Administration, designs, models, fees	450,000	450,000
Historical policy supervision	36,000	81,000
Legal, accounting, fiscal	27,000	63,000
Fund development, national promotion, educational materials	243,000	----------
Phase total	6,021,000	9,099,000
Total	15,120,000	

Mr. Chairman, I have heard statements to the effect that the Veterans of Foreign Wars oppose this program.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to read a telegram which I received, dated February 14, addressed to me, as follows:

Veterans of Foreign Wars was not responsible for preparation and distribution of so-called urgent brochure against H. R. 8290 recently distributed to all members House Interior Committee. Veterans of Foreign Wars primarily concerned with needed expansion of Arlington National Cemetery rather than waging fight against a freedom wall. We are not trying to promote any rental housing projects in that area or to pull anyone's chestnuts out of the fire.

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Veterans of Foreign Wars,
National Legislative Representative.

Mr. Chairman, that is what the Veterans of Foreign Wars has stated. Of course, they realize that the space which is now occupied by the Arlington Cemetery is being used up very rapidly and they know there will be need for other space. If they have any interest at all in this particular tract of land it might be that it could be used as a cemetery. But the law has already been approved that this is to be used for the purposes of a national monument.

May I say that, as I understand it, the area involved in this particular shrine program will not take care of graves for veterans who wish to be buried in this cemetery for a period of over 1 year to 18 months. In other words, this particular small area would be more or less a palliative to what is troubling those who are looking forward to adding to the Arlington National Cemetery grounds. We shall be compelled to go to other places for more land to do any good for what may be required for additional grave space in that area.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. As the gentleman knows, I have a rather vague interest in the Marine Memorial on Raising the Flag on Iwo Jima that is located near to where this monument or shrine is to be constructed. My question is, Could the gentleman advise us as to whether or not there is any opposition from the Marine Memorial Association to this site?

Mr. ASPINALL. No; there is no opposition from the Marine Memorial Association. They, in fact, have looked over what is proposed for this whole site and they are favorable to it. The bells from the Netherlands will be placed to the south of the proposed monument and the Iwo Jima Memorial stands to the north of it. These three will therefore make an integrated area for the purposes for which these particular shrines or monuments are to be used.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Do I understand from the gentleman's statement that the Veterans of Foreign Wars and any other veterans' organizations have withdrawn their objection to this proposal?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado is not able to give an affirmative answer to that. All I said is that, as far as I know, there is no opposition at all from the American Legion or from any other organization of veterans and that the Veterans of Foreign Wars have stated their opposition, if any, to be based on the plans which they presently support, to increase the acreage for the Arlington Cemetery.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, the Veterans of Foreign Wars did protest the use of this land for the purposes the gentleman has stated?

Mr. ASPINALL. There were those who did, but it was not for the purposes for which it was stated. The protest was for a different purpose.

Mr. REES of Kansas. My understanding is that the Veterans of Foreign Wars objected because they wanted to preserve this land for the Arlington National Cemetery?

Mr. ASPINALL. They realize that the Arlington National Cemetery must be increased and if this land were available they would like to have it for that purpose. However, this land is not available for that purpose because by act of Congress the purpose for which the land is to be used has already been established.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If this legislation is not approved, then it might be used for that purpose?

Mr. ASPINALL. Congress might pass another act, yes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman care to advise us whether he thinks the necessary approval from the various Government agencies that have responsibility with reference to this matter is sufficient to justify action by the Congress at this time?

Mr. ASPINALL. I personally believe that it has. We have in our files a letter from the Secretary of the Interior and we have a letter of transmittal in this brochure, which is prima facie evidence of approval. We also have a verbal decision from the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior to the effect that the procedures already had are sufficient.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado has certainly given the committee a thorough explanation of this legislation. I firmly believe that he is the best informed man on this subject in the Congress. I know that he has attended all of these meetings and has found out everything that there is to be learned on this subject. There actually is probably little I can add to what he has said.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the thought of a Freedom Shrine is something that this committee and this Congress should be willing to agree to. We have built monuments in this nation to men. We have the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and the Jefferson Memorial and many others, all dedicated to men of history in this country. But, so far as I know, nothing has ever been built which in one area will combine the ideals and the expression of the history of this Nation. This is not an idle matter, in my opinion. We wish to erect in one place the history of this Nation and what this Nation stands for; her five freedoms, and what they

mean. This Nation was the first nation to ever dignify the individual and the rights of the individual. We have fought for these things over the 175 years that we have been in existence. This would all be concentrated in one place. Certainly I realize that the people who are interested can go to the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument, the Library of Congress, and many other places that we have here in Washington, D. C., or other cities and through visitation to those places can find out about this country and what our trials and tribulations have been, but in no one place are all these things brought together. Now, this is not something that is going to be built overnight. It is admitted that this may take 20 to 30 years before the carvings and the friezes and the reliefs are finally put on these walls.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Washington if this bill is not adequately safeguarded; in other words, the Government does not retain the right to refuse the project and if the money is not raised, the right to reject the same.

Mr. WESTLAND. Yes. The gentleman is quite correct. This must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The legislation merely authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract with the Freedom Shrine Foundation. That is all it does. It is up to the Secretary to see that adequate funds are available before construction ever starts.

Mr. MARTIN. That is, from private sources.

Mr. WESTLAND. Completely from private sources. It is stated in the bill that this monument will not be built at any expense to the United States. The contributions will come from the school children of the country and the public and not from the Treasury in any manner.

Mr. MARTIN. I would think, then, as the gentleman explains it, that it would be another historic monument for our Washington visitors to see, and it would be erected at no cost to the Government. I further understand that this land cannot be utilized for military purposes even if the monument is not erected.

Mr. WESTLAND. That is correct. The land has already been dedicated for this purpose. I might also add that President Eisenhower was the first contributor to this freedom shrine. Two hundred and twenty-one State supreme court justices, some probably from every State in the Union, have approved this project.

To me it is interesting that this is being built next to the Iwo Jima Memorial and that the Commandant of the Marine Veterans' Organization has approved the location of this freedom shrine.

I believe this Congress will be doing the right thing in authorizing the construction of a shrine dedicated to the ideals of a republic such as ours.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] for his courtesy in yielding me this time, because he knows that I am very definitely opposed to the enactment of this proposed legislation. This opportunity the gentleman has given me to express my views is definitely appreciated.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Members of the House if they know that this particular group did not give birth to this operation just at this moment. In fact, this monument was planned for the top of one of the beautiful, rugged mountains in that great State of Georgia. Now it is being brought to the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

Some of the then promoters collected over a quarter of a million dollars and then the project was abandoned because no more contributions were available in that area.

Mr. Chairman, if there is any question in your mind, I suggest that you read the Senate hearings held in August of 1957 on S. 2363 under the title "The Freedom Monument." Of course, we all know that this operation has been more or less agitated since 1930. The report of the Senate Committee, which preceded most of the Members here by a great many years, is interesting. Of course, I appreciate the ruling of the Speaker when he said that each Congress has the right to assert its legislative prerogatives as each of the preceding Congresses have done. However, I am going to quote what these wise old men said in those days because I think it is worthy of your consideration.

> In particular, the noble slopes toward the river should be rigorously protected against the invasion of monuments which utterly annihilate the sense of beauty and repose. This is one of the most beautiful spots in the vicinity of Washington. It should not be defaced or touched in any way and a law or rule should at once be passed forbidding the placing of any monuments on this hill.

When our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was conducting hearings, on January 9, Mr. Finley, of the Fine Arts Commission, made the following statement:

> When the tract was first acquired by the Government, it was proposed to build a hospital there, but we felt it would stand up against the skyline and would be rather ugly from the Lincoln Memorial. At that time it was suggested that the tract be thrown into Arlington National Cemetery to protect that area. * * * Yes. In the beginning when we first acquired the tract, that was the position of the Fine Arts Commission, that it ought to be incorporated in that area (Arlington National Cemetery).

While my very able friend who is in charge of this bill in making his presentation said he felt that Congress was committed, I cannot agree with his concept. I do not believe this Congress is committed to the degree that his comments impressed me as meaning. If we were committed, then obviously the bill the gentleman has before us is unnecessary. However, we all have a right to have specific opinions, and I respect the gentleman from Colorado very much, reserving the right, of course, to have my own.

To indicate what I have in my mind, for the benefit of the Members I should like to call attention to the third line on page 2 of the bill, and I quote:

> *Provided*, That the United States shall be put to no expense in the erection of this monument: *Provided further*, That unless the erection of this national monument is begun within 5 years from and after the date of passage of this act, the authority hereby granted is revoked.

In order that we may further understand the opinions of the people who are presenting this issue for the acquiescence of the Congress and some of the statements that have been made by which there might be some misconstruction, I have just read you the comments about the expenditure category as expressed in the bill we are considering, H. R. 8290. Now I read the following excerpt that was taken from the hearings in August 1957, on S. 2363. I quote in part the testimony of those who were presenting their case to the Senate:

> Everything except the "erection" of wall will be at Government expense. Taxpayers committed to pay for landscaping and so forth.

I think that perhaps the people who have served in this august body far longer than I have know that we have had two outstanding monumental experiences on the Mall in Washington by public contributions, wherein they both fell on the seat of their financial trousers and went into a state of oblivion at the expense of the Government.

I am not saying that this will follow that process, but I should like to ask you what guarantee there is in the bill if we the Congress should by the enactment of this legislation be providing every promoter, irrespective of who he may be, with the background of acquiescence by the Government to go out and collect money from the great American public without in turn assuming the responsibility of accountability back to the Congress. There is not one word in the bill that will do that, and the author knows it.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I have in my hand a copy of a letter under date of February 5, 1958, from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Just a minute. I know what the gentleman is going to read. May I say to you that the gentleman who is presently the Secretary of the Interior is a wonderful gentleman. His commitment, however, through a letter is not a component part of this bill, and he will not do anything and should not do anything that is not incorporated in the law, or the intent of Congress which is the directions for him to operate under.

Mr. ASPINALL. A component part of the law is that the Secretary must enter into an agreement before any construction takes place or anything happens as

far as this monument is concerned. Mr. Chilson happens to be the Under Secretary of Interior. I also have in my hand a letter dated March 19, 1958, from Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I know, but may I call my friend's attention to one thing: When he speaks of the gentleman in the Secretary's office, he is the same gentleman who made the statement in the Senate that this had been cleared by the commissions, and that was erroneous.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did not the Speaker within the half hour, when the point of order was raised by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], rule that this Congress could not bind a future one, and they could come along any time they got ready?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct, we should interpret the ruling as to what is intended, and not be steered down a blind alley by a letter from somebody in the office of the Secretary of Interior.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Will the gentleman point out to the committee the responsibility that would rest upon the Federal Government in the event the contribution was not sufficient to construct the project? The gentleman has expressed great fear and apprehension, and I am quite sure that he is armed with citations to give the committee that will support his proposal.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I should like to answer the gentleman as nearly accurate as I can by saying that any time a public operation of this character is instituted by an act of Congress, if the law within itself spells out the liability of those who are operating in a private category versus that of the Government, then it is obvious. But, in the meantime what is going to happen to you and me as Members of this House?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I asked the gentleman from California to cite to us the law where he says that the responsibility will be the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It will be the responsibility of the Federal Government, if they wish to leave it in status quo or to build it. In other words, what are you going to do if you have a wall up there 60 feet high and it is not completed. Is the Federal Government or are the Members of the Congress going to leave that eyesore there or are we going to supply the money to complete it?

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I sincerely hope that it will be adopted today without too much difficulty. As has already been pointed out, this matter was originated in the 83d Congress. It has proceeded under the guidance of eminent people in this country, people of outstanding capacity, undoubted integrity, and patriotism. The members of the Congressional committee are well known to us and I am sure all of us will agree, they are people to be trusted. Certainly, they are to be respected not only so far as the pending matter is concerned, but in all matters.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. In fact, this proposal started in the 82d Congress when the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] introduced a bill setting aside this land for this particular purpose. That is how far back it goes.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman. That had slipped my mind for the moment. I might say also, Mr. Chairman, as a result of discussions I have had with the President personally in recent weeks, I can say to you that he is very hopeful for the enactment of this legislation. The gentleman from California raises the question of cost. I cannot conceive of any interpretation of the action to be taken here today that could in any way bind any future Congress to provide the money, if it cannot be raised in the way provided in the legislation. In other words, we have no obligation and we are not committed to provide the money, if the money cannot be raised by voluntary contribution. On the contrary, every indication is that the money must be raised by contribution or the project falls. Let me point out, fundamentally, why I am for this and why I think we should all be for it.

I do not think I need to remind you that the troubles which confront us are the direct result of a great struggle that is being carried on between the free peoples and the slave peoples of the world. We know that arrayed against us are the people who are slaves of governments. As we meet them in contest after contest, there are on our side arrayed the people of the freedom-loving countries, people who believe in freedom and live under freedom.

I happen to believe that our system is the best system and that it will do the most good for the most people. As a matter of fact, I know and you know that every time our free system has been put to the test in war or in peace, the free people have won.

Now if we know that, does it not follow that our people must believe in freedom? They must understand and appreciate its greatness. They must know how it benefits them. What is this thing that we call "freedom"? This shrine is designed to help establish in the hearts and minds of our people an understanding and knowledge of what freedom really is.

This country of ours is the greatest stronghold of liberty anywhere in the world. Where but in the Capital of the United States could you better locate such a shrine as is here contemplated? By the hundreds of thousands every year, schoolchildren and grown people flock into Washington.

I shall never forget the first time I came to this city, a youngster from college, coming into Union Station in the nighttime and walking over in front of the Capitol and looking at that lighted dome. I felt a thrill inside of me that did something to me that no reading in any history book ever did.

Even yet, when I go down to the Lincoln Memorial and stand in the presence of that great emancipator and read the words, "In this temple, as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union, the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever," that means something to me. The same thing is true when I look at the Washington Monument and the Jefferson Memorial, and when I go to Philadelphia and look at Independence Hall and Constitution Hall. Yes, or when I go down to Williamsburg and see there the restorations that remind me of the great struggles that have gone on in this country in order that we could be free.

Now, what is proposed here is to have another great symbol of freedom; another great symbol to be seen by all the people who come here to the Capital of this great Nation, and to be there again impressed with the great wonders that we know as a free people, stimulating them and stimulating us, if you please, to continue our struggles for freedom and for freedom-loving peoples here at home and wherever else they may be.

Just one other matter. I realize that when anything like this is undertaken there may be differences of opinion as to just what ought to be constructed. There would also be differences of opinion as to where it should be located. I wish sometimes, for instance, in the District of Columbia somebody would decide where route 240 is to come into the District of Columbia. It would help me and a lot of us who have to drive from here to the West.

Now, here it seems to me the right solution has been found, an area where this shrine will fit in with the other great shrines in Washington and become a part of the Nation's Capital. There could be no better place. I cannot think of any better purpose to which that tract could be put than the one that is here contemplated. So I earnestly hope we can go ahead with the adoption of this resolution. We have delayed so long that the people who are in charge of raising this money, willing to contribute of their time on this very worthy enterprise, may well be discouraged. Let us get this legislation passed so that they can get underway with the collection of the money, and in our time we can see how great this shrine will be.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I share in the great concept of freedom. It is one of the most magnificent things in the world. I believe that we should not "goof" again. We should not gamble. Let you and I vote to put up the money for them to build it, and then I will go along with you.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman knows my great regard for him. I can see in that observation many possibilities. I just happen to believe that if this great shrine is made by voluntary contributions, collected from across this

broad land of ours, many of them made in very small amounts by youngsters who one day will come down here and see this shrine, it will better belong to the people of the country.

It will mean far more if built that way than if we appropriate the money; and I might say further to our friend the gentleman from California that it looks as if we have got to make plenty of appropriations without this one.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the general objective of this legislation. Most certainly any memorial or monumental shrine which would serve as a reminder of our five precious freedoms is a great thing, a wonderful thing; and I would like to commend the commission that developed the plans and program up to this point and particularly the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], who is the sponsor of this legislation.

There are, however, certain objections raised by many of the residents of the community in which the Freedom Memorial is proposed to be erected, and I believe many of the objections of those residents caused delay in considering this legislation when it was on the Consent Calendar last year. Since that time I have received many letters and petitions from the residents of this community, voicing various objections to it.

I do not believe that the Congress wants to ignore completely the wishes and the will of the community in which they propose to construct a project. I think all of my colleagues will agree with me that I cannot afford to ignore it; it would not only be politically stupid, but it would also be inconsistent with the principles of good representative government. On the other hand, I want to recognize and do recognize that each community—not only this one, Arlington, but all communities for that matter—that make up this so-called National Capital area have certain responsibilities by being a part of this National Capital area. We most certainly come before Congress from time to time reminding the Congress of its responsibility to us, since the Federal Government is the principal industry in this area. We feel that it is a two-edged sword that cuts both ways. Certainly when things like this come up we should and are willing to make certain compromises and certain sacrifices so that the Federal Government can expand and improve its operations if they are properly done, and if the Congress desires to do so. Therefore, we do not want to take a "dog in the manger" attitude or a negative approach every time a matter such as this comes up.

In order to work out a workable solution I took the position of counseling with the principal objectors to this legislation to find out specifically what their objections were, because we do not want to ignore them. As a result of these consultations I plan to propose here four minor amendments which I believe will remove practically all the principal objections of the citizens of the area where this monument is proposed to be located.

First. I propose to offer an amendment requiring consultation with the local governing body. In this case it would be the County Board of Arlington, Va. The Chairman of the Commission agreed that that would be acceptable; in fact, he volunteered to consult with the official governing body. Although the people of Arlington did want the right to approve the final plans, it was agreed that it would probably establish an undesirable precedent of giving the local governing body the power of veto over Congress, so that is the reason that in the amendment we have provided merely for the right of consultation.

Second. There is a question as to whether or not the Fine Arts Commission, the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Planning Commission does have the right to have the final approval of the final plans. I think the legislation says "plans as approved." We would like to make certain that they have one final look at those plans before construction is started if changes are made to the plans and when the plans are completed.

Third. We want to make sure that the monument is not commenced and then left half completed for several years. We would like to suggest an amendment that construction not be started until all the funds are made available to assure completion of the project.

Fourth. We feel that the height of 90 feet, since it is more or less a blank wall, is entirely too high. It is nonconforming with the zoning regulations in the surrounding area. If a 90-foot wall was built there, it would be objectionable to residents in the surrounding area and they could force the county board to permit construction of buildings of that height immediately behind the proposed monument area. This would be most undesirable insofar as the effect on the Mall area is concerned.

I do hope that the Congress will consider these valid and reasonable objections which have been voiced by some of the people who are affected by this legislation and whom I have the honor to represent.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am a little puzzled to know what all the shouting is really about. I do not think that there has been clearly stated any reasonable opposition to this bill that ought to prevent its passage. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], I assume from his remarks, is for the bill with certain amendments. He will have the opportunity to offer his amendments. I am favorably inclined toward his suggestions, but I think most of them are covered by the legislation itself.

What I want to do is to go back a little bit on this thing to its origin. As you know, the city of Washington was laid out over a century and a half ago. It was laid out with great care by great landscape artists and architects. It was provided that certain great monuments should occupy certain positions in relation to other great monuments. So one of those great monumental sites, as selected by all of the Commissions on Fine Arts for the District, is the site which is now under consideration, a site that is in line with the Capitol, the Monument, the Lincoln Memorial.

This land under discussion was acquired by the Government and this particular site is a part of that ground. The 83d Congress set up this program. Congress passed a law and I do not think there was a voice in Congress or out of Congress opposing this wonderful idea in this time of great stress in the world to have a monument that would stimulate thought and stimulate activity and organization for the great freedoms for which this country stands.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all of a sudden, for no apparent reason, there arises all of this objection to a thing that the Congress has already done without a single voice being raised against it.

Congress settled the question that you are talking about now, whether this monument should be located there, and Congress settled the question whether this monument should be built, and Congress settled the question as to what organizations within the District and within the Federal Government should have control of the type of architecture and the construction and the administration of this monument after it is constructed. Now, why all the shouting? The Act of Congress, which you passed unanimously, if I recollect correctly, provides that this monument shall be built upon this particular site and authorized its construction, subject to approval by certain Government agencies, and this provision which completes the authorization still provides that it shall be subject to approval of these same agencies. Now, I just wonder, as I said before, what all the shouting is about. I have been told that the American Legion objects to it. Now, understand, my friends, that this is a site for one of the great monuments to be erected in Washington. It is not a site for a cemetery. It will never be used as a cemetery, and there is not enough ground there to be any good as an extension of the Arlington Cemetery. So, I cannot think that that is the serious purpose behind this sudden inspiration against this bill. I am more likely to think that some of the constituents of my good friend and associate, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], who own property in that neighborhood, have some idea that it will affect their values or their view of the Potomac River or the city of Washington, because that seems to be where this noise originated. Now, incidentally, as a Virginian, I would not want to do anything to harm the gentleman's constituents, who used to be mine; they are very valuable constituents and very fine people, but the fact remains that I have not heard one logical reason for Congress to reverse itself completely and undo something that they did by unanimous approval just 2 years ago.

I happened to be one of the members of that commission, and I do want to say this before I close. This commission was

composed of 4 Members of the House and 4 Members of the Senate and 4 members appointed by President Eisenhower, all eminent citizens. I served with them for 2 years. At the expiration of that time my engagements here in the Congress were such that I was not able to give further time. But, I do want to say that I never served with a group of more dedicated, patriotic, high typed citizens than the four men that the President appointed to go on this commission. And, if you have any fears about what is going to happen to the money or whether these people's patriotism is all right, or whether they are good Americans, just please forget it.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. The gentleman raised a question a minute ago about this furor that has been raised. In view of the fact that this monument is going to be erected by public subscription, would the gentleman support an amendment that the Secretary of the Interior will not allow construction to start until the funds are available?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, I can speak for no one but myself, but I do think that some restriction such as you propose ought to be put in. We do not want an unfinished monument out there, and I hope some amendment that will clarify that can be made.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I did want to say to my colleagues that I was chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 83d Congress when we reported the original bill which made this possible today. It did start in the 82d Congress when the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] had a bill in to set aside this tract for a freedom shrine. It is nothing new for Congress to authorize freedom shrines of different kinds. Even a cowboy shrine was authorized last year. That was located, I believe, in Oklahoma. We sent one or two Members of Congress down last year for the dedication of this cowboy shrine.

Here is a shrine that is not going to cost the Government one penny. It is so provided in the bill. It comes under the direct supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.

This matter was considered by eight Members of Congress and other distinguished citizens who were appointed by the President, the machinery set up that made it possible to have a freedom shrine built to symbolize the five freedoms of the United States.

This is to be on Federally owned land. It will not cost the Government one penny. If anyone wants to sponsor an amendment requiring that the funds must be on hand before construction starts, I would see nothing wrong in that. But certainly here in the Nation's Capital we should be able to erect a monument to the five freedoms that would be there for the rest of the world to see, for the schoolchildren and the visitors who come to the Nation's Capital.

I can understand the opposition of some of the citizens of that community, people who may have some land in the area to sell for residential purposes. I assume they offered the same resistance when that large apartment house was built within a few blocks of this area. Some people do not like apartment houses in a residential section. They do not like to have other buildings placed where they might obstruct some of the view. But we must forget some of our selfish interests in promoting what seems to be the best interests of the country.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I wholeheartedly agree in what he has said. I was particularly interested in the provision on the second page of the bill which says that the United States shall be put to no expense in the erection of this monument. Of course, an amendment to the effect that no Congress should ever have to contribute anything to this monument would be fine, but that cannot be done, as one Congress cannot bind a succeeding Congress. But this should be plain enough to any future Congress that there was no intent in this Congress that funds should be provided by the Federal Government for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill under the circumstances will pass.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOYLE. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman one question. I have studied the previous act of 1954 and there is nothing in that act on the question whether or not the more than twenty-three-odd million dollars is to be raised on a commission basis. My question is whether or not the solicitors of this money from American schoolchildren are to get any percentage of commission on the sums they collect.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am not able to answer that question.

Mr. DOYLE. Should it not be put down very clearly in writing in this legislation that they are not to collect money on a commission or percentage basis? I am certainly opposed to their being paid on a commission basis on moneys contributed by the schoolchildren of the United States. This is neither appropriate nor dignified nor in the interest of sound solicitation of such funds.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is possible that some member of the Commission may be able to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. DOYLE. It is expected that the Federal Government is not to be out any expense, but in subdivision (e) of the act of 1954 authorizing the creation of this Commission it is expressly provided that any Federal agency can make any investment of its own funds without reimbursement from this Commission That language is expressly provided in the act authorizing this Commission in 1954.

Another thing is, I notice that in the act of 1954 the Commissioners appointed from private life get $50 a day for acting as Commissioners. This is not very public spirited, is it? Is that money to come out of the contributions from the schoolchildren of the United States? If it is, I am opposed to it also. I am not opposed to the high and worthy objectives of the bill. Our committeemen are to be complimented on their work.

Will someone answer those questions?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. After all, the Secretary of the Interior is to have the responsibility of deciding what is in that contract. He will not permit—at least I can not imagine any Secretary of the Interior who would permit—any organization or group of men to make a lot of money to which they are not entitled while working in any fund raising campaign which may be necessary.

As far as the amounts to be paid to those people who would serve as Commissioners or advisers, that also would be up to the Secretary of the Interior. Most certainly they would have a right to be paid for their time. They should not be paid out of the construction fund, of course, and I do not expect that any Secretary of the Interior would ever permit it to be done.

Mr. DOYLE. Subdivision (b) of the original act of 1954 specifies that these Commissioners from private life shall receive $50 a day, and that means for part of a day the way it is construed in law and practical application. This monument project must be kept on the highest possible level of fund solicitation.

Mr. ASPINALL. The Commissioners have already served. They have not received one dime for expense money. The National Mounment Commission will go out of existence as such upon the approval of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to grant authority to The National Freedom Shrine Foundation, Inc., to erect a monument as contemplated by the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1029), in accordance with plans and designs as approved by the National Monument Commission, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Secretary of the Interior, and the National Commission of Fine Arts, but subject to all the provisions of the said act of August 31, 1954: *Provided*, That the United States shall be put to no expense in the erection of this monument: *Provided further*, That unless the erection of this national monument is begun within 5 years from and after the date of passage of this act, the authority hereby granted is revoked.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "The" and insert "the."

Line 5, strike out "Incorporated," and insert "a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL: On page 2, line 5, immediately after "monument," insert: *"Provided further,* That the erection of this monument shall not be begun until the Secretary of the Interior has found that sufficient funds are available to insure its construction, not including work of artistry."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Would the gentleman be willing to strike out those words, "not including work of artistry" and have the period put immediately after the word "construction"?

The reason I make this request is that this work will be done, of course, over the next 50, 60 or 75 years. The work of construction, the completing of the wall, the landscaping, the providing of parking spaces, and so forth, are all matters of construction. I am in perfect accord with what the gentleman is attempting to do, but if he includes the phrase "work of artistry" he may limit it so that sculptors and other like workers who are going to be putting the lessons of history on this great wall will not be permitted to finish the work.

I think it would be better if those words were omitted. May I offer what I believe to be contemplated in this work and it will be determined before the final contract is arrived at and that is the expenditure of a little bit over $15 million depending on whether or not they use marble or granite. The work that is necessary to the construction of the monument itself and to the landscaping and to provide parking space will cost approximately $6 million.

Mr. BROYHILL. Is the gentleman asking that those words be omitted?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes.

Mr. BROYHILL. I will agree to that because, as the gentleman knows, the amendment as I originally proposed it, stated that it would not be constructed until sufficient funds were available to assure its completion. Of course, I recognize that certain works of ornamentation will take years following the completion of the superstructure. The main thing I wanted to do was to assure that they would not start the construction of the so-called superstructure with a limited amount of funds and then have it half completed standing out there as an unsightly monstrosity for a number of years causing pressure to be put upon the Congress to appropriate the balance of the funds for its completion. If we eliminate the words that the gentleman has suggested and then leave it to read to assure its construction, and that is intended to mean the superstructure, I would agree to the words being deleted.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that those words be deleted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado. So long as this restricting language would not apply to artistry and to subsequent decorations that will go into this shrine, the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia would be completely acceptable. I believe it is presently within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and that he would take care of that sort of thing. But, if this type of amendment gives a greater assurance to the gentleman from Virginia, I would be in thorough accord.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment and to reoffer it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL]?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the gentleman wants to withdraw his amendment and then offer another amendment?

Mr. BROYHILL. Yes, the same identical amendment but leaving out the words "and including work of artistry."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that H. R. 8290 has been scheduled for House action because we do not have all of the facts surrounding this project and are unable at this late date to get them. In the first place, this is one of the few bills presented to the House by any committee where hearings have been held and the hearings are not published or available to the membership. I have read the hearings because a friend of mine, living in the proposed area of the Freedom Monument, bought a copy of the hearings and gave it to me to read. I became interested in this project only after this friend told me, when I returned this year, that he had placed his home on the market for sale and I asked him why and he told me about this monument that was going to be erected in front of his property—a wall 90 feet high. I determined to secure such information as possible for myself about the plans and specifications of this monument and the history of it, and I found some very astonishing things.

There is no question in my mind but that the plans contemplated in Public Law 742 of the 83d Congress have not been approved, as so ably outlined by the gentleman from Iowa, simply because no such plans exist. In the committee report you will note that the monument is to be a roofless structure 500 feet long, 250 feet wide, and 90 feet high. Now that has all been changed. Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Associate Director of the National Capitol Parks and Secretary of the National Monument Commission, testified before the committee as follows: On page 55, the gentlewoman from Idaho asked him the height of the monument above the ground and he replied:

Eighty-one feet.

Mrs. PFOST. That is 9 feet short of the original structure.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is right. I should add to that that the structure has been depressed upon the site an additional 5 feet. That is, of course, subject to change and one of the very important considerations that I had to deal with yesterday in my talks with the consulting engineers that we have asked to develop it is to consider further depressing and to provide for complete hiding of all automobiles by putting them all underground. There will not be any parking obvious anywhere.

Mrs. PFOST. Apparently this model is actually only 4 feet short of the original 90 feet proposed.

Mr. THOMPSON. No; you have to keep in view that it is substantially more than 5 feet. I would like to ask you not to hold us to that because our effort will be to further reduce it and depress it.

As near as I can find out, the height has not only been reduced but the entire monument has been reduced materially. I understand now that it will be about 300 feet long and something like 125 feet wide. All of this testimony was in January 1958, when Roger Ernst, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, states the plans were approved in August 1957. You get almost as many dimensions as the number of people you talk to.

I know that there was no ulterior motive on the part of the gentleman from Colorado in not having these hearings printed, but I must say that if these hearings were printed and available to the membership, I doubt if very many of the Members would vote for this freedom memorial at this time.

Another example—there is nothing new about this monument. It has been under study for many years. It was first proposed in New York and then later moved to Georgia, where it was to be erected on Pine Mountain and the legislature, as I understand it, set aside some 2,000 acres on which this Hall of History, as it was then called, was to be erected. Mr. Ralph Kaul, chairman of the county board at Arlington, Va., brought this out in his testimony and I read from page 60 of the hearing:

This is in the scale of the monument as explained and discussed before the Senate Committee, and represents the original proposal. I am pleased to learn from the testimony here today that the size of the monument seems to change and in the right direction. It seems to grow smaller with each hearing and I would like to raise the question with the committee: Is the reason for the huge size of this monument that it was actually planned for a high plateau on Pine Mountain, Georgia, and transplanted without any significant changes to this much smaller site in the heart of Arlington County and our National Capital area? I have here, Madame Chairman, the "National Sculpture Review" dated Fall, 1953, and the pictures in this magazine show this monument as you see it here, as you see it as published in the newspapers when the somewhat belated hearing in the Senate was held. The description of the memorial is in these pages for the 1953 edition for Georgia.

At the end of his testimony on page 72, Mr. Kaul asked as follows about the National Sculpture Review:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. With your permission, I would like to put in the record the article I referred to in my testimony.

Mr. ASPINALL. Reserving the right to object, I shall object if it is put in the record, but I shall be happy to have it in the file and our report.

I can find nothing in the report about this article from the National Sculpture Review of 1953 and apparently this testimony was the first time that the gentleman from Colorado had heard of the Georgia project because I quote now from the testimony of Mr. John Harbeson, the consulting architect for the Freedom Shrine. On page 76 quoting Mr. ASPINALL:

You heard Mr. Kaul's reference to the Georgian site. I do not know. This is the first time it has ever been brought up. To me it does not make much difference whether that is true or not, but do you know anything about whether or not in the beginning such an edifice as this was planned for a site in Georgia?

Mr. HARBESON. I know further than that, sir. I have been connected with this memorial back in that time. The concept of this history of our Nation's principles developed long before any site in Georgia was considered.

This lack of knowledge of the Georgia project seems incredible, because its existence became an important part of the hearing conducted by the other body in August 1957.

As a matter of fact, this monument was first promoted way back in the thirties or sometime like that for the city of New York. Now this promotion in Georgia raises several points.

First. How many are there now connected with the National Freedom Shrine Foundation who were connected with the Georgia promotion which failed?

Second. How much money did they raise, and what happened to it? In the hearings of the other body, I would like to read from the testimony of Charles Palmer, of Atlanta, Ga. On page 3:

Mr. Chairman, it may be of interest to have a bit of background. The period of evolution of this project has been 7 years. Originally, in Georgia, there was a group that had certain public land as an agency of the State of Georgia. In order to find an appropriate use for those lands, they sought that which would be helpful to all our people. They found that for over 20 years an architect named Eric Gugler, assisted by great sculptors, such as Paul Manship, and historians, such as Judge Learned Hand, had developed a model at a cost of $100,000, so that the entire world could be shown the kind of freedom which the people from all over the earth who comprise our Nation had created in the United States of America. As a result, public-spirited citizens in Georgia put over $275,000 in further developing the model and forming an organization, composed of great leaders in the United States, to build this project.

Are we to sanction another appeal to the schoolchildren of America for a group who spent $375,000 in tax-free subscriptions just to make a model and form an organization?

If full and compete hearings were held on this project, all of these facts should be developed so that we in the Congress are not going to be caught in an action to deliver into the hands of any group the right to go to our schoolchildren and raise $23,950,000, as mentioned in the committee report, not knowing whether any part or all of it is going to be spent on a memorial or what portion of it is to be deducted for the promotional ideas, and believe me there is plenty of promotion behind this. Tuesday I received a visit from Mrs. Helen Chapman, vice president of the National Freedom Shrine Foundation, who left with me a promotional piece from which I would like to read. The Congress is spending a lot of money to investigate the pressures on certain of our independent agencies and I think that this committee should have found out more about the pressures on this Congress to pass this particular memorial and who is to benefit by the construction of this memorial. Dr. Wells said that this is to be constructed of granite and it might be interesting to know where they anticipate getting this granite.

Our Veterans' Affairs Committee has spent a good deal of time investigating certain promotions in sales campaigns being conducted over the country supposedly on behalf of veterans, and we find that only a small part of the funds raised finally trickled down to the veterans for the purpose for which it was solicited.

Now are we going to give carte blanche to a group here to go to the school children of the United States with pleas of sympathy that would touch the heart strings of any person and allow them to rake in $23 million without putting some control on the raising of the funds and the cost of the promotion? Let me read to you a sample of what would be said in regard to this and I quote from page 29 of the hearings, Dr. Kenneth B. Wells, president of the National Freedom Shrine Foundation, testifying:

The Freedom Shrine may well be the practical means of starting a great renaissance in our democracy. It will energize every boy and girl, man and woman as they share in building it. It will give us love of the Constitution—and incandescent faith in personal responsibility. It will enlarge our spirits to the noble ideals of individual service, to the noble concept of a Nation without hate. It will hasten our spiritual revival and build sure faith in our destiny as a fighting, working team to overcome the score against the Free World.

Personally, I feel that H. R. 8290 should go back to the committee for further hearings and study. I claim no knowledge of the architecture or art phases of this memorial but from a practical point of view I cannot help but believe that the most inspirational works of art will lose much of their appeal when placed in an oven which this roofless structure will be during the summers here in Washington. We have, as an example, the amphitheater in Arlington Cemetery which cannot be used in the summertime because of the heat in that marble edifice. And, how about the winters of rain and snow such as we have experienced this winter? If we must have it, this bill should be amended in several respects and I shall offer such amendments at the proper time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If we adopt the Broyhill amendment, which requires a certain amount of funds in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, then it will take care of the gentleman's objection?

Mr. YOUNGER. No. I have another amendment that will take care of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNGER was granted 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. YOUNGER. It is a question of whether or not this House wants to consider a measure that, in my opinion, has not received the attention that it deserves. I am no artist. I do not know the artistic side of this, but I do have a feeling that regardless of the sculpturing they put into this oven which they are going to build with four walls and no roof in our hot summer very few people can enjoy the sculpture in the oven we have there.

And in the winter, if we have another winter like this, it will be covered with snow most of the time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman can throw any light upon the question of whether we would be called upon, if this legislation is enacted, to build out of all the taxpayers' money another bridge across the Potomac River to get to it?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Has any figure been given on the cost of maintenance over a number of years in the foreseeable future so we can see what kind of a bill for maintenance we are buying if we pass this bill today?

Mr. YOUNGER. No.

Mr. FULTON. Is this going to be a hunting license to go into the schools of the country to seek for an unknown percentage to get dollars and pennies from the school children? Or is it going to be the program of a tax-exempt organization for income tax purposes so that we, the Federal Government will pay part of the cost?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNGER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, in the committee report you will find the cost is set out as $23,950,000. I hold in my hand a brochure that was written by the vice president of the foundation in which they criticized the rumor that it cost $24 million, and they say this:

This is an outside estimate. Architects, sculptors, and other experts in the field believe that $15 million is a more realistic figure.

That shows that kind of consideration that has been given to this very important matter.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] has raised some questions about the attention which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House gave to this legislation.

The other body had hearings on the bill before their Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the bill was reported out without any opposition whatsoever after the hearings. It was a full hearing of the committee before which residents from Arlington who lived right back of the site made their appearance.

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs also had their hearings last summer before we adjourned. At the beginning of this session of Congress we were requested to hold another hearing so that the residents of Arlington might appear before our committee. We listened to them. They are well-intentioned people. I think that it is to be said in all due fairness to them that they have other ambitions for that area; in fact I have a copy of a letter in my hand which was addressed to Conrad Wirth, the Director of the National Park Service, and signed by one Frank L. Dieter, a director of the Arlington County, Va., Supervisors wherein they ask for the removal of certain zoning ordinances effective in that area at the present time to permit them to build a 12-story building on the skyline, on the horizon.

We listened to these people from Arlington, and after we had heard them, we, without any opposition that I know of, reported the bill out of the committee, and it came before this body without any opposition from our committee.

We understand that in any program such as this there are some people who may be hurt slightly. The question came as to whether or not they might lose a view toward the Capitol of the United States, whether they might be able to see over this particular monument to the memorial to the Great Emancipator, former President Lincoln. We took all of such objections into consideration and the bill was reported out without opposition.

In answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER], I may say that we are not here adopting any specifications as such.

We are adopting the general plan, and before the contract is entered into between the Secretary of the Interior and the corporation in the District, there must be a meeting of minds between the members of the Planning Commission and the members of the Fine Arts Commission as to specifications. The present law provides that the District shall counsel with and confer with the people of Arlington in this matter. That is a provision in the law we passed some 4 years ago. The people of Arlington will be consulted with before any final plan is agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I want to inquire of the gentleman from Colorado whether there have been expressions of dissatisfaction from members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs over the fact there have been no hearings or any alleged consideration of this measure. I certainly have not heard any today.

Mr. ASPINALL. There has been no dissatisfaction, there has been no particular request for printing. There is no reason for printing because we had only a few objectors from that particular area and we all understood why they were in opposition.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It is my understanding that this bill was considered by the Senate committee and immediately thereafter it passed the Senate unanimously.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. I may also say that the monument has been designed by one of the great architects of the world, Mr. Eric Gugler, who planned the construction of a memorial to our veterans overseas. After that the idea of this great monument came to him and it was picked up by people down in Georgia for another purpose. However, it was found that this was too big for anything contemplated in Georgia.

This has the approval of President Eisenhower, Judge Learned Hand and all of the chief justices and the justices of all the State supreme courts of the United States. They have all agreed on this program.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOYLE: On page 2, line 9, insert: "*Provided*, That no solicitation of contributions or funds for this purpose shall be made upon a commission or percentage basis."

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it would not be a dignified solicitation of funds for this worthy object to go to the schoolchildren of the United States and have it known or unknown, the way the present bill now stands, as to whether or not anyone is getting a commission or how much of a commission. I am absolutely opposed to a solicitation of funds for this worthy project on a commission or percentage basis. It does not sound good. It is not good to leave it thus.

I submit that my amendment is well founded, is appropriate and should be written into the bill that is enacted here today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has it not been customary in previous legislation to limit the fees which attorneys, for instance, charge for aiding veterans?

Mr. DOYLE. Certainly, and it should be in this bill. There should be some reasonable limitation and restriction protecting the integrity of every dollar solicited and, every cent of every dollar.

The report states that this is a public-spirited organization, and I do not counter that. May I say that I am in favor of this monument memorial being erected. I think it is a worthy project under proper conditions, but not under the wide open conditions in which it is left at the present time in this bill. Three of these commissioners are to be appointed from private life. Under the act of 1954 it is expressly provided they shall be paid $50 per diem for their services. Under the construction made of compensation for such commissioners they can serve 1 hour, 2 hours or 3 hours a day and get $50 for it. I am absolutely opposed to a presentation of this as a public-spirited organization, as cited in the report, when one-third of the commission more or less, is going to be paid $50 a day. That is not in the public spirit, which will appeal to the American public. That is taking a pretty good cut out of moneys from the children of America. It should not be tolerated, it must be eliminated.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Will the gentleman from California state whether there was any commission charged for raising that money in Georgia?

Mr. DOYLE. I do not know. No one has spoken to me about this bill, but I am so shocked to have this kind of a proposition come, as indefinite and as wide open as it is, for any person to take advantage of, that I feel compelled to raise these points which I believe are basic in such situations.

As you know, I seldom speak on the floor of the House, but I did feel compelled to speak on these two features of this proposal, because it seems to me it is absolutely inconsistent to let it go to a so-called public-spirited organization where one-third of them are going to get paid $50 a day or part thereof, with no limitation on what is to be paid as commissions for raising funds.

One more point. You and I know, as Members of Congress, that even though we may have the finest Members of Congress on this commission, we are too busy as Members of Congress, to pay much attention to commissions like this, with the result, that practically speaking, this commission will largely be controlled by the private members appointed from private life, the men that may get $50 a day, and you and I, as Congressmen, will be too busy to protect that patriotic fund raised by the school children of the United States. I ask support of my amendment requiring that this prohibition be included in the bill. I do not question the integrity of any commissioner.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Could you give us an estimate of the total annual maintenance cost of this large monument?

Mr. DOYLE. I have no such information.

Mr. FULTON. Does anybody have it?

Mr. DOYLE. I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Now, does your amendment cover the promoters in this deal?

Mr. DOYLE. It covers anyone. No percentage, commission, no fees. My amendment does not prohibit necessary traveling expenses and subsistence to be paid if authorized and legal charges. It allows the commissioners, in the performance of their duties, to get paid subsistence and traveling. Now, I assume that the Secretary of the Interior would see to it that their hotel bills were not the most expensive hotels over the Nation as they travel. I do not know, I do have time to go into that detail of the bill, but I assume there would be reasonable, honest firm control of all these travel and subsistence expenses, so that the children of the country would not be paying exorbitant hotel bills and meal bills for these commissioners or anyone else in the project.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman has offered a good amendment, and I think we ought to hear from the members of the committee handling the bill as to what commissions are to be paid, if any. Is there any information here as to what commissions are to be paid, and if so, how much and who is to receive them and so on?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, as I said previously, there are to be no payments made to any commissioners. The commission will go out of existence as soon as this bill is approved.

Mr. DOYLE. May I answer the gentleman in this way. In the act of 1954, in subdivision (e) it provides that the commission shall report annually to the President and the commission does not go out of existence until their final report is made. The commission stays in office 5 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. The act to which the gentleman refers is the act under which the commission has up to this time operated. That provides that for every year of the commission's life it should make a report. However, with the approval of the design, of the plan, the commission's duty ends, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. DOYLE. May I say to the gentleman in this bill before us today, if you will turn to page 2, line 2, you find this language: "but subject to all the provisions of the said act of August 31, 1954." So, in this bill, by your own language, you carry into effect the intent and purpose of all of the provisions of the act of August 31, 1954, enacted by another Congress. The language of bill before us, expressly so declares.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my friend that after the authority and responsibility for which the Commission was created are ended—that is, the bringing of the plans to Congress—the office of the Commission has ended.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask the gentleman, then, who controls the expenditure of this money that will be collected from the schoolchildren during the balance of the time?

Mr. ASPINALL. The Secretary of the Interior is empowered to contract with the corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia for the erection of the monument; and after the monument is erected then the Secretary of the Interior will have complete control. He will have control, of course, during the period of construction because that will be a part of his plan.

Mr. DOYLE. That means that not even any Member of Congress will have any contact with it after, at most, a year or two.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have not yet gotten any word as to what the promoters are going to get. I am not speaking now of the National Commission; I am speaking of the promoters, the people who will collect this money. How much are they going to get for collecting the money?

Mr. DOYLE. I will say to the gentleman that my amendment goes to that very point.

Mr. GROSS. Can we not get some information about that? Is there nothing in this proposed legislation touching on that?

Mr. DOYLE. Apparently it has never been gone into in any of the hearings. It has been left wide open. I know that this language could be an open door for exorbitant fees, commissions, and so forth, to be collected from the schoolchildren of the United States, without their ever having had it disclosed to them that any percentage of those contributions are going to promoters or commission collectors.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I asked the question a moment ago, and I still think it would be appropriate if some member of the committee would advise the Committee of the Whole how much or what percentage, if any, of the funds will be paid as commissions for soliciting this money. That is the point to which the gentleman's amendment goes; is it not?

Mr. DOYLE. Exactly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And up until now we have not been advised. If there are any commissions to be paid I think the House ought to know about it.

Mr. DOYLE. So do I. And that is the purport of my amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say for the third time that I would like to have my question answered. That is: What will be the annual cost of upkeep from here on? How much will it be?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I think it will not be necessary for me at this time to take any more time on my amendment. I ask for support of my amendment.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Massachusetts about the program for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. If this bill is not disposed of today, it will be continued tomorrow. If it is disposed of today, the program for tomorrow will be the bill H. R. 5822, which is a conference report on reinvestment of gains of air carriers. Also S. 3262, the Olympic winter games bill, which was up under suspension several days ago.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that I am not averse to what the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] attempts to do. I do not desire to permit anybody to make unconscionable profits in this campaign. May I say again that the payment of the commissioners is not involved because under the provisions of the act there will be no commissioners. So there will be no $50 a day to be paid to them.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTLAND. Would not the gentleman say that General Bradley would hardly lend himself to an organization which would try to extract profits or commissions from the school children of the country?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. General Bradley and some of the other men who will more than likely receive the responsibility of any program to build this project would not think of any such thing. Neither are they to be members of a paid commission.

As far as the question of receiving a percentage of the funds is concerned, I will have to be honest, and say that my friend has brought something to my attention that never entered my mind. Maybe I am just a little bit naive in that respect, but I do have confidence in the Secretary of the Interior who must

execute the contract for the Government. There is no Secretary of the Interior of whom I have knowledge or anyone charged with the duties of that office now or in the future whom I can imagine who would permit a group of individuals engaged in this sort of public undertaking to make unconscionable profits out of the children of the public schools of the United States. That kind of thinking is entirely beyond me. I just cannot imagine such a thing.

There may be this question, though, as to whether or not there is to be any Congressional authority and responsibility held over this program. I have just handed to the Clerk an amendment which will make necessary the bringing back to the two committees, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and the like committee of the other body, of the agreement which has been arrived at between the Secretary of the Interior and the corporation organized under the law of the District of Columbia, and let it rest with the committees 45 days to see whether or not the agreement proposed is one in which the people of the Nation and the Members of Congress can join. I have handed such amendment to the Clerk, because I do not wish to have any organization run away with authority which the Members of Congress feel they should have in this respect.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What would be the purport of the gentleman's amendment, again, if he will restate it; to bring it back to the Congress in 45 days?

Mr. ASPINALL. No, to bring back the agreement which is authorized by this legislation, which is to be signed by the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the United States and the corporation organized under the law of the District of Columbia, which corporation will be the one charged to do the work of bringing about the construction of the monument.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that no such agreement exists today?

Mr. ASPINALL. No, there is no agreement.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought. That was the basis of my point of order, that no agreement in conformity with the public law has been reached.

Mr. ASPINALL. That is not what the public law calls for. The public law on which this piece of legislation is founded simply asks that we bring to Congress the plans, and the plans have been approved, not the specifications. The law does not ask for specifications. The law does not provide for any particular height. The plans do not provide for any particular height. Those details will be arrived at upon final consideration by the authorized agencies.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Can the gentleman state for the purpose of the legislative record on this issue that if the Doyle amendment is defeated it would be the opinion of the chairman of the committee sponsoring this bill and the members of the committee that no commission or promoter connected with this project should make any unconscionable profit, or any profit?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. It depends on what you mean by profit. This money has to be raised some way or other, and remember that this is a nationwide program. We do not want people to make money out of the schoolchildren's contributions, but somebody is going to have to be paid for their leg work. I would make this statement to my colleagues that, with the understanding that the agreement is to be brought back to us most certainly I would see to it, if I were a member of the committee at that time or a Member of the House, that it did provide that no unconscionable profit could be made.

Mr. DOYLE. Will the gentleman state frankly for the intent of the Congress as revealed in the RECORD that no contract proposed by the Secretary of the Interior with this corporation shall be of any force and effect unless it is first approved by these two Congressional committees?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is the purport of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 75, noes 24.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL: On page 2, line 5, immediately after "monument" insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the erection of this monument shall not be begun until the Secretary of the Interior has found that sufficient funds are available to insure its construction."

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, this is identical to the amendment offered by me a few moments ago deleting the words "not including work of artistry" which words I asked unanimous consent to have deleted at that time, but the request was denied. It leaves the amendment now so that the language of the bill would mean that no construction of the main wall itself, and what I refer to as the superstructure, could be started until the Secretary of the Interior had determined that sufficient funds are available to complete the project. It would mean that we would not be confronted with an unsightly monstrosity, a half-completed wall there for a number of years that would require the Congress to have to appropriate funds to complete it. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has agreed to this amendment.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection and, in fact, personally I am willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Substitute a colon for the period at the end of line 8, page 2, and add the following: "*Provided further*, That prior to granting authority to the National Freedom Foundation as hereinbefore provided, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives copies of the proposed instrument of grant and accompanying papers, and said grant shall not become effective until the expiration of 45 calendar days (exclusive of days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain) from the date of such submission."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which I made reference to a few minutes ago. This amendment will assure, under language which has been used heretofore in such authorizing bills, the control of the legislative department of Government over the program. If within the 45-day period there appears to be something that is not in accord with the wishes of Congress, as determined by the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs in both branches of the Congress, then the objection will be raised and the proposal will be returned to the Secretary of the Interior and the District corporation.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is acceptable to this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNGER: Page 2, line 5, after the word "monument:" insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the National Freedom Shrine Foundation shall establish a construction trust fund account, and shall deposit in such account 100 cents of every dollar collected by it for the construction of the monument and such fund shall be used only for the payment of actual construction costs of such monument."

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, in talking with Mrs. Chapman, who is vice president of the foundation, the other day, trying to find out how they are going to operate, she said they are going to have two budgets. One budget will be for construction and the other budget for expenses. They are going to raise funds separately. They will solicit funds for conducting their campaign, and that will be a separate solicitation. Then the solicitation will be solely for funds for the construction of the monument. All that I propose here is to put into law exactly what the foundation has said it is going to do, as an instruction to the Secretary of the Interior that when he does make this contract he will definitely

have instructions from the House as to how to make that contract.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. By accepting the amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL, does that not make this amendment unnecessary?

Mr. YOUNGER. No.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Aspinall amendment brings the bill back to the two committees.

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes; but that is after the contract has been drawn. This would be instructions to the Secretary to make sure that that item was in the contract, because the foundation tells me that they propose to operate in that manner. It is a fine manner. I am thoroughly in accord with the proposal, but as long as there is so much discussion on this, let me give you an example: I tried to find out what happened to the $375,000 that was raised in Georgia. In talking with Mr. Thompson, of the Interior Department, he said it was all returned. I said, "Will you give me a letter to that effect?" He said, "No; I can't do that." I said, "Why?" He said, "I cannot really vouch for it."

The other day in talking with Mrs. Chapman, I said, "What happened to the $375,000 raised in Georgia?" And she said, "It was all returned." I said, "Will you give me a statement that I can take to the House guaranteeing that?" She said, "No; I cannot." I have been unable to find out. If that had been put into a trust account, you could find out something about it. That is all I am attempting to do here.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. I can understand why the gentleman from California has some misgivings about the amount of money raised in Georgia. I also had. So I got in touch with Mr. Palmer, who sent me this telegram:

On closing books Hall of Our History May 15, 1954, when it was decided not to proceed further in efforts to establish this great memorial in Georgia, the final audit by Price, Waterhouse & Co. showed $281,000 had been expended from private-source gifts. Of this amount, approximately $90,000 went to bringing the models up to date and the balance over the previous 3 years was used for part-time New York offices and staff, consultants, historians, travel by staff members over many months to most of the States in the Union, printing, artwork, telegraph, telephone, and miscellaneous. No money was paid board members. As a result of this preliminary campaign, $621,000 additional funds were pledged by 49 foundations and individuals. These pledges were released when our efforts ended to establish this great memorial in Georgia.

The gentleman from Colorado wants to be perfectly honest. These moneys to which Mr. Palmer makes reference were moneys which were necessary to bring this idea into some kind of balance. They did have legitimate expenses in their campaign.

Mr. Palmer said that the balance of the money was placed on the remodeling of the models which they have. They are available now. He stated that the pledges were returned. In other words, they went so far, and then rather than be dishonest or attempt to mislead the public, they folded up and got out of the way.

Mr. YOUNGER. Do I understand the gentleman from Colorado to say that no money was returned, that the only thing returned was pledges, not cash?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is right, according to my understanding. There is no need for mirth, for these expense moneys were furnished by well-to-do and well-intentioned individuals; these moneys were not gathered together from people who could not afford to make their contributions. These were moneys paid by individuals to finance the cost of the campaign which they planned.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to call attention to the fact that such an amendment as this would be so restrictive that the foundation could not operate at all. Perhaps that is the reason why the amendment was offered.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. Not at this moment.

Mr. Chairman, let me call this to your attention, that neither the Red Cross, nor the Community Chest, nor the Boy Scouts of America could have been established under such a restrictive proviso as that contained in the pending amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado puts adequate safeguards into the legislation so that an amendment such as the pending one is not necessary. I ask that it be voted down.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, all the Younger amendment does is to permit a group of patriotic citizens, if they so desire, to raise a fund of money which can be used to finance raising funds for this monument. Mr. YOUNGER's amendment makes sure that not $1 of the money contributed by the schoolchildren and other people to build this monument will go to promoters for promoting a fund-raising drive.

If approved, his amendment will guarantee that every dollar contributed toward this monument will go into the monument and that none of the money raised will go to fund-raising promoters. The cost of this monument, we have been told today, will be $20 million. If promoters should take for their work 35, 40, or 54 percent of this money from the schoolchildren and others who contribute to the fund, there might be criticism and justified criticisms.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does the gentleman express the fear that there is somebody wanting to get their hands in the till and take 20 to 25 percent of the money contributed for this project?

Mr. MACK of Washington. May I say to the gentleman from Alabama that I am a newspaper publisher in my town. I have seen drives for hospitals, Y. M. C. A.'s, and other things, where the promoters got heavy fees for their fund raising.

Sometimes 25 to 50 percent of the money that was subscribed for a charity went into the pockets of promoters. I think we should guard against that happening if and when this monument's public drive for funds is undertaken.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does the gentleman think it is necessary to write in such a prohibition in the case of the Red Cross and its operations and solicitation based on the fear that some culprit is going to take the money out?

Mr. MACK of Washington. This does not prohibit the raising of funds to finance the drive. The gentleman from California's amendment, as I understand it, permits groups of patriotic citizens to provide funds to finance the cost of the drive. It does, however, assure that the contribution of the schoolchildren and others will be specifically used for the purpose for which it is intended, that is financing of the monument and not for commissions or fees to promoters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We had one of these right here in the District of Columbia in my time here in Congress. We passed a $3 million appropriation for a sesquicentennial celebration in Washington. Nothing ever came of it and, if I remember correctly, one-half or approximately $1,500,000 disappeared some place. It went down the drain.

Mr. MACK of Washington. That has happened quite frequently in my community.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Would the gentleman be satisfied with an amendment to the Penal Code making the punishment for the offense of stealing from this fund twice as much as it is at the present time?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I think that is beside the point.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. All that I am doing is following out exactly what the vice president of the Freedom Foundation has told me they were going to do. There is nothing blocking in my amendment. Mr. Chapman right here at the entrance to this Hall told me the other day that is exactly how they were going to operate. If that is their promise and if that is the way they are going to do, let us put it in the law? I am not doing anything to obstruct this bill.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. I appreciate that my colleague from Washington has had a great deal of experience in the newspaper world. I come from Chicago. The very vital point the gentleman raises has occurred in our town.

They call them boilerrooms in Chicago. They raise money for a very fine purpose. Down in that boilerroom they solicit those funds, but very little of it gets to the fine projects such as have been mentioned here.

The Nevius tract on a part of which this monument is to be built was acquired long ago, in 1947, I think, by the Government. Its acquisition is an illustration of how recklessly and wastefully the Government agencies sometimes go into the business of acquiring more and more property and thereby takes it off tax rolls of States and local communities.

In 1947, the Veterans' Administration wanted a site for a hospital it intended to build. It paid $65,000 an acre or a total of $1,600,000 for the Nevius tract of 28 acres.

The Veterans' Administration could have acquired an equal acreage in almost as desirable location on a main highway only 5 minutes' drive from the Nevius tract for $25,000. Nonetheless the VA paid $1,600,000 for the 28-acre Nevius tract.

The Nation was in debt. Its budget was unbalanced. The $1,600,000 paid for this tract therefore was added to the national debt. The interest on that $1,600,000, about $48,000 a year, has been paid by the taxpayers since.

The owners had been paying Virginia or Arlington County about $17,000 a year on this land and those taxes to the local community were shut off as soon as the Federal Government obtained title to the property.

Soon after acquiring the property the VA decided it did not want to build a hospital on the Nevius site after all. The propery for 11 years has laid unused. The State of Virginia has lost a tax income of $17,000 every year of that time and the taxpayers have been assessed an added $48,000 a year each year for 11 years on the $1,600,000 this land cost the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOYLE: On page 2 insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provision of subsection (b) of the act of August 31, 1934, the Commissioners appointed from private life shall not receive any compensation for their services."

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] that the Commission goes out of existence upon passage of this bill, if passed, and that no per diems will be paid to the Commissioners, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment in the interest of saving time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL: On page 2, immediately after line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Before the Secretary of the Interior grants authority to erect such monument, the Secretary of the Interior and the National Monument Commission shall consult with the local governing body of Arlington County, Va., with a view to ascertaining whether or not any modification of the approved plans and designs for such monument for the purpose of minimizing the impact of such monument upon local residents and property owners and complying as nearly as may be to local zoning ordinances, is feasible. If as the result of such consultation, the plans and designs are modified, such modified plans and designs shall be approved by the National Monument Commission, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the Secretary of the Interior before the erection of such monument is begun."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment that the gentleman has proposed. It is practically the same thing that we have in Public Law 592, 82d Congress, at the present time. I see no reason for it, because we have that public law at the present time, but if the gentleman wants it in the bill, it is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. BROYHILL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but I do not believe the language is entirely superfluous, and it is not without precedent that we do have actually in the law at the present time a requirement that consultation be had with the local governing body. It does not require approval of the local governing body and therefore does not give them the power of veto.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand it, the gentleman is not asking for the power of veto.

Mr. BROYHILL. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. He is asking for the right of consultation.

Mr. BROYHILL. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Compliance and so forth, as nearly as possible.

Mr. BROYHILL. That is right. And it gives the people of the area who are concerned about this particular project some assurance that there will be consideration given to their wishes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. If your amendment is adopted, it actually might not mean a thing, except the Commission is forced to advise with the people in Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL. It gives the people who are affected some protection and to have their objections heard and maybe the possibility of some modification, and it also requires final approval of the plans and specifications by these various Commissions.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It is possible to conceive that the Commission may listen to the people in Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL. Most certainly that is possible, and I have no question but what they will, but it does not require them to accept their request or recommendation.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. In a sense it gives them a power that the Members of Congress do not have.

Mr. BROYHILL. No, indeed. It does not.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The people in Virginia could object, but that is as far as they could go.

Mr. BROYHILL. That is not as far as they could go. The Commission will be required to consult with the governing body of Arlington County.

Mr. GROSS. So this is more or less window dressing.

Mr. BROYHILL. With men of good will sitting down at the conference table and hearing the various objections to problems like this, compromises can be had and agreements and modifications can be made, and we feel that is all we could ask for at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to enactment of H. R. 8290, the so-called freedom shrine bill.

Proponents of the bill have emphasized that there will be no cost to the Government in connection with the monument, and the bill itself states "that the United States shall be put to no expense in the erection of this monument." I repeat, "erection of this monument."

But get this, and I quote from the committee report accompanying the bill: "The monument, upon its completion, shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service." This simply means that there very definitely will be an expense to the Government; for landscaping, parking areas, and maintenance. Furthermore, the monument would be constructed on Government-owned land; land that cost the taxpayers of this country more than $1,600,000 for 28 acres of ground, or at the rate of $65,000 an acre.

While it is thus clear that there will be an expense which must be assumed by the taxpayers, even more important to bear in mind is the fact that the monument, according to the committee report, will cost an estimated $23,950,000. And how is this huge sum to be raised? Through a public appeal, directed mainly to the schoolchildren of the Nation. How in the world sponsors of this proposal ever expect to raise nearly $24 million in nickels and dimes from the schoolchildren of the United States I do not know.

In my opinion, it simply can't be done, and I predict here and now that if erection of the monument is authorized, it will only be a matter of time before the sponsors will be back seeking an appro-

priation from Congress to bail the project out.

It has been alleged that this monument, proposed by the Freedom Shrine Foundation, was actually designed to be located atop a mountain plateau in Georgia as a Hall of History. Whether this is true, I do not know, but I do know that a similar project in Georgia failed for lack of funds, which incidentally also were to be raised by public subscription.

I also know it was the original intention that the Washington Monument would be constructed with private funds, and yet only $300,000 actually was obtained. Congress appropriated $1,300,000 to complete the project.

Furthermore, I know that there was to be a George Washington Memorial Building constructed at Constitution Avenue and Sixth Street NW., paid for through public subscription. Private funds built only the foundation, no appropriation was forthcoming from Congress and the project was abandoned.

If the public subscription fails, and if Congress then refused, as it should, to bail the project out, what happens then? The bill provides no safeguards against partial completion and abandonment of the project. It does not require that funds be collected in sufficient amount to assure completion before construction begins. Partial completion and abandonment would constitute a serious detriment and an eye-sore for Arlington Cemetery and the Nation's Capital.

The bill requires no accounting to be made to the Government of how much money is collected by the private Freedom Shrine Foundation, or of how it is spent.

Aside from the costs, which I predict eventually will have to be assumed by the taxpayers if the project is to be completed, there are other compelling reasons why the bill should be defeated.

The monument would be constructed on the so-called Nevius tract, adjacent to the magnificent Iwo Jima marine statue and bordering Arlington National Cemetery. To former marines now serving in this body, and there are several, I would point out that the monument, according to the committee report, would be a roofless structure 500 feet long, 250 feet wide, and 90 feet high. Such a huge structure would dwarf the Iwo Jima statue, which, in my opinion, is one of the most inspiring memorials in the Washington area.

Even more important to consider is that burial facilities at Arlington National Cemetery are expected to be exhausted within 3 to 5 years, and I firmly believe that the Nevius tract should be saved for expansion of the cemetery.

I find no reference in the bill or the brief committee report—and incidentally there are no printed hearings in connection with the proposal—as to what will be done with the apartment buildings, constructed only a few years ago and directly behind the Nevius tract. Are they to be razed? If they are to be razed, is the Government or the Freedom Shrine Foundation to assume the costs?

For these and other reasons, I believe H. R. 8290 is a bad bill and I urge that it be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and I admire him greatly—talked about all the shouting in opposition to this bill. I am sure the gentleman from Virginia was not shouting when he appeared before the Appropriations Committee a few years ago—and his testimony is to be found in the hearings before the Committee on Public Works on August 15, 1951—in which he opposed sale of the tract that would be used for this monument as sheer and utter waste. I do not know whether the gentleman has changed his mind about the use of this land or the waste that is involved in it. He is quoted in these hearings as saying: "Now, gentlemen, some of us here have been interested in economy, and we have been making quite a drive on it this year to try to stop some of these foolish expenditures by the Government." I oppose this bill with or without amendments, because I know that some day in the future the sponsors will come back to Congress and say, "We could not raise the $24 million and Congress will have to bail us out."

We ought to either strike the enacting clause or recommit this bill and turn to something useful.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I have a question on this Freedom Foundation group. I do not see any description of that group. Who appoints the members of the Commission, and so forth? I think we, as Members of Congress, ought to know who these people are, whether they are appointed for life or what the situation is.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps some member of the committee would like to answer some of the questions that have not been answered.

Mr. WESTLAND. If the gentleman will yield to me, I would be glad to answer the question.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTLAND. The honorary chairman of this foundation is the President of the United States. The honorary national commissioners are the Honorable Herbert Hoover and the Honorable Harry S. Truman, former Presidents of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. What are their terms of office? Can the gentleman say?

Mr. WESTLAND. I cannot tell exactly. At least 2 of them are out of office now and 1 will be out of office in 1960. Spencer T. Olin, who is president of the Olin-Mathiesen Chemical Co., is a member of the executive commission.

Mr. GROSS. Is he one of those gentleman who——

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to answer the gentleman's question, if he will permit me to finish.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to know if the gentleman knows whether he was one of the prime movers in that foreign aid giveaway clambake that was held in Washington a few days ago. If he was I can understand even better that there will be no reluctance to call on all the taxpayers to foot this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the bill have any merit except its sponsorship? Is that all there is to it—just those names?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of my good friend from Iowa. We are together so often it almost causes me pain when we happen to differ on something. The gentleman talked about what I said about acquiring this property some 10 or 15 or 20 years ago. That sounds something like the old saying about that is going a long way back to get oxtail soup.

I did oppose the acquisition of the property. Like my good friend, I have always tried to support economy and sound, good business judgment in the acquisition of Government property where it was necessary.

It happened that this property had been on the market for a long, long time. The only customer was the United States Government. There was an effort to buy it. I appeared before the Committee on Appropriations along with a very distinguished member of that committee from the State of California, a Republican, and opposed it, because they proposed to pay $800,000 for it. I told them it was too much, and I told them that, before they got through with it, they would be paying twice as much for it. My prophecy was correct, because they took them to court and the Government paid $1½ million, not for that particular site, but the ground of which this site is a part.

I do not make any apologies for my action. I just wanted the gentleman to know that I am still with him on the question of economy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am always glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not need to apologize to me or any other Member of the House for his economy record. That is the reason why it was impossible for me to understand his position here this afternoon.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Because we are not paying for this monument; the Federal Government is not.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill before us is again typical of what happens when we think we are getting something for nothing. I certainly make no charges against the fine people who sponsor this project, but to turn another group loose to raise $23 million opens up lots of possibilities. As a former district attorney and from what I hear about what went on in Georgia in connection with this project. I cannot help but wonder.

I notice in the committee report they make reference to the fact that the money will be raised from the school children, the students of the Nation. Our Subcommittee on Appropriations has just concluded its hearings on agriculture in connection with the school lunch program, where we have heard statements as to the situation confronting many schoolchildren throughout the Nation.

I have been around Washington, and I am proud of it as a city. I should like the Capitol and the Halls of Congress and the actions we take here to be a monument to freedom in a sound country. We have many fine monuments in Washington, and I am proud of those. The Washington Monument, Jefferson Memorial, Lincoln Memorial, and hundreds of lesser ones. We now have some statues on this side of the bridge down here across the Anacostia that I understand were given to us because of the foreign-aid program. It is highly questionable, if I listen to the people on the floor aright, that anybody feels that we are monument-shy. But I do say to you that if there is a need for this monument in the mind of any Member, you should not go at it this way, where you think you are getting something for nothing, but actually inviting lots you do not anticipate, and which I do not know would happen, but might. We should authorize Federal construction so that we could get control of the planning and building and hold control of it. We should not think, because they would attempt to get this money from the schoolchildren of the United States and others that we are getting something for nothing. The American people will pay the cost either way. If you get it by this bill, you may be getting something you will not be so proud of after you get it, not to mention what could happen to money raised but not spent for construction.

I am not an expert in this field by any manner of means, but it is my understanding that at least one of the people who were deeply involved in the Georgia fiasco will be in charge of the program here. Certainly there is nothing here to show that there has been a proper determination of the need for this monument, in view of all of the monuments we have in every direction around Washington. If that decision is made in the affirmative, it is my belief that the Congress should face up to its obligation and provide funds for it directly and control it for the American people will pay the cost either way. In the absence of that, I feel that I should oppose this bill.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. During these days we hear a great deal of criticism of the schools because we are not teaching the basic subjects, reading, writing, and arithmetic—and since Sputnik I—not enough emphasis on science. If we read this report—for H. R. 8290—we find that the National Freedom Shrine Foundation intends to raise over $23 million by soliciting schoolchildren. We are now burdening the schoolteachers of this country with a hundred and one chores not directly related to teaching—and taking their time for countless activities that should not really be in the classrooms. There are many school districts which have passed regulations saying they will not allow solicitations because time after time the teacher must take the time and effort to collect for Red Cross memberships, TB seal sales, PTA memberships and a host of other money drives all of which are worthy, but it is still time taken from the classroom.

I wonder if the gentleman will offer an amendment which would provide that the Freedom Shrine Foundation would not have the right to solicit the schoolchildren of the United States for the funds for this monument.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentlewoman from Oregon that in my own mind I think there should be a determination on its merits as to whether the Nation needs such a monument. If so, I think it should be handled in an entirely different way. Certainly I am one of those who doubts whether we are giving enough attention in the schools to the basic fundamentals. Too little attention is given to American history. But I do believe that this same effort directed in the classrooms to bringing about a knowledge of American history and what the word "freedom" means would be a better way of trying to meet our problem than by putting another monument in Washington that a relatively few who get to come here may see it.

Freedom is more than marble walls. We should teach its meaning in our schools, we should demonstrate it in our actions, but a monument, good though it might be, would be nothing as compared to work in these other ways.

I would say again that if this be sound it should be determined so, and if it is that sound it should be handled by the Congress and paid for by the taxpayers, and not go forth under the present guise that just because we think we may be getting something for nothing, we turn such a monument over to an outside group, who certainly would be able to capitalize on "Government is behind us. Freedom is involved, all schoolchildren can buy stock". Such a selling game could lead to lots of unsavory possibilities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Then we would take care of this thing in perpetuity. We are giving them $1,600,000 worth of land and the landscaping is to be carried out by the Federal Government, and then we would take care of it in perpetuity; is that no correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. And we should own it if we do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 8, after the word "revoked" strike the period and insert a colon and the following: *Provided further*, That the National Freedom Shrine Foundation, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, shall not have authority to solicit funds from schoolchildren.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, while I personally am in sympathy with the purposes of the bill itself, I do object to the language which is contained in the report on page 2:

That the National Freedom Shrine Foundation, a public-spirited organization incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia, plans to raise the funds for the monument estimated to cost $23 million by an appeal to the schoolchildren of the Nation and to the general public.

Then on page 3, there is a restatement of almost the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated just a short while previously, I think that money-raising is not the function of the schools. I think the teachers of this country should not be burdened with this additional solicitation of funds—and that is the reason for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question of the chairman of the committee in charge of this legislation. I have a telegram from the president of the auxiliary of the largest Veterans of Foreign Wars post in the United States and located in the district I represent.

I will read it:

Urgently request you vote against H. R. 8290, the Freedom Monument bill. This is in support of the official position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. This monument would occupy the only remaining vacant land which can and should be used to provide a much-needed addition to Arlington National Cemetery. Your vigorous opposition to the passage of the monument bill and help in leaving this land for the cemetery will be greatly appreciated.

Would the gentleman be good enough to explain.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I thought I gave the gentleman the answer when I read the telegram that came from Mr. Ketcham of the legislative office of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I understand the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I happen to be a member of that organization. They desire more land for the cemetery and they will have to have more land for the cemetery shortly. But, there is not enough land involved in this plot of land on which this monument is proposed to be built to take care of the wishes of the Veterans of Foreign Wars or the other veterans' organizations. They do not wish to be brought into this discussion whatsoever, as I understand it. I think, of course, the gentleman is perfectly in order in reading the telegram that his people have sent to him, but may I again say that that should have been entered into the record in 1954 when this land was set aside for this particular purpose. I have nothing more than that to say.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then, the gentleman's opinion is that VFW is not opposed to this legislation at the present time?

Mr. ASPINALL. My opinion is the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the disabled veterans' organizations, and the other veterans' organizations all desire more land to place in the National Arlington Cemetery and it is my opinion and understanding that there is not enough land here to do any good, and that they must get the land from other places.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a past national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Since the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been brought up, would the gentleman permit me to read the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly. We will appreciate having it for the RECORD.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I hold in my hand a letter signed by Omar B. Ketchum, director of the national legislative service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is dated March 25, and reads as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., March 25, 1958.

Hon. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. YOUNGER: This is to confirm our recent telephone conversation with respect to the position of the national organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States concerning legislation to authorize the use of a tract of land now owned by the Federal Government and identified as the Nevius tract on which to construct a memorial known as Freedom Wall.

The VFW has no official position with respect to the Freedom Wall memorial but we do have a resolution requesting that the Nevius tract, which is contiguous to the Arlington National Cemetery, be reserved for use by the cemetery as additional burial plots. When the VFW adopted the resolution asking that the Nevius tract be made a part of the Arlington National Cemetery we had information to the effect that the cemetery only had sufficient land for burial purposes to last from 3 to 5 years after which the cemetery would have to be closed unless additional land was made available.

Consequently, when a subcommittee of the House Interior Committee was considering legislation to authorize the use of the Nevius tract for construction of the Freedom Wall memorial the VFW filed an objection—not against Freedom Wall—but against allocating the Nevius tract as the site for the Freedom Wall memorial and that said land be reserved for use by Arlington Cemetery.

I am enclosing a copy of the VFW resolution which was adopted last August at our 1957 national convention and while there has been some additional controversial information concerning land which is available for burial purposes for annexation by the Arlington National Cemetery, the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in asking that the Nevius tract be reserved for the cemetery has not been changed.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

RESOLUTION NO. 270—APPROPRIATE BURIAL OF VETERANS AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

Whereas it has been reported that space for the burial of veterans and members of the armed services of the United States in Arlington National Cemetery is rapidly becoming exhausted, and is expected to be exhausted within 3 to 5 years; and

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars has a deep and profound interest in the continuation of honoring our deceased comrades with appropriate burial: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 58th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we petition the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the enlargement of Arlington National Cemetery and to make available for this purpose the Government-owned land that is located directly to the north of the present north boundary line of Arlington National Cemetery, and which is not now occupied, or any other Government-owned lands that may adjoin the cemetery suitable for this purpose.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANT] for their explanation of the views of this great organization.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full 5 minutes, but out of the debate this afternoon has arisen a situation which distresses me. Whether we are for this resolution or against it, whether we approve the amendments which have been adopted or do not, this fact remains: from parts of the debate, a slight stigma—unintentional, I am sure—might be thought to have been placed upon the Commission that brought forth this proposal. No Commission is more worthy of our respect. At one time during this discussion, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] tried to name the distinguished members of the Commission, but was interrupted. I think that those names should be placed in the permanent RECORD, with the statement, on our part, that no portion of our debate should, or could, possibly be construed as imputing any worthy motive to those who have given without stint of their time and great capacity. Will the gentleman add those names to the RECORD at this point?

Mr. WESTLAND. I will be delighted to do so.

They are President Eisenhower, ex-President Hoover, ex-President Truman, Spencer T. Oliver, Don Belding, President Olin Mathieson.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a small boy, driving by a cemetery, I was given to understand that the monuments were there to remind someone that a loved one had gone—a dear one lost—those who remained should never forget, always be reminded of virtues to be cherished. In that sense perhaps this monument might be the proper thing, if its purpose is to call to mind the freedom our forefathers paid for with their suffering—some with their lives—because as of today we do not seem to have too much of the old-fashioned freedom left to pass on to our children. To my mind, the way to teach young folks to know about freedom and believe in it, to cherish it, is to have them read some of our history. Learn of the sacrifices made to win it—of the necessity of ever guarding it: Put a monument over there on that hill, young folks coming to the Nation's Capital—of which we are so proud—looking off to the south and east and seeing Virginia may be reminded of the pride she has in her history, how difficult it is to give freedom to all. That freedom for all is not a free gift to any one or to any group. That always it must be deserved and once gained protected but fairly used and exercised.

If those youngsters came from Michigan and saw or visualized a Freedom Wall then in the Congressional Library read some of the newspapers or read the hearings held by the McClellan committee and other Congressional committees, they might have some queer ideas about freedom as we know it today. They might not even know what was meant by the word—certainly they would know that the legend over the entrance to the Supreme Court, "Equal justice under law" meant nothing.

A witness called attention to the fact that troops had been sent to Little Rock. The chairman inquired whether troops would be sent to protect a "man who wants to work?" The answer was, of course not. And the reason? Because we fear the political power of the union boss.

In Virginia, some say, half the population is deprived of their freedom. Michigan young folks leaving Washington—after a look at a "Freedom Wall" go back home and, time and again, might see or learn of the unions' goons destroying property, beating men and sometimes women whose only offense is a desire to work. And they wonder what the word "freedom" means.

That was a good 4th of July speech the gentleman from Indiana made. It was a rip-snorter, but I noticed he had trouble getting it out. And no wonder, when in labor disputes many times there is no freedom to personal security, to enjoy property.

What is the use of trying to get young folks to believe in freedom when, day after day, in their daily lives it does not exist in the communities where they live? Does it? There is not a Member in this House who reads the daily papers, who has read the hearings in this body and the other body, who does not know that it is the acknowledged practice and has been for at least 20 years, for certain groups to say, "You can't do this or you can't do that," when your moral and constitutional right to do that very thing is unquestioned. We have a theory that freedom is essential and the right thereto should be protected—but today it is to a great degree just a theory—not in some areas a practice.

To me it seems just silly and foolish when young folks come down here to show them a monument to freedom, tell them about freedom, and then when they go back home they realize that it does not exist and that the Congress does not have, has not had for at least 20 years, the courage, or the inclination, if you prefer the milder term, to see that legislation guaranteeing the exercise of our right is enacted or enforced; that by legislation we have enacted we have made it possible for some to deprive

others of their natural, their moral, and constitutional right to enjoy the freedom to which they are entitled.

Why in the world do we not send this bill back where it belongs, to the committee? Just recommit it when we get back in the House. Such a motion will be offered either by me or by our colleague from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

To me the greatest reminder of the cost of freedom—of how precious it is, of how necessary it is—to guard and protect it—comes as I walk down the lanes between the row on row of small white stones in Arlington Cemetery.

When we make freedom secure here in the homeland we should do as suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], erect and maintain a national monument to commemorate freedom.

Send this bill back to committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, because of my deep affection for the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and knowing how sincerely he visions a monument to the ideals of our democracy here in the Capital of the Nation as an inspiration to youth and age throughout the generations, I had wished from the bottom of my heart to support this measure. Frankly, I have tried to find reason in my mind for the casting of an affirmative vote. I have said to myself that the motivation is noble and pure, that those who are associated with the proposal are of the highest standing, persons of wisdom and integrity and patriotic purpose, and the monument to the 5 freedoms of speech, religion, press, assembly, and petition might well stand through the years, as the Statute of Liberty, a beacon to hope and an inspiration to dedication.

Then, always, would come to my mind this question: Why then should we pass the burden of its cost on little children? What right have I to say that here is a wonderful thing that should be done, so let the children dig up pennies and nickels and dimes to pay for it.

Mr. Chairman, we have no moral right to place on little children an indirect tax of $23 million. If we think this monument should be erected, and that the welfare of our country demands its immediate undertaking, we should have the gumption to vote the money of grown-up taxpayers to that end. Anyway you put it, $23 million is $23 million. And in the present time of recession and growing unemployment we should be prudent with money whether extracted by a direct tax or, as in this instance, an indirect tax.

You do not raise $23 million without organization and without putting on pressures. There are many, many children in our schools whose parents are running homes on very limited budgets. There are some homes where it is pretty hard for the mother to make both ends meet in providing for her brood. When there is a money drive on in school the children from these homes must make their contribution or be shamed in the presence of their teachers and schoolmates.

If only 1 child out of every 1,000 were shamed in this manner, one little heart broken because illness at home or other pressing demands had sapped the family resources, or there was unemployment, a million monuments to the ideas we profess to live by could not justify.

This I feel strongly, emotionally. I am not thinking of the many children who could give without much sacrifice. I am thinking of the children who could not give because of the poverty of their parents. This Congress has no moral right to set these little children in the public gaze of teachers and schoolmates on a stool of shame.

Mr. Chairman, in providing a school milk and lunch program we take cognizance of the fact that otherwise many children would be undernourished. Is there any consistency in voting on these children their proportionate share of an indirect tax of $23 million?

No one is naive enough to believe the $23 million will come walking in with no organized solicitation. And where there is organized solicitation, no matter on how pure and dedicated an operational basis, there is pressure. There are many demands on the American people today, the demands of the churches of their faith and of charities close to heart and community interest. To these our people willingly and cheerfully give to the best of their means. But with most of our people there is a limit to what they can give. If this $23 million is raised by subscriptions, it will have to come from somewhere. Most of it probably would come from reduced contributions to present institutions and causes, and the solicitation would center on the sales argument that the Congress of the United States in the enactment of a law authorizing the passing of the hat by this particular demand had officially stamped it with priority over all other demands.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote to recommit the bill to the committee, because I cannot argue myself into believing that hat-passing authorization wisely should be included within the legislative policy of the Congress of the United States. The Congress has the constitutional power and responsibility of extracting money by taxation and of spending money by appropriation, but there it ends.

Mr. NORBLAD. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, the basic idea of a Freedoms Shrine is, in my opinion, an excellent one and I just wish I were able to support this legislation.

However, the location is the factor in my mind that dictated my vote to recommit the legislation.

The location which has been selected is not the proper one as that land should be used for other purposes.

If another proper site is selected, I shall be only too glad to support such legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and Mr. MCCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ROONEY, 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. 8290) to authorize the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy in the fulfillment of the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1029), "An act to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes," pursuant to House Resolution 459, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill H. R. 8290 to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WESTLAND) there were—ayes 100, noes 67.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I made a point of order that a quorum is not present and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and six Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 195, nays 169, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—195

Abbitt	Bennett, Mich.	Bush
Abernethy	Bentley	Byrd
Adair	Berry	Byrne, Ill.
Addonizio	Betts	Canfield
Alexander	Blatnik	Cannon
Alger	Blitch	Carrigg
Andersen, H. Carl	Boland	Cederberg
	Bonner	Chamberlain
Ashmore	Bosch	Chelf
Auchincloss	Bow	Clark
Avery	Brooks, Tex.	Clevenger
Barden	Broomfield	Coad
Beamer	Brown, Ohio	Corbett
Becker	Burleson	Cramer

Cretella
Cunningham, Nebr.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Dellay
Dennison
Devereux
Dingell
Donohue
Dooley
Dowdy
Durham
Dwyer
Everett
Feighan
Fenton
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Gary
George
Glenn
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Hale
Hardy
Harrison, Va.
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Hull
Jackson
Jenkins
Jennings
Johansen
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kearns
Kee
King
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
Lennon
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDonough
McFall
McIntosh
McMillan
Machrowicz
Mack Wash.
Madden
Marshall
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Mitchell
Morano
Moss
Moulder
Mumma
Murray
Neal
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Phibin
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Polk
Preston
Prouty
Quie
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed
Reuss
Riehlman
Riley
Robeson, Va.
Robison, N. Y.
Rodino
Sadlak
Saund
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott, N. C.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Sheehan
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Springer
Staggers
Taber
Talle
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tewes
Thomas
Tuck
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Yates
Younger

NAYS—169

Albert
Allen, Ill.
Anderson, Mont.
Andrews
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Bailey
Baldwin
Barrett
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Baumhart
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bolling
Bolton
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Mo.
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Carnahan
Chenoweth
Christopher
Church
Collier
Cunningham, Iowa
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Dawson, Utah
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Dixon
Dorn, N. Y.
Doyle
Edmondson
Elliott
Farbstein
Fascell
Gathings
Gavin
Granahan
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Gubser
Hagen
Haley
Halleck
Harden
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harvey
Haskell
Hill
Holland
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hyde
Ikard
Jarman
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Keating
Kelly, N. Y.
Kilburn
Kilday
Kilgore
Kirwan
Knox
Lafore
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Libonati
McCarthy
McCormack
McGovern
McGregor
McIntire
Macdonald
Mack, Ill.
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Montoya
Morgan
Morris
Multer
Natcher
Nicholson
Nimtz
Norrell
O'Brien, N. Y.
Ostertag
Patterson
Pfost
Porter
Powell
Price
Rabaut
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Robsion, Ky.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Santangelo
Saylor
Scudder
Selden
Shuford
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sisk
Smith, Va.
Spence
Stauffer
Steed
Sullivan
Teller
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Vursell
Walter
Weaver
Westland
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Calif.
Wolverton
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—65

Allen, Calif.
Anfuso
Ashley
Baker
Baring
Boggs
Breeding
Brooks, La.
Buckley
Burdick
Celler
Chiperfield
Coffin
Colmer
Cooley
Coudert
Curtis, Mo.
Dies
Dollinger
Dorn, S. C.
Eberharter
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Flood
Frelinghuysen
Garmatz
Gordon
Grant
Gray
Gwinn
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Healey
Hébert
Horan
James
Kean
Kearney
Keogh
Knutson
Krueger
McVey
Magnuson
Mason
Moore
Morrison
Passman
Radwan
Rains
Rivers
St. George
Scott, Pa.
Shelley
Sieminski
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Tollefson
Vinson
Vorys
Wainwright
Wharton
Willis
Withrow
Zelenko

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Horan against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Krueger for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Mr. Wharton for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Healey against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Hays of Arkansas against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Zelenko against.

Mr. Radwan for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Allen of California for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. James for, with Mr. Sieminski against.

Mr. Chiperfield for, with Mr. Flood against.

Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Coffin against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Moore for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Vorys.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. McVey.

Mr. Engel with Mr. Wainwright.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Withrow.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. HOLIFIELD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SAUND changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BROOKS of Texas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SCUDDER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MACK of Washington changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. LECOMPTE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF RULES IN ORDER ON MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker on Monday next to recognize the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or any designated member thereof, to suspend the rules on a resolution accelerating certain appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN DOLLARS SUPPORT IRISH SWEEPSTAKES

Mr. FINO. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we persist in our reluctance to accept gambling as a normal thing for people to do, and, while this Congress continues its resistance to a national lottery, billions of American dollars continue to leave our shores every year in support of foreign operated lotteries.

Believe it or not, the United States has become the principal contributor to most of these foreign lotteries—all because of our blind stubborness in refusing to legalize our own national lottery in this country.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the official list of numbers drawn on horses in the 92nd Irish Sweepstakes was announced in most of our newspapers. Do the Members of this House know what the total proceeds from the worldwide sale of tickets were? A record high figure of $13,500,000. Do the Members of this House know what part of this amount represents American dollars? Probably $10 million of the total.

Mr. Speaker, this means that after the payment of prizes and expenses, the Irish Government, 410 hospitals, and the Irish Red Cross Fund will become the beneficiaries of additional millions of dollars—yes, American dollars. This revenue to our Irish friends would not have been possible without the substantial contributions made by millions of Americans who enjoy this type of harmless fun.

Mr. Speaker, while we, in this Congress, permit and allow hypocrisy to blind us from the obvious, the Irish Sweepstakes continues to grow bigger and bigger—thanks to American dollars.

Do the Members of this House know how large this industry is in Dublin?

This form of legalized gambling activity has expanded to such proportions that it necessitates the employment of a permanent staff of 2,000 employees all year round. At the rush interval of each sweepstake, the staff rises to 4,500 clerks. As a matter of fact, to house such a staff, a hall was built in Dublin with a seating capacity for 4,000 clerks and is now used as the headquarters of the sweepstakes.

Mr. Speaker, judging from the millions of dollars that pour into Ireland which has a population of less than 3 million people, it wouldn't be difficult to conclude that if we had our own national lottery in this country, our Government could easily realize $10 billion a year in additional revenue.

Mr. Speaker, are we ever going to banish hypocrisy and give the American people what they want?

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. JENKINS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, today we are assailed by a massive campaign to persuade the people of the United States that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be extended for another 5 years. This legislation is currently under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member.

Despite the seriousness with which we accept the arguments in support of this legislation, I believe that the tremendous consequences on the American economy of continuing past policies toward lower and lower tariffs must also be given searching examination. For many years, industries in Southern Ohio have suffered great distress because of the virtually unbroken policy of inviting the invasion of American markets by foreign-made goods. I have viewed this process with alarm and I am all the more alarmed today as I see evidence that this same economic difficulty has spread rapidly over many regions of the Nation.

In stating the case against the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, I want to commend the remarks of my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable JOHN E. HENDERSON, before the Ways and Means Committee on March 21. Representative HENDERSON's district adjoins my own 10th District and the problems of his area are well known to me. They are similar to those in my own area. I believe Mr. HENDERSON has stated the case well and ably and, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include his statement at this point in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN E. HENDERSON, OF THE 15TH DISTRICT OF OHIO, ON THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGEEMENTS ACT, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON MARCH 21, 1958.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee, I appreciate the courtesy you have accorded me this morning in hearing my remarks on this bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another 5 years.

This is the third time I have appeared before this committee to oppose measures which would, in my opinion, further weaken the economic fabric of seven counties of southeastern Ohio, the area which I have the honor to represent here, through the lowering of what tariff protection still remains for the domestic industry of this Nation. Three years ago, I expressed my opposition to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Later, I appeared here to urge the committee to withhold consideration of H. R. 5550, the bill which would have authorized United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

Since the initial enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the 15th District of Ohio has suffered increasing economic hardship as a result of import competition. The combination of industries upon which the livelihood of my district is so largely based makes the area a most unfortunate victim of the low-tariff policies. One after another, the established enterprises which have provided employment for entire communities have been placed upon a sacrificial altar as part of the ritual of a national trade policy which I believe to be basically unsound. This process has continued without interruption as our Nation's representatives have agreed to lower and lower tariffs in international conferences.

I refer specifically to our domestic pottery, glass, ceramic tile, stainless steel flatware, coal, and oil. For the most part, these industries have borne the basic blows in the tariff concessions which have been granted to the products of other nations with what appears to be a basic and continuing disregard for the position of such producers and their employees in our economic society. Unless and until some recognition of the realities of the reciprocal trade program is indicated by Congressional and executive action and proper safeguards are provided, support of this legislation would be unconscionable either in economic or social terms.

Let me make it quite clear that I am not here today to argue against foreign trade. No reasonable individual today can deny the economic interdependence of the nations of the free world. I do say, however, that our foreign trade policy and the implementation of this policy have oversimplified the issue in visionary terms and, because of that visionary approach, the policy is harming the domestic economy of our Nation. What has been apparent in my district for almost two decades—namely, a violent collision between the ways of life of the United States and those of countries abroad—is continuing and increasing on a national scale. Our consistent refusal to recognize this situation long ago and to meet it honestly is being expressed today in widespread domestic dissatisfaction over the invasion of our domestic markets by cheaply produced goods from abroad.

Those of us who have opposed our trade policy have been dismissed in the past as "isolationists" and "economic Neanderthalers," too provincial to see the greater glories being achieved and too stubborn or narrowly selfish to accept with good grace the sacrifice of some domestic industries and the employment they provide for our people. A kind of informal code seems to have developed as a matter of Federal policy that some industries are negligible and expendable. This kind of reasoning, detached as it is from reality, has guided our economic policy into greater and greater economic concessions. The denial of the difficulties which exist will not correct the increasing dissatisfaction which is apparent today, nor can it have any result other than spreading the plight which southeastern Ohio communities know so well to more and larger regions of the country.

I have explained that the 15th District of Ohio has been a kind of laboratory where the practical results of low-tariff policies may be seen and clearly understood. Briefly, your committee is aware of what has happened in the domestic coal industry and the frustrations which that industry has felt so sorely over the years as it has struggled against the importation of residual fuel oil. The closed mines, the reduced workweek, the abandoned communities, seem to deny the fact that rich resources exist beneath the earth. My district can present a succession of such examples where the direct relationship with import policies can be shown.

More recently, the small oil producers, of which there are many in southern Ohio, have been squeezed off from their markets by the increasing volume of imported petroleum. This situation has been the subject of some consternation in our mobilization planning since domestic oil production and the continuing exploration for new deposits of this resource are essential to our national defense. Time-consuming studies by the Office of Defense Mobilization and later by a Cabinet committee have come to the conclusion that our mobilization potential was being threatened by this development, yet we are still seeking voluntary limitations of imports with what seems to be indifferent success several years after the problem was fully understood.

The importation of stainless steel flatware has caused the eroding away of a good source of employment in my district. The Tariff Commission has found that this domestic industry is being harmed by competition from abroad, yet it is our announced policy to await the further developments which certainly seem logical enough to predict now.

The handmade glass industry, which has all but disappeared from the domestic scene, still exists in a last remaining vestige in the 15th District, a victim of the inroads of import competition.

In few areas of the country is there such a concentration of ceramic tile, pottery, and china production as in southeastern Ohio. All of these firms are suffering economic distress to which there seems to be no solution other than to change our present trade policy—a policy which has been fashioned from the legislation your committee is considering today. I should like to discuss briefly what is happening with respect to the earthen and china tableware industry on a national scale to illustrate my conclusions in this matter.

In 1951, this industry employed approximately 20,000 persons. Today, the most reliable statistics I can obtain indicate this figure has been reduced by more than 50 percent to something less than 10,000 employees. The average workweek in 1951 stood at 40 hours. Today, the average for the industry does not exceed 25 hours. Of the 20 companies which represent 85 percent of the industry's production, earnings before taxes were $694,000. After taxes, earnings were $124,207. Total wages paid by the industry approximated $26 million. During this same period, imports of earthen dinnerware rose from 2,778,000 dozen pieces in 1951 to 6,700,000 dozen in 1957. China dinnerware imports rose from 5,354,000 dozen to 8,400,000 dozen pieces in this 6-year span.

The principal country from which these imports come today is Japan, which has found in the American market a fertile outlet for its cheaply manufactured products. While our domestic firms paid their employees an average of $1.60 per hour in 1951 and $1.85 per hour in 1958, the hourly wage in Japan for a worker possessing comparable skills is 31 cents. In this industry, where approximately 65 percent of the sales dollar is composed of labor costs, it seems virtually impossible for any reasonable expectation

of competition to exist under these circumstances. During the last 3 years, I am advised approximately one-third of the domestic producers have gone into bankruptcy or have ceased operations before they were greeted with such a prospect. Four of the largest producers in the industry have gone out of business within the past 3 months.

The experience of this one segment of the pottery industry permits conclusions which I believe the Committee should consider carefully. It is an excellent example of the standards of one nation in direct competition with those of another. First, free trade today or within the foreseeable future is as abstract as the concept of the economic man was in the 19th century.

In my opinion, those who discuss the shining objectives of free trade are luxuriating in an intellectual vacuum. The arguments are advanced that if a product cannot compete favorably pricewise in the domestic market with like imported products, then, by the economic laws of nature, the producer must accept his fate and leave the marketplace. While this may be true for domestic producers competing with each other, it is not applicable where imported products are concerned. We have long-since abandoned the philosophy of unrestricted competition in this country. We have indicated our belief in fair labor standards, minimum wages, child-labor legislation, and a myriad of other controls which reflect the demand of the people for their own protection and the betterment of their lives. To a great extent, we are negating the expressed national aspirations of our own people by continuing to welcome competition in our own markets by goods produced under circumstances which, by law and the established morality of our own economy, would be impossible here. Any American producer who attempted to impose those conditions which would be necessary usually to meet import competition would be put out of business by the very Government—our Government—which now insists upon a trade policy which welcomes products produced under conditions unacceptable here. This position is inconsistent, paradoxical, and morally indefensible.

We also hear the argument repeated so often in the catechism of the supporters of the reciprocal trade concept that the United States has been built upon the ability to advance technologically so as to maintain the superiority of its product and the greater productivity of its workers. Let us remember that part of the largesse we have showered upon countries abroad has included the most advanced designs of American production equipment. Through foreign aid, machinery of high quality has been furnished by the American taxpayer to nations which now return the production from this equipment in manufactured goods to compete in our domestic economy. It is ironic that so many of the same taxpayers who have contributed the funds to support foreign aid are now called upon to collect unemployment compensation and to witness the loss of a lifetime of financial investment because of our policy of generosity abroad.

Lastly, we are told that the international security of the United States demands a continuing sacrifice of our domestic industry; that the hard choice leaves no alternative and that we cannot tolerate the kind of "subsidy" which tariff protection involves. That our international situation is perilous, no reasonable person can deny. However, the basis for whatever real deterrents exist against the grand designs of the Soviet Union are anchored in the economy of the United States—and I believe anchored in all of the interrelated segments of our economy. We have assumed that the Nation's economy is an indestructable bulwark and we have fashioned and pursued policies based upon this false premise.

It is perhaps normal for our Department of State to insist that our viewpoints be motivated by international considerations even to the exclusion of domestic interests. But the State Department should be but one voice in the councils of our Government. Unfortunately, I think it is the only voice which is being heard consistently and articulately today. It is long past time that we consider all of the aspects of our trade policy and what our refusal to deal with the problems it has brought has meant to our people—not only the graphic hardship which can be seen in southeastern Ohio—but the growing distress which is becoming more obvious in every part of the United States.

Some years ago, token recognition was written into the reciprocal trade legislation to assist industries suffering serious damage from import competition. Experience has shown that, in its application, the concept of the peril point has been virtually useless. It has brought hope and pious promises. However, hope has turned to disillusion in industry after industry which have sought refuge and protection in this provision. If the legislation now before the committee is approved and passed without extensive revision, it is certain that the decimation of American industries already under economic attack will continue and inroads will be made in industrial spheres not yet affected. To me, the enactment of this bill without amendment involves that calculated admission. It is an admisison I refuse to make and it is my hope that my feelings are widely shared by the members of this committee and my other colleagues here.

Legislation has been introduced by Representative RICHARD SIMPSON of your committee which would place in proper focus the issue of needed tariff protection. I have joined Mr. SIMPSON in sponsoring this legislation. Basically, this legislation would change the procedure which exists today and return to the Congress many of the powers in tariff questions which it has delegated to the executive branch. It is my most earnest hope that this great committee will carefully consider the issues at stake here and I urge that safeguards and appropriate and meaningful protection of our domestic interests be incorporated into the final version of the legislation which is reported out for consideration.

MERRIMACK COLLEGE STUDENTS SEE CONGRESS AT WORK

Mr. LANE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Merrimack College, in North Andover, Mass., has hit upon a new idea, which all of our colleges and universities should put into practice.

When fully developed, it could be an interneship in public service for graduates who have majored in history and government.

American education has neglected this important phase of our national life. Students have been taught the theories and the history of government without having the opportunity to see it at work.

What the Federal Government is doing today is making history, and students should have the chance to observe how it functions on the realistic and practical level. Only in this way will they become fully equipped to understand its operations and to make contributions toward its improvement.

Each year, Merrimack sends five students from the graduating class to Washington for the purpose of familiarizing themselves with the legislative branch during their week's stay.

It was my responsibility, and pleasure, to show John J. Daley of 8 Colby Street, Lawrence; and Donald Maullick, of 110 Ferry Street, Lawrence, the living textbook that might be called Inside Congress.

They saw the daily workload that is processed in my office, met visiting constituents, visited committee rooms which are the production lines for legislation, and were briefed on the opportunities for college graduates in the Federal civil service.

The young men were keen observers, and asked many penetrating questions.

I, myself, found the experience to be stimulating, and I look forward to further visits from college students who want to see their Government in action, as they prepare for careers in its service.

Merrimack College merits our congratulations for initiating this program to broaden the horizons and the knowledge of those students who are majoring in government. It is a real step forward in educational methods.

THE IMPORTATION OF CANADIAN GAS IS A THREAT TO THE NATION'S COAL MINERS AND RAILROADS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Power Commission has not previously taken into consideration the effect of imported fuels on American jobs, the current unemployment table provided by the United States Department of Labor should be cause for serious deliberation. The President of the United States is making every effort possible to correct the prevailing economic imbalance and to get our people back to work as soon as possible. Committees of Congress are designing legislation to bring about whatever mechanical repairs are necessary to mesh the gears of our economic machinery.

Under the circumstances, no one in a policymaking position of the Federal Government should be unmindful of these attempts to get our unemployed people back to work. Certainly no agency of Government should take any action that would add to the economic burdens that beset the Nation. In this regard, the Federal Power Commission cannot in conscience—or in consistency with the policy of the White House and of Congress—permit importation of Canadian gas.

Last April 17 the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], addressed the House on Halt the Importation of Unemployment. His was an expression of

hope that the FPC would not allow foreign natural gas to displace miners and railroad workers in the Appalachian area of our country. He explained that the coal industry had already found the going tough enough without being exposed to unwarranted encouragement of foreign competition which further augments unemployment rolls.

Mr. Speaker, since that statement was made, tomes of testimony have been presented to the Federal Power Commission by representatives of both the coal and railroad industries. There is no question about the adverse implications inherent in this precocious promotion proposed by the pipeline people. It would carry unnecessary economic hardship into every mining community of the United States. There would be no net fuel gain—only a net employment loss, for an invasion of Canadian gas would in no way create increased demand for energy that is not already being adequately served by American fuels—coal, oil, and natural gas.

The foreign pipeline would carry an economic disease which would first break out in scattered mining communities of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, and the lignite areas of North Dakota. Thence the blight would spread and impair the vitality of railroad lines now carrying coal to Midwest markets. Within a short time a new epidemic of joblessness and hardship would be felt from Altoona and Cresson, Buckhannon and Beckley, Cadiz and Cambridge, Hazard and Harlan, and along the lines of the Pennsylvania Railroad, the B. & O., the P. & L. E., the New York Central, the Chesapeake & Ohio, the C. & E. I., the Wabash, and other lines that move coal to the market places of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois. Dockworkers whose livelihood depends upon the business of transferring coal from hoppers and gondolas to lake vessels would join the ranks of the unemployed, and so would the truck-drivers and other retail employees now working in coalyards of the Middle West.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the FPC will reflect the liabilities to make certain that their decision will be based upon considerations for the general welfare of the people of the United States. What concerns me is whether the Commission feels that it is authorized or obligated to take adverse economic impacts on United States interests into consideration in its deliberations. I call to the attention of Congress an address on February 24, 1958, by a distinguished member of the Federal Power Commission before the American Society of Civil Engineers in Chicago. In speaking in glowing terms of the possibilities of bringing gas from Canada to the Midwest, Commissioner William R. Connole offered this observation:

> The Commission is directed to issue a certificate unless it finds that to do so is contrary to the public interest. This I interpret as an expression of Congressional intent favorable to the authorization of international pipeline.

I personally am at a loss to discover any such inference in the Natural Gas Act, although I feel that—so long as a respected Commissioner finds himself on such uncertain ground—it is incumbent upon the Congress to be more definitive of its intent. Meanwhile I trust that the Commissioner, after he had had an opportunity to make a thorough study of the Canadian gas case and to discover for himself that the project would obviously be inimical to the public interest, will quickly revise his conclusion.

There is no room for Canadian gas in our Midwest fuel markets, especially at a time when employment in coal and railroad communities is far below normal levels. Rejection of the pipeline applications by the FPC will be in conformity with the spirit of the administration and of Congress in the drive to get our people back to work and not eliminate job opportunities.

A COMMENDATION OF JOHN ROONEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and tabulations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 1958, the New York Times, under the byline of James Reston, carried an item which, to say the least, was libelous of our very good friend and distinguished colleague from New York—Mr. ROONEY.

There may be other Members as diligent, effective, and faithful to their duties as Mr. ROONEY, but I can think of none who exceed him in that respect. He knows his duty and his obligations to his country and to his constituency and fulfills them honestly and well. None give them more conscientious attention.

In the light of these irrefutable facts let us appraise the irresponsible charge made against him.

The news item contends that our colleague as chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee has been slashing the State Department budget particularly with reference to the operation of the Foreign Service Institute.

I am sure that no one can dissent from my statement that the State Department would be the best judge of who does what to its appropriations.

Here is what the State Department said in writing on the subject. I quote the letter of March 18, 1958, of the Deputy Under Secretary of State, the Honorable Loy W. Henderson:

> DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ADMINISTRATION,
> *Washington, March 19, 1958.*
>
> The Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY,
> *House of Representatives.*
>
> DEAR JOHN: I am writing this note to tell you how distressed I am at the statements contained in a newspaper article this morning indicating that you have been slashing the State Department's budget for years and that in general you have been influencing the foreign policy of the United States in a negative way.
>
> I wish to make it clear that those of us in the State Department who are concerned with budget matters do not share these views. We recognize your unexcelled knowledge of the budgetary problems of the Department and the Foreign Service. It is true that at times there have been differences between the Department and your committee with regard to various budget requests and to the use to which the Department puts funds appropriated to it. Nevertheless, many of your criticisms have been constructive and helpful. Again and again on the floor of the House you have ably explained the Department's needs and defended its requests. We in the Department respect you and, although at times we have not seen eye to eye with you, we have never doubted your devotion to the public interest and we have always considered that the Department and the Foreign Service are indebted to you for the interest which you have uniformly displayed in our hearings before your committee.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> LOY W. HENDERSON.

Now let us look at the record.

Here are the official figures:

Training budget for fiscal years 1949 through 1959

Fiscal year:		*Amount*
1949	(Republican Congress)	$782,515
1950	(ROONEY, chairman)	964,221
1951	(ROONEY, chairman)	1,181,400
1952	(ROONEY, chairman)	1,368,371
1953	(ROONEY, chairman)	1,245,834
1954	(Republican Congress)	768,451
1955	(Republican Congress)	907,143
1956	(ROONEY, chairman)	2,007,953
1957	(ROONEY, chairman)	3,391,329
1958	(ROONEY, chairman)	4,679,545

Note, please, that in 1949, 1954, and 1955 the Republicans were in control of the House and Mr. ROONEY was not the chairman of the subcommittee, but a member of the minority.

Here are some more official figures:

Salaries and expenses (supplemental items not included)

Year	Budget estimate	House committee	Senate committee	Appropriation
1949	$76,373,615	(1)	(1)	$72,919,000
1950	76,952,100	$76,652,100	$76,652,100	76,652,100
1951	78,731,000	77,300,000	78,300,000	77,800,000
1952	77,400,000	[2] 75,500,000	74,487,777	74,200,000
1953	79,900,000	[3] 78,488,581	77,392,306	75,962,750
1954	85,784,200	60,000,000	[4] 50,000,000	65,600,000
1955	63,700,000	62,500,000	[5] 62,027,280	62,500,000
1956	69,550,000	63,760,000	68,700,000	66,760,000
1957	92,210,000	90,000,000	91,210,000	90,500,000
1958	112,000,000	93,088,500	99,088,500	98,088,500

[1] Not a single item in fiscal year 1949.
[2] Reduced to $73,000,000 in House of Representatives amendment offered by Mr. Stefan.
[3] Reduced to $76,000,000 in House of Representatives amendment offered by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia.
[4] Plus $15,600,000 of unobligated balances available to Department ($5,600,000 for cost of terminating employees).
[5] Plus $1,000,000 transfer.

Please take particular notice that it was the last Truman budget that called for $85,784,200. It was President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, who insisted, over the protest of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and his Democratic colleagues, that his Department's budget be cut back. Mr. Dulles had his way, in spite of the warnings that the cuts would seriously impair and impede the operation of every segment of his Department.

It is indeed unfortunate that some members of the press forget that the

reputation they built for accuracy was based on their checking their facts at the source and not with rumor, and doing that before publishing. Many a good story might therefore go unprinted because it is not sustained by the facts.

But these men should be the first to guard against unwarranted attacks upon public officials. The improper impugning of the good faith and character of our colleagues must necessarily react against those who are too free with their accusations.

I am pleased to call attention here to the article on the same subject, written by Roger Stuart, as it appeared in the New York World Telegram of March 24, 1958:

ROONEY DEFENDS ECONOMY ROLE IN FOREIGN AID

(By Roger Stuart)

WASHINGTON, March 24.—Armed with a State Department letter of assurance, Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of Brooklyn, defended himself today against a charge of being penny foolish in appropriating funds to this country's foreign programs.

Mr. ROONEY, who is chairman of the powerful House Appropriations Subcommittee, called the charge made by a newspaper columnist "the most ridiculous thing I have ever read."

It was learned, meanwhile, that State Department defended Mr. ROONEY against the criticism that the shortage of American diplomats trained in foreign languages was his fault.

A letter addressed to him by Loy Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State, said:

"We recognize your unparalleled knowledge of the budget problems of the Department and the Foreign Service. It is true that at times there have been differences between the Department and your committee with regard to various budget requests and to the use to which the Department puts funds appropriated to it.

"Nevertheless," Mr. Henderson added, "many of your criticisms have been considerate and helpful. Again and again on the floor of the House you have ably explained the Department's needs and defended its requests."

Mr. ROONEY has also been under attack recently for turning down an administration request for an additional $2,054,000 for United States exhibits at the Brussels World's Fair. He later approved a $1 million transfer of other funds.

While refusing to comment directly on the charges of penny pinching and false economies the Brooklyn Democrat said he has battled for years against what, in his view, would constitute a waste of the taxpayers' money.

Denying that he has ever opposed funds for legitimate operations, Mr. ROONEY said that quite on the contrary, he had made it a point of keeping abreast of the problems and responsibilities of various agencies and lent a sympathetic ear to their requests.

He readily conceded, however, that he had called attention "to silly, stupid throwing away of funds on projects that no self-respecting Government agency ought to be engaged in," including:

Hundreds of subscriptions to the New York Times sent to members of the British cabinet and both houses of Parliament by the United States Government.

Purchasing costly editions of encyclopedias which are distributed by the United States Information Agency to people who, ofttimes can't read them."

A villa on the Riviera "where 20 or 30 Foreign Service officers can luxuriate in beautiful surroundings while they study languages."

Mr. ROONEY's committee handles budget requests covering the State and Justice Departments and related agencies.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the figures which the gentleman has presented and which prove undeniably that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has been a very good friend of the Department of State. I have not always agreed with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] nor have I always agreed with the Department of State. But I think that Mr. Reston should better have checked the facts in this case.

I read Mr. Reston's column quite often. I think in the main he has a very good column, and I enjoy reading him.

I am surprised that he made this accusation against our friend, Mr. ROONEY.

Mr. MULTER. We are all surprised. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I see the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] on his feet. He was himself a longtime newspaperman and a very distinguished newspaperman in his own right, and is a distinguished and hard-working Member of this body. I should like to yield to him at this time.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I do have 30 years of pleasant newspaper experience behind me. During those three decades there were many occasions when I wrote columns expressing my own opinion or reporting the opinions of others. I simply want to say that I think a reporter has a right, especially if he is writing a column, to express his opinion; and he also has a right to report the opinions of others. That is why at this moment I am not engaging in any way in a discussion of the column mentioned by the gentleman, but only exercising the right of any citizen, even a Member of Congress, to express an opinion of his own.

My opinion, based on observation during the last 6 years, is that it is very far from the truth to imply even indirectly that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is an enemy of the Department of State or the Foreign Service of the United States. On the contrary, I think he has been one of the most stalwart friends of the State Department and the Foreign Service in this House. I have watched him on many occasions standing here fighting hour upon hour for appropriations for the Department of State. I think his value as a friend to our State Department has been increased by the fact that he has not been a "yes man." He has not accepted every recommendation offered by the State Department. So when he has stood in the well of this House and defended appropriations for the Department of State, Members on both sides of the aisle have recognized that he has not hesitated to challenge appropriations with which he disagreed.

I would simply say this, that I am convinced, even without the evidence of the letter and the figures read by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] that the responsible officials in the State Department and in the Foreign Service recognize JOHN ROONEY as a friend and not an enemy.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]. I, too, have seen Mr. ROONEY work in the Appropriations Committee since I have been a new addition to the House Appropriations Committee. I read the article of Mr. Reston with dismay. Usually Mr. Reston speaks with accuracy but in this article he is very much in error. Mr. Reston made the statement that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has been slashing the appropriations and is less than enthusiastic about giving ambassadors the necessary language training and representation allowances, and that he is regarded as one of the most powerful men in America in a negative way.

I should like to state categorically that the facts contradict the assertion in Mr. Reston's article and the record proves that Mr. ROONEY increased the appropriations and did not slash the appropriations. As one of the great men of New York State used to say, "Let's look at the record." I have listened to the statements that Mr. MULTER has made and also the figures the gentleman from New York has given about the appropriations in early years. However, let us take the appropriations for the years 1955 to 1959, that is to say, the appropriations for the training fund for the purpose of training those men who represent the United States in the embassies throughout the world, men who go to foreign lands but who do not speak the language of the foreign country, men who do not know the customs or the traditions or the languages of that land.

What has Mr. ROONEY recommended and approved as chairman of this House subcommittee? In 1955, when Mr. ROONEY was chairman of the subcommittee the appropriation for such training was $2 million. In 1958, the appropriation was $4,679,549. Is this a slash or an increase? In 1959, there has been requested an appropriation of $5,064,000. This is at least two and a half times the amount that was appropriated in 1955. Where is the proof to support the assertion that Mr. ROONEY has slashed the appropriation? There is none.

For any reporter to state that Mr. ROONEY has been slashing the fund is a travesty on the truth. The facts belie the assertions by this writer. He should be ashamed to make such a statement, and owes Mr. ROONEY an apology for such a statement. I believe the Members of the House are jealous of the fine reputation which Mr. ROONEY has developed down through the years. No Member of this House should be so maligned or vilified by any reporter who claims credit for being a decent reporter. I

know that Mr. Reston is a decent reporter and must have been misled, else he would not have made such baseless statements. I join my colleague in taking issue with this reporter, so that the world may know that JOHN ROONEY is one of the most respected, most dedicated, and most able members of the Committee on Appropriations, who has used his influence for good and not for harm and has done so in an affirmative way. I am privileged to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from New York in his statements about the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. I do not know anything about the facts. I did not know of the article until I heard it mentioned this afternoon. But I do know JOHN ROONEY. He represents the part of Brooklyn which adjoins the area I represent. I know he is conscientious, fairminded, and hard working, and that he does what he thinks right. I compliment the gentleman on correcting the accusations that have been made so unfairly, and I associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. MULTER. I sincerely appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. It has been 10 years that I have served on the subcommittee with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. I have had the opportunity year after year of watching him as he has conducted the most intelligent and searching examination of witnesses who were justifying the requests before us. I think the members of the Appropriations Committee as a whole will agree that there is no man on the committee who excels him in his ability to represent properly the viewpoint of the House of Representatives in dealing with the executive branch of the Government and give intelligent, careful, and lengthy consideration to the items before our subcommittee.

It has never been charged by anyone before that Mr. ROONEY was crusading against any department of the Government. There have been agencies of the Government which were vulnerable, and Mr. ROONEY has found that vulnerability and done his best to correct it. There were some situations that were very glaring. But in no instance has he done anything to affect adversely the Foreign Service Institute, nor has he done anything that could be termed a deliberate act to reduce the effectiveness of the State Department.

This reporter whose name has been mentioned said that Mr. ROONEY was an obscure Member of this body, although a very powerful man in some sort of way. There are 434 witnesses in this body who would refute the statement that he is an obscure Member. When there is a good lively scrap going on in the House, he is generally found in the middle of it, and he is a very effective man in debate.

With reference to these charges, if looking after the Government's and the people's business properly and conducting searching examinations and demanding proper justifications for appropriations requests is a crime, then the gentleman from New York should be hanged.

If it is a virtue, he deserves the thanks of every Member of the House of Representatives as well as the thanks of the entire Nation.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for his kind comments.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I want to join my colleague from New York in seeking to correct an erroneous impression which has appeared in the press with respect to Congressman ROONEY. I serve with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] on the Appropriations Subcommittee which allocates the funds for the Department of Commerce and related agencies. On that committee I have seen him work so diligently and so conscientiously and so well that the budget that is hammered out by our subcommittee is a good one principally because of the able work done by Congressman ROONEY, and, of course, by our very fine chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON]. Prior to the time that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] assumed the chairmanship of this subcommittee, Mr. ROONEY had been chairman of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Subcommittee and Mr. PRESTON served with him. They still are a team on that budget. It is handled very well. I have not been privileged to serve with Mr. ROONEY on the Appropriations Subcommittee which allots the funds for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the other agencies which fall within the purview of that subcommittee. I have, however, listened to his explanations before the full committee when he brought in his bills. I have listened to his explanations of the bill both in committee and on the floor, and I read the hearings and have had an opportunity to examine the manner in which he conducted the examination of witnesses who appeared before his subcommittee. He has been thorough. He has been fair. I am startled by the statement that appears in the New York Times for Wednesday, March 19, under the byline of James Reston. I recognize Mr. Reston as a very fine reporter. I think, perhaps, this is one instance of the old saying that the rule has its exceptions and that this is one of the exceptions to the rule, which is usually applicable to the accuracy of Mr. Reston's reporting, when he states that Mr. ROONEY may be responsible in a measure for the lack of adequate appropriations for the training program for the Foreign Service. I believe sincerely in training our ambassadors and our Foreign Service members in the languages of the countries in which they will serve. I feel quite confident that Mr. ROONEY does also. With respect to the appropriations for the training program itself, let me state that the training budget for the fiscal years 1949 through 1959, the budget which was referred to by Mr. Reston, is as follows: These are the figures which were allowed.

For the fiscal year 1949, there was allowed the sum of $782,515.

For 1950, the sum is as follows, but I should state before going into the figures for 1950 that Mr. ROONEY was not chairman of the committee in 1948, when we considered the 1949 budget. He was a ranking member inasmuch as that was the 80th Congress. In 1950, he became chairman of the State Department subcommittee and in that year the appropriation which was allotted was $964,221, an increase over the previous year's appropriation.

In 1951, the appropriation was increased to $1,181,400.

In 1952, the appropriation was increased again to $1,368,371.

In 1953, the appropriation was cut a small amount to $1,245,834.

In 1954, which was the 83d Congress when Mr. ROONEY was not chairman, in that year the budget was reduced to $768,451.

Nor was Mr. ROONEY chairman in the year 1955 when the budget which was approved amounted to only $907,143.

In 1956 Mr. ROONEY became chairman of the subcommittee again, and there was an increase from the previous year's appropriation of $907,143 to $2,007,953.

The following year, 1957, the budget was again increased to $3,391,329.

For the year 1958 the budget was again increased to $4,679,545.

This year there has been a budget request for $5,064,984; and I feel confident that Mr. ROONEY will not only come up with an accurate and a very detailed and searching examination, but I am sure also that he will give it a sympathetic examination and do everything he can in behalf of a reasonable and adequate appropriation for the training service.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for permitting me to put into the RECORD an accurate statement of the appropriations as they have been made for the last 10 years.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his enlightening remarks.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I cannot sit here and listen to this explanation of the position of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] without adding my own tribute to him for his fairness, for his sense of justice, and for what is most valuable to us all, his sense of due economy.

I would like to say further to the gentleman from New York, that I as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee have visited in many lands, many capitals, the homes of ambassa-

dors, and many consulates, and never anywhere have I heard anything but friendly praise of Mr. ROONEY's efforts.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for her remarks.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I desire to associate myself, Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]. I did not read the article to which the gentleman has made reference and had not heard of it until he brought it to the attention of the House this afternoon. But I do know that the membership of this House knows and appreciates the services of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. There is no more able, conscientious, hard-working Member of this body than the gentleman from New York, JOHN ROONEY.

We have learned that we can rely on his recommendations from the great subcommittee over which he presides. We have learned that when he comes in here with a bill he comes prepared on every item in it, and that he has thoroughly exhausted the background of every request from the departments of the Government with which he deals. He has performed an invaluable service over the years to the Congress, to the State Department, and to the country. I know that when I say this I am speaking the sentiments of every Member of this House.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the distinguished majority whip for those fine remarks.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the remarks made by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. The gentlewoman from Illinois is a minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, a committee on which I am privileged to serve on the majority side; so I think you can accept the gentlewoman's remarks and my remarks as reflecting the sentiment, I would say, of all the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs as to the outstanding service that JOHN ROONEY is rendering to the State Department and to our Nation.

Today, Mr. Speaker, in many countries for the first time there is available to people at the grassroots the classics of our American democracy, cheap, inexpensive volumes translated into many tongues and languages, and there in these foreign lands for the first time these people at the grassroots are drinking in and absorbing and being inspired by the classics that fired our forefathers.

We are deeply indebted to JOHN ROONEY for his devotion to this country and its ideals and in the furtherance of the ideals of this country being careful, of course, that the money should be used wisely. I feel that from the expenditure of every penny that goes through his hands, our Nation and our cause receive the utmost in value.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, JOHN ROONEY is one of the great Americans of our time.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I am pleased to yield to our very distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows of the ability, the standing and the prestige of our friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], not only in the House but in the Senate. He is one of the most influential and effective Members of this body. As has been stated by previous speakers, he is one of the ablest debaters in this body.

His leadership is superb. He is a man of definite mind, and that is what we need in this world today, men and women in public life who have confidence in themselves in order to meet the problems that confront not only our Nation but the troubled world.

The gentleman from New York, JOHN ROONEY, is possessed of the elements of leadership so important at all times in public life, particularly in the world of today and more particularly by Members of the Congress of the United States who have to pass upon so much and so many important matters of concern to the people of our country and to the people of the world.

As evidence of the high regard in which he is held by the colleagues of his own party, he was elected chairman of the Democratic caucus in the 84th Congress. We all know what it means to be elected chairman of the caucus in either party. It is clear evidence of the profound respect that the membership of a party, Republican or Democrat, has in the one that they elect as chairman of their caucus. On that occasion he was unanimously elected. On innumerable occasions he has been designated by the Speaker to preside over the Committee of the Whole of the House of Representatives considering very important legislation. He was selected not only because of his ability to control the House but also because of his extensive knowledge of parliamentary law.

So far as I am concerned, there is no man I have greater respect for than the gentlemen from New York, Congressman ROONEY.

He is honorable and trustworthy in every respect. He is a man of deep faith and a man whose high motives cannot be challenged or attacked, because they are above reproach.

I have respect for Jim Reston. I have read his articles throughout the years. In writing the article he did last week, however, he was clearly out of character. I do not know what prompted him to get out of character. In any event, Jim Reston usually does not write an article which constitutes a personal attack upon any individual, and particularly when it undertakes to undermine that individual by impugning his motives, or otherwise. I am sorry that Jim Reston wrote this article because while I have not always agreed with him, I have profound respect for him and I dislike to see the respect I have for him even slightly impaired. I must in all frankness admit that the article he wrote about our friend, JOHN ROONEY, has at least slightly impaired my profound respect which I heretofore held for him, not that Reston cares whether I have profound respect for him or not. But that is a matter for me to determine. The fact is I did respect him. I still hope he will get back on the track again of being objective on broad questions, in which field he is so capable and in which field he wields such a powerful influence, and that this is not an indication he is going to take the journey of picking out individuals here and there and concentrating his articles upon attacking them.

In the case of JOHN ROONEY, he picked the wrong man, because everything he said about JOHN ROONEY is completely contradicted by the facts and by the evidence. I have only met Jim Reston a few times, I know him more through his articles than by personal contact, but I have read to some degree character in his articles.

If I have any knowledge of the man writing this article, why, I am going to be awfully disappointed if he does not write another article apologizing to JOHN ROONEY for what he had to say about him in this article. The only one who has really suffered by this is Jim Reston, and the only one who can really recover himself from the impairment, in the minds, at least, of the Members of the House who have great respect for JOHN ROONEY, is Jim Reston. I am addressing myself conservatively and impartially and objectively. Knowing JOHN ROONEY as I do and as our colleagues do, I am sorry that Jim Reston wrote the article he did, because the only one who was impaired in his standing by writing the article was Jim Reston and not JOHN ROONEY, and the only way that Jim Reston can recover the impaired prestige is by getting back on the track, by apologizing to JOHN ROONEY in the first instance—and I hope he is big enough to do that, and I assume he is—but in getting back on the track and apologizing first, and keeping and adhering to that pathway that he has so consistently followed throughout the years in writing on broad questions of national and international policy, a field in which he is so ably qualified. Jim Reston is not the man to write that kind of an article, but Reston was out of character, and he was badly mistaken when he wrote the article he did about JOHN ROONEY.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for his fine tribute to our colleague.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity to read the article to which my colleague from New York has referred, but I could not let this opportunity go by tonight without saying a word about my colleague, the gentleman from New York [JOHN ROONEY]. There have been times when

I have not quite agreed with the individual position he has taken on certain legislation, but there has never been a time since I have been a Member of this House, for the past 12 years, that I have not had the greatest admiration and respect for JOHN ROONEY's ability and integrity and the manner in which he has approached his problems, and particularly those on this most important Committee on Appropriations. I have gone to him on many occasions to discuss different matters with him, and I have always come away with the confidence that he knew exactly what he was talking about and that he approached the subject with a great background of knowledge. I think that it is sad today that anyone would attack a great American and a great Congressman, one so devoted to the job as he has been for all the years I have been here. His integrity and his motives are beyond question. I admire JOHN ROONEY as a great man and I admire him as a friend, and I would like to pay my respects to him tonight and also say that I am very sorry that anyone has attacked him or his activities in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman from New York for those fine comments.

May I conclude by assuring our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY], that our respect for him has not diminished one iota, and we wish him well, much happiness and continued success in his service to his constituency and to our country.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it has been my distinct pleasure to have known our very capable and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], for many years antedating his membership in this body. The reputation he justifiably earned in Brooklyn as a lawyer and as one of the top trial assistants to the district attorney there was just a prelude to his wider, stronger, and more justified reputation as a Member of this body. His indefatigable application to duty, his broad liberal philosophy, his mastery of the details of the legislative process are qualities that we have come to recognize, respect, and to expect from him. We are proud of him as a fellow Brooklynite and fellow New Yorker, and we are prouder of him as an effective, conscientious, and dedicated Member of the House of Representatives. To us, criticism of his position on any specific items, especially when that criticism is not founded upon the facts, is a practice that we quite naturally abhor. Others have addressed themselves to this criticism and have to my complete satisfaction proven the utter baselessness of such criticism. As public officials we must, I suppose, expect to find some who do not agree, but we can and do expect that that disagreement will be based on logic and reason and in some way related to the facts. Our confidence in the integrity, perspective, and diligence of our colleague, Mr. ROONEY, remains unshaken and our plea to him is merely to continue the fine work that he has done over the years.

CURRENT UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRIMBLE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker. a responsible realistic appraisal of the present economic conditions can no longer avoid the conclusion of the seriousness and gravity of our present economic recession. Painful as it may be, we must admit that all economic indicators point to a continued sagging in the economic conditions and sufficient danger signals exist that this recession may start feeding upon itself and that it will develop into a depression.

But I do not predict a depression. I believe that immediate positive action on the part of Congress could turn the tide and bring our dynamic economy on the road to prosperity and plenty. Much as I regret to say it, we can no longer expect that the administration will awaken to the needs of the people and see the seriousness of the present situation and provide a needed program.

It is up to us in Congress to act.

THE ECONOMIC INDICATORS

The best available estimates of current unemployment is that the total number of unemployed in the country is reaching about 5.5 million, and this does not measure all the victims of the current decline in economic activity. Millions of workers are now employed 4, 3, or even less days per week. The senior Senator from Illinois, who is also one of the foremost economists in the country, PAUL DOUGLAS, has estimated that part-time employment forced by present economic conditions is equivalent to 1,250,000 total unemployment. This means that the effective unemployment in the country now is in excess of 6½ million persons. In other words, one out of every 10 people in the labor force now is unemployed.

This has resulted in a serious decline in the income of people. According to the Department of Commerce, wages and salaries between August 1957 and February 1958 have declined by more than $7 billion. To give you an idea of the great magnitude of the decline in wages and salaries in the past 6 months—it is equal to the total wages and salaries earned during a whole year in the nine Northwestern States, including Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming or to the total wages and salaries in my own State, New Jersey.

The evidence of the gravity of this situation continues to pile up. A recent Department of Commerce release—and nobody would accuse the Honorable Sinclair Weeks as being a prophet of gloom and doom—announced that expected investment by businessmen in plant and equipment during the current year will decline by $5 billion compared with the past year. This is a decline of more than 13 percent from 1957.

On the same day that the Department of Commerce released the disappointing report about the decline in business investments, the Federal Reserve Board published its annual Consumers Research Survey.

This consumers report has been published annually since the end of World War II. This year, in showing the expectations of the American consuming public during the coming year, it revealed a marked rise in pessimism about the general outlook of the economic position during the year ahead. There has been an especially sharp falling off in the plans of consumers to buy new cars, as well as significant decline in their plans to buy new homes.

Another report released this week showed that industrial production in the country has declined to the lowest level recorded in more than 3 years.

CONDITIONS IN NEWARK, N. J.

This is not a sectional recession or one that has affected only a few selected industries. The present recession is all pervading and it has affected all areas within the country. Latest available statistics on the percentage of persons drawing unemployment insurance for those who are covered by unemployment insurance indicates that in almost a third of the States more than one out of 10 covered employees are now drawing unemployment insurance. Among the States with this alarming level of unemployment can be found Arkansas and Mississippi in the South; Maine in New England; Pennsylvania in the Central Atlantic States; Michigan in the Middle West; many of the Mountain States and Oregon and Washington on the Pacific Coast. No region in the country has escaped this plague of recession and unemployment.

For New Jersey, the total insured unemployed, according to the latest available figures, exceeds 150,000, and is approaching the 10 percent mark.

Newark, which I have the honor to represent, has also suffered from the present recession. My latest data indicate that more than 73,000 people or almost 8 percent of the labor force in the Newark labor-market area, are unemployed. I might add that one of the major factors for the increased unemployment in Newark is a result of the plant shutdowns due to the cancellation of Government contracts.

A careful analysis of this situation indicates that we cannot, I am sorry to say, expect any improvements in the immediate future. This at least is the situation in Newark which I know best and I think, in other areas of the country. The latest report of the usually careful and thoughtful department of labor and industry for the State of New Jersey indicates that it does not expect any changes in the employment picture in the months ahead. The conclusion of this department indicates the reverse:

Scarcity of Government contracts and civilian orders has made employers skeptical

of early improvement. Many are fearful of being forced to drop more of their skilled workers because of the poor business outlook.

A BOLD PROGRAM URGENTLY NEEDED

The country is now reaping the fruits of the administration high-interest, tight-money policies. These policies instead of leading to the arrest of the inflation have resulted in more than 3 percent increase in the cost of living during the past year, and the latest statistics have continued to show a rise in cost of living despite the serious recession that the country is experiencing. But while the administration was ready and eager to act when it came to increasing interest rates and bringing bonanzas to the bankers, it is almost reluctant and hesitant to offer a positive program to help the unemployed.

The evidence is conclusive that we are now facing a serious economic downtrend. This is no longer a matter of partisan analysis. I fully hope that in face of the gravity of the situation we will all get together from both sides of the aisle to support a program which will reverse the present recession and return the country to prosperity.

TAX REDUCTION

First, I believe, is needed positive action to increase the purchasing power of the consumer and to bolster his sagging confidence. As I have indicated earlier, the Federal Reserve Board has concluded on the basis of its consumer opinion study that buying of automobiles and other major durable consumer goods is going to drop during the current year. An immediate tax reduction which would increase the take-home pay of consumers would bolster purchasing power. It is the quickest and most effective way to expand consumer buying. To achieve this end, I have introduced H. R. 2376. Many other distinguished colleagues in this House have introduced similar or identical bills. Briefly, my bill calls for increasing the personal exemptions of the taxpayer for himself, his spouse and his dependents from $600 to $800. It is estimated that by the passage of this bill, we will increase consumer purchasing power by about $5 billion, or by almost the same amount that investment is expected to decline during the current year. Relief from the burdensome and inequitable excise taxes is also essential.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND PUBLIC WORKS

But I do not believe that the tax reduction alone would be sufficient at this time to stimulate the economy and to create full employment. Other positive programs are necessary. Many American communities have been lagging during the period of inflation and rising government costs in building necessary public facilities. I think that the present time is particularly propitious to make up this deficiency. With this view in mind, I have introduced a bill which would provide funds up to $2.5 billion to be expended in labor-surplus areas to build needed public facilities, which are essential for the health and welfare of the people in these communities. The renovation of public facilities in the several communities in the United States would not only improve living conditions in these communities, but would make possible greater economic growth and increase productivity in the years ahead.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Meanwhile, along with trying to bolster the economy, we must not forget the foremost victims of the present recession—those who have become unemployed during the past few months. Many of the present 3.5 million persons drawing unemployment insurance will have their subsistence payments expire before they succeed in finding new jobs. As a matter of fact, during the first 2 months of the present year, the unemployment insurance of about 300,000 workers has expired. While no statistics are available, it is safe to assume that many of these workers have not found new jobs and have had to depend upon public assistance for their subsistence. I believe that Congress should immediately extend the period of entitlement for unemployment benefits. My bill, H. R. 11381, would authorize temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefits rights under existing State law.

Not only is the duration of unemployment insurance benefits too brief but they are also entirely too low. For 1957, average benefits were only one-third of the total earnings of employees. Congressional action is long overdue in this area. Frankly, it is difficult for some States to increase unemployment insurance while others maintain low benefits. It would give those States with low unemployment insurance benefits an unfair competitive advantage over the States which increased their benefits. Congress must therefore act to equalize the level of benefits in the various States and establish minimum acceptable standards. This is not only desirable during a period of recession when it is essential to increase the purchasing power of consumers, but it is sound legislation also for periods of prosperity. It is gratifying that the House Ways and Means Committee has scheduled hearings this week on H. R. 11381 and other legislation in this field.

THE EXPANSION OF DEFENSE

Last, but not least, we must expand our Defense Establishment. This legislation is necessary regardless of the economic conditions of the country. For several years now our defense establishments have suffered serious cutbacks because of the administration's emphasis upon a balanced budget. I am glad to see that in this area the administration has already taken steps to expand defense orders. Building up our national defense is particularly appropriate at this time during the recession, because not only will it fulfill a vital need of the Free World, but it will also help the economy.

We all know that prosperity is needed not only to prevent suffering of unemployment and privation, but our national interests and our very security require full employment in the United States. The propaganda value of unemployment and destitution in the United States is immeasurable to the Communists in the cold-war propaganda campaign.

I am pleased that the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, will hold extensive hearings, beginning April 14, on our nationwide unemployment problem. As our distinguished chairman has stated, "to take a wait-and-see attitude before we act could prove disastrous." We cannot be indifferent to the human misery involved in the recession nor can we ignore its devastating effect upon the foreign economic and political position of the United States.

The program which I have outlined is urgently needed and essential at the present time. But it is not just a means to combat our present recession. The legislation enacted now will serve to strengthen the economy during periods of prosperity as well.

HOLD TO OUR PRINCIPLES

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 should like to call my colleagues attention to one aspect of the United States recognition of the United Arab Republic which has been largely and I believe very improperly ignored. I am speaking of the failure of the State Department to make clear this country's position toward the discriminatory policy of some Arab nations with respect to their recognition of the passports of American Jews and to request clarification of the policy of the combined Arab state. This question assumes major proportions particularly in view of the intent announced by Egyptian and Syrian spokesmen to pursue a policy of anti-Israel activities and considering that Syria now refuses to admit Jews within her borders.

The refusal of Arab nations to issue visas to any but non-Jews appears now to be a firmly entrenched practice. At every point where this issue has come up the United States has acquiesced before a policy in complete opposition to American concepts of religious freedom. The most glaring example concerned the renewal of the American airbase lease at Dhahran. The State Department at that time agreed to a clause which bound us to staff the base only with personnel which were not objectionable to the Saudi Arabian Government. This of course refers to employees and personnel of the Jewish faith. When Mr. Dulles refused to insist that the clause be omitted, he gave this country's tacit approval to a practice that is anathema to the American people.

As for the indignities that our citizens who are Jewish suffer when they must travel in the Middle East, perhaps we can do nothing to effect a change. But when we do have the opportunity to demand equal treatment for our citizens abroad I firmly believe that we must be bound to act in a manner that is consistent with the principles on which we tell the world this Nation is based.

We are told that we have effectively been forced to go along with policies that we do not approve because such a sacrifice might make possible the realization of the larger goal of winning friends and influencing people in the Middle East. Everything must be subordinate to the principle that guides our foreign policy in that part of the world—that is—that the eventuality to be avoided at all costs is that Russia should be allowed to strengthen her position.

Mr. Speaker, I do not for a minute disagree that this is a question of overriding importance. I am fully aware of the need to establish Western sympathies in the Middle East. But there are some principles that cannot and must not be sacrificed no matter how valid and momentous the ultimate foreign policy goal might be. I believe that the democratic principles which we advertise are those which represent the greatest force for good in the Middle East; they are our strongest bargaining points. When we abandon one that is as basic as religious freedom, we undermine our own strength, we lose the respect of the very people whose sympathy we are trying to win, and we leave ourselves open to the unanswerable accusation that our principles have meaning only when we find it expedient to invoke them.

This is a nation that can operate from a position of strength. The product we are selling is the best on the market—one that we need never apologize for, nor distort as changing climate dictates. But in glossing over the question of almost certain religious discrimination on the part of the United Arab Republic we demonstrated a weakness and lack of faith in ourselves that added to our lack of courage in the past can only damage our position in the final analysis.

The following article by Milton Friedman of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency is a thoughtful presentation of the issues involved, and I quote it for the benefit of those Members who might not otherwise have an opportunity to read it:

HOW OUR STATE DEPARTMENT IGNORED A HUMAN ISSUE—IN RECOGNIZING NASSER'S NEW DOMAIN, WE COULD HAVE CHALLENGED BLATANT ARAB PRACTICE, BUT TOSSED IT AWAY

(By Milton Friedman)

WASHINGTON.—Does the State Department insist on equal passport privileges for American travelers of Jewish faith? This issue emerged when United States diplomatic recognition was granted to the new United Arab Republic of Egypt and Syria.

A rare opportunity existed for the State Department to challenge Arab discrimination against American Jews. It involved the human dignity of over 5 million citizens. The United States admits Arab visitors without regard to religion. But Americans have been barred from Arab lands merely because of their faith.

Secretary of State Dulles is devoted to religious ideals. This devotion caused hope that he might insist on reciprocal-visa countries respecting Americans of all faiths. Mr. Dulles indicated publicly that the United States would judge the emerging Egypt-Syria union by its attitude toward international obligations. Arab leaders subsequently made known they intended, through their new combined state, to intensify anti-Israel and, apparently, anti-Jewish activities.

When the State Department made its decision on recognizing the new Arab unit, the honoring of American Jewish citizens' passports was not considered a determining international obligation. Diplomatic recognition was extended with good wishes and without mention of this defeat.

International obligations normally include the honoring by any new state of all United States passports. However, a State Department source pointed out that America is not required to insist on this. Officials deemed it diplomatically expedient tacitly to ignore the matter. They were anxious to avoid a Jewish issue, pointing out that Soviet Russia is wooing the Arab world.

Syria bars American Jews as a matter of policy. Exceptions were made for one or two propagandists, describing themselves as Jews, who visited Syria for purposes of anti-Israel and anti-Zionist propaganda. Dollar-hungry Egypt admitted most non-Israeli Jewish tourists. But some were rejected and insulted. Against this background, it was expected that the State Department would ask the Egypt-Syria union for clarification on whether present discriminations would continue.

A State Department official thought this over. He pointed out an interesting consideration. If the United Arab Republic (Egypt-Syria) were challenged, then what about America's Arab friends? He referred to the Arab Federation now linking Iraq and Jordan. Both Iraq and Jordan have flagrantly refused to honor United States passports held by Jews.

The State Department is trying to persuade Iraq and Jordan of American friendship. Their cooperation against communism is sought. Knowing the Iraqi and Jordanian hatred for Israel, American diplomats consider it unwise to press for admission of United States Jews. A point is made about the physical safety of Jewish travelers. But intercession for Jews, although American citizens, might jeopardize the larger diplomatic objectives, according to this view; it could be interpreted in Baghdad or Amman as pro-Jewish.

Pan-American World Airways informs passengers that Jews cannot disembark or change planes at Baghdad. This applies to Jews of American nationality. An American non-Jew may enjoy full protection of his passport and stroll about the airport. But an American Jew must sit quietly on the plane.

State Department officials know that their colleagues of Jewish faith are unwelcome in Iraq and Jordan—the partners forming the friendly Arab Federation. Personnel of the United States International Cooperation Administration occasionally need to visit Baghdad or Amman to aid those countries. But when department and section heads in Washington realize the employee is a Jew, however specially qualified, a substitute is quickly sought. Iraq and Jordan receive huge grants of economic and military aid paid for by United States taxpayers of all religions.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee could raise embarrassing questions. On July 26, 1956, the Senate unanimously adopted a resolution that stressed the primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among United States citizens based on their individual religious affiliations (and that) any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions generally is inconsistent with our principles. Both the Republican and Democratic Parties in 1956 adopted platform planks opposing foreign religious discrimination against Americans.

Secretary Dulles' present policy of allowing foreign governments to discriminate against Americans on religious grounds differs sharply from earlier official policies. In 1893 Czarist Russia sought to deny visas to naturalized American Jews and question visa applicants at the Russian Embassy about their religion.

An indignant State Department then told the czarist regime something of American ideals. On February 28, 1893, Acting Secretary of State William F. Wharton informed Moscow:

"It is not constitutionally within the power of this Government or any of its authorities to apply a religious test in qualification of equal rights of all citizens of the United States; and it is therefore impossible to acquiesce in the application of such a test, within the jurisdiction of the United States, by agents of a foreign power, to the impairment of the rights of any American citizen or in derogation of the certificate of this Government to the fact of such citizenship."

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE DURATION MUST BE EXTENDED

Mr. RODINO. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the latest official figures indicate that 5.2 million people were totally unemployed in the country as of February 1958. Additional millions of people have only part-time employment because of the declining economic activity in the country. Careful estimates have suggested that the part-time economic unemployment is equivalent to an additional 1.2 million total unemployed as far as the impact upon take-home pay or purchasing power is concerned.

The much hoped for recovery from the present recession has not been realized. Indications are that during March, instead of a seasonal upturn, the recession is deepening and the situation is becoming graver by the day.

While all sectors of the economy have suffered from the present recession in terms of reduced profits or income, obviously the most seriously injured victims of the present economic conditions are those who are unemployed. The latest figures indicate that about 3.5 million people are dependent for their livelihood upon unemployment insurance. We have allowed unemployment insurance to deteriorate over the prosperous years and now we find that payments are entirely inadequate, even for subsistence, and the duration of unemployment benefits is entirely too short.

In 1957 average unemployment benefits were only barely over a third of the regular gross pay of average salaries in covered employment. When unemployment insurance was enacted as part of the social-security legislation of the thirties, it was expected that the benefits would amount to at least half of the earnings of individuals. It is, therefore, necessary to boost unemployment-insurance benefits. But we cannot expect at this time that the States will act or will act swiftly enough. The administration over the past 5 years has exhorted the States to increase their unemployment-insurance benefits but with little success. We cannot expect the States to act at this time when the unemployment-insurance burden has been increasing.

Another basic shortcoming of unemployment insurance is that the duration of benefits is entirely too short. During a period of prosperity, the duration of unemployment insurance is not very important because most workers can secure new jobs before the normal period of 26 weeks of benefits expires. But, in this present grave situation, this is no longer the case. During the first 2 months of 1958 about 300,000 unemployed persons exhausted their unemployment insurance. In most cases, it is highly probable that these people have not succeeded in getting jobs and therefore are dependent upon public assistance or other charity for their subsistence. If the present slump continues, the number of people who subsist on unemployment insurance and public assistance is going to increase.

A compassion for the suffering of the unemployed and their families requires that we do not allow these people to remain without any means of subsistence during these hard times that the economy is experiencing. In addition, the exhaustion of unemployment insurance also harms the economy because it robs people of their meager purchasing power and thus gives rise to breadlines and to a psychology of depression. We must therefore prevent at all costs the exhaustion of unemployment insurance before the unemployed receive jobs.

In order to overcome the present great deficiencies of the unemployment system, my bill, H. R. 11335, would boost unemployment insurance benefits and extend the length of these benefits. Briefly, H. R. 11335 provides for the following:

First. It would boost the unemployment insurance benefits to at least half of the earnings of an individual who becomes unemployed, provided that the benefits are not in excess of two-thirds of the average weekly wages earned by employees within the State.

Second. The duration of unemployment insurance benefits would be extended to 40 weeks.

Third. The Federal Government would pay the State unemployment insurance fund the difference between current benefits and the benefits paid under the bill.

I believe that this bill is greatly needed and that it would avoid untold suffering and also help the economy. I urge the Ways and Means Committee to give immediate favorable consideration to H. R. 11335.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ADDONIZIO. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of World War I many nationality groups in Europe, who had suffered for centuries under oppressive alien rulers, attained sovereign status by proclaiming their independence. That was one of the most welcome results of a terrible and destructive war. Subject nationalities of the Austrian-Hungarian and Russian Empires threw off the detested alien yokes, and one by one, the Czechoslovaks, the Estonians, the Latvians, the Lithuanians, the Poles, the Ukrainians, and others joyfully declared their independence.

The Byelorussians did likewise. After the overthrow of the czarist regime in the Russian revolution in 1917 the central government of Russia was put out of business, and anarchy was spreading in many parts of the country. Subject nationality groups were looking out for themselves, and before long many of them broke away from the old decadent empire.

The Byelorussians, who had lived under the Russian czars for several centuries, had had their own sovereign independent state before the birth of the Russian Empire. During the period of foreign rule they carefully guarded many of their national traditions. They therefore seized upon the welcome chance provided by World War I, and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918. Then they formed their own democratic form of government in their historic capital city Minsk, and in the short time allotted to them, they began to rebuild their war-torn country. Unfortunately, however, the poor Byelorussians were not to long enjoy their richly deserved reward. In December of that very year the bloody Bolsheviks were on the warpath; their Red army overran Byelorussia, annexed it to the Soviet Union, and some 10 million Byelorussians became its helpless victims.

Since then, for almost 40 years, Byelorussians have been living under the oppressive yoke of their detested Communist tyrants. Their lives have been curtailed and regimented. Their labor is ruthlessly exploited. Their movements and behavior are closely watched by the ubiquitous state police, and they are forced to work for the Moscow-controlled Communist state. Their beloved country is now unlike a large prison house. Their tyrannical bosses are trying to extinguish all ethnic and national sentiments, including all hopes of freedom for Byelorussia. Fortunately, even under these most abominable and almost unbearable conditions, the liberty-loving Byelorussians still cling to many of their ideals of freedom and independence. They still sustain the undying hope that some day they will be able to shake off Communist tyranny and live in freedom in their beloved homeland. By joining in the celebration of their 40th Independence Day. I earnestly hope that before long it will be possible for these stouthearted Byelorussians to attain their simple but noble national goal.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECKER, for 1 week, March 29 to April 6, 1958, on account of official business.

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. SCHWENGEL, for 1 hour, on Monday next.

Mr. BAILEY, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes, on Monday, March 31, 1958.

Mr. GUBSER, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, April 17.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. BETTS (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming), for 1 hour, on April 15.

Mr. BECKER (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming), for 1 hour, on April 22.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HYDE and to include a letter to the members of the Public Works Committee.

Mr. FOGARTY, to revise and extend remarks made in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KNUTSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. FULTON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHUFORD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

Mr. METCALF, and to include a speech by Mr. MONTOYA.

Mr. GUBSER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 10843. An act to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 28, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1754. A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), Department

of the Navy, transmitting the Department of the Navy's Semiannual Report of Research and Development Procurement Actions of $50,000 and Over for the Period July 1 Through December 31, 1957, pursuant to title 10 United States Code, section 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1755. A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the report of activities of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year ending December 31, 1957; to the Committee on House Administration.

1756. A letter from the assistant secretary, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the report of activities of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1957; to the Committee on House Administration.

1757. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a report of the Bureau of Accounts covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the control of the Treasury Department, pursuant to Public Law 798, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 11518. A bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels; with amendment (Rept. No. 1574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 10015. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1959, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1118. An act to facilitate the administration and development of the Whitman National Monument, in the State of Washington, by authorizing the acquisition of additional land for the monument, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5984. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands at Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument, Colo., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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:

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2230. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Charlotte Rudland Dansie Association; without amendment (Rept. No. 1576). 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 Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 11687. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. R. 11688. A bill to amend sections 1461 and 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing or transportation of obscene or crime-inciting matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 11689. A bill to provide that the amount of social security benefit based on disability will not be reduced by any benefits awarded under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or Armed Forces based on disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 11690. A bill to authorize assistance under the Small Business Act of 1953 to small-business concerns adversely affected by programs under the Soil Bank Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 11691. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to prohibit the deduction of expenses or losses incurred in illegal wagering; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 11692. A bill to authorize the construction of a courthouse and a Federal office building in Chicago, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R 11693. A bill to amend part III of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to exempt from the provisions of such part vessels navigating on Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11694. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clallam County, Wash., to the Department of Natural Resources, State of Washington; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 11695. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. R. 11696. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $250 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 11697. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits in the harbor of New York, to extend the application of that act to the harbor of Hampton Roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 11698. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for retired employees of air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 11699. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase certain real property from the city of Knoxville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 11700. A bill to authorize civilian personnel of the Department of Defense and certain personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to carry firearms; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 11701. A bill to amend the Fisheries Cooperative Marketing Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 11702. A bill to provide that a division of the Tax Court of the United States shall at all times maintain an office at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 11703. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act so as to provide for a more effective distribution of Federal funds for medical and other remedial care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. R. 11704. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the New Melones Dam and Reservoir, Stanislaus River, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 11705. A bill to amend title VI of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide that certain disabled veterans who were unable to receive education and training or vocational rehabilitation may receive a lump-sum settlement in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. R. 11706. A bill to provide for temporary additional unemployment compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 11707. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Nation's pioneer lumberjacks with a likeness of the Lumbermen's Memorial Monument in the Huron National Forest on said stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11708. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 11709. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the Nation's pioneer lumbermen; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 11710. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 11711. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 11712. 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. HYDE:

H. R. 11713. A bill to authorize land exchanges for purposes of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 11714. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase one of the limitations on grants for construction from $250,000 to $500,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 11715. A bill to amend the agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to increase in certain cases the minimum acreage allotment for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 11716. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of sales and exchanges of real property held for more than 1 year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. J. Res. 584. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on service to Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties from the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. J. Res. 585. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on service to Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties from the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 586. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of the week beginning on October 13, 1958, as National Olympic Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLAY:

H. J. Res. 587. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 517. Resolution favoring the application of the principle of self-determination to the people of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 11717. A bill for the relief of Zelda Glick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 11718. A bill for the relief of James A. Shearer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 11719. A bill for the relief of Eric Tse-Kwong Chow and his wife, Vera Hu-Hsien Chow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 11720. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 11721. A bill for the relief of Christina De Santis; 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:

501. By Mr. BENTLEY: Resolution adopted by the Detroit Lithuanian Organization Center in Detroit, Mich., on February 16, 1958, expressing the hope that no agreements will be made with the Soviet Union which would recognize slavery and tyranny; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

502. By Mr. NIMTZ: Petition of Mrs. John Gentry and 14 other members of the River Park Women's Christian Temperance Union, of South Bend, Ind., urging 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.

503. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chief clerk, New York City Council, New York, N. Y., requesting that they be recorded as not favoring an increase in postal rates on city mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward Martin of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address I made at the 56th annual Lincoln Day dinner of the Allegheny County Republican Executive Committee, Pittsburgh, Pa., on February 13, 1958.

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

REMARKS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN AT THE 56TH ANNUAL LINCOLN DAY DINNER OF THE ALLEGHENY COUNTY REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, PITTSBURGH, PA., THURSDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 13, 1958

In commemorating the greatness of Abraham Lincoln we recall one of the most critical periods in our history.

In that time of dark tragedy, when the fate of the Union hung in the balance, Lincoln said in an address, and I quote:

"We live in the midst of alarms; anxiety beclouds the future; we expect some new disaster with each newspaper we read."

In our day we too live in the midst of alarms and as we look to the great statesmanship of Abraham Lincoln for guidance we find the quality so badly needed today.

Burdened with the gravest responsibilities ever laid upon any President, Abraham Lincoln stood firm and steadfast. He did not stampede. He thought things through, calmly and carefully. When his armies were being defeated because of incompetent generals he calmly changed commanders until he found a competent general.

I do not mean to minimize the job ahead of us. It is true that we face many complex problems as a nation. But this is no time to become jittery.

It is a time for calm and sound reasoning, a time to make an inventory of our assets, to measure our God-given blessings of liberty and independence.

It is a time for faith in America, faith in our system of government and in our way of life. It is a time to look forward with renewed patriotism, increased courage and firm determination to strengthen the defense of American freedom.

At this time we have become alarmed because the Russians were the first to launch a satellite into space. Many of our people have been influenced by emotionalism and feel that Russia has surpassed us in scientific achievement. Many believe that the Communists are far ahead of us in military preparation.

But the world knows that the United States technology and productive capacity far exceeds anything the Russians have to offer. Our experience in two world wars is ample proof that productive power—supporting military strength—is decisive in modern war.

No Communist propaganda can overcome that fundamental truth.

I know you will agree with me that the defense of American freedom is not a political issue. It should not be debated from a political standpoint. Patriotic Americanism—not political expediency—must be the test by which we measure the progress and development of our defense preparations.

When we apply that test we find we have kept pace with the Soviet in military preparation. We have equipped our Army, Navy and Air Force with nuclear weapons for tactical use. We have atomic-powered submarines. We have a whole family of missiles, many in the production stage and many others already operational with our Armed Forces. Overseas bases have been strengthened. We have greatly improved the warning and control systems of our continental defense.

In addition we have built millions of homes, automobiles, refrigerators, radios, television sets, and labor saving equipment. We have placed millions of dollars in colleges, churches, hospitals, and other welfare institutions. Russia has done nothing along this line in 40 years of dictatorship.

Let us for a moment consider food power which is probably the most important thing in war. We are unmatched anywhere in the world. Let us take the production of eggs, meat and milk, which are really the bases of food power. The United States has only 7 percent of the world's population. Only 13 percent of Americans are farmers which is only 1 percent of the world's population. Yet they produce 51 percent of the eggs, 41 percent of the red meat and 46 percent of the milk used in the world.

I bring these matters of great national importance to your attention because Abraham Lincoln's birthday anniversary is a most appropriate time to consider our situation calmly and without passion. Here in Pittsburgh 102 years ago an outstanding group of patriotic American citizens assembled to consider plans for the organization of the Republican Party.

It is therefore equally appropriate at this time to consider the record of the last 5 years under a Republican administration.

We are at peace, although there have been many times when it seemed impossible to prevent a brush war. No American soldier has been under fire during the Eisenhower administration. Our enemies know and respect our real strength.

We have curbed inflation, regardless of the gloomy attitude of some economists, labor leaders, and industrialists. Since 1953 the dollar has declined in value from 52 cents to a little less than 50 cents. Compare that with the loss of 48 cents in purchasing power between 1939 and 1953, when the Democrats were in control.

We have passed a civil-rights bill, the first in 100 years, and if those who stand to

benefit therefrom aid us, that bill will be a success.

We have stopped the trend toward socialism in our Government.

Taxes have been reduced the greatest amount in any period in our history.

We have balanced the budget.

We have reduced the number of Federal employees.

We have taken the Government out of much private business.

Communist and subversive leaders have been rooted out of important Government places and many have been convicted.

Decency has been restored in Government.

The Republican Party keeps its promises.

Now just a moment about Pennsylvania government. Our present governor, an estimable young man, campaign in 1954 that he would reduce taxes. Instead of reducing the cost of government, State government has increased 40 percent.

Pennsylvania's long-time debt is one of the most alarming of the whole Nation. The latest available report is that we have $860 million in authority debt and $340 million in debt backed by the full faith and credit of the State. The authority debt is issued without vote of the people. The full faith and credit is voted upon by the people.

You all know my philosophy of government.

I think government at all levels is spending too much money. I think government is doing things that the people should do for themselves and could do better and cheaper.

I repeat, let us have faith in America, even though it may be necessary to have more bullets than butter.

We must have a strong defense. It must be built on scientific knowledge, a powerful coordinated defense organization and reserve forces, backed up by the patriotism and sacrifice of a people who have a pride in our flag and our way of life.

The Farmer's Interest in the Export Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address on the farmer's interest in the export market, which I delivered today at the National Conference of Organizations on International Trade Policy.

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

THE FARMER'S INTEREST IN THE EXPORT MARKET

(Speech by Senator FRANK CARLSON at National Conference of Organizations on International Trade Policy, Sheraton Park Hotel, March 27, 1958)

Export markets have been important to American farmers from the very inception of our country. For many years farm products were America's primary export. Times have changed. Our country is no longer principally agricultural, but farm products exports are still important.

The United States is the world's largest exporter of agricultural commodities. Last year we supplied 22 percent of world agricultural exports. We sent the output from over 60 million acres of our farms to foreign ports.

No segment of our country depends upon foreign markets as much as does American agriculture. Yes, agricultural exporting is one of the biggest businesses in the United States today. Farm product exports reached a record level in 1957. We moved over $4.7 billion worth, about 13 percent of domestic production, to virtually every country in the world. This trade means dollars to our farmers. Exports must be maintained. Every effort should be made to expand them.

In short, a vigorous trade program is vital to American agriculture. Now, as a Kansan, I know what foreign markets mean to wheat farmers. In 1957 the United States exported 550 million bushels of wheat and flour equivalent valued at $958 million. This was equal to 55 percent of the total United States wheat production. When a farmer looks out at his wheatfields, he should remember that the production from 1 out of 2 of his acres moved to foreign customers last year.

American wheat is not the only important traveler. Last year cotton exports reached the highest volume in a quarter century—7.6 million bales valued at $1.1 billion.

Now, don't tell me that the cotton farmers of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico haven't a real stake in trade. I'm sure my colleagues in the Senate from the South realize this.

Tobacco producers should know that $400 million worth of their products moved abroad in 1957; $350 million worth of feed grains; $213 million worth of soybean and cottonseed oils; American cattlemen sent almost $380 million worth of meat, hides and skins, tallow, and livestock to foreign customers last year. And so it goes. Rice, poultry, and dairy products—all important export products. Our dairy farmers have every reason to be interested in foreign trade as their exports totaled over $231 million in 1957. New outlets for dairy products are being developed.

Now why all these statistics? I went through this list to show that all sections of the United States have a real stake in trade. These commodities are produced in all of the 48 States. What would happen if we lost export markets and found it necessary to take out of production all or a portion of the 60 millions of acres of farmland producing export products? This land undoubtedly would be transferred to the production of other commodities such as dairy products, cattle, hogs, fruits, and vegetables, poultry, and poultry products. This increased production within our country would expand the supply of these commodities and would undoubtedly reduce the price and income of the producers now raising such commodities.

Therefore, all farmers whether they produce for export or not, have a direct interest in keeping our exports at a high level.

What about the reciprocal trade agreements program? How has it affected agriculture? Is it really important? The facts are that close to 80 percent of our record exports went to countries with whom we have reciprocal trade agreements. As much as two-thirds of our total exports to these countries moved under some form of trade agreement concession to the United States.

Admittedly, a sizeable percentage of our exports have been sold for foreign currencies under Public Law 480, a program which has been important in moving our agricultural surpluses. Public Law 480 will continue to benefit agriculture; however, United States farmers must seek to develop permanent long-term markets for dollars.

Unless we permit our customers the right to earn dollars in the United States, we will be tied down to temporary programs such as Public Law 480 and even to a permanent policy of foreign aid.

Expanded trade on a sound two-way business-like basis means more markets and more opportunity. American farmers and ranchers must be given a chance to compete with quality products. Our farmers are efficient and want to sell for dollars. With the expanding world population, sound permanent markets can be built for our farm products. Needless to say, the prosperity of the country depends, to a large extent, upon a healthy agriculture.

The reciprocal trade agreements program and the mutual security program are very much in the headlines today. Our actions are being closely watched around the world. Trade—the ability to sell, to earn, to buy, is the greatest inducement we can offer the nations of the world. Without expanding international trade on a mutually beneficial basis, the mutual security program will be of little avail and free world unity a thing of the past.

H. R. 2870, Construction of Dam on Potomac River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are aware that H. R. 2870 is my present legislative proposal in my continuing efforts since May 1956 to secure congressional approval for the construction of a dam by the Potomac Electric Power Co., at the confluence of the Potomac and Monocacy Rivers in Montgomery County, Md., in my Congressional District. In order that my colleagues will know the present status of the matter, I am requesting permission to insert immediately after my remarks today a copy of a letter which I sent to my distinguished and kind colleague from Minnesota, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, with whom H. R. 2870 is presently pending:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1958.

Re H. R. 2870, granting consent of Congress to the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the construction of a dam on the Potomac River.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: You will recall that H. R. 2870, which I introduced on January 14, 1957, has the same purpose as H. R. 11481 which I introduced on May 28, 1956, and which was favorably reported by the Public Works Committee on July 26, 1956, House Report No. 2940, 84th Congress 2d session, but was not acted upon by the House of Representatives prior to adjournment of that Congress.

As you know, the dam which would be authorized by Congress would make available such additional water as would be necessary to efficiently and economically operate an electric-energy generating plant which Potomac Electric Power Co. proposed to construct near the dam site at Dickerson, Md.

H. R. 11481, as introduced by me on May 28, 1956, provided:

"Be it enacted, etc., That authority is granted to the Potomac Electric Power Co.,

to construct, maintain, and operate a dam on the Potomac River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation approximately three-fourths of a mile downstream from the confluence of the Potomac and Monocacy Rivers.

"SEC. 2. Work shall not be commenced on such dam until the plans therefor, including plans for all accessory works, are submitted to and approved by the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers, who may impose such conditions and stipulations as they deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"SEC. 3. The authority granted by this act shall terminate if the actual construction of the dam hereby authorized is not commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years from the date of enactment of this act.

"SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved."

After the introduction of H. R. 11481, the committee sought and received the views of the Department of the Army (Chief of Engineers) and the Federal Power Commission. At the hearing before your subcommittee, I stated that the Potomac Electric Power Co. had no objections to the amendments to the bill as proposed by these two agencies. I should point here that the company had very substantial and grave misgivings about the amendments proposed by the Federal Power Commission; but, in the hope that, by raising no objections to the FPC's proposed amendments, the legislation, amended, would be enacted into law in the 84th Congress, the company raised no objections to the FPC's proposed amendments. It is interesting to note here that H. R. 11481 as reported favorably on July 26, 1956, did not include the FPC's proposed amendments, but included only the amendment proposed by the Department of the Army (Chief of Engineers) to which the company did not then and does not now object.

H. R. 2870 as introduced by me on January 14, 1957, contains the amendments proposed to H. R. 11481 by both the Department of the Army and the Federal Power Commission. Frankly, Potomac Electric Power Co. only agreed to the inclusion of the FPC's proposed amendments because of my advice that their inclusion in H. R. 2870 would expedite processing and favorable action on the legislation by the Public Works Committee and the Whole House of Representatives. But, for reasons beyond your control or mine, no action whatsoever has been taken thus far in the 85th Congress on H. R. 2870.

In the interim, and because of the urgent and dire need for substantial increased electric generating facilities in this expanding area, the company was able, to devise a plan which would permit it to operate at least one 175,000 kilowatt generating unit, at the proposed Dickerson, Md., plant, with the present available water supply. Therefore, I am most happy to advise you that the first ground for the construction of the new plant at Dickerson was broken on July 23, 1957, and it is anticipated that this first generating unit will be in operation by the summer of 1959.

The company's program for the Dickerson plant calls for an expenditure of approximately $35,000,000. In addition to the first unit, the program includes a building to house another 175,000 kilowatt unit, a pump house on the river bank, a 1½ mile railroad siding to link the plant with the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, and a 46-mile 230,000 volt steel tower transmission line. And, of course, this new plant will bring tremendous economic and other benefits to the area.

In light of the continuing inaction on H. R. 2870, and in view of the fact that technological advance and ingenuity will permit the operation of at least one generating unit at the Dickerson plant with the present available water supply, the company has asked me to advise you and the members of your Public Works Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors that all of the language beginning in section 3 of H. R. 2870 after the word "act" on line 17, page 2, and ending with the word "purposes" on line 15, page 3, is unacceptable to the company; and that the company, therefore, does not favor the enactment of H. R. 2870 unless the aforesaid unacceptable language is deleted from the legislation prior to enactment. I concur fully in the company's decision.

I reiterate that the company has no objection to the amendment included upon the recommendation of the Department of the Army (Chief of Engineers) and as adopted by the Public Works Committee in its favorable report of July 26, 1956, on H. R. 11481, Report No. 2940, 84th Congress, 2d session. In other words, the company continues to favor the enactment of H. R. 2870, but only in the same form as adopted by the Public Works Committee in 1956. By this letter I respectfully request your subcommittee to delete the aforesaid unacceptable language now appearing in section 3 on pages 2 and 3 in H. R. 2870 and earnestly urge the subcommittee to report favorably H. R. 2870 as so amended as promptly as the schedule of the subcommittee will permit.

I should point out that the Federal Power Commission did not appear at the hearings held by your subcommittee on H. R. 11481 on July 17 and 24, 1956.

Washington Meeting of Organization on International Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today Washington is host to a most significant meeting affecting America's partnership with the free world. I refer to the welcome gathering of the National Conference of the Organization on International Trade Policy.

At this very moment, in the Sheraton Park Hotel, the Conference is hearing distinguished spokesmen of the administration and leaders of private life speak on the importance of mutually beneficial two-way trade.

Earlier this week I was pleased to address a gathering at Rockford College, in Rockford, Ill., on the same theme. I mentioned the importance of the mutual-security program. I cited the need for extension of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. I said, however, that we must always adopt a well-reasoned, intelligent position as regards both—avoiding extremes, but pushing hard the kind of American statesmanship which is so essential in this atomic-space age.

I send to the desk two items which I believe will be of interest. The first is today's program for the Washington conference. The second is the text of my own address on Monday evening, at Rockford. I ask unanimous consent that both be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF ORGANIZATIONS ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE POLICY, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.; MARCH 27, 1958—ADVANCE PROGRAM

PLENARY SESSION 9:30 A. M.

Chairman: Warren L. Pierson, president, Trans-World Airlines, Inc.

Invocation.

Keynoters: Administration, Hon. Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce; Congress, Hon. HALE BOGGS, United States Representative from Louisiana.

PLENARY SESSION 10:30 A. M.

Chairman: Harry Bullis, chairman, General Mills, Inc.

Speakers: Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture. (Other speakers to be announced.)

LUNCHEON 12:30 P. M.

Chairman: Philip M. Talbott, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Invocation.

Address: Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson.

PLENARY SESSION 2:30 P. M.

Chairman: Philip Cortney, chairman, United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, Inc.

Speakers: Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State; Hon. James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor; Hon. C. Douglas Dillon, Deputy Under Secretary of State; Andrew N. Overby, vice president, the First Boston Corp.; James S. Schramm, National Retail Merchants Association.

FORUM 4 P. M.

Registered participants will be afforded the opportunity of submitting questions throughout the conference. These questions will be answered at this session by representatives of agriculture, commerce, government, industry, labor, and other segments of the economy.

RECEPTION 6:30 P. M.—DINNER 7:30 P. M.

Chairman: Sidney A. Swensrud, chairman, Committee for a National Trade Policy.

Invocation.

The Vice President of the United States.

Minority whip, Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS, United States Representative from Illinois.

The Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN.

The President of the United States.

Organizations participating in the conference supporting reciprocal trade program (list as of March 11): American Association of Port Authority; American Association for the United Nations, Inc.; American Association of University Women; American Cotton Shippers Association; AFL-CIO; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Merchant Marine Institute; American Retail Federation; American Seafood Distributors Association; American Veterans Committee; American Veterans of World War II; American Watch Association; Americans for Democratic Action; Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States; Atlanta Chamber of Commerce; Baltimore Association of Commerce; Brotherhood of Railway Clerks; Brunswick Port Authority; Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc.; Canners League of California; Catholic Association for International Peace; Cedar Rapids Chamber of Commerce; Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City; Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans area; Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry; Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc.; Committee for a National Trade Policy; Committee for Foreign Trade Education, Inc.; Committee of American Steamship Lines; Cooperative League of the U. S. A.; Dallas

Chamber of Commerce; Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce; Detroit Board of Commerce; Export Managers Association of San Francisco; Export Managers Club of Chicago; Foreign Commerce Club of New York, Inc.; Foreign Traders Association of Philadelphia; Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Galveston Chamber of Commerce; General Federation of Women's Clubs; Greater Charleston Chamber of Commerce; Greater Erie Chamber of Commerce; Greater Muskegon Chamber of Commerce; Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce; Houston World Trade Association; Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce; International Advertising Association; International House, New Orleans; Jacksonville Area Chamber of Commerce; Jewish War Veterans of the U. S. A.; Junior World Trade Association of San Francisco; Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade of the City of New York; Leaf Tobacco Exporters Association; League of Women Voters of the United States; Long Beach Chamber of Commerce; Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; Louisville Chamber of Commerce; Maine Port Authority; Maryland Port Authority; Massachusetts Council of Retail Merchants; Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce; Millers National Federation; Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce; Mississippi Valley Association; Mobile Chamber of Commerce; Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.; National Anti-Dumping Committee, Inc.; National Catholic Rural Life Conference; National Council of American Importers; National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America; National Council of Jewish Women; National Farmers Union; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.; National Retail Merchants Association; Norfolk Chamber of Commerce; Norfolk Port Authority; Oakland Chamber of Commerce; Omaha Chamber of Commerce; Overseas Automotive Club; Overseas Exporters Club; Pacific American Steamship Association; Port of New York Authority; Rochester Chamber of Commerce; San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; San Francisco World Trade Center Authority; Savannah District Authority; Seattle Chamber of Commerce; Synagogue Council of America; Tobacco Association of the U. S. A.; Tobacco Associates, Inc.; Trade Development Council Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia; Traffic Club of Galveston-Texas City; United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, Inc.; Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice; United Churches of Christ, Council for Social Action; Washington Board of Trade; Worcester Chamber of Commerce; World Affairs Council of Philadelphia; World Trade Center of New England; World Trade Club of Seattle, Wash.; Young Democratic Clubs of America; Young Republican National Federation; Young Women's Christian Association of the United States.

MUTUAL SECURITY: KEY TO AMERICAN SURVIVAL

(Address by Senator WILEY)

I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak with such a splendid group.

I would particularly like to commend you as faculty members, students, members of the League of Women Voters, and interested citizens, for your active interest in local, State, national, and world affairs.

As you well recognize, the stimulation of public interest and participation in current issues is more important than ever before to the strength and progress of our Nation.

OUR CRUCIAL TWIN GOALS

Your purpose—like mine—is the well-being of 173 million Americans. That means achieving the twin goal of maintaining world peace and world prosperity.

For, on the one hand, the destruction of peace—the coming of world war III—could mean the devastation of the United States, as well as its enemy, with an almost incalculable loss of lives.

And, on the other hand, the destruction of world prosperity—the onset of a depression, here or abroad, could mean conditions under which our foe, communism, might make further alarming advances.

Peace and prosperity—these are the goals of this Republic and of men and women of good will everywhere.

COMMUNIST AGGRESSION: A CONSTANT THREAT TO WORLD PEACE

As we realize, the major threat to world peace continues to be international communism's challenge to the very existence of this free world.

You will recall that Khrushchev has promised to attempt to bury us.

As yet, even in this so-called thaw in East-West relations, there has been no change of this traditional Communist doctrine.

To support the Kremlin's aggressive policies—political, economic, and military—the Soviet Union and its satellites have mobilized vast resources.

Consequently, the free world finds itself faced with a real task. It is, maintain a strong overall defense, or, perhaps, one day, fall to the mercy of a merciless, atheistic, tyrannical dictatorship: communism.

For that defense—we, the United States and our allies—must also mobilize our resources. This means our brains, as well as our national resources and technological and scientific capabilities. It means mostly our hearts and our souls, our thinking and our attitudes.

THE BASIC TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

Tonight, I should like to discuss some of these challenges and problems in effectively combating communism, as well as promoting sound relationships among the free nations. Important among these are two: First, a continued effective mutual security program and, second, a sound policy of trade among nations on a mutually beneficial basis.

It is our thinking and our attitudes on these two objectives which represent our No. 1 interest tonight.

MY PRINCIPAL CASE FOR TWIN POLICIES

My theme is simple.

I say to you, and I hope, I can prove to you that mutual security is in our own enlightened national interest. That means, we are doing it basically, to safeguard the Republic, itself.

A sound reciprocal trade program is likewise in our own national interest. It is likewise for the Republic.

Together, these two programs will promote both peace and prosperity.

Lacking either, the chances of war and depression would unfortunately greatly increase.

We want neither war, nor depression, nor recession.

Illinois, like Wisconsin, has recently had its share of economic trouble. We want to and will pull out of the present slump. Both the programs which I am advocating tonight will help in that process—will help raise our economy from the doldrums.

World communism today dominates one-third of the world's peoples, 900 million in all, spread over one-fourth the world's land surface. It is still on the march.

In our global efforts to halt the spread of communism, the mutual security program, I believe, has been one of our most effective deterrents.

MANY UNFAIR EPITHETS HURLED AT AID PROGRAM

I am well aware, of course, that this program has been—and is—the target of sharp and severe criticism. It has been variously called a giveaway, a rathole into which is wastefully poured the hard-earned dollars of our taxpayers, and other unfair epithets.

Is there any truth to these charges?

Let's look at the picture carefully.

OCCASIONAL MISTAKES IN AID HANDLING

Invariably, of course, there has been criticism—and much publicity—about occasional maladministration of mutual security funds.

Instances come to light where poor judgment was used in isolated instances in spending the taxpayer's hard-earned funds.

The fact is that in a multi-billion-dollar program, occasional mistakes are indeed, almost inevitably, made. But remember, we are dealing here with a fast-changing, difficult world situation, involving literally dozens of countries in every corner of the globe.

Did you ever stop to think how many mistakes were made by our side during World War II? They were mistakes made in good faith by fallible men, leading combat operations of unbelievable difficulty. But we won.

And we will win the war—the so-called cold war, this war to prevent a hot war, even though errors may now and then be committed amidst the stress of battle, on very tough battlefronts of the cold war.

Let me assure you that, along with the critics, I believe that a microscopic eye should be turned on this multi-billion-dollar program. That is the purpose of the hearings now underway by our Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the sums requested for the 1959 fiscal year. It is absolutely necessary to assure the best possible adminitration of our tax revenue. But let us not magnify a few relatively minor errors and condemn a whole program. Let us look at the overall record, not a piecemeal slant taken by a few critics.

OVERALL RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

First of all, what has the program accomplished?

Basically, since its inception, it has been an iron link between the United States and our allies; strengthening our mutual efforts to oppose communism.

WHOLE NATIONS HAVE LITERALLY BEEN SAVED BY THIS PROGRAM

For example, it has saved and bolstered the economies of friendly nations—West Germany, South Korea, Greece, Turkey, and others. It has helped to keep them from falling into the Communist camp—either by aggression or subversion.

Is this important?

Definitely—unless we want to stand by and watch the Communists engulf more and more people, resources, and real estate. If this happened, we would find ourselves gradually isolated, and then surrounded by a hostile world.

Can you set a price tag on the value of a free and strong West Germany or Korea or Greece or Turkey? Is saving of these nations a rathole? Of course not.

But what of the future? Right now, the program helps to support military establishments of nations who—if they have the guns and equipment—are willing to man the front lines against any future Communist aggression.

WHAT ARE THE ALTERNATIVES?

Now, what are the alternatives to helping to strengthen the economic and military capabilities of our allies?

Initially, we would face a tremendous increase in our own national security budget—already at $45 billion annually. According to estimates, this increased cost would far exceed the amount going into the mutual security appropriations.

Presently, as you know, the 2½ million troops of friendly nations in the front lines can be maintained at relatively modest cost by mutual support. That cost is far below

the cost of maintaining comparable United States troops overseas.

For example, a Korean soldier can be supported for one-twenty-fifth the cost of supporting a United States soldier in Korea.

Why do we need a frontline so far away?

Well, it really isn't far at all.

Think, for a moment, of the fact that an intercontinental missile, loaded with a nuclear warhead could demolish Rockford in less than 30 minutes from launching time from a base on Siberian soil. Is this really far away? Definitely not.

We must recognize, also, that, if the Mutual Security Program were seriously crippled, we would require a heavy increase in inductions of American youth—many of you now attending college—into the Armed Services.

Even if we were to try to maintain all available American manpower in mobilization, however, we would be greatly outnumbered—if we had to stand alone against an ever-expanding Communist world.

In addition, the sources of strategic material that we badly need, and the economic value of trade itself, would gradually be cut off; choking our economy and defense.

In thus protecting our own economy and our own security—at lesser cost and jeopardy than the alternative policy—is this a giveaway?

Definitely not.

Why give the world away to the Communists? Why not seek to continue to keep it free, as we are now doing?

WHY NOT SPEND THIS MONEY AT HOME?

But now, in view of our own domestic economic problems—including growing unemployment—some folks may ask, of course: "Why send money abroad? Why not spend the money right here at home?"

First of all, let me assure you that I do, indeed, believe we need to take appropriate action immediately to deal with the serious economic situation on the home front.

As you know, the Congress and the administration have taken and are now taking definite corrective steps—through new housing legislation, speedup of the Federal road program, a new river and harbor bill and other steps.

However, let me point out that mutual security itself also has a positive and very constructive effect on our domestic economy.

For example, 90 percent of the money spent on the program is for goods and services purchased right here in this country—thus stimulating business and industrial activity.

In addition, these expenditures create about 600,000 jobs and today we need them.

OUTLINE OF PROPOSED EXPENDITURES

Now, every citizen—every taxpayer—may rightly inquire: Just how would the mutual security funds—if approved for fiscal year 1959—actually be spent?

Roughly, the $3.9 billion program proposed for the fiscal year 1959 will provide money for economic and military assistance, as follows:

(a) For military assistance: $1.8 billions, including modern weapons and missiles, planes, and other military costs. This military hardware in friendly hands is essential to prevent another Korea.

(b) For defense support: $835 million, including the costs of equipment, construction of roads, airfields, housing, communications, pay for troops, and other expenses of supporting a military establishment.

(c) For the loan development fund: $625 million; providing money, in addition to other public and private sources—for sound and technically feasible projects in underdeveloped countries.

This money would be loaned at 3½ percent interest for road works and similar projects, and 5¼ percent to 6 percent for profitmaking projects.

(d) For special assistance: $212 million; providing funds for stabilizing economic conditions, assisting economic development, and achieving other political, humanitarian, and nonmilitary objectives.

(e) For technical cooperation: $164 million; providing for the most part, technical assistance in three basic fields—agriculture, health, and education. In essence, this is an investment for bettering the living standards of needy people. (Remember, for example, that in south Asia the average per capita income is still only $50 per year. Average life expectancy is only 33 years.

(f) And, finally, about $306 million would be provided for contingent funds to support related efforts to attain the various objectives which I have outlined.

DON'T ECONOMIZE AT THE EXPENSE OF MUTUAL SECURITY

You are all aware, of course, that your Congress in Washington faces one of the most difficult budget problems which it has faced in the postwar era.

On the one hand, we are rightly increasing Federal spending so as to cope with the slack in our economy. On the other hand, we realize that, as spending goes up, two dangerous possibilities loom before us. The first is the possibility of a very heavy Federal red-ink deficit.

The second is the possibility of still more harmful inflation.

No thinking American enjoys the prospect of either a deficit or worse inflation.

Inevitably, therefore, a lot of talk is heard that one way to reduce Federal spending, one way to cope with the budget problem, one way to avoid inflation, is to slash to ribbons the Mutual Security Program.

"Let's economize at the expense of foreigners," some people say.

KHRUSHCHEV WOULD DELIGHT IN UNITED STATES MEAT-AX SLASHES

But let me point out to the countrary, this paramount fact, as President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, and other American leaders have rightly pointed out, slashing mutual security would be economy in name only.

It would be false economy. It would be economy, not at the expense of foreigners, but at the expense of ourselves and our own security.

It would be the sort of foolish United States action which Nikita Khrushchev, and his Kremlin cohorts, would most enjoy.

That is why I suggest that we preserve the Mutual Security Program from ruthless meat ax slashing.

The present aid bill before the Senate is, of course, not a sacred bill. It can be changed. It will be changed. The amounts requested under it are all subject to Congressional modification.

But, sound revision is one thing; a meat-ax destruction of the bill would be another thing.

IMPORTANCE OF RECIPROCAL TRADE

In the same spirit of commonsense, in the same spirit of reason; a sound, well-balanced approach to our problems, I turn now to the second phase of our interest tonight.

Currently, as you know, proposals for extension of the reciprocal trade agreements are being considered in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. You are aware, of course, that initial action on tariff legislation must be taken in that committee.

Now, the question arises: Is extension of the reciprocal trade agreements in the best interests of the country? Do we really need world trade?

I say, "Yes."

To answer these in detail, it might be helpful to review the meaning of trade to us, and to our allies.

IMPORTANCE OF WORLD TRADE TO UNITED STATES AND OUR ALLIES

In today's world, trade among nations on a mutually beneficial basis, I believe, is indeed becoming increasingly important.

Why? Because there are few, if any, self-sufficient nations on earth, including the United States.

We, of course, do have vast resources. Upon these, we have built the greatest production plant in the world. Out of this plant, we have produced goods to establish the highest standard of living for our people in the history of mankind.

In figures, this amouts to about a $440 billion gross national product; a $360 billion national income; and, until recently, and all-time high of employment. To these records of production, income, and employment, of course, trade has made an important contribution.

TRADE CREATES 1 OUT OF 14 JOBS

What is our volume of trade and its significance on our economy?

According to Commerce Department reports, our exports alone amount to about $19½ billion annually.

In addition to creating a sizeable amount of industrial activity, the export-import trade is estimated to provide about 4½ million jobs for our workers. This represents about 7 percent of the total employed force. This means that foreign trade creates a job for about 1 in every 14 American workers.

By comparison, trade provides as much direct employment as the automobile, chemical, steel, and textile industries combined.

Conversely, less foreign trade would mean fewer jobs in the production of automobiles, telephones, TV sets, household appliances, and farm tools and other items. A reduction in trade, of course, would mean fewer job opportunities for laborers, salesmen, advertisers, stenographers, accountants, bookkeepers, engineers, machinists, and others.

In view of our increasing unemployment, this is especially important.

STIMULATING THE ECONOMY INDIRECTLY

The stimulus of trade, of course, is felt outside the actual trade circles. Like the ever-widening ripples around a stone dropped in the water, the effect of trade is far-reaching.

For example, production of export products creates jobs. The jobholders, in turn, buy more things produced by other Americans. Handling and processing of experts and imports also expand services that create employment. Higher levels of income resulting from trade, make it possible for a large number of our people to purchase a greater variety of goods and, generally, to live better.

IMPORTS OF ESSENTIAL RAW MATERIALS

On the import side of the picture, we imported about $13 million worth of commodities in 1957. A high percentage of these imports are in raw or semiprocessed form—necessary to our manufactures.

Do we really need these commodities?

Very definitely.

This is especially true in view of the fact that the United States is self-sufficient in only 9 of the 39 minerals vital to our industries.

In addition, of course, there are a vast variety of other goods and foods which can be available to United States consumers, only through imports.

PROTECTING OUR DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES

It is a fact that we must, of course, be alert to any possible adverse effects of trade policies on some few domestic industries. This means that we need to do all we can to provide a fair competitive climate, a market for home products, reasonable profits, and a general opportunity for our United States businesses to thrive and prosper.

SOME INDUSTRIES HARD HIT BY IMPORTS

Currently, there are a number of industries in our Nation that are facing severe economic problems. Some of this is due directly, or indirectly, to imports flowing into the country. Among those which have been hard hit are the following commodities: Plywood, lead and zinc, and others.

Do we need to protect them? The answer is: "Yes."

There must be careful procedure in determining the needs in each of these industries. And there must be taken whatever action is appropriate and necessary.

Peril-point and escape clause provisions in our tariff laws must be applied, wherever necessary. They must not become dead letter provisions of the law.

NO INCONSISTENCY IN MIDROAD POSITION

Is this, then, inconsistent, with overall reciprocal trade policies?

Definitely not.

In all this testimony before Congressional committees, administration witnesses stress that what they are advocating is not an extremist position—neither free trade nor excessively high barriers.

A sound middle-of-the-road trade position is the ticket to prosperity.

With these facts in mind, I firmly believe that the reciprocal trade agreements—properly administered—can, and should be extended to benefit the Nation as a whole.

The duration of the act, of course, should be limited, so that Congress can review it as conditions change.

These, then—mutual security and reciprocal trade—are two of the important issues now confronting us.

If these programs are carried out successfully, I believe they will strengthen our Nation and the free world.

JAPAN HAS VOLUNTARILY RESTRICTED SOME EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES

I want to conclude on this note of cooperation between the free nations.

America's friends abroad are well aware of the generous assistance which has been given them on the mutual security front.

On the trade front, those countries which export products to us in large quantity are also aware of the occasional problem they cause. They know that sometimes, their exports to the United States have impacted adversely several of America's domestic industries.

That is why, in a few instances, for example, Japan has voluntarily—I emphasize—voluntarily—agreed to limit the quantity of certain of her exports to us, such as textiles.

In other words, it should never be assumed that our friends are not aware of our problems.

They have tried to "put themselves in our shoes," and I think we should try to "put ourselves in their shoes."

In other words, instead of America taking some blind action which would harm our friends, let us always carefully weigh our actions, so that we maintain our strong ties with the free world.

WE ARE ALLIED WITH 43 NATIONS, HAVE 200 BASES

Remember that we are engaged in a system of alliances with no fewer than 43 different countries of the world.

We have air, navy and ground bases, numbering perhaps more than 200, throughout the world. Soon, we will have guided missile bases in several lands.

To continue our network of trade, our network of alliances—requires true reciprocity, genuine cooperation.

If, from the heart of Rockford and Milwaukee and Boston and Los Angeles comes a spirit of understanding and good will, then I know it will be reciprocated in Paris, in Bonn, in London, in Karachi, in Bangkok.

In this age of space, this age of the atom, this age of the jet, let us write a new chapter in man's understanding of man.

Today, you seek to expand that understanding here in Rockford. Let us hope that you will be of real assistance to your countrymen in furthering that understanding.

Closing a Glaring Loophole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit the deduction for income-tax purposes of any expense incurred in illegal gambling operations. This bill would also make it impossible for gamblers, in reporting their income, to reduce their winnings by the amount of their losses, if the losses were incurred in illegal gambling operations.

This proposal would reverse the Supreme Court decision in Commissioner against Sullivan, handed down March 17, 1958. In this case the Court held that operators of gambling enterprises may deduct as ordinary and necessary business expenses amounts expended to lease premises and hire employees, even though their business is illegal.

The Supreme Court has given organized crime a big break by ruling that gambling operators can deduct from their gross income the expenses of illegal operations. Congress has a moral obligation to close this loophole.

The expenses involved in this particular case were allegedly the cost of hiring employees and renting space. But the decision as it now stands certainly opens the door to gamblers to deduct other items which are considered ordinary in their particular business. This might well include the cost of buying police protection to ignore violations of the law, of hiring thugs to scare off competitors, and other illegal payoff transactions which are essential to the operations of the bigtime gambler.

The Court in effect has said that since Congress has never expressly disapproved of these deductions there is nothing it can do. They have left the determination up to Congress. In my opinion there is no earthly reason why Congress should hesitate one moment in setting the Court and the gambling world straight as to its intentions.

To do just that I have introduced today a bill to prohibit the deduction of any expense incurred in furtherance of gambling operations which are illegal under State law. No law-abiding citizen should be forced to pay more taxes to the Federal Government because the lawbreaker is allowed to reduce his tax burden by the amount of illegal expenditures he has made.

Congress should do all in its power to take the profit out of bigtime gambling. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent yearly to realize profits that run into the millions. If we cannot stamp out illegal gambling, we should at least make the operators pay heavily for it.

The bill I have introduced would strike at the big bettor as well as the big operator. Today the professional gambler can offset gambling losses against winnings in reporting his income. Because the law does not specify whether this includes losses from illegal gambling transactions, it presumably does. Therefore, my bill makes it clear that gamblers cannot claim losses from illegal betting. Perhaps that will discourage some of the suckers who fall prey to bigtime gambling operators, and at the same time reduce the operators' profits.

Of course, no one objects to friendly, man-to-man betting. But when gambling becomes large and commercialized, milking, bilking, corruption and harm to the ordinary bettor follow as night follows day. Whenever the big gamblers move in, waves of moral putrification spread out in all directions.

This bill is aimed directly at these big operators with their inherent corruptive powers. It would admittedly strike only a relatively minor blow at organized crime. But every blow counts in the struggle to eradicate the syndicates and their undesirable operations. They have been feeding on the good people of this land for too long. When it comes to paying taxes, they should be treated as what they are—not law-abiding businessmen, but out and out racketeers.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to prohibit the deduction of expenses or losses incurred in illegal wagering

Be it enacted, etc., That section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by redesignating subsection "c" as subsection "d" and inserting the following new subsection:

"(c) Illegal wagering: No deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for any expense paid or incurred in or as a result of illegal wagering."

SEC. 2. Subsection (d) of section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting before the period a comma and the following: "except that losses from illegal wagering transactions shall not be allowed".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall be effective with respect to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this act.

All in Favor Say "Aye"—We Like Miller, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD, my second of the Davis motion that Fishbait Miller is one of the "most" and/or "greatest." Fishbait does things for you as if it were his entire pleasure. His care, attention, understanding, and help in any and all problems, large and small,

is way above and beyond the call of duty, and done always with the best humor. No wonder he is so popular. All in favor say "aye." Aye.

No Toll Charges on the Blue Ridge Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SHUFORD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, on the morning of February 27, 1958, I was informed by the National Park Service that it would start June 1, 1958, a toll system on the Blue Ridge Parkway. Immediately I contacted Park Director Wirth and Secretary of the Interior Seaton and requested that the North Carolina Congressional delegation meet with them at the earliest possible date to voice our unanimous opposition to the Park Services directive. On this date I also introduced legislation in the House of Representatives which provides that the Blue Ridge Parkway shall be toll free. Similar legislation was introduced by several other North Carolina Members.

Secretary Seaton scheduled a meeting with our delegation for March 19, 1958, at 9:30 a. m. in the Interior Department's conference room.

On that date the Honorable Luther Hodges, Governor of North Carolina, Senator Sam Ervin, Senator W. Kerr Scott, and the entire North Carolina delegation from the House of Representatives appeared, and along with the other interested citizens presented to the Secretary, our views on this unpopular decision. After presenting our testimony we requested Mr. Seaton to rescind his order.

My colleagues from North Carolina had designated me previously to act as chairman for the delegation, the same position I held when this matter was up in 1955, since I was a member of the Interior Committee of the House of Representatives and familiar with the details of this controversy.

Yesterday Senator SAM ERVIN, Senator W. KERR SCOTT, Congressman HUGH ALEXANDER, and I went to a meeting of the Senate Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, presided over by Chairman CARL HAYDEN. We attended the session, as Senator ERVIN stated, "to give Secretary Seaton information to help him come to a righteous decision—one responsive to our views." While Interior Secretary Fred Seaton was testifying before the committee, Chairman HAYDEN recognized Senator ERVIN who asked Mr. Seaton what he intended to do about the proposed tolls on the Blue Ridge Parkway. Secretary Seaton replied, "I will not attempt to collect tolls on the Blue Ridge Parkway," reversing an earlier Interior Department order.

Mr. Seaton later gave as his reasons for rescinding the order the main arguments our Congressional delegation had presented to him at the March 19 meeting.

First, the parkway joins other State and Federal highways, so a question exists as to Interior's right to levy charges.

Second, the jurisdictional tangle would necessitate some 20 toll stations along the road. He agreed with us that it was illogical to ask a motorist to stop from 1 to 20 times on the drive.

Third, he noted that the parkway had been in existence since 1940 with no tolls.

Asked if his announcement ended the controversy Mr. Seaton said, "So far as I am concerned."

He said that, so far as he knew, he was the first Interior Secretary to say flatly that tolls should not be charged.

Others have kept the issue half alive on the back burner—

He said—

Of course, I can't bind my successors, but I have got the issue off the stove.

As I have stated many times before, I am unalterably opposed to the imposition of a charge for the use of the parkway and to keep this issue from being brought up again, my North Carolina and Virginia colleagues wish to settle this matter permanently. My bill, H. R. 11055, and identical bills, provide that the Blue Ridge Parkway shall be toll free. These bills are now pending before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of which I am a member. From the information I have received from the Interior Department I feel it will offer no opposition.

When this worthwhile legislation is presented to you for your consideration in the near future, I urge you to support it so we can settle this controversy for all time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD], not only for the fine statement he has just made but also for his diligent and effective work in trying to keep the Blue Ridge Parkway free of tolls. The entire North Carolina delegation has cooperated and worked together as a unit, with other interested citizens from our great State on this matter. It has been a team victory and I am delighted that Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton has revised his decision and has now decided that there should be no tolls charged on the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Mr. Speaker, having served on the committee of which Mr. SHUFORD was chairman to coordinate and bring to the attention of Secretary Seaton the proposed unjustifiable toll on the Blue Ridge Parkway, I know of my own knowledge that he has been untiring in his efforts and has spent countless hours in conferences with Secretary Seaton, Congressional leaders, the North Carolina Congressional delegation, and Speaker of the House, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, as well as civic leaders and public officials in North Carolina.

It was through the leadership of Congressman SHUFORD that we were able to prevent tolls being placed on the parkway 2 years ago. And I am proud to say that all of us interested in this matter again owe a debt of gratitude to Congressman SHUFORD for the diligent manner in which he has championed this cause.

One Hundred Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I have prepared commemorating the 138th anniversary of Greek independence.

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

March 25th marked the 138th anniversary of Greek independence. Greeks everywhere, joined by all freedom-loving people, are marking this anniversary by celebrations throughout the Nation this week. It is fitting therefore that tribute be paid to the tremendous contribution which Greece has made to the cause of freedom.

Greece is a small country, barely 50,000 square miles, with a population which probably never numbered more than 10 million.

But the paramount and permanent influence which this small country has had over the lives of men, particularly over the lives of the people in the West, during the last 2,000 years, bears no relation whatever to its size or to the material possessions of its people. The creative, intellectual, artistic and literary gifts of the Greek people to humanity is so great, so numerous and so widely varied, that it is almost impossible to enumerate even the most important ones. It is sufficient to say that some of the finest and noblest ideas and ideals which form the very foundations of our civilization have there origin in Greece. They were born and cradled in ancient Greece and attained their maturity in that happy land.

This ancient home of a greatly gifted people has had its splendor and glory, but for a long period it was subjected to foreign conquerors. Its inhabitants were held down by alien rulers. For almost 2,000 years, from 146 B. C. to A. D. 1821, the Greeks were subjected successively to the Romans, to Frankish kings, and to Ottoman sultans.

It is a great tribute to the Greek character that during this exceedingly long time of subjugation and oppression under alien regimes, often cruel and almost unbearable, they clung to their language, to their religion, and to their national traditions with admiral tenacity. During all that time they did not lose their sense of values. They held steadfastly to their dream of freedom and independence. The more they were oppressed by their overlords, the more firmly they resisted their oppressors. Finally on March 25, 1821, under the patriotic leadership of Archibishop Germanos, they raised the standard of revolt in his monastery near Patras and launched their war for independence. For 8 years, they fought in unison

and fought stoutly against their powerful and ferocious enemy. Often they engaged in battles with terrible odds against them. Just as often they fought with their backs to the wall, but in the end, by their courage and tenacity, together with the financial aid and moral support of their friends in other lands, they attained their goal. Then they were welcomed, amid joy and merriment, into the family of free and independent nations.

We have always held the Greek people in high esteem. We have had great sympathy for them and have consistently supported their national cause. In their fight for freedom and independence against the tyranny of the Turks, and especially in their desperate struggle to maintain their independence against fascism, nazism and communism, they have always counted upon our sympathy and aid. I am glad to be able to say that we have not disappointed them.

Early in the last war when Greece was overrun by the Axis powers our wartime President, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, was confident that Greece would be liberated and rewarded for her heroic fight against the forces of barbarism and tyranny. At the end of that war when she was liberated, she was about to fall into the clutches of Communist tyranny. Our answer to this new threat was the Truman doctrine. In March 1947, President Truman initiated his program of economic and military aid to save Greece from Soviet penetration.

In money alone our aid totaled more than $2 billion, and we have never felt that a single dollar was undeserved. Today Greece is safe from external threats, and has become a bastion for freedom in the Free World's fight against communism. She is the only really free and independent country in the whole Balkan Peninsula. We honor her as our ally in this world struggle, and we all join Greeks everywhere in the celebration of their National Independence Day. With a whole heart, we are proud to rejoice with them.

Military Pay Adjustment Bill Will Not Accomplish Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the military pay adjustment bill because I am convinced it will not do what it purports to do.

We have been told that this measure will prevent potential careerists from leaving the Armed Forces for higher pay elsewhere. I submit that this bill offers little if anything to convince the waverer.

What it does provide is a giant windfall for the generals and admirals, whose career decisions, I should imagine, have already been made. To the one-term enlistee, weighing the pros and cons of continued service, the bill holds out nothing more than a cost-of-living adjustment plus the vision of a pot of gold waiting at the end of the rainbow.

I doubt that any office boy or junior clerk, in to see the boss about a raise, could be successfully put off with a penny an hour and the hope of a vice presidency some day. Neither can we expect to guarantee a satisfactory reenlistment rate with a minor bonus and an injunction to persevere.

This bill would increase the basic pay of 4-star officers by 47 percent, of lieutenant generals by 38 percent, of major generals by 31 percent, of brigadier generals by 25 percent, of colonels by 21 percent, and of lieutenant colonels by 17 percent.

Yet we were told during the debate on the bill by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] that the really serious shortage has developed among officers with from 3 to 13 years of service experience. The report of the Committee on Armed Services notes that under normal circumstances, promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel comes between the 18th and 21st year of service and promotion to colonel between the 22d and 26th years. The chief benefits of this bill, therefore, fall to those who have already passed the critical stage in their careers.

The significant shortages are among the junior officers, first lieutenants and captains, whose pay is to be increased by only 8 to 12 percent.

Worse yet, the benefits are so directed that they will never reach the average officer in any significant amount, no matter how long he may remain in service. The 47-percent increase will go to a mere 38 officers, less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the total officer complement in the United States armed services. The 38-percent benefit will reach 94 officers, the 31-percent benefit 513 officers, and the 25-percent benefit 641 officers. In short, four-tenths of 1 percent of all officers—those of general rank—will enjoy the greatest share of the rewards.

Small mention was made of this fact in the debates on the bill. Instead, proponents told us how heavy were to be the benefits to the enlisted men. We were informed that two categories of supergrades will get raises of 28 to 44 percent in pay. What was conveniently ignored is the provision in the bill that only 3 percent of the enlisted men—at a maximum—can serve in these supergrades at any one time.

The cost estimates on this bill for fiscal year 1959 show that only 688 men can expect to be promoted immediately to supergrade E–9 and only 3,387 to supergrade E–8. The overwhelming majority of master sergeants—more than 97 percent, in fact—will continue to serve in their present pay grade. For them the increase is to average a mere 16 percent.

It should be added here, too, that the situation among enlisted men is the same as it is among officers. The very men whose continuance in the service is most in danger benefit least from the proposed increases.

Nor is this wholly a matter of pay. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] pointed out so cogently during the debate, high-ranking military officers, especially generals, enjoy a good many side benefits—airplanes, personal staffs, luxurious quarters at minimum costs. I do not quarrel with these benefits. I do, however, agree with the gentleman from Indiana that when generals' salaries are compared with those of civilian executives, these fringe items plus a very liberal retirement plan, plus free medical attention, plus career security must be added into the balance.

To be sure, service careers must be made more attractive if we are to retain skilled technicians and trained officers. But to use this argument as a basis for creating a topheavy pay schedule is to stand reason upon its head—as more than one member of the Committee on Armed Services tacitly admitted during the debate.

At one time, in the heyday of the Cordiner report, we were led to believe that legislation such as this would save the country $5 billion annually in defense appropriations. The Defense Department has now disowned this extravagant claim. It does promise to save $100 million a year after 1962. I am convinced that it will do nothing of the sort.

I am disturbed to see this general's pay bill waltzing past in a masquerade costume. It is not an incentive plan for junior officers or for on-the-fence enlisted men. It is a bonanza for the brass.

Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1958, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] addressed the annual convention of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers at Denver, Colo.

He devoted part of his address to the grave questions growing out of the President's request for extension of the Trade Agreements Act. He has well stated the position of many of us from the raw material States—we have much to gain by foreign trade; but we have everything to lose if this trade is to be over the bodies of our domestic raw material producers and the business communities which serve them.

Mr. MONTOYA's address follows:

President Clark, officers of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, delegates and guests at this convention, I am indeed happy to be here today on this platform and to discuss with you the many problems which affect the welfare of not only your membership but of the American workingman. We in the Congress, at all times, try to keep our sights on the trends which pattern our economy because the fluctuating nature of our prosperity is beset with danger signals at all times. At the present time, when the unemployment figure is in the neighborhood of 5 million people in this the wealthiest nation in the world, we cannot afford to relax and plunge into a state of complacency. Certainly, we cannot afford to resort to slogans of hope and confidence and reassurance as a self-satisfying panacea for the economic ills which are gnawing at the foundation of our economy.

You in the mining industry are fully aware of the hardships, trials and tribulations, pains and sufferings that attend a recession

in the very industry in which you are engaged. As workingmen you understand fully this brutal and indeed sad picture as it shows its ugly face in the many mining camps of the West. The grave warning which your very able officers gave to Congress and to the administration a year ago are today becoming self-evident truths and still no positive program has been formulated to alleviate the dire consequences which have resulted from administrative inaction not only in our mining industry but in many other phases of our economy.

It is no wonder that the American people, schooled by bitter experience in the ups and downs of our economy, have been rebelling against giveaway programs on foreign aid, against multi-million-dollar duplications of specific defense projects which sometimes have no sense of positive direction. I, for one, cannot accept justifications for the foreign-aid program in the name of peace and at the same time sacrifice our domestic economy in the process. I believe there is a middle ground which can be met with a sensible approach and a dedicated regard for the welfare of our constituents at home. This seems to be the battle in Washington where you find a Democratic Congress acting as the balance wheel trying to stabilize the workings of our foreign policy in such a manner that our domestic economy will not be sacrificed.

It is fortunate that our forefathers provided for having three separate branches of Government; namely, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Throughout our history, the doctrine of separation of powers among these three branches has never been more evident than during the present time.

In our foreign relations the Congress has exerted real leadership in trying to steer a clear course in the field of our domestic economy. The Congress has been the guiding force trying to evolve means to combat the ills that plague the different aspects of our economy. This is true of the lead and zinc industry.

You will recall that approximately a year ago after lengthy hearings by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives a recommendation was made to the Tariff Commission that it initiate hearings on this very critical situation so that proper recommendations could be presented to the President for final action under the escape-clause powers. Although the hearings have been held by the Tariff Commission, no decision or recommendation has been arrived at by that agency, and we come back to the old story that the American people are getting sick and tired of waiting for decisions to be made after the illness has struck the patient down.

The President has sufficient authority at the present time, without the benefit of a new law, to either curb imports of lead and zinc, or to impose a tariff which will equalize the competitive feature between foreign and domestic producers of these ores. Presently, the Congress is being called upon to extend the Trade Agreements Act which will continue this authority of tariff regulation of imports in the hands of the President and neither I nor any other Representative in Congress who has a vital concern for the welfare of this industry here at home can conscientiously vote to give the President this requested authority when he has consistently refused to invoke it for the purpose of forestalling the dire consequences with which you are plagued today.

Before we can vote to give the President the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, we must be convinced that he will use the power granted therein to prevent the downfall of our domestic economy; that he will become the attending physician instead of the available diagnostician at the bedside of this ailing patient—our lead and zinc industry.

Those who clamor for bipartisanship in our foreign policy must stand ready to prove bipartisanship in the herculean effort to lift our economy from the threatened chaos to which it is presently assigned.

The 30,000 families throughout the country directly dependent upon the domestic lead and zinc industry and the additional thousands employed in related service industries undoubtedly will not be amused at the efforts to reduce the emergency facing this industry to semantic dullness. The freetraders who believe in unrestricted importation for the sake of good foreign relationships will, if this policy continues, some day become the reluctant mourners at the eventual funeral of a once healthy lead and zinc industry.

We must not give up the battle so easily because I feel we are made of sterner stuff. You as real citizens and your neighbors and friends and we as your duly elected representatives will continue to wage the fight for the understanding of our problem. We will emerge from the wilderness into the open forum and we will not relax in our firm determination to get recognition for our lead and zinc industry. I may add at this point that copper and uranium are also becoming orphans and victims of those in the administration who espouse the idea of free unrestricted trade. The West is an integral part of the United States of America and united it will fight for positive action which will be remedial in scope and strong in substance. For us to fail in the midst of adversity is but to say that we will abandon ship before the torpedo has struck its mark.

The gravity of our unemployment situation cannot be underestimated in spite of reassurances from the White House that the spring portends an upward trend. There is no present economic justification for this emphatic optimism. Throughout our country today exist many pockets of depression, if you please. You yourselves can point to many in your own areas and cannot reconcile in your own minds the reasons for the optimism that is flowing out of Washington from Mr. Eisenhower's press conferences. Are we to resign ourselves to a government which is steered by reassurances for the better rather than by action to curb distress? Are we to forget that during the last year there were 13,771 business failures, the highest since the 1929 debacle of "prosperity just around the corner"? I don't believe the time has come for ordinary citizens to jump out of windows in despair to accentuate our critical situation and impress its gravity upon the powers that be. I don't believe that partisan politics should be applied in offering any diagnosis of our ills. Our concern should rise above this plateau and as it rises to the horizon of understanding it should find bipartisan consideration to the end that our country and the citizens within it should become a fertile valley of plenty for all Americans. This course requires positive leadership and positive action. In my estimation, the Congress of the United States has its ears tuned to the pulse of public sentiment in filling this vacuum and already many proposals have been offered in the Congress for a progressive public works program, a healthy reclamation effort which, if enacted into law, and approved by the President, will serve as reenergizers to the sagging economy of today. We must not ignore the great effort that is necessary to improve upon our educational programs. Giving out scholarships under Federal subsidies to worthy students is a fine goal but it is not enough. We must not forget the underprivileged children of America who because they reside in school districts with exhausted bonded capacity do not have school plant facilities equal to those in more fortunate areas of this rich Nation of ours. This is the land of equal opportunity for all and this must not be only a phrase in our Constitution; it must stand as a monument insuring equal opportunities for all.

It is indeed a sad commentary on the principles enunciated in our Constitution with respect to equal opportunity that we find in many parts of our country inadequate and antiquated school buildings with poor lighting and heating facilities. In many school systems today the crowded conditions have made it necessary to split the school day into two sessions to insure attendance of all the students. The States and the local school districts have exhausted their energies and their financial capacities to cope with these problems and still the complete remedy is not in sight—yet, the enemies of Federal aid to education persist in voicing their opposition to this inescapable approach to the problem. They argue that they do not want the Federal Government to interfere with the education of their children and when pinned down for specifics they cannot tell you wherein the Government has interfered. Their clamor follows a pattern which permeates the history of any movement to help the underprivileged.

The labor movement experienced it. The old people were plagued with it when Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed welfare assistance and social security; and when the system of unemployment compensation was conceived and proposed to the National Congress. Although this fight has raged in the past, we must not fall into a state of complacency and rely strictly on history to overcome the formidable opposition. We must roll up our sleeves as we did then on social security, collective bargaining, unemployment compensation, and gear ourselves for action. We must apprise our parent-teacher associations, our school officials, our leading citizens that education is not a naked concession that must be taken at face value according to the ability of the local unit of government.

We must insist on quality because education is the great impenetrable bulwark in our first line of defense. We must not depend upon a state of complacency to move the wheels of our educational process. You and I and many others like us must imbue the movement with our support, with our enthusiasm, with our supplications, and with all the energies that we can devise in order to insure progression instead of retrogression in the field of social security.

The high cost of living daily renders this system less valuable to the retired worker. Must we fall into a state of resignation to the status quo just because the Great White Father has failed to recommend proper legislative action in this regard? Collectively and individually we must urge our public servants to take inventory of this worsening inequity which finds social-security benefits dwindling into insignificance because of the steadily increasing cost of living. The same is true of unemployment-compensation benefits.

I am convinced that the prosperity of this Nation cannot be preserved unless we nurture it so as to insure adequate living wages and proper working conditions for the working people of America. A program that ignores the welfare of the working people and the farmers in the lower level of our economy will eventually become the pallbearer at the graveyard of depression. History proves this conclusively and I believe that recent experimentation with tight money and other related approaches clearly bears out the sanity of a more desirable approach which I have mentioned.

In the field of labor relationships we cannot escape the inevitable fact that organized labor is being put to the test of proving that it is an institution with the prime objective of improving the lot of the working man. This has come about because of a few cases of asserted dishonesty among labor officials. It is sad indeed that the winds of public opinion formulated by these isolated cases

of violation of trust should cast aspersions on the vast majority of the ranks of labor.

You and I are cognizant of the many attempts being made today by the enemies of organized labor to discredit the union movement in America. Clear-thinking men and women will never buy the propaganda brochures that are being compiled by high-salaried public-relations men in an attempt to sell to the American people the idea that union labor is an evil in our economy, but let us not be quiescent about this reaction * * * let us not go to sleep at the wheel * * * let us prove, as members of the rank and file, that we have corresponding duties and obligations.

I know you will not forget that when the right of collective bargaining comes as a legislative concession from your Government that you as American citizens owe it to yourselves to preserve the integrity, the principles, and the ideals for which this Government stands.

I know that you will not forget that patriotism manifested and expressed in your deliberations and your every-day comportment will constitute the strongest nutrient for insuring the endurance of this legislative concession of collective bargaining and faith in the American labor movement. Approach your problems with realism, with logic, and as Americans. Do not permit yourselves to be herded into a stampede of ill-conceived action by unscrupulous agitation. Your dedication must always be on the side of right, on the side of patriotism, on the side on good faith. When you have adhered to these principles, your performance will be visible and will serve to drown the outcries of those enemies who clamor for retribution against the workingmen under the guise of untrammeled freedom of enterprise.

I want you to know that I feel highly privileged to be able to speak to you on this occasion. May we hope that with our common efforts the tides of adversity will be met with unity of purpose and dedicated resolve to the end that the common weal of the workingman of this country will be improved upon and stand fraternally as an ally of a better tomorrow.

Hon. Herbert H. Lehman: A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, March 28, 1958, marks the 80th birthday anniversary of a great American, former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.

His distinguished record of service as governor of New York and as United States Senator has won for him the respect and admiration of all Americans. His courageous dedication to the cause of liberalism and humanitarian justice has served as an inspiration to those of us who were privileged to know him.

While Senator Lehman was a wealthy man, he devoted his life of public service to the best interests of the average American, and particularly the most unfortunate among us. A stanch defender of the public interest, he consistently opposed special privilege legislation, fought intolerance and racial bigotry, and worked tirelessly for the improvement of liberal programs of the New and Fair Deals.

I join the millions of grateful Americans in extending to Senator Lehman warm birthday greetings. May he continue to enjoy good health and happiness for many years to come.

The Omnibus Education Act of 1958, H. R. 11960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, I addressed the House for 1 hour on the need for a realistic Paul Bunyan plan for education. Today I am introducing the Omnibus Education Act of 1958, H. R. 11960, which I originally proposed on March 10.

I shall not make a statement at this time but should like to refer you to pages 3829–3840 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 10.

H. R. 11960 provides for the following amounts of money to be expended:

Grants-in-aid and payments to individuals and institutions	Loans-in-aid and advances	Description of aid
$2,500,000,000	----------	Elementary and secondary school construction and equipment.
----------	$500,000,000	Local school board purchase fund (a revolving fund).
----------	10,000,000,000	Advances to reserve funds (credit assistance to State school financing agencies).
3,000,000,000	----------	Operation of public elementary and secondary schools (increase of teacher salaries, building operation and maintenance, pupil transportation, expansion of curriculums).
1,000,000,000	----------	Guidance and counseling (institutes; aid to State agencies).
500,000,000	----------	Undergraduate scholarships.
----------	10,000,000,000	National student loan fund (a revolving fund).
500,000,000	----------	Summer-school and extension courses for teachers.
500,000,000	----------	Graduate fellowships.
500,000,000	----------	New educational mediums (research, experimentation, equipment—radio, television, and motion pictures).
400,000,000	----------	Special education for exceptional children.
200,000,000	----------	School health services and research in child health.
100,000,000	----------	Adult education.
700,000,000	----------	Vocational education below college grades (agriculture, including on farm training; home economics; trade and industry; and distributive occupations).
100,000,000	----------	School lunches.

The Legislator Looks at the Physician's Place in Public Affairs—Congressman Judd Speaks to Medical Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Courier issue of March 1958, the magazine of the George Washington University Medical Center, Washington, D. C.:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WALTER H. JUDD, REPUBLICAN FROM THE FIFTH DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA, BEFORE THE MEDICAL SCHOOL STUDENT BODY ON JANUARY 11, 1958—DR. JUDD IS A PHYSICIAN, A FORMER MEDICAL MISSIONARY IN CHINA, AND HAS BEEN IN THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS SINCE 1942

The day has come when it is not possible for the doctor to practice by himself, any more than it is for a businessman to work by himself. They have both got to work in terms of the whole picture.

Our profession is going through a transition, the same as various other professions, even politics to some extent. In the beginning the doctor treated symptoms. He didn't understand what caused them, but he was called in to relieve pain or difficulty. * * * He was skillful in relieving symptoms, much more than we are today, in my opinion, because he concentrated his attention on these symptoms.

He knew how to write prescriptions that had such a bitter taste that it had at least some sort of psychological effect on the patient. He got better in order to be relieved of the necessity of taking more of the decoctions.

These men were not too bad in their field. In China I found the medical profession at this stage of development. They were experts at prognosis from their study of pulses. They have about 14 different kinds of pulses.

They will tell you how long the patient can live with these different kind of pulses. I learned not to stick out my neck and tell them I didn't see why the patient had to die because when it comes to predicting how long he was going to live, they were usually more accurate than I was because they concentrated on this one thing.

Now, there is a danger in this kind of medicine because when you treat the symptom, you don't get at the basic root of the disease. I learned that when I gave aspirin to malaria patients along with quinine, at about the time the fever was about to break, anyway, they would break into a sweat and the fever would go down and the aches and pains and misery would be gone.

They would say, "That's wonderful," and they wouldn't take the bitter quinine; they just wanted the aspirin.

I would say, "But you'll be sick again in another few days if you don't take the quinine."

"Never mind," they'd say, "I'll come back and get another aspirin."

So, I had to quit giving aspirin in order to get them to take the quinine. Often I gave them medicine for the disease and hoped and prayed the symptoms wouldn't disappear too quickly, because then the patient wouldn't come back again * * *.

This was the stage of development in medicine a few years ago.

Then somebody discovered the tubercle bacillus, and someone else the diptheria bacillus. Someone began doing autopsies in numbers. It became clear that there were processes going on in organs that produced the symptoms. The doctor began to shift his attention from the results, the symptoms, to the causes of disease.

This was the period when I was trained in medicine, often called the period of therapeutic nihilism. We treated the disease, studied the disease, forgot about the patient. The ear was glued to the stethoscope, the eye to the microscope. It was a good period but it was not enough * * *.

Then we asked, "What can we do to prevent these processes?" The shift, the continuing metamorphosis was to preventive medicine. You had to be able to interpret the tuberculin patch, study sewage disposal, water and milk purity, pure food laws. The doctor had to use his immunizing needle as well as his stethoscope.

Then we went to a fourth stage, waking up to what the Chinese doctors had known all the time, the importance of the relationship of the emotions and the mind to the processes, and vice versa. We lost too many patients to those who treated people's emotions and created faith in them while we were just taking care of certain physiological processes.

There developed a good deal of attention to psychosomatic medicine.

The war came for us as it did for businessmen, and you went through medical school and were all ready to begin practice, but the Government said, "No, Uncle Sam has greetings." So you went out and tried to practice medicine around the world under conditions for which you were not prepared, and many a doctor woke up to the fact that it was not enough to be a skilled physician; he had to pay some attention to the political developments that had gotten us into all this dislocation * * *.

So, just to practice medicine, not to consider other things, we have got to pay more attention to public affairs than we have ever done in the past. We have to do it, really, for three reasons: first, we have to do it to insure the conditions which will enable us to practice good medicine with success and satisfaction for ourselves.

Second, we have to pay some attention to public affairs in order to influence and improve conditions which adversely affect our patients. This is part of our obligation; not just to make the diagnosis, "This man has hypertension," or "He has arthritis," because he's got something else wrong with him, too. He's got a business that's in trouble. Inflation is taking his life's savings. He doesn't see what is ahead; he is apprehensive about atomic weapons. What kind of a world is he going to live in?

These things bother him just as much as his ulcers or his insomnia or his gaseous indigestion. If you are really going to contribute to the man's needs, you have to understand the impact of his environment on him and be in a position to influence that environment to produce more favorable conditions.

There is a third reason, in addition to what you have to do, yourself, as a physician. That is to influence your future and that of your children as citizens, because before anyone is a doctor or a clergyman or a businessman, he is a citizen of this Republic. You are taxpayers and parents; you are trustees of a heritage, a way of life, a philosophy, that has made it possible for you to be here in this medical school.

That heritage is under attack: cold, calculating, determined, and increasingly successful attack, all around the world. If we are going to be good physicians for ourselves, our families and our patients, and our society as a whole, we must realize that nobody is needed more desperately than those with the kind of minds you have after the kind of training you have had in your medical school. Approach the political diseases just as you do physical and emotional diseases.

Doctors, almost to a man, are opposed to socialized medicine. By that I mean medical services supported and controlled by the Government.

The general public says, "You doctors are against socialized medicine because you have a union, a closed shop. You want to keep everybody out of it and you want to protect you own interests, jack up prices, and so on. You are against Government supported and controlled medicine because it will hurt you."

Now, this is not so. It isn't because it would hurt us that we are against it. The good doctor can always get ahead under any system. The poor doctor is better off under socialized medicine than he is under free competition. He does not have to worry. He gets out of medical school and the Government offers him six or seven thousand dollars a year right off the bat. He can continue with that the rest of his life and probably won't do much better than that. But, at least he is secure. Government will keep him on almost indefinitely.

The rank and file will be more secure under socialized medicine. Once in a while you find a doctor who is for it. The doctors as a group would not be worse off.

But, the patients would be worse off.

There are three essentials to good medical practice. First, the relationship between the physician and the patient must be wholly voluntary. If it isn't, something goes out of the interest and the confidence of the relationship. If the patient is just a number assigned to him by the Government, the doctor, in many cases, doesn't have the same interest he would if the patient chose him, in which case the doctor would want the patient to keep coming back to him.

Contrariwise, if the patient didn't choose the doctor, and was just assigned, that patient doesn't have quite the confidence in him and sits there, sort of on guard, holding back, not willing to come out and lay the whole story before him because he is not sure.

The combination of confidence and interest is necessary if there is to be good medical practice. Under Government it would not be voluntary on either side.

The second requirement for good medical practice is that there be no intermediary between the patient and the physician. Under socialized medicine there has to be an intermediary. Somebody has got to decide whether the doctor made the right diagnosis.

Who is that going to be? It is going to be the Government. Who is going to be in the Government? Doctors? Yes, at the top, but in general it is going to be the clerks who will go through the records to see if the doctor did all the things. Did he take all the X-rays, did he do all the routine tests? Furthermore, the clerk sits there and reads all the history.

Maybe men are willing to tell about all their escapades, but most women are not, and when she finds out that everything she tells the doctor is going to be checked on by some clerk, she isn't going to tell the doctor. She is deprived of the chance to have good medical treatment and the whole thing breaks down. It is a system that looks perfect on paper, but it doesn't give more and better care for less. It gives less and poorer medical care for more * * *.

The third essential for good medical practice is that you must have a system that gives maximum incentive for the doctor to improve himself, to study, to get ahead according to his ability.

What are the incentives? There are two. One is financial reward. There is in every profession the individual who has a "self-starter." No matter what the economic conditions, he will give everything he has. But the type is a minority in our profession as in every other. Most of us do better if we are going to get a reward, or think we are, in rough proportion to the effort and merit that we put into it.

The other incentive is professional recognition. Dollars are tangible and they are precious, but there is another thing which is more precious and that is recognition, professional advancement in accordance with your growth, your improvement and your merit.

I think the position you will come to covet more than any other is to be known as the doctor's doctor. I remember once while I was at the Mayo Clinic, a couple of boys from a certain eastern medical school came out to look around with their new medical knowledge and evaluate the various medical establishments there.

One of them, who knew me distantly, called me up and told me about the "temple of mediocrity," as he called the Mayo Clinic, with its mass-production methods.

Well, the Lord was with us on this particular occasion, because when we started next morning's clinic and the boys were up in the amphitheater to watch the temple of mediocrity, who was wheeled in as the first patient, but their own professor of surgery. He had come out to have his own gallbladder taken out at the Mayo Clinic.

You can fool the patients, but you can't fool the other doctors. * * *

Recognition is a tremendously rewarding thing, and if a society freezes you and you become like bureaus of the Government, something that's important, essential for good medical practice goes out. * * *

[We have to be aware of these things in public life] * * * not because we are doctors, but because of what we know as doctors about the practice of medicine. We are concerned with the quality of the service. They [the reformers] concentrate on more equitable distribution of the services; they assume the quality, taking it for granted.

In getting more distribution they tend to cut the nerve of the thing that produced the good quality. Where you have socialized medicine, you have what you have in England; you have better distribution of a commodity that is increasingly unworthy of being distributed because of continued disintegration brought on by lack of interest, confidence, integrity, and incentive.

We need your type of mind, the kind of mind first trained at the autopsy table. Autopsy is seldom flattering. But you are trained not to recriminate and say, "Why did you make that mistake?" but to ask, "How did you make that mistake?"

You may have been perfectly sure the trouble was in the liver. You may have had expert consultants who all agreed it was in the liver. And you may have been able to convince all the relatives the trouble was in the liver. But when you opened him up the trouble was in the pancreas, and it was in the pancreas, period. It doesn't make any difference if the doctor is a Republican or a Democrat. It was in the pancreas.

The doctor is taught to study in terms of what is, not what he wishes.

Then he is taught the biopsy idea. He looks through a microscope and sees cells that have rejected the law-abiding processes of growth. He doesn't say, "It is cancer, all right, but it's only in the big toe."

As some said, "It's only what Hitler is doing to the Jews," or "It is only what the Chinese are doing in Manchuria. * * *"

"It's a long way off. Let's wait and see if it spreads."

It gets to the heart or the liver or the brain or the lungs. It is too late then.

The doctor is trained to say, "No, that's cancer. The thing that makes cancer bad is not what it is, but the way it grows. * * *"

Farm Policies of Secretary of Agriculture Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for the attention of my colleagues a communication which I wrote to President Eisenhower regarding the farm policies of Secretary of Agriculture Benson:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In recent weeks it has seemed to me that attacks against Secretary of Agriculture Benson have taken on new vigor. I am alarmed by the persistent demands that he be relieved from duty and would like to go on record as strongly opposing these demands.

As a third generation dirt farmer and the Representative in Congress of one of the top 15 counties in agricultural production I believe I am qualified to express myself. I therefore respectfully request your indulgence in the following statement of the reasons why I wholeheartedly support Mr. Benson.

First, I strongly subscribe to the policy of placing principle above expediency. Mr. Benson has proven himself to be a man of principle by acting in the best interests of his country rather than a favored few.

Secondly, I believe Mr. Benson's policies have been and are in the best interests of farmers themselves. Farmers have chosen their occupation because, by their very nature, they are people who love independence and freedom. The farm policies of the past have succeeded in making farmers wards of the Government, a situation which is repugnant to the very nature of a legitimate "son of the soil."

The only suggested alternative to Mr. Benson's policy for the gradual abolition of high price supports and the return of a self-respecting system of free farm enterprise has been a system of high fixed supports. During Democratic administrations this system proved a dismal failure. It created a huge surplus during wartime periods of abnormally high demand when prices would have been high without Government interference. This surplus has been with us to depress prices whenever artificial wartime stimuli were absent. In fact, it can be said that farm prosperity during Democratic years was directly tied to war and not to the price-support system. I see no reason why we should return to a system which has caused our present ills and was erroneously given credit for the prosperity created by the sacrifice of American boys on foreign battlefields.

High price supports, in my opinion, can be compared to a drink of whisky to the alcoholic. It gives him temporary relief but only aggravates his major problem. His only chance for cure is to leave the "stuff" alone and go to a diet of sound and substantial food which eventually fills his body with a real and lasting strength. Continued dissipation will inevitably lead him to an institution as a ward of the Government.

Furthermore, high fixed supports for basic commodities are unfair to a great bulk of our Nation's farmers who raise specialty crops. In the Midwest tractors and fertilizer bought with purchasing power from support money have gone up in price. These increased prices have also been paid by specialty farmers in my district who haven't received Government help. Many of my poultrymen feed price-supported grains and sell unsupported meat. Cattlemen have the same problem. Is this fair?

Good farmers can make a profit without spoon feeding from vote-hungry politicians. It is true that the farmer's costs have gone up but his productive capacity has also gone up to a greater degree. On the same acres farmed by my father and his father before him it is possible for me to produce twice the tonnage with less work if I am only willing to take advantage of new fertilizers, insecticides, irrigation practices, machinery, and farming techniques. I readily admit that under a system of free farm enterprise certain marginal farms and farmers will not survive, but it is not the function of Government to support a marginal and inefficient operation. If that has become our policy then let's be fair about it and support the marginal butcher, baker, and candlestick maker. Let's support the ne'er-do-well who is too lazy to work and hold a job. Let's make him a ward of the Government, too.

High fixed price supports are a fraud on the consuming public. At a time when we are concerned about unemployment and shrunken pay envelopes it is utter deceit to subsidize one bloc of our economy and force the worried housewife to pay higher prices for the food on the family table. How long can we go on subsidizing the marginal farmer simply because he is politically potent without doing the same for the rest of the country? The farmers I know and have lived my life with want to pull their own load and will gladly do so.

Price supports are a greater fraud on the small farmer. Thousands of corporation farmers have been attracted to the business with the lure of a guaranteed profit. With plenty of capital for labor saving machinery and unlimited bargaining power for the acquisition of land and volume purchases of seed, fertilizer, and other necessary items they have forced the small farmer to compete in a world of big business. Faced with the necessity of doing most of his own work with smaller units and less efficient machinery he has failed in this competition. Since the advent of cotton price supports, the trend in the great Central Valley of California has been toward larger and larger farm units. I strongly believe that Democratic farm policies have given us the corporation farm and ruined the small, family sized unit.

Mr. President, the time has now come when we must honestly answer this question: "Will farmers be free or wards of the Government?" There is no in between point. We must either socialize our farms or get out of the business entirely. I urge you to get out and suggest two positive steps:

1. Retain Ezra Taft Benson, a man of integrity, foresight, and courage.

2. Announce to the public that within a specified period of time it is the intention of the United States Government to get completely out of the price-support business except for a program which is legitimate disaster insurance.

I have great faith in the American farmer. When confronted with the challenge to do right or wrong, he will do right. As a Republican I hope our party will have the courage to give him a clear-cut choice. Let's stop trying to cover up a fire with another smoke screen. Let's put it out with cold, clear water and get at the job of building a decent and free farm economy.

I apologize for the strong terms in which I have expressed myself but nothing weaker would be sufficient to carry the views of a free farmer who wants to stay that way.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Member of Congress, 10th District, California.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the Free World most of us know that the Soviet Union, by its unrelenting and wanton tyranny, has caused more misery and misfortune to tens of millions of people than any other regime on record. No other regime has, deliberately and systematically, by brute force and with impunity, enslaved so many millions for such a long time. Moscow-dominated communism now covers over one-eighth of the world's land surface. Dozens of racial and ethnic groups have been, or are being, suppressed by the Soviet steamroller. We know this fact, but we sometimes forget the fact that some of these ethnic groups still cling to their cherished ideals of liberty and freedom, and ceaselessly hope that one day they may attain their goal. The Byelorussians, numbering several million, are one of these larger ethnic groups in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government has done everything in its power to obliterate existing differences between the Byelorussians and the regular Russians, but historically these two people represent distinct ethnic groups. Even though Byelorussians had been subjected to the czarist Russian regime for several centuries, they succeeded in preserving some of their national ideals and traditions, and thus have kept alive the idea of their distinct nationality.

On March 25, 1918, the Council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic proclaimed the independence of that nation. After 125 years of czarist domination the Byelorussian people were free and they immediately began to establish their own democratic sovereign government.

Unfortunately, it is with sadness that we commemorate the 40th anniversary of this historic date. Soviet tyranny was soon established through the ruthless use of overwhelming military might. Soviet police-state methods were substituted for the people's hard-won liberties. Thought control replaced freedom of speech and press. In short, through force the Soviets attempted to crush the free spirit of 20 million people.

The peoples of the Free World know, however, that the perseverance of this gallant nation cannot be broken. The Byelorussian people with their undying belief in God and the dignity of the individual will triumph once again. We pray with these gallant people that the day is not far off when the Byelorussian people will join the free peoples of the world in a joyous independence celebration.