national defenses and after a few humiliating years be forced to surrender our individual liberties and meekly submit to the tyrannical rule of atheistic materialism.

The Russian package deal is as follows:

1. That the United States give formal recognition to the status quo as it now exists in the world. In other words, we are being asked to recognize the right of the Russians to occupy, exploit, and destroy all the many nations now under occupation by the Red army or controlled by the Communist puppet regimes set up by the Russians. We are thus being asked to sanction the cruel division of humanity which is responsible for world tensions. This would mean turning our backs upon our proven allies, the oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain, and deserting all the moral and political principles which rest at the very foundation of our civilization. In a very special sense this would mean condemning our brethren now suffering under the heel of atheistic communism to a perpetual hell on earth.

2. That a general disarmament agreement be entered into, which hard experience tells us would not be worth the paper it was written on, whereby the free world would denounce the use of the weapons of defense which alone have stood in the way of further Russian armed aggression against the nations on the periphery of the vastly expanded Russian empire. We are being asked to trust the Russian Communists, to believe that they will abide by such an agreement. The record shows that any agreement entered into by the Russians is good only so long as it serves their objective of world conquest, and no longer.

This is the package deal the Russians are presenting as their price for peace. They have it well disguised but only the most naive fail to see this pattern.

If, in a moment of weakness, we acceded to such package deal, we would set our country and the entire world upon an unavoidable course of war. Freemen will never surrender peacefully to the tyrant, and war would thereby result at a time selected by the Russian leaders and in circumstances which they believed promised swift and certain victory.

Nevertheless, there are strange voices in our midst calling for a try at peaceful coexistence with the Russian Communists. Others support recognition of the status quo on the basis that by so doing we would in some mystic manner wipe the slate clean and cleanse the world of all tensions and strife. But these strange voices seem unmindful of and have no concern for the dignity of the individual and the inherent right of all people and nations to liberty, freedom, and self-government.

The road to a just and lasting peace, at best, is not an easy one. It demands patience, courage, sacrifice, and unwavering support of those basic ideals and principles which grow out of a recognition of the essential dignity of man. It permits no room for compromise of those ideals and principles and rejects secret agreements arrived at in the tempting atmosphere behind closed doors.

It is dedication to this spirit which causes the Irish Government to be denied membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, because to gain membership she would be required to sign an agreement to recognize the status quo in Ireland for a period of 20 years. Ireland by right belongs in NATO but the price of admission would have required her to desert her ideals and principles. She could not more recognize the right of the British Government to maintain the unnatural division of Ireland than we Americans would wish NATO to recognize the unnatural division of Europe caused by the Russian Communists.

It is paradoxical that NATO, by proclamation has adopted the principle of the right of all people and nations to self-determination and self-government, yet the British as members of NATO refuse this right to Ireland and thus exclude her from membership in NATO.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1958

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

O Thou God of our salvation, in the holy pilgrimage of this sacred week we fain would join devout multitudes, under all skies, treading the way of sorrow. We lift our eyes to man's Best Man, as with steadfast face, in lowly majesty, He rides on to a waiting cross on a green hill outside a city wall. May that cross of the Redeemer, which in these days of the Passion is the mystic magnet for millions, be for us, as never before, as we watch Him there, the sublime symbol that truth will conquer error, that light will dispel darkness, and that life at last is lord of death.

In our personal lives and in our national and global relationships, may we face whatever the future holds, calm and confident that the third day comes. May we hold that faith, and hold it fast. We ask it in the ever-blessed name of the Risen Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 2, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

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 bill (S. 1386) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of power or train brakes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 776) to permit temporary free importation of automobiles and parts of automobiles when intended solely for show purposes.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 5005. An act to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude chicory and to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to chicory;

H. R. 8794. An act to provide an exemption from the tax imposed on admissions for admissions to certain musical performances; and

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to invite the several States and foreign countries to take part in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to June 13, 1958.

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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9821) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 305) providing for printing additional copies of general revenue hearings, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 497. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

S. 2120. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, Mercedes division.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROVISIONS OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITIES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide certain administrative authorities for the National Security Agency, and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, covering the period July 1, 1957, through December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation fund, dated September 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT PRIOR TO RESTORATION OF BALANCES, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prior to restoration of balances, Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, as of February 28, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

A letter from the Executive Vice President, National Fund for Medical Education, New York, N. Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education, for the year ended December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESEARCH INTO FLIGHT PROBLEMS WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE EARTH'S ATMOSPHERE

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for research into problems of flight within and outside the earth's atmosphere, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Clarence Van Vredenburgh, of St. Augustine, Fla., relating to the printing, by the Government Printing Office, of instructions for individual purchasers, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 3600. A bill to provide for certain purchasing programs for copper, lead, manganese, and zinc, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3601. A bill for the relief of Ralph E. Swift and his wife, Sally Swift; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 3602. A bill to authorize the exchange of land or timber within the Siskiyou National Forest, Oregon, for certain other land adjacent to such national forests; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 3603. A bill to amend section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3604. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1915, which established the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and to establish the National Astronautics Agency, and for other purposes; to the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics.

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

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

S 3605. A bill to authorize the termination and modification of certain contracts requiring premium payments for Government oil from the naval petroleum reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 3606. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States for educational purposes by returning to the States a portion of the Federal income taxes collected therein; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 3607. A bill for the relief of Harvey L. Forden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 3608. A bill to revive and reenact the act authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MINERALS STOCKPILE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Congress is acting expeditiously in meeting the needs of an antirecession program, and we have completed action on some very important legislative proposals. However, I feel that one of the most important issues which must be considered this session is the means of restoring some stability to the mining industry.

There are various proposals and suggested solutions to the problem, and finding the proper solution to the problems of the minerals industry will not be easy. I offer the following suggestions for the consideration of the Congress and the administration.

An economic price for minerals based on production costs, competitive prices and domestic needs should be established.

A direct subsidy should be paid to producers whenever the selling price is below the economic price.

An attempt should be made to establish an International Commodity Agreement between exporting and importing countries.

A readjustment program should be established, along with an exploration and development aid program.

And we should establish a buffer stockpile of domestic minerals.

It is with these objectives in mind that I, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for certain purchasing programs for copper, lead, manganese and zinc. The bill would extend for 1 year Public Law 733, the Government Stockpile Purchase program, which is due to expire December 31, 1958. This proposed legislation would add the four minerals I have just mentioned to the list of those minerals already covered under this program.

I am proposing that during 1959 the Federal Government buy 400,000 tons of copper at 30 cents a pound; 180,000 tons of lead at 17 cents; 280,000 tons of zinc at 14½ cents, and 9 million long ton units of low-grade manganese at about $2.30.

There has been a very slight upturn in the economy of the minerals industry, but the miners of copper, lead, zinc, and manganese need help. We cannot let this industry fall apart, not only because of its importance to the defense effort, but because of its effect on the general economy of the Nation.

If stability is to be returned to the mining industry we cannot depend on piecemeal legislation. Congress must enact a sound minerals program immediately, and I urge that the appropriate committees of Congress take action soon after the Easter recess.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3600) to provide for certain purchasing programs for copper,

lead, manganese, and zinc, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. SYMINGTON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That section 2 of the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 is amended by inserting after clause (d) the following:

"(e) a program to purchase 400,000 tons of refined electrolytic copper (in standard sizes and shapes) produced from ores mined in the United States, its Territories, and possessions at a market price of 30 cents a pound.

"(f) a program to purchase 180,000 tons of common lead (in standard sizes and shapes) produced from ores mined in the United States, its Territories, and possessions at a market price of 17 cents a pound.

"(g) a program to purchase 280,000 tons of slab zinc produced from ores mined in the United States, its Territories, and possessions at a market price of 14½ cents a pound.

"(h) a program to purchase, in accordance with regulations and prices (except those inconsistent with this act) issued pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, with respect to purchases at Wenden, Ariz., 9 million long ton units of manganese ore mined in the United States, its Territories, and possessions. Three million long ton units of such ore shall be purchased at each of the existing purchasing depots located at Wenden, Ariz., Deming, N. Mex., and Butte-Phillipsburg, Mont.

"Purchases made under programs authorized in clauses (e), (f), (g), and (h) of this section shall be distributed throughout the entire period during which such programs are authorized in this act in order that they are made in as nearly as possible equal amounts in each calendar month during such period."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 is amended by striking out "1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "1959".

EXCHANGE OF LAND OR TIMBER WITHIN SISKIYOU NATIONAL PARK, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding first-term Members of the House of Representatives is Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon. Mr. PORTER is particularly alert to the pertinent and immediate problems concerning his area, especially with respect to timber in the national forests.

The Fourth Congressional District of Oregon produces more commercial lumber for sale than does any of the other 434 Congressional Districts of the United States.

It is the belief of many of us who live in Oregon that the Siskiyou National Forest along the banks of the beautiful and scenic Rogue River should be more effectively protected. The Rogue River is one of the major fishery streams in the United States. Over the years, it has attracted to its banks such famous fishermen as former President Herbert Hoover, General of the Army George C. Marshall, and the famous western novelist Zane Grey.

So that the Senate may have before it a bill similar to that which Representative PORTER has introduced in the House, for the improvement of the banks of the magnificent Rogue River, which is one of great scenic grandeur, I introduce the bill and ask for its appropriate reference.

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

The bill (S. 3602) to authorize the exchange of land or timber within the Siskiyou National Forest, Oreg., for certain other land adjacent to such national forest, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT RELATING TO MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN RESERVES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, at the request of the Federal Reserve Board, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and an explanation prepared by the Federal Reserve Board be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3603) to amend section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the provisos in the fourth and fifth paragraphs of such section, lettered (b) and (c), respectively (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 462), by changing the colon in each such paragraph to a period, and by adding after such fifth paragraph the following:

"Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section—

"(1) The Board of Governors, under such regulations as it may prescribe, may permit member banks to count all or part of their currency and coin as reserves required under this section; and

"(2) A member bank in a reserve city may hold and maintain the reserve balances specified in paragraph (a) above and a member bank in a central reserve city may hold and maintain the reserve balances specified in paragraphs (a) or (b) above, if permission for the holding and maintaining of such lower reserve balances is granted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, either in individual cases or under regulations of the Board, on such basis as the Board may deem reasonable and appropriate in view of the character of business transacted by the member bank."

SEC. 2. (a) The fifth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, lettered (c) (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 462), is amended by striking out the word "thirteen" in such paragraph and substituting in lieu thereof the word "ten."

(b) The sixth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 462b) is amended by striking out the words "on the date of enactment of the Banking Act of 1935."

The explanation presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR REVISION OF RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is proposing to Congress three changes in existing law concerning reserve requirements of member banks. The proposed amendments would:

1. Authorize the Board to permit member banks to include all or part of their vault cash holdings in their required reserves;

2. Authorize the Board to fix the reserve requirements for demand deposits of central reserve city banks within a range of 10 to 20 percent, instead of the present authorized range of 13 to 26 percent. (For other classes of deposits at member banks, the ranges within which the Board is authorized to fix the requirements would remain as at present.)

3. Make more flexible the Board's authority to permit individual member banks in central reserve or reserve cities to carry lower reserves than those specified for banks in such cities.

Purposes of these proposals may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. The counting of vault cash as reserves would correct a generally recognized inequity that now exists because many banks find it necessary for operating purposes to hold larger amounts of vault cash than do other banks. Since vault cash holdings and reserve balances at the Reserve banks are interchangeable and both serve the same purpose in influencing the volume of bank credit, they should both be counted as reserves. Counting of vault cash as reserves would also have collateral advantages, such as reducing the costs of transporting and handling currency and facilitating the holding by member banks of larger stocks of currency that would be available over widely dispersed areas for use in a national emergency.

Such a provision would make possible the release of over $2 billion of reserves for all member banks. Country banks hold nearly $1.4 billion of vault cash, amounting to about 4 percent of their net demand deposits or over a fourth of their present required reserves, while Reserve city banks as a group have vault cash holdings amounting to less than 2 percent of net demand deposits or a tenth of their total required reserves. The vault cash holdings of many large city banks, however, including most central reserve city banks, amount to 1 percent or less of their net demand deposits and but a small fraction of required reserves. Thus this provision taken alone would not only add greatly to the total supply of reserves but also would have the effect of widening and distorting existing differentials in reserve requirements as between classes of banks. It would, therefore, be necessary to put these changes into effect gradually and to accompany them by partly offsetting adjustments in the reserve requirement percentages.

2. Under the present law, by reclassifying cities or by abolishing classifications and also by changing requirements, the Board has legal authority to alter differentials in requirements as between the broad classifications of member banks. By using this authority any undue distinctions between classes of banks may be gradually reduced. If vault cash holdings are permitted to be counted as reserves, it would have the effect of lowering the required reserves of each class of banks, but particularly of country and reserve city banks, where vault cash holdings are relatively large. The Board consequently is proposing no change in the percentage requirements as now stated in the law for these classes of banks—7 to 14 percent and 10 to 20 percent, respectively, against net demand deposits.

It is proposed, however, that permissible requirements for central reserve city banks be lowered to the 10 to 20 percent range authorized for reserve city banks. A maximum requirement of 20 percent against net demand deposits for any bank or class of banks is believed to be adequate for any purpose under present or prospective conditions. While this amendment would retain authority for keeping three classes of banks with differential requirements against demand deposits, it would tend to encourage narrower differentials as between classes of banks.

3. Under existing law individual member banks can be permitted to carry lower requirements if they are located in the outlying districts of central reserve or reserve cities. This provision permits the Board to alleviate inequities which arise when banks located in such outlying districts are predominantly engaged in business that is similar to that of banks with a lower reserve classification. It does not, however, permit the Board to bring equivalent relief to such banks if they are located in the central districts of reserve and central reserve cities. The amendment proposed would permit adoption of more rational criteria for exempting individual banks than can be used under existing law and thereby make possible elimination of some existing inequities.

With the amendments proposed, along with other provisions of existing law, the Board would have adequate authority to make any changes in the structure and level of reserve requirements that are likely to be appropriate under present or prospective conditions. Legislative authority with respect to both the level and structure of reserve requirements for member banks should be sufficiently flexible to enable adjustments to be made in a manner, in amounts, and at times that are consistent with the aims of monetary policy, with the international position of the country, and with the maintenance of a sound and effectively functioning banking system. Existing law with the amendments proposed would permit moving gradually toward a more equitable and rational structure of reserve requirements and toward making in the course of time any changes in the level of reserve requirements, consistent with appropriate monetary policy and sound banking practices, that may be needed to meet the monetary and credit needs of a growing economy.

PROPOSED NATIONAL ASTRONAUTICS AGENCY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1915, which established the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and to establish the National Astronautics Agency, and for other purposes.

I prepared the bill some days ago, but deferred introducing it until the recommendations of the President were submitted to the Senate. There are some substantial differences between the concept of the space agency and space problems as dealt with in my bill and the recommendations of the President.

It is a matter concerning which we need to maintain open minds until hearing can be held. I believe there are some points suggested by the bill which are worthy of consideration in connection with the whole subject, and I therefore introduce it, for appropriate reference.

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

The bill (S. 3604) to amend the act of March 3, 1915, which established the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and to establish the National Astronautics Agency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ACT OF 1958—AMENDMENT

Mr. THYE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3497) to expand the public facility loan program for the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON COUNTRY LIFE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 2, 1958, the names of Mr. THYE and Mr. STENNIS were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3596) to establish a Commission on Country Life, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS (for himself, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MORTON) on April 2, 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. MANSFIELD:

The American's Creed, written by William Tyler Page in 1917.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article in tribute to Miss Rhoda Zucker, supervisor of the University of Wisconsin's Milwaukee speech correction clinic, and excerpts from testimony before the House Appropriations Committee and a report of the committee.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency plans to begin public hearings on or about April 21, 1958, on bills dealing with long-term credit and capital needs of small businesses. Bills to be considered are S. 2160, S. 2185, S. 2286, S. 3191, and any other bills on this subject which may be introduced.

The hearings will be held in room 301, Senate Office Building. All persons who wish to appear and testify are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk of the Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert E. Hauberg, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi, for a term of 4 years—reappointment.

Rupert Hugo Newcomb, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Mississippi, for the term of 4 years—reappointment.

Sumner Canary, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio for a term of 4 years—reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, April 10, 1958, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROSENWALD RARE BOOK AND MANUSCRIPT COLLECTION OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, 15 years ago a public-spirited collector of discriminating taste, Mr. Lessing J. Rosenwald, of Jenkintown, Pa., made his first gift of rare books and manuscripts to the Library of Congress, for the Nation. Since then he has added greatly to the Rosenwald collection in the Library, thereby making it possible for the Library to maintain its position of preeminence in this country as a repository of rare books of the 15th and 16th centuries. These books, instead of being locked away in private hands, are thus made available to the world of scholarship.

The Government and the Nation owe Mr. Rosenwald hearty thanks for his generosity. To commemorate the 15th anniversary of his first gift to it, the Library of Congress opened, yesterday afternoon, an exhibit of 200 books collected by Mr. Rosenwald, including his recent acquisitions from the library of the Dukes of Arenberg. As a longstanding member and present chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Library's release describing the exhibit, which is entitled "Early Printed Books of the Low Countries."

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

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS WILL EXHIBIT RARE ILLUSTRATED BOOKS FEATURING 160 VOLUMES FROM LIBRARY OF DUKES OF ARENBERG—DEVELOPMENT OF THE DUTCH AND FLEMISH BOOK FROM 1470 TO 1600 TO BE SEEN IN 200 VOLUMES COLLECTED BY LESSING J. ROSENWALD

A colorful exhibition of 200 rare 15th- and 16th-century books—mainly examples of

the early illustrated book of the Low Countries and all collected by Lessing J. Rosenwald of Jenkintown, Pa.—will be opened in the Library of Congress on Wednesday afternoon, April 2.

About 160 volumes in the display were purchased by Mr. Rosenwald in a single lot from the library assembled by the Dukes of Arenberg and arrived in this country only recently. Until Mr. Rosenwald acquired them, these books had not been accessible even to scholars for several decades, and more than 30 of them are believed to be unique. They have been lent for public exhibit by Mr. Rosenwald to acquaint Americans with the presence of these books in this country.

The other volumes in the exhibit are Dutch and Flemish books of the same period from the Rosenwald collection in the Library of Congress. Together with the titles once collected by the Dukes of Arenberg, they present a picture of the Dutch and Flemish books—especially the illustrated book—as it developed from 1470 to the end of the 16th century.

At least 100 volumes are illustrated with woodcuts or engravings and reflect Mr. Rosenwald's special interest as a bibliophile. Among early illustrated books, the Dutch and Flemish examples occupy a position of preeminence, if not predominance. So great was the influence of these early wood engravings in France and England that the illustrations were frequently copied or at least imitated in style. The woodcuts reveal also a close relationship between the miniature artist and the early painters of the Low Countries.

The books range in period from an unusually fine copy of a block book (printed from woodblocks), the Biblia Pauperum, dated about 1470, to the Adnotationes et Meditationes in Evangelia—Auctore Hieronymo Natali, an exceptionally handsome folio printed in 1595 at Antwerp by Martin Nutius and illustrated with engravings by the brothers Wierix. Within these boundaries of time, many other books command special attention and respect.

There is a copy of the second book to be printed in the English language—Jacobus de Cessolis' The Game and Playe of the Chesse, printed at Bruges by William Caxton during March 1475. One of the more popular early books printed in Holland was Nicolaus Pergamenus' Dialogus Creaturarum Moralisatus, illustrated with simple woodcuts of great charm and printed at Gouda by Gerardus Leeu in 1480. The Rosenwald copy is bound with two other early Dutch books, the Gesta Romanorum, also printed in 1480, and the undated first edition of Jacobus de Cossolis' book on chess, De Ludo Scachorum, printed about 1475. These three, together in a contemporary binding, constitute the most remarkable Dutch volume belonging to the 15th century.

Another noteworthy Dutch book of this period is Jacobus Palladinus de Theramo's Consolatio Peccatorum, printed at Haarlem in 1484, containing 32 hand colored illustrations by the "Haarlem woodcutter," regarded as the finest artist of the woodcut in his country at the time.

One of the great monuments of early Flemish printing is the handsome folio edition of Boethius' De Consolatione Philosophiae, printed at Ghent by Arend de Keysere in 1485 with original drawings at the beginning of five of the books of text, the work of an unknown but talented miniature artist. A considerable number of Dutch translations of popular romances, such as Raoul Le Fevre's Die Vergaderinge der Historien van Troyen (Haarlem, 1485) and his undated Historie van den Vromen Ridder Jason, are included in the exhibit. They reflect the adherence of the Dukes of Arenberg to the chivalric orders; the rulers of this small German duchy in the Holy Roman Empire had been made Knights of the Golden Fleece by Charles V.

The only complete copy known of the earliest Dutch book devoted to hunting and fishing—Dit Boecxken Leert Hoe Men Mach Voghelen Vanghen Metten Handen—marks the transition between the two centuries, since it has been dated by bibliographers as printed about 1500.

The Histoire van Melusine, printed at Antwerp in 1510, is an entertaining illustrated edition of a popular medieval fairy tale. A romantic story of the Charlemagne cycle is Een Schoone Historie van Margarieten van Limborch, printed at Antwerp in 1516. The first Flemish edition of Paracelsus' work on venereal diseases, printed in 1553, is the only copy known; this is representative of a small group of books devoted to the subject of health, medicine, and surgery.

In 1560 there appeared the first edition of a Dutch cookbook, which has apparently escaped the attention of the bibliographers of gastronomic literature, a collection of recipes from Latin, French, and Italian authorities, entitled Coock Boeck. The same year there was issued at Antwerp from the press of Christopher Plantin one of the most beautifully printed books published in the Low Countries during the century, Les Ordonnances de l'Ordre de la Toison d'Or, which is printed on vellum.

Mr. Rosenwald's acquisition of the Arenberg books, which he now lends for exhibition, marks another outstanding achievement in his career as a collector of rare books. His scholarship and impeccable taste in this field are already well known to the book world and to visitors to the Rare Book Room in the Library of Congress, whose collections he has greatly enriched. In 1945, 1947, and again in 1948 the Library was able to open major exhibitions of rare examples of the book arts which were drawn entirely from the Rosenwald Collection; the beautifully illuminated manuscript book, the giant Bible of Mainz, which is on permanent exhibition in the Great Hall, was among his gifts.

Of the Rosenwald Collection, the Library said: "In it are the great monuments of the book arts, each beautiful in itself, but each rendered more beautiful and more impressive and more meaningful through the distinguished company of others. A part of history is here; a speculum of the centuries at once reflecting the grandeur of the past and fashioning the future."

The present exhibition marks the 15th anniversary of Mr. Rosenwald's presentation to the Library of Congress of the first in a series of gifts now forming the Rosenwald Collection. It may be seen on the main floor of the Main Building until August 31.

An attractive catalog, describing in detail all the books in the exhibition and containing a number of illustrations from them, has been issued. Copies may be purchased for 30 cents each at the Government Printing Office or (in person only) at the sales stand on the main floor of the Library of Congress. Its title is Early Printed Books of the Low Countries.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHT GALA CELEBRATION OF PAN AMERICAN WEEK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the conclusion of today's session, the Senate will take a recess until Monday, April 14.

Coincident with its return, Washington, the Nation, and the whole Western Hemisphere will commence celebration of Pan American Week, which will continue through Sunday, April 20.

I am delighted to say that the advance program of events during Pan American Week is one of the finest and broadest which I have been pleased to note, down through the years.

COMMENDATION OF DR. MORA

The Secretary General, Dr. José Mora, and his colleagues in the Organization of American States, are certainly to be commended for the excellence of their preparations for all these events.

OFFICIAL AND GENERAL EVENTS

There will be both formal, official events of the Council of the OAS and a gala series of general and social events.

The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, and other leading American officials will, of course, participate, as will the ministers of foreign affairs of the Republics to the south.

Over and above the formal diplomatic phases of the week, many cultural and other aesthetic contributions will be featured. From Columbia will come a beautiful orchid exhibition; under the auspices of the coffee-producing lands, there will be a series of friendly get-togethers; from Latin American photographers and artists will come fine examples of their work; and then there will be the first inter-American music festival, which will feature some of the greatest music and some of the most outstanding performers of the hemisphere.

In addition, the Pan American Medical Society and other worthy inter-American groups will play their parts in the week's festivities.

LEARNING MORE ABOUT THE OAS

One of the worthy byproducts of the celebration of Pan American Week is that we Americans, in particular, become better acquainted with the Organization of American States. Virtually every American is familiar with the Monroe Doctrine, and what it stands for in American foreign policy; but not enough Americans realize the wonderful chapters which have been written since the first International Conference of American States, as held in Washington in 1889.

They do not fully realize the full impact of the Rio Treaty of 1947, which embodied the basic principles which were later to be incorporated in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which followed as a great instrument of regional defense.

Americans should get to know far more than they do the ramifications of the historic Bogota Charter which established the Organization of American States in 1948. And what better year to do so than this year, 1958, when we celebrate the 10th anniversary of the charter during the very Pan American Week which is coming?

We need to know more about the council of the OAS, and its organs; about the inter-American economic and social council, the inter-American council of jurists, and the inter-American cultural council.

By Americans understanding them better, we will help to improve our effec-

tiveness in them, and their effectiveness in dealing with problems common to the hemisphere.

IMPORTANT OFFICIAL VISITS

In this connection we contemplate with pleasure increased American interest in our good neighbors.

We are pleased to note the forthcoming 18-day visit by Vice President NIXON to the presidential inauguration in Argentina, as well as his visit to seven other Latin American countries; and the return visit by Dr. Milton Eisenhower to several Latin American nations, in order to get new first-hand reactions as to current problems in these areas.

I understand that a very distinguished delegation will join with the Vice President to represent us at the inauguration in Buenos Aires.

So, too, I may say, we have been delighted to receive President-Elect Mario Echandi, of Costa Rica, and to anticipate the coming of President Carlos Ibandez del Campo, of Chile.

SENATE COMMITTEE TO TAKE UP AID BILL

The other day on the Senate floor I referred to significant testimony given in our Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, the Honorable R. R. Rubottom, Jr.

When the Senate reconvenes, our committee will commence marking up the 1959 fiscal year mutual-security bill, which contains important sections dealing with the 20 Republics to the south, and includes authorizations for some $92 million in aid, as recommended by the executive branch.

I have been pleased, of course, to cosponsor the draft bill, along with our distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

But this mutual-security bill represents but one of many legislative measures which affect Pan American relations.

As all of us are aware, a vast host of problems, opportunities, and challenges confront us in our dealings with our sister republics.

MEANINGFUL QUESTIONS ON PAN AMERICA

By way of background to still more meaningful celebration of Pan American Week, I have compiled some of these leading questions. I think that to seek the answers to these questions will be one of the best ways by which we can follow through on the April 14–20 observance.

I know these problems are very much in the minds of our diplomats, as they are in the minds of Dr. Mora, Ambassador John Dreier, and their colleagues.

Here, then, are a few of the big questions confronting us and our friends. I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

TEN QUESTIONS ON UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

ALLEGED UNITED STATES LACK OF INTEREST

1. How best can the United States constructively meet the perennial assertion in many of the Latin American countries that we of North America "have not been sufficiently interested in events below the Rio Grande because of our deep concern with events elsewhere in the world; notably in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East"?

HIGHER LIVING STANDARDS

2. What can we do to help improve standards of living in the Western Hemisphere, particularly to help encourage better distribution of the good things of life?

UNCLE SAM CANNOT CURE ALL PROBLEMS

Here let me interpolate that this, like other problems, is of course Latin America's own problem, as such. It must be worked out independently in each of the lands. Naturally, we are eager to be of reasonable assistance.

But let me make it very clear that the destiny of the Latin American nations is naturally and basically in their own hands. We cannot, of course, solve for them problems which are, basically, their own; any more than we can solve for any other land, anywhere else in the world, problems which are fundamentally theirs.

TRADE AND INVESTMENT

3. What should be done to encourage more mutually beneficial two-way trade within the hemisphere, and in particular, increased sound foreign investment in the hemisphere? In particular, how best can we cope with the perennially difficult problem of tariff restrictions?

LOAN POLICY

4. What should be the attitude of United States lending agencies, the Development Loan Fund and the Export-Import Bank, toward appeals for economic assistance, especially on the part of nationalized monopolies of petroleum and similar vital materials in Latin American nations? Similarly, what should be our future United States position on the subject, often proposed by our Latin friends, of an inter-American bank?

DIVERSIFICATION

5. What additional steps can be taken to diminish the overdependence by some Latin American nations on a comparative handful of commodities and raw materials. (This overdependence, as at the very present, results in severe economic distress, because these materials' prices are fluctuating downward.)

INFLATION'S RAVAGE

6. What steps can be taken to help encourage sounder fiscal management in many parts of the countries there which have been hard pressed by rampant inflation?

INTEGRATION OF CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

7. Closely related to the above questions; what can be done to help further trade among the Latin American nations themselves and, in particular, to help encourage the beginning of steps toward a common market among the Central and/or South American Republics?

SOVIET EFFORTS AT PENETRATION

In view of current intensified efforts by the Soviet Union toward economic penetration of Latin America—offering a wide variety of barter and other arrangements—especially for Latin surpluses, what are the answers to these particular problems:

8. What additional steps should be taken to strengthen the internal security of Latin America against the Communist menace (a menace which we have seen erupt, especially in Guatemala and in British Guiana, as well as elsewhere)? In many lands can be seen Communist political deals, Communist guerrilla movements, assassinations, and intrigue.

9. Military assistance: What should be future United States policy as regards military assistance to the Latin American countries in order to preserve the security of the hemisphere (while, at the same time, assuring that our arms aid is used only for the purpose originally intended, as specified in the agreements, themselves)?

10. Political differences: Another perennial question, What should be the United States attitude toward Latin governments which are friendly to the United States, hostile to communism, and cooperative in efforts against Red subversion, and yet which themselves have less democratic forms of government and political standards which differ widely from our own?

COMPLEX QUESTIONS TO ANSWER

Most of these questions are complex and difficult to answer.

And the answers cannot be static answers, for the situation among the 20 nations and the 184 million peoples to the south is very dynamic.

Latin America is on the march. It is one of the fastest changing in all areas of the globe. Within its 8 million square miles, the pace of economic, political, and social development is constantly quickening.

I have previously commented on many of the problems, listed above.

So have many of my colleagues. Just yesterday, my friend the able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] addressed himself very constructively to the vital matter of United States defense installations in the hemisphere.

EXPERT WORK BY SENATORS

Anyone interested in Latin America knows, too, of the splendid work of our colleague from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who has time and again shed helpful light on Latin problems.

In our Senate Foreign Relations Committee, our Subcommittee on American Republics, headed by our forthright and vigorous friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been very active. On that subcommittee our colleagues from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], to name but a few, have brought back from many visits to Latin America most helpful insight and suggestions.

Our associates from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and from many of the other States have likewise repeatedly demonstrated their deep interest.

I mention these facts because I think they help underline the fact that we of the Senate, like our associates in the House, are not unmindful of Pan-American problems.

And so as we approach Pan American Week may we move ever closer to solution of the problems mentioned above.

REACTIONS WELCOME

Toward that end, I invite the judgment of interested Americans. I have personally addressed general inquiries in my capacity as one deeply interested Member of the Senate to leading groups like the United States Inter-American Council and others in order to seek their best advice.

I have suggested they get in touch with our Foreign Relations Subcommittee and with its House Foreign Affairs counterpart, as well as with the Senate and House Appropriations Committees. I have sent out reprints of my own and of Assistant Secretary Rubottom's and other officials' remarks in order to secure expert reactions to those views.

This, then, is a prelude to a Pan American Week of ever-greater meaningfulness.

OPTIMISM VERSUS PESSIMISM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during this period, when on this floor we hear

so many expressions of pessimism, it is noteworthy that we do not hear many statements of that sort out in the country. In fact, today I was talking to a visitor from South Dakota, who told how the newspapers there are stressing the positive and the constructive, and how the whole atmosphere is being changed and is serving to antidote the negative.

Mr. President, recently I heard a humorous story which aptly describes the situation: A blind man had a roadside hot dog stand. He was also hard of hearing, and he had no radio. Since he could not see, he was not aware of what was published in the newspapers. On the side of the highway he erected a sign which described the good hot dogs he sold. Then, every day, he stood by the side of the road and cried, "Buy a hot dog." And many people bought them. His business boomed and he had to increase his meat and roll orders, and had to buy a larger stove, in order to take care of the trade. The business increased so rapidly that finally he had to call home his son, from college, to help him. Then something awful happened: His son said, "Father, haven't you been listening to the radio? Haven't people been telling you about the articles in the newspapers? Money is tight. And if it stays tight, we are bound to have bad business. A big recession may be coming on, so you had better prepare for poor trade."

Whereupon, the father thought, "Well, my son has been to college, and he reads the newspapers and listens to the radio, and he ought to know."

So the father decreased his meat and roll orders, and no longer bothered to stand beside the highway to sell his hot dogs. And his hot dog sales fell, almost overnight.

"You are right, son," the father said to the boy. "We are certainly headed for a recession."

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a dispatch from London, which was published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 31. The dispatch was written by John Allan May, and is entitled "Britain Drubs Gloomy Critics." The article gives us encouraging news about the state of affairs in Britain, about which Churchill once said, "There will always be an England." I ask unanimous consent that the 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:

BRITAIN DRUBS GLOOMY CRITICS

(By John Allan May)

LONDON.—The British Treasury blew up March 30, scattering concrete evidence of Great Britain's greatness over a wide area.

Triggering the explosion were flashes from overseas reporting that this country is helpless and almost defeated; that it is living on its past; that it even has but little of that left now.

In fact, boomed the treasury, the British still finance half the world's trade, pay out more for defense than almost any other peoples on the globe, save more than they ever managed to do in the past, invest more, work far longer hours than most other peoples, lose far less time in industrial disputes, and lead in the world economic stability as well as in practical engineering.

SOME MYTHS EXPLODED

In an article in its monthly Bulletin for Industry entitled "Some Myths Exploded" the treasury declared:

The significant industries here are not the old but the new. For instance, the electronics industry has increased 5-fold in 12 years and now is the second largest in the world. So now are British petrochemicals.

Since World War II Britain's share of world trade in electrical machinery has risen from one-tenth to one-quarter; its share of the world automobile trade from one-sixth to one-quarter, and of tractors from one-twentieth to over one-quarter.

Between 1951 and 1954 the time lost per person through strikes in Britain was only one-eighth of that lost in America and less than a quarter that lost in Australia and Canada.

WORK HOURS COMPARED

In manufacturing, the British on the average work 7 hours longer than Americans, 6 hours longer than Canadians and, since the second quarter of 1957, even a little longer than West Germans.

Since 1948 the rate of net investment has doubled in Britain.

This country started operating the world's first commercial scale nuclear power station in 1956; with Zeta it shows itself ahead in fusion-power research. All the turbine-powered airliners in service at present in the world are British.

Britain, per head of population, is the world's largest market and the world's largest supplier. It is No. 2 irrespective of population.

WORLD TRADE KEY

Nearly half the world's trade is financed in pounds sterling, the British currency. Without sterling most of the world's trading nations would find their trade constricted and themselves poorer.

Proportionately, the British are the largest overseas investors in the world. They help underdeveloped countries with a higher proportion of private investment than even the United States. In recent years British overseas investments have averaged half a billion dollars a year.

The British spend a larger proportion of their national income on defense than any other of America's allies.

Unemployment here has just risen—to 2 percent. In the United States it is 8 percent. So it is in West Germany.

The Treasury hopes that the fallout from this explosion of myths will be radioactive in two senses: One, in that everywhere radio will be active in spreading the facts.

Two, in that the world now will be able to see through the dark reports about Britain's future.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this is the Easter season. It speaks of the resurrection. It is for us to resurrect ourselves from the fears and doubts and negative thinking that some would have prevail. There are those who can only see the 5 million unemployed, not the 63 million employed. The $334 billion income of this Nation means nothing to them. They fail to appreciate that this Easter we have no third world war on our hands.

Mr. President, let us rejoice and thank God for His goodness to America.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was:

Ordered, That notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate to April 14, 1958, the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was:

Ordered, That notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate until April 14, 1958, the Vice President be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the Senate.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "GENERAL REVENUE REVISION OF 1958"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 305, which relates to the printing of additional copies of hearings entitled "General Revenue Revision of 1958," for the use of the House Committee on Ways and Means. I am advised that if the concurrent resolution is adopted today there will be a saving of $3,500 in printing.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. 305) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 4,000 additional copies of the general revenue revision hearings entitled "General Revenue Revision of 1958."

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

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

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP AND COMMERCE BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND SWEDEN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, today, April 3, marks the 175th anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship and Commerce between the United States and Sweden.

The treaty was signed by Benjamin Franklin, then Minister to France, and the Swedish Ambassador in Paris, Count

Gustaf Philip Creutz. The United States Congress ratified it on July 27, and on September 25 the treaty was publicly proclaimed.

It was the first treaty concluded by a nonbelligerent nation with the United States after the American Revolution.

The initiative was taken by the King of Sweden, Gustaf III, probably at the suggestion of his Ambassador to France. From the beginning, the King had followed the American Revolution with great interest. In 1776, after the Declaration of Independence, he wrote to a French friend that if he had not been what he was, he would have liked to go to America, himself, in order to see, firsthand, the various stages by which "a state, so to speak, creates itself."

Besides its moral value, the Swedish and American treaty gave official sanction to commercial relations which already had been established.

In 1956 our Congress authorized the Franklin Medal, celebrating the 250th anniversary of that great American's birth. The first award was made to Sweden in due and proper recognition of this friendship treaty.

The great State of Minnesota—which I am proud to help represent in the Congress—was built through the efforts of many people of many lands, and the Swedish people have long been vital to our growth.

The Swedish people will celebrate their annual Svennskarness Dag, or Swedish Day, in Minneapolis this summer, and the Honorable Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, will be present on that occasion. It seems fitting to me that one of the pioneers in human rights should meet with a people who are and have been pioneers in every sense of the word.

When we salute the treaty of friendship here in the Congress, we salute the Swedish people everywhere.

I am proud of our Swedish heritage in our Minnesota. We salute them on this day of friendship—here, in Minnesota, and across the sea.

Mr. President, I now wish to speak on another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

HIGH SCHOOL ROCKET PROGRAM

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the interest of young people in rockets has led to a demand for a nationwide high-school-age program, not only for rocketry, but for the whole field of science.

Creation of a Youth Science Corps was recommended in a report to President Eisenhower last week by the President's Conference on Occupational Safety after a Washington meeting of 3,000 delegates, called by the Department of Labor from all parts of the country.

Since February 8, in letters to the President and defense officials, I have been urging a high-school rocket program, as I stated in the Senate on March 19. Now I go further and concur in the strongly supported finding that young Americans attracted to the glamour of rockets should be shown the whole sweep of modern science and encouraged to find careers therein.

As Russia now has more scientists and engineers than the United States, nothing is more vital to the future of our Nation than an immediate start toward a Youth Science Corps.

By this, I do not mean a new youth organization, but rather a program that can be applied locally by existing youth groups, schools, and science clubs, in keeping with the familiar American pattern.

Russia has outrun us by developing a whole new educational system. We have failed to make the most of what we have. It should be plain that the way to catch up is simply to make better use of our own ready assets.

This can be done quickly without any large expenditure of money, either public or private, by the employment of a great untapped resource, waiting half idle in all areas. I refer to the facilities of the military reserves.

Mr. President, it will take more than the 3-minute period allowed in the morning hour to complete my statement. I do not wish to trespass on the time of any other Senator. Therefore, I ask unanimous permission to proceed beyond the 3-minute limitation. If there is objection, I shall ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of my statement printed in the body of the RECORD. If there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent to proceed so I may complete my statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, since World War II huge sums have been spent on no less than 7 reserve forces—the reserves of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, plus the National Guard and Air National Guard, not to mention the Civil Air Patrol and other federally aided groups.

The facilities include training centers, complete with classrooms and a great variety of training aids, with paid caretakers and instructors. They are there for the training of our citizen-soldiers—veterans who have chosen to remain on call, young volunteers, and millions of others held on a reserve status after military service.

Classroom space, which the Government owns or rents, is empty much of the time. Reserve officers and enlisted men, whose training has cost billions upon billions of dollars, represent all professions, including many scientists, engineers, and technicians.

What could be more logical than to give the taxpayers an extra dividend on this outlay, by making these facilities and talents available for a Youth Science Corps?

This, I am informed, was the idea behind last week's action of the President's Conference, after the endorsement of the Science Clubs of America, totaling some 18,000 clubs, with 400,000 members of high-school age.

This plan was presented to the Department of Defense, through the American Rocket Service, on December 4, 1957.

The plan was the outgrowth of work by Lt. Col. Charles M. Parkin, Jr., Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and Kendall K. Hoyt, Executive Director of the Association of Missile and Rocket Industries, an Air Force Reserve colonel.

Colonel Parkin is the moving spirit in the organization of youth rocket clubs, to channel the enthusiasm of the young people into serious study of rocketry and to set a pattern for supervised activities as a safeguard against the dangers of unsupervised firings.

Colonel Hoyt was the organizer of the Civil Air Patrol cadet program in World War II, when the corps totaled nearly 100,000 high-school boys and girls. The program included training in highly technical aviation subjects under the volunteer direction of adult airmen. As a reserve commander after the war, he showed how better results can be achieved by the help of veteran reservists.

Incentives for reserve guidance of local youth science units may be provided through the present system of awarding credit for reserve promotion and retirement. Each reservist must earn not less than 50 credit points a year. A point may be earned by devoting not less than 2 hours to an approved activity, including instruction or administrative work for the Civil Air Patrol, a clear precedent for similar duties in the Youth Science Corps.

It is not suggested that the military shall direct science training, but rather that civilians—and reservists who are halfway between military and civilian status—shall make use of military reserve facilities for one of the greatest undertakings of modern times.

This plan would permit the established educational and youth groups in each area to use reserve facilities for an introduction to science and engineering. Young people would be shown, by interesting experiments, what science means and why they should study mathematics and physics in high school for their careers. Then they would be encouraged to specialize in such fields as electronics, chemistry, aviation, missiles, and engineering.

Out of all this, it may be expected that the young people who are not fitted for science will lose interest, while those who prove themselves will be encouraged to continue. Some will become technicians and graduates of technical institutes. Some will go the full way to become graduate scientists or engineers. Thus we will begin to regain our lead over Russia.

I cannot think of a better way to counter the mass training of youth behind the Iron Curtain than by an American style youth science corps. It seems to be within the powers of the administration to launch such a program at once without any added legislative authority or funds from Congress.

A policy statement is needed to the effect that each Reserve unit and individual is authorized and encouraged

to assist in pre-science training of young people insofar as this does not interfere with the primary duties of the Reserves, and that reserve credit will be authorized for this work.

Given this help from the multibillion dollar military reserve system, a youth science movement can fast take form and can enroll hundreds of thousands of young Americans eager for knowledge.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I intend to inquire into the national investment in the sevenfold program of the Reserves, now losing much of their old role in warfare that no longer would give them time to mobilize.

It would be a tragic loss, and a dangerous loss in the face of Russia's advances, if we failed to transmit the hard-won knowledge of today's veterans to our future defenders.

Mr. President, I have met with Colonel Parkin in my office. I have discussed the matter with him, and we intend to confer in the future.

It seems to me we should develop the organization in an orderly manner, with groups under the supervision of well-trained scientists, for the development of rockets, because we must not have the youth of our land acting like criminals, endeavoring to invade military depots to obtain ammunition or explosives to be used in rockets.

I believe we have erred. I think we ought to proceed with the military personnel we have in an orderly manner to organize our youth and to permit them to conduct organized launchings of rockets.

CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am hopeful that when the President receives Senate bill 497, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, the conference report on which was agreed to by the Senate last night, he will consider the fact that 96 Senators and 435 Representatives have worked on this measure, and that it represents the combined judgment of the two bodies.

There are provisions in it which many of us would like to have seen expanded. Had any individual Senator or Representative written the bill, it would not be exactly as it is. It is the composite of the hopes, aims, and brainwork of 531 legislators.

It is my further hope that the President will not see fit to veto the bill merely because there are 3 or 4 items in it which he does not like.

I know that the distinguished Vice President, who now occupies the chair, is aware of the fact that in the give and take of the legislative process a bill such as this represents a composite judgment, often involving compromises.

This bill means much to the expansion of our trade by means of improving our harbors and waterways. The development of our water resources means much to the interior development of our country.

I feel that the President should sign the bill, and allow this great public-works program to go forward. It is a program which is badly needed at this time.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES INCURRED BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1740) to authorize the payment from the employee's life insurance fund of expenses incurred by the Civil Service Commission in assuming and maintaining the assets and liabilities of certain beneficial associations, which were, after line 9, insert:

SEC. 2. Section 10 (d) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (5 U. S. C. 2099 (d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The arrangements authorized by this section shall be made not later than 3 months following the date of enactment of this amendment. Such arrangements shall apply only to life-insurance agreements existing on August 11, 1955, and on the date of the respective arrangement."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the payment from the employees' life-insurance fund of expenses incurred by the Civil Service Commission in making certain beneficial association assumption agreements and to extend the time for making such agreements."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The bill comes back to us with only minor amendments. I have discussed the subject with both the majority leader and the minority leader, as well as the ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. One of the minor amendments allows 3 months additional time in which to perfect certain arrangements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is about to complete action on a bill which will do justice to some organizations which should have been taken care of a year ago, when the Federal employees' group life insurance bill was passed.

Last year we passed a bill in the hope of taking care of about nine of these associations, but because of the lack of funds and the time lapse, the Federal Government was unable to do it.

I am very happy that we have reached the point today at which we shall take over the associations of Federal employees insurance groups. They will be combined into the overall picture.

This bill should have been passed a year ago, but I am glad we are completing action upon it today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Kansas make the statement which he has made. As he knows, our committee approved this particular bill last year, in the closing days of the session, but there was not sufficient time in which to complete action upon it. It now comes back to us from the House with only one minor amendment in the text, and an amendment to the title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] to concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

WHAT LABOR NEEDS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Prof. Kermit Eby, professor of social sciences at the University of Chicago, has served as a union organizer and in fact helped to organize the auto workers in 1935 and 1936. In 1948 he served as director of education and research for the CIO. Now, at the University of Chicago he is bringing to that campus an understanding of the union movement and a realistic approach to the problems of labor and management which is approached by few, if any, other universities in this country. His observations are always worth thoughtful study.

In the April issue of The Progressive, Prof. Kermit Eby makes a comprehensive analysis of some of the basic weaknesses and flaws in the present operation of many of our labor unions. He points out that some of them are functioning to serve the interests and to preserve the human dignity and opportunity of almost everybody but the laboring men and women who pay the dues which keep the labor unions rich and healthy. He makes a plea for a return to the concept that the labor unions exist for the workers of this country rather than the concept that the workers of this country exist for the unions.

THE CIO AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Incidentally, Mr. President, while on my feet let me call attention to another penetrating and provocative publication recently published under the auspices of the University of Chicago. I refer to a 162-page book entitled "The CIO and the Democratic Party," published by the University of Chicago Press and prepared by Fay Calkins. Every active citizen interested in the welfare and the future of freedom in this country should read this book which can be ordered from the University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, if not available in your local book store or library. This careful, scientific study of some ugly facts in the political life of our times should rock those who read it out of their dream world and make them realize that the attorney who selects his own jury is usually signally successful in winning his court cases.

The CIO and the Democratic Party is neither a piece of fiction nor a scholarly essay. It is a case study, replete with statistics and official records, broken up into seven startling chapters. Perhaps the most significant is chapter 6, entitled "Michigan: PAC Enters a State Party." Whether he reads it or not,

every Democrat attending the 1960 National Democratic Convention is sure to learn something about the significance of chapter 6 before his convention nominates its candidates for President and Vice President in 1960.

Southern Democrats—who in the past 25 years have done so much and tried so hard to maintain some of the old Jeffersonian principles in the operations of their once glorious Democratic Party of States rights and individual freedoms—would do themselves a special favor by reading the CIO and the Democratic Party sometime between now and the next Congressional election and, most certainly, sometime between now and the next Democratic National Convention. Otherwise they may not really know what has happened to them, their ideals, and their parties until it is too late to prevent something which they might otherwise find brave, courageous, and unprecedented ways to avert.

I now call attention to the article by Kermit Eby which induced me to take the floor, briefly, on this subject today. I ask to have incorporated at this point in my remarks the article entitled "What Labor Needs."

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

WHAT LABOR NEEDS

(By Kermit Eby)

Before me, as I write, are two piles of sources. One contains resolutions concerning ethical practices, or lack thereof, of the AFL–CIO and many of its great member unions, such as steel, autoworkers, and machinists. In the other pile is the record of the AFL–CIO's attempts to implement its resolutions.

The resolutions read much the same, as if they had been drawn up by the same committee or the same lawyer. They decry corruption and emphasize the long historical criticisms of the movement toward corruption in business and government. They point with pride to the purge of communism in 1949, affirm their faith in democracy, and ask, by inference, a continued faith in their integrity. There is an undertone of hurt pride and a bit of arrogance in more than one of the resolutions, "for after all," they claim, "we are the defenders of the weak, the protectors of democracy, the enemies of reaction."

The records of action on resolutions are forthright, particularly in the AFL–CIO. The guilty leaders and unions are confronted with their guilt, threatened, and expelled. It took moral courage to expel 10 to 12 percent of an organization's dues-paying membership, which the teamsters represented. There is an evidence of good faith, too, on the part of the AFL–CIO in cooperating with the McClellan committee. All of this is good, but not good enough. Not even Walter Reuther's watchdog committee of prominent citizens is good enough.

Both resolution and watch-dog committees begin with the wrong assumptions. Underlying their action is a declaration that the guilty should be punished. Underlying my own position is the affirmation that the unions must ask why they are the guilty. For a long time I have had a continuing argument with a labor publicist who says I have no right to demand a higher morality of labor leaders than I do of any other members of the American economic community. And I always reply to him, "Indeed, I do"—just as I demand a higher morality of churchmen who profess dedication to more than secular values.

If I could influence the labor movement, there would be fewer resolutions and more personal and institutional introspection. It has long been my thesis that the tragedy of the labor movement has been its corruption by the mores of the world it once challenged. The examples are many and obvious in union practices:

1. Its drive toward salaries of union officers comparable to those of management.

2. Its ostentatious accommodations, in Washington and other cities where union headquarters are located.

3. The quality of the accommodations demanded by its representatives at conventions and meetings: hotels on the boardwalk in Atlantic City.

4. The Miami habit—going south for winter convention vacations.

5. Expense accounts and the use of money as a tool to influence policy.

6. The development of a "pork chopper" mentality—the distance between those who live on dues and those who pay them.

7. A tendency of union officials to look at the union as my union; the members as my members.

More than once I have pointed out that the Dave Beck who fell so far was once the darling of the business community, and more than once I have been told by members of the business community of Detroit: "You can do business with Hoffa; he doesn't run off at the mouth and want to reform the world."

There is much concern in the labor movement because of the discrepancy in McDonald's $50,000 per year and the $100,000 or $150,000 of a United States Steel executive. It would be more relevant if the concern were expressed for the spread between the $50,000 of McDonald and the $5,000 of the dues payers who provide it. I would feel more hopeful if a bit more mea culpa was in the protest of those who write labor's resolutions, a bit more willingness to admit a common guilt.

The main trouble of so many labor leaders I have known is their lack of a sense of humor. They take themselves too seriously. Perhaps because they came to power in the movement by much speaking, they have become used to their own voices. They are poor conversationalists; in other words, they are poor listeners. As in all tight power structures, there is no one to say "Nuts" to officer bombast, not even the court fool who in times past could both regale and instruct the king. There is little or no self-criticism, and for all practical purposes no historical criticism in the movement, no letters to the editor, or talk back to officers. Yet the movement does respond to external criticism—thus it was in the case of corruption.

The labor movement as a minority movement grew and prospered with its highest value expressed in loyalty for those in the common cause. In the power structure loyalty is an important virtue in times of crisis, in wartime or strike, but it can muzzle criticism. The team is important, but the truth as men see it is more important. Because of this stress on loyalty, and the supersensitivity of the leaders, there can be no equal exchange between men or little honest criticism. In order to make possible honest evaluation, I would begin with freedom in the movement itself.

For example, the men who determine the top policy of the auto workers 3 years ago stressed the annual wage which was ratified by the convention. Then the educators went to work to indoctrinate the rank and file and succeeded. But that is not education, it's indoctrination. Education, from my point of view, means the willingness to begin with an open end instead of a fixed agenda. It assumes that educators make available to the workers all of the facts, even those contrary to the line.

This willingness must rest on the leaders' part in the labor movement as seen in their constant affirmation and dedication to their fellow men. Have they not, more than once, resolved that labor and the people who make it up are not commodities, but real flesh and blood persons? Because of this affirmation I have a tendency to be disturbed when a labor leader speaks about "my" union or even of the "rank and file."

The real heart of my argument rests on the conviction that there can be no real education in a voluntary organization until there is a frank appraisal of power and power relationships in the immediate area where power operates and power impinges. It just doesn't make sense to study power relationships in the other man's back yard while utterly ignoring your own.

If the labor movement had a sense of humor or was self-critical, it might ask why it builds its political strategy on a two-party system and takes advantage of the factions within a single party—and at the same time is everlastingly afraid of factions or parties in its own ranks. Many labor spokesmen are as humorless as the most concerned Communists who insist that it is freedom for the slate to be determined by the elite and voted for or against by the members.

Just listen to this, from the mouths of leaders of the steelworkers in Chicago (the same men who speak so eloquently of democracy) as they denounce the followers of Don Rarick, who had the temerity to challenge incumbent leadership and organize a dues protest committee which polled almost a third of the steelworker vote in a recent election:

First Joseph Germano, regional director: "The dues protest committee is a group of dissidents which numbers amongst its membership nearly all the Communists and Trotskyites that have been well known to the union." Al Whitehouse, another district director, said: "Our greatest enemies are the company stooges within our ranks." Charles Smith of the same rank declared: "Dirty rotten traitors are trying to destroy our union from within."

Now, one has to be more than a bit stuffy to take oneself so seriously as to imply that every third steelworker is a divisionist, or a stooge, or a traitor.

Practically, the problem is the concept of indispensability which is so prevalent in the movement. Self-perpetuation is the aim instead of preparation of men to succeed to power and take over responsibility. It seems to me that the chief problem of the AFL–CIO is its rigidity resulting from the middle-age of its leaders, the young radicals of the thirties. Unions today are great bodies, powerful organizations with no souls. Universally the plaint is: members do not come to the meetings. Really, why should they? The power structures are rigged, and there is no ideology unless it is an emphasis on more—more pay and more security.

To counteract this, I would resolve to initiate all policy from below, from shop and local groups, and to bring into these discussions every conflicting view and then seek synthesis. Frankly, I do not believe union democracy is possible unless men feel free to introduce controversy. There is utterly no hope, if the incumbent power structure attacks opposition as disloyal.

In essence, I am saying that the only men who can be trusted with power are those who are willing to give it up. And the only organizations which can be trusted are those which have built in them, either by precedent or constitutional provision, the machinery for the orderly transfer of power.

Recognizing men's unwillingness to give up power, and organizational tendencies to self-perpetuation, I would invite the labor movement to amend its constitutions to place

limitations on the length of officers' tenure; to incorporate in the election provisions the necessity for contested elections; to make possible selection of candidates by petition; to prohibit employees of the unions as convention delegates, permitting only the so-called rank and file, the members, to represent themselves. I would also place limitations on salaries and emoluments. As a yardstick I would attempt to relate the salaries of officers to those who pay dues.

As I have suggested, resolutions are not enough. To me the important question is: "Mr. President, what do you really think of the dues payers who man the assembly lines? Are they statistics, names on cards, or men with the same dignity as yourself and the same capacity for decision?"

Perhaps if all of us thought more of "power with" and less of "power over," we would be less inclined to speak of "my" union or of the steel workers as the hierarchy at 1500 Commonwealth. The union is not merely its officers. There is no real hope for reform beyond resolution until the union structure is permeated with new men and a new philosophy.

Where to begin? In the first place there needs to be a restoration of the fraternity on which the labor movement was built. Today, the distances between officers and members disturb me almost as much as the corruption. Dave Beck's greatest sin was not pilfering; it was arrogance, contempt for those from whom he sprang. As I have said, the efforts to purge the corrupt have been top-level efforts. It is Meany and Reuther and their ethical practices committee waging a war on Beck and Hoffa. So far there has been little or no sustained effort to involve the rank and file in the crusade. And more than once, I have heard top leaders express their doubt about rank-and-file willingness to take a moral position. "We," the top brass infer, "are a few pure St. Georges fighting corruption below us and all around us."

When unions grow as large as the steelworkers, auto workers, and others have, when they have a million or more members and equally great resources, it is hard for the decisionmakers to keep in touch with those whose decisions they control. The officers are part of a bureaucracy in the same manner as the officers of a giant corporation are a part of a power structure. In the auto workers the leadership is more enlightened, but the distance is as great and the apathy as intense.

Fundamentally, then, I conclude with the thesis that the unions are failing at the point of the strongest claim for their existence: Respect for human dignity. To restore this, unions in this age need broader goals than merely good jobs and bread-and-butter demands. To begin, I would invite all unions to resolve to let the power of decision return to the people. Wherever and whenever possible, human values in the industrial processes should be put first.

Recently, during a discussion of inflation, a high-ranking officer of the steelworkers asked my opinion of their policies. I replied: "They are too inbred. The time has come when the productivity increases you talk about must be reflected in reduced prices to consumers. The merry-go-round of price and wage increases must stop." Since then, I have thought a great deal about my reply; it has broader ramifications than I realized. Union members must be brought into involvement of public issues. The time has passed when great organizations dare put the private welfare of themselves and members first. Labor must, if it would go forward, move with the community and not against it. The day is past when labor can find its defense as a persecuted minority.

Today, there are many resolutions and much soul-searching in the labor movement. If it were possible, I would revise the order of priority and begin with soul-searching, invite a sense of humor, the tolerance of historical criticism, the reevaluation of the loyalty concept, the free flow of information, the encouragement of dissent, the self-limitation of power, and the increase of union and public responsibility.

WE ARE DOING QUITE WELL, THANK YOU

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, everybody knows that a country cannot talk itself out of a depression when it really has one. Likewise, Mr. President, everybody should know, although some apparently fail to understand, that a country can talk itself into a recession or a depression if it throws discretion to the wind and determines to commit economic hara-kiri.

Reckless talk, undue emphasis on the weak spots in our economy; overemphasis on the bad and critical analysis and deprecation of the good; a newspaper and radio pattern of reporting and editorializing devoted to magnifying the bad economic news and to minimizing the good economic news; partisan action and talk designed to discredit indications of soundness and to destroy confidence in ourselves can add up to a national psychology which can do more to push our country toward a real depression than all the economic statistics and business indicators added together.

SOUTH DAKOTA PUSHES FORWARD

In this happy Easter season I am pleased to report some happy economic news from the great State of South Dakota. I am happy to report once again that in South Dakota the psychology of our people is sound and business is good. And all of this did not occur by accident.

Months ago our daily newspapers and our radio and television services decided to take an honest, objective look at our economic situation and to report to our people with equal emphasis and enthusiasm—and I emphasize those words, because I think they constitute good medicine, a good prescription for those engaged in the operation of media of public information to follow—the good news along with the bad insofar as the economy of our State is concerned. The result has been electrifying and encouraging. The buyers' strike which has been developing in so much of the rest of the country in large part because of the disproportionate emphasis being placed upon relaying bad news and skeptical predictions to the people has not been apparent in South Dakota. Eight of our ten business indicators now show our South Dakota economy several substantial percentage points ahead of this time in 1957. And the good news back home continues to grow better.

Mr. President, a similar experiment was recently undertaken in Cleveland, Ohio, where those in charge of various media of public expression decided to encourage spending rather than to discourage business. There, too, the results have demonstrated that success is really easier to sell than defeat, if one works at it. In other words the do it yourself theme can be expanded to include a do it to yourself result if a genuine effort is made in the right—or the wrong—direction.

The results of this effort have been very gratifying. It is proposed to undertake a similar program in 12 other great metropolitan centers immediately after Easter.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled, "We're Doing Quite Well, Thank You," published in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of March 26, 1958. The editorial indicates some of the reasons why we are doing quite well, thank you.

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

WE'RE DOING QUITE WELL, THANK YOU

Certainly refreshing as well as comforting are the statistics on unemployment in Sioux Falls as published in the Argus-Leader Sunday.

These records, obtained from the State Employment Security Department, show a proportion of unemployed in February of this year below that of last year. And last year's February figures were below those of a year ago.

This is a striking contrast to the figures reported from many other cities in the Nation.

The reason for the better situation here is that our basic economic picture is solid. Farm income generally in 1957, for example, was above that of a year ago. Furthermore, building has been well maintained.

And it appears there's no immediate prospect of a change for the worse in the Sioux Falls picture. A recent review of building projects within the city suggested a total volume of considerable proportions. In addition, there will be the very substantial outlays involved in highway construction in this immediate area during the summer.

What lies further ahead beyond the spring and early summer is, of course, something that will be materially influenced by factors which are not predictable now.

One of these is the crop production this year. That's something that will be determined largely by the weather and no one knows now what the weather will be. Another factor is the general level of farm prices.

But these are annual uncertainties and we have learned to live with them.

For the present at least it is pleasant to know that our economy is in good order and that the outlook, insofar as it can be foreseen at this time, is for more of the same.

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at various times during the past 2 months I have pointed out that we can predict, with substantial accuracy, the total volume of the completely unemployed in the country from the statistics of the insured unemployed.

On Monday of this week I pointed out that the total numbers of the insured unemployed had increased from 3,338,000 on the 15th of February, to 3,493,000 on the 15th of March, or by an increase of 155,000. I stated that on the basis of past figures, the insured unemployed approximate 63 percent of the total number of the unemployed. This latter group, of course, also includes the unemployed in the uncovered occupations, those who are still in the waiting period, and those

who have exhausted their claim to benefits. This indicates that the increase in the total unemployed from the 15th of February to the 15th of March, therefore, is about 250,000, which would make, if we accept the figure of 5,200,000 fully unemployed for the 15th of February as being correct, a probable total of fully unemployed for the 15th of March of 5,450,000.

Of course, there is a certain margin of error in these figures. Therefore, I believe the most accurate estimate would be that the figure of the completely unemployed for the 15th of March, when it is issued next week, will probably be between 5,400,000 and 5,600,000. If this increase in unemployment occurs it will be a very appreciable increase, when we remember that normally there is a decrease in unemployment between the middle of February and the middle of March. For instance, last year, 1957, there was a decrease of 151,000 in the numbers of the insured unemployed in that month. Therefore, an increase in unemployment of 50,000, when there is normally a decrease of 150,000, is, in effect, an increase of 200,000 in the number of the insured unemployed. If this is typical of the latest number of the insured unemployed then this would be the equivalent of an increase in the fully unemployed of over 450,000.

Mr. President, now let me turn to the question of insured unemployment. I am ready to estimate what the probable number of the insured unemployed will be when the figure is announced tomorrow. I have collected statistics from various State departments of labor. I now estimate that the statistics on insured unemployment when they are released tomorrow, will be approximately 3,510,000, or an increase of approximately 17,000 over the number for the 15th of March. In other words, in the week between the 15th and 22d of March there was probably an increase in the number of insured unemployed of 17,000, but with a margin of error which might bring the total to between 15 and 20 thousand.

Since, as I have said, we should remember that the insured unemployed constitute approximately 63 percent of the totally unemployed, the figure for the increase in the totally unemployed becomes approximately 25,000 in that week.

It is very interesting that in the corresponding week last year there was a decrease of 58,000 in the number of the insured unemployed. Therefore, instead of going down 58,000, as was true last year, the number of the insured unemployed in the third week of March went up this year by about 17,000. This was virtually the equivalent of an increase in unemployment of 75,000 as compared to the record of last year. Of course the bad weather of the third week of March played its part in this.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator have any estimate of the number of unemployed persons who never had qualified for unemployment insurance benefits?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In general, if we can accept the census figures, which do not refer to insured families but show a sampling of all families, their figures are generally thirty-seven sixty-thirds higher than those covered by unemployment insurance. That is, if the census figures are taken as 100, the insured unemployed will be 63, roughly. I believe that in the future weeks that percentage will go down to 62 or 61, as people exhaust their insurance benefits but remain unemployed.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator have any estimate of the number of unemployed part-time workers?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I have been making estimates for a number of years, and I recently published in the RECORD some material on that subject. There are millions of people on involuntary part-time work. They are allowed to work only 4 days or 3 days or, in some cases, only 2 days a week.

If we accept 37½ hours a week as standard, and then take the census figure of the number who work less than 14 hours—14 or 26 or 36 hours—and get a midpoint for each group, and multiply these midpoints by the numbers in that group and divide the sum of the products by the total number, we can estimate what the number of the part-time workers is in terms of equivalent total unemployment.

For February 15 that figure came to an additional 1.2 million.

I have always said that the real figure of involuntary unemployment for the 15th of February was not 5.2 million, but 5.2 million plus 1.2 million or 6.4 million. If we merely apply the same figure of 1,200,000 for March 15, we get a total of between 6.6 and 6.8 million unemployed, which would be still further increased by the decline in employment between the 15th of March and the 22d of March.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Illinois agree with my interpretation of his figures—and I am indebted to him for them—that the prediction of the President of some weeks ago, that the first of April might see some upturn in the recession, does not seem to be borne out by the unemployment figures?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sorry to say that the unemployment figures indicate the decline in employment is still continuing. I assure the Senator that I am not happy about that situation, but I believe that all the facts should be reported.

Mr. MORSE. Can the Senator tell me and the Senate his position in regard to increasing unemployment insurance benefits from the standpoint of time, and what he thinks the Senate should do about it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that task is immediate and pressing. Two things, I believe, need to be done. First, the duration of the benefits needs to be extended. No State, I believe, provides benefits for a period in excess of 26 weeks during the year, and the average is 20 weeks, and in some cases less than 20. Then there are other provisions restricting the number of weeks of benefits according to a certain ratio—such as 1 to 6, and, in some cases, 1 to 4—to the weeks for which contributions were made during the preceding year.

Therefore a great many unemployed have exhausted their claims for benefits, and now have to be thrown upon other resources. Unless there is a business pickup, this danger will be accentuated still further in the weeks ahead. So it is obviously essential that Congress should provide some way of extending unemployment benefits. I believe this should be for an additional 16 weeks.

The second point, upon which the Senator from Oregon very properly touched, is the question of the adequacy of the benefits. I had some share in writing a number of State unemployment insurance laws in the 1930's. I may say it was the universal intent to have benefits equal approximately half the average earnings. That was done so that the worker would bear half the cost, and therefore have an inducement to hunt for a job, and yet have half the loss borne by the insurance fund. The average ratio now of benefits to earnings is approximately one-third. Various devices have been employed to cut down the ratio, such as fixing maximum limits, and putting other restrictive provisions into the laws. Therefore I believe there is need to raise the amount of the benefits as well as to extend the period of the benefit payments.

I cannot think of anything more pressing for Congress to deal with than this subject. I hope speedy action will be taken in the House, which is considering this measure, known as the Kennedy-McCarthy bill, and also in the Senate, so that we can proceed simultaneously, instead of having the delays which occur when the two Houses only move in sequence.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Illinois knows, yesterday in the Senate I expressed the point of view that I did not think we could morally justify any delay in the matter, and that I was perfectly willing to remain here until final action was taken, because I believe it is of great importance that we proceed without delay.

I have one final question to ask the Senator. Yesterday I made what I considered to be my major speech on tax reduction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I deeply appreciated the comments of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. All I was doing was following in the steps of my economic adviser, which is exactly what the Senator from Illinois is to me on this subject. But I am disturbed about the point of view which is being expressed, namely, that advocacy of a tax reduction at this time is a form of fiscal irresponsibility. Does the Senator from Illinois share that opinion?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I certainly do not. As the Senator from Oregon knows, I have not only urged, but have worked for a balanced budget in periods of business prosperity. In fact, I believe that during periods of business prosperity we should accumulate an appreciable surplus which can be used to help retire a

portion of the national debt. I have worked for those causes.

But in a period of severe recession, with the prospect of a depression ensuing, the greatest danger which faces the country is prolonged and extensive unemployment, which could literally shake the foundations of the community. That is the primary danger against which we should try to guard.

As the Senator from Oregon knows, the Federal Reserve Board, after making its bad mistake last August of raising the interest rate at the very time business was turning downward, has tried since then to help restore prosperity by lowering the interest rate.

A number of things have happened in connection with that. First, the banks have not lowered their lending rates in the same ratio the Federal Reserve has lowered its rediscount rate.

Second, merely making credit cheaper does not insure that businesses will borrow. Businesses will only borrow if they feel that there is an economic demand for their products. They do not now feel that there is a sufficient demand for their products to justify increasing their output, so they are not borrowing more from the banks.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Utah for his very tactful suggestion. If the Senator from Utah wishes me to discontinue, I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. WATKINS. I was concerned about when the Senate would reach the conference report on the road bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Utah wish me not to reply to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WATKINS. I was making that statement as an observation. I did not see the acting majority leader here, and I was trying to ascertain when the Senate might reach the conference report, if it is to be on the program for today.

Mr. MORSE. I think we shall be finished with our colloquy in a few minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Utah objects to our continuing I shall be glad to take my seat.

Mr. WATKINS. Not at all. I did not raise the question for the purpose of objecting; I was simply trying to get information which would enable me to guide my future plans. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Illinois may recall that in my speech yesterday I discussed what I thought was a very interesting parallel between conditions now and those in the late 1920's. During the late 1920's, we maintained our tax rates. The interesting point is, however, that the income from those tax rates went down.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. We faced the problem of a deficit. That causes me to ask the Senator from Illinois this question: Does he share the point of view that a tax cut at this time would be inducive to a greater deficit, or is there any possibility that a tax cut now might very shortly produce greater income for the Treasury, and have just the opposite effect from that of increasing the deficit?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would not go so far as to make the latter point. I would say instead that a tax cut, by releasing purchasing power, would lead to a greater volume of purchases, a greater volume of sales, a greater volume of production, and a greater volume of employment than would otherwise occur.

Hence, it would raise the tax base from what it was at the time that the tax cut went into effect; but I would not say that this would necessarily be sufficient to offset the decrease in revenues which would be caused by the reduction in the rates themselves. I will merely say that the loss in revenue would be by no means so great as it would seem to be on the surface.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Illinois go so far as to say, as I indicated in my speech yesterday, that a tax reduction would have the effect of affording such a stimulation to the economy as to produce more money from taxes as a result of the greater employment which would result?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would not want to make such a claim. I think that would perhaps be claiming too much. I would merely say that the loss in revenue would not be so great as would seem to be apparent, if we assumed the tax base is fixed. The tax base would not be fixed; it should broaden.

Mr. MORSE. That is the lesson I want to learn. Does the Senator from Illinois hold to the point of view that if we reduced taxes at this time the Government probably would not lose so much in the reasonably near future as many of those who fear a tax cut are telling the American people would be lost?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. MORSE. And that as a result of the tax cut and the stimulation to industry which might result, we might find, particularly if we proceeded with public works programs, that it would increase the amount of wealth in the United States, and within a few years we would find ourselves better off as a result of a tax cut than we would be if we maintained the present tax rates and got less money from the taxpayers, which would be the case if the rates are kept up?

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the Senator from Oregon knows, I am not opposed to a reasonable public-works program. But I also believe that such a program will not have as quick and immediate an effect as a tax cut, because a long time is needed to get a public-works program underway.

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly the point of view I expressed in my speech yesterday. I shall stand on that record.

KLAMATH INDIAN RESERVATION LEGISLATION — ARTICLES IN AMERICAN FORESTS MAGAZINE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding conservation and forestry periodicals in the United States, American Forests, has been making a valuable contribution in this field by publishing representative articles on the crucial Klamath Indian Reservation question. Already an able article by Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton has appeared in this series, and now the March 1958 issue of American Forests contains thoughtful presentations by two prominent citizens of my State.

They are Robert W. Sawyer, retired editor of the Bend Bulletin, of Bend, Oreg., and Bill Jenkins, managing editor of the Klamath Falls Herald and News, of Klamath Falls, Oreg.

The article by Mr. Jenkins discusses the vital importance of conserving the timber of the Klamath Reservation, so that continued watershed protection will be provided in a realm where rise some of the major rivers and lakes of southeastern Oregon.

Mr. Sawyer's article argues, with validity, I believe, that the vast pine forests of the Klamath Reservation should be acquired by the United States Forest Service and be made part of the great system of national forests, which are so vital to Oregon and the Pacific Northwest.

The two articles complement each other, because national forests contribute greatly to the watershed protection which Mr. Jenkins advocates. Because the Senate Interior Committee is now considering S. 3051, which deals with the Klamath situation, and which I have introduced at the request of the Department of the Interior, I believe that my colleagues will find much useful information in these two articles from American Forests magazine for March.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the articles by Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Sawyer be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the American Forests of March 1958]

KLAMATH TIMBER SHOULD BE IN NATIONAL FORESTS

(By Robert W. Sawyer, former editor Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin)

At some time before the adjournment of the Congress, final decisions will be made in the long-debated Klamath Indian situation. On these decisions hang results amounting on the one hand to grave damage to a leading industry and hardship to many depending on it, calamity to a region and the virtual destruction of supremely important natural resources, or, on the other, stabilization of the industry, prosperity with new tax income for the region and the conservation of those resources. Whichever decision is made the cost will be substantial, but higher, much higher and more widely spread if out of it flow the former rather than the latter results.

The Klamath situation, as this is written, is as set up in Public Law 587 of the 83d Congress as amended by Public Law 132 of the 85th and by the action so far taken

in execution of the mandate of that legislation. This includes, in particular, an appraisal of tribally owned assets, currently in the process of being completed. Present estimates indicate that approximately 98 percent of the real property value of tribally owned lands consists of forest lands and the timber thereon.

After the completion of the appraisal each tribal member will be given the opportunity to withdraw from the tribe and be paid his proportionate share of the value of the tribal property. Those who do not withdraw will remain in the tribe and participate in a tribal property management plan.

It is contemplated by the law that funds with which to pay the tribal members who elect to withdraw shall be secured by sales of selected portions of tribal property (sec. 5 (a), par. 2). A reading of the Termination Act shows that it is expected that the selection shall be largely of reservation timber and in view of that fact the forest lands are being appraised in a relatively large number of economic units of various sizes. These units have been established and will be sold in a manner that should bring the highest total return when sold in sufficient quantity to produce the sums necessary to meet the requirements of the law with respect to the withdrawing members of the tribe. The latest estimate of the total volume of sawtimber contained in all units is 4,300,000,000 feet.

Title to the land will pass with the timber. Thereafter the only regulation covering the logging operations will be the Oregon Forest Conservation Act which requires the leaving of only a few small seed trees per acre.

Here it should be noted that under the law no sales may be made "prior to the adjournment of the second session of the 85th Congress," an event not likely to occur much, if at all, before this coming August. Then there is the requirement that the realization of income from the sales and the distribution of their shares to the withdrawing Indians must be completed by August 13, 1960. Thus a short 2 years is the authorized period within which the sales are to be made.

All of the foregoing, the appraisal, withdrawal by the Indians and preparations for sale is, of course, preliminary to the basic and ultimate purpose of the law—the termination of Federal supervision over the Klamath Tribe maintained since 1864 by the United States as trustee for these Indian wards.

At the present time this Klamath Reservation forest is being managed under the practices known in modern forestry as sustained yield. Annual sales of the timber are made but only so much in volume as is being added by growth on the remaining forest. Thus there is assured a permanent forest, a permanent supply of logs for wood-using industry in the region, permanent employment for woods and millworkers and a sustained annual income for the Indian beneficiaries. Such permanence extends benefits and values throughout the local, the State and even, to a degree, the national economy.

Sales from the reservation forest (1949 to 1954, inclusive) have averaged 72 million board-feet a year. From these and other lesser resource sales there has been an annual income to each member of the Klamath Tribe—man, woman, and child—of approximately $800. For the end product ready for the customer there has been, by conservative estimate, in payment for labor, material, and supplies an annual distribution of over $3 million of which over $2 million was for wages. This is in addition to the annual stumpage return of approximately $2 million which has contributed substantially to the welfare of the Klamath Indian people.

In that same period (1949–54) the sawmills of the Klamath region have averaged an annual production of 300 million board-feet, the volume above the 72 million feet from the reservation having come from privately owned lands and the national forests of the region. And incidentally, it should be noted that only the larger operators own timberlands from which to draw. Small mill operators, of which there are 13 in the region today, are almost entirely dependent for their log supplies on the national forests and on the forests of the Klamath Reservation. Sustained-yield management of these forests is essential for the continued existence of these small mills.

On the basis of estimates that the reservation appraisal will be $110 million and that 70 percent of the Indians will withdraw from the tribe, timber with an appraised value of $77 million must be sold in order to pay each his share estimated to be approximately $50,000. It is inexorably provided in the Termination Act that this shall be done by August 13, 1960.

What portion of the 4,300 million board-feet of timber on the reservation must be sold to meet this obligation depends, of course, on the number of tribal members who elect to withdraw. If, as has been assumed, 70 percent of the tribal members elect to withdraw, the amount of timber to be sold in order to pay for their interests would be approximately 3 billion board-feet or almost twice the total annual cut in all Oregon east of the Cascades for the latest period for which figures are available. The assumption cannot be made, however, that such sales will bring a fair return for the withdrawing members if sales are made as the law now contemplates. Such a sales program is bound to bring much lower stumpage prices per thousand board-feet than those received from routine sales of small quantities of timber. Even though next August, after sales are begun, there is a recovery from the present depressed condition of the lumber market, prices will be lower, for here will be a forced sale attended, on the part of the seller, with all the losses and depreciated prices that a forced sale entails. Here will be a sale in an amount that may be as much as 10 times the annual capacity of the region's sawmills, with each successful bidder required to pay cash on the acceptance of his bid and all sales to be completed by August 13, 1960.

This means the sales at depressed log prices of billions of board-feet of the forest property beyond the sales made under ordinary and proper forest practice. It means a glutted timber market affecting stumpage prices, and consequently mill production and woods and mill worker employment far beyond the Klamath region. It means the end of sustained yield on a substantial portion of the Klamath Reservation forest. It means an orgy of timber cutting during a relatively short period of time and then an area and an economic desolation affecting thousands. The Klamath Reservation forest as a base for timber, for employment, for industry, for recreation, and for water conservation will be largely destroyed.

Here let it be agreed that not all the purchasers will proceed at once with the harvest of their timber. Many, however, will undoubtedly do so. Otherwise they gamble on the log and the lumber market and on the hazards of losses by insects and fire while interest on their investments runs and taxes will be payable on property in their ownership (land, timber and machinery) on each January 1. Smaller operator-purchasers, in particular, who have moved in with portable mills to realize promptly on their investment will hasten to "cut out and get out" and their lands will go tax-delinquent.

Now it has been variously proposed that the sales be made in a manner to avoid these calamities and with conditions attached requiring cutting on a sustained yield basis. Even from the Department of the Interior there has come a proposal complete with drafted bill under which the reservation lands selected to be sold to pay withdrawing members of the tribe would be offered for sale to private purchasers subject to management restrictions. The Department's proposal calls for payment by the private purchasers of the full realization value for the forest property with requirements that the property thus sold be operated on a sustained yield basis.

Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, offers an explanation of what is meant by the term "realization value" in the letter with which he transmitted the proposed bill to the President of the Senate. "Realization value," Secretary Seaton said, "is the amount for which the lands could be sold on the open market prior to the termination date, without limitation on use, if as much as 70 percent of the forest were offered for sale. If 70 percent of the Indians elect to withdraw, that is the maximum amount they could expect to receive under the present law. The Indians cannot be required to take less."

Parenthetically, it should be noted here that in a hearing before a Senate subcommittee the Klamath region's largest timber owner and mill operator explained carefully why it could not buy reservation timber at such a realization price and undertake a sustained yield operation. It could not afford, nor could any other private operator, to pay down the realization value of the timber and then hold such an investment over a long period of years.

What the administration's proposed bill apparently attempts, then, is to require private operators to purchase the timber units at prices which they, the operators, admittedly cannot pay if they are required to practice sustained yield management on the purchased property. Such a proposal therefore does not give the operators the opportunity to purchase the timber units suitable for sustained yield operation which, at least on the surface, is the real purpose of the bill.

On the other hand, if operators are able and willing to bid the appraised values for the property with sustained yield restrictions the Indian people will not be receiving as high a value for their interests as they would receive were the property sold without such restrictions. Under such circumstances, the courts, following the applicable rules relating to such a trust as exists here, would award the Indians a sizable judgment to compensate them for the lesser prices they receive because of the sustained yield restrictions. In short, sooner or later and in one way or another the United States will have to pay the withdrawing Indians the full retail (retail value is described by the management specialists as the current average selling price of commercial sales times the total volume of timber, without any discount for the period of time required to harvest—editor) value of their timber.

The answer, and the only sensible answer, is the outright and undisguised purchase of the reservation by the United States at the appraised value, payment to withdrawing Indians of their share of the price, addition of the timberlands to the national forest reserves and allocation of the marshlands for management by the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service.

If these courses are followed, the withdrawing Indians will get their money, in my judgment there will be no resort to the courts, those who remain in the tribe will have the income from fair prices paid for stumpage on the portion of the reservation maintained for their use, sustained yield forest management will continue and the Klamath marsh, highly important as a unit

of the Pacific flyway will be kept inviolate. And there are other values to be realized. Sales of timber by the Forest Service will bring an annual revenue to Klamath County for roads and schools (25 percent of the forest income) a continuing log supply for the mills of the region will be assured with opportunities for the small as well as the large operator to share in the annual harvest and the watershed will be protected, a condition essential for both the Federal irrigation and the private power developments of the Klamath Basin.

Purchase by the United States is the economical course to follow. It would serve the general welfare. The crash program now contemplated will cost millions more in loss of sustained yield values, in worker dislocation, in tax losses, in depressed log and lumber values, in water supply impairment, and in damage to the general economy of the Klamath Basin and the rest of the pine producing region.

[From the American Forests of March 1958]

KLAMATH WATER BIG COG IN OREGON'S PROSPECTS

(By Bill Jenkins, managing editor, Klamath Falls Herald and News)

Three years ago an adjourning Congress hastily pushed through Public Law 587 under the terms of which the vast Klamath Indian Reservation in Klamath County Oreg., was to be removed from Federal trusteeship. Implementation of the bill included a sale of the reservation's assets to provide the necessary moneys with which to pay off those tribal members who expressed the desire to take their fair share of these sale moneys and withdraw from the reservation.

Since that time a deepening concern has been expressed by westerners and by timber interests as well as by the various conservation groups as to the wisdom of carrying out the original provisions of Public Law 587. Under the terms of that ill-advised document the resources of the reservation are to be sold. Ninety-eight percent of the total value of the reservation lies in its vast stands of sawlog and pulp timber. An appraisal report on the reservation issued February 3, 1958, by the management specialists lists the total realization value of the assets as $121,643,918. Of this total 95 timber units account for $118,391,610 of the overall value.

It has become increasingly clear that if the terms of the law are carried out to the letter this timber will be sold at fire-sale prices in order to provide the necessary funds for those withdrawing members. Under these terms 1 of 2 things is very likely to happen: Either the timber will be sold off at depressed prices in numerous small lots which would result in a boom-and-bust era of logging activity, or the tribal members would be kept waiting for their money if they are to receive retail value. In either case it is improbable that any effort would be made to maintain a sustained-yield basis for harvesting the timber. At present only Federal purchase seemingly could bring about both immediate funds and sustained-yield practices. And in view of present circumstances it is believed to be highly unlikely that such a purchase will be authorized by the present Congress.

But whatever becomes of the timber in the final analysis, there is another all-important issue to be considered. The preservation of the Klamath or upper basin watershed and the full utilization of the lands of the reservation and adjacent areas regardless of the timber crop.

Here it might be wise to afford a glance at the existing circumstances. The largest stream in the stretch of Pacific coast between the Columbia and the Sacramento is the Klamath River. The Klamath originates in the Upper Lake, which in turn drains into Ewauna Lake and becomes the actual headwaters of the Klamath River. Half of the total amount of water being fed into Upper Klamath Lake, from which stems the river, originates from rivers and streams within the boundaries of the Klamath Indian Reservation. In addition to this a further large portion of the water supply comes from minor creeks and springs, almost all of which are located either on the reservation or immediately adjacent to it. Most of the ground water in the upper basin area is believed to originate in the water-bearing underground strata on the reservation.

Two of the principal rivers, the Sprague and the Williamson, can be said to provide nearly half the total flow to the Klamath River. The combined flow of these streams into the Upper Lake is some 660,000 acre-feet per year. Total flow of the Klamath River at Keno, according to a 49-year record, is 1,165,000 acre-feet. Any threat to these streams would undoubtedly alter the situation to a great degree.

A further study of the situation will show that the runoff of the Sprague and Williamson Rivers below Chiloquin, largest town within the reservation and located near the center of the area, registers 42.4 percent of the total during the months of March, April, and May. The Sprague River alone, above Chiloquin, shows a runoff of 49.4 percent during these same 3 months.

In short, nearly half the streamflow is dashing merrily on its way to the sea during a relatively short period and at a time when full utilization of the water is not realized. If the forest cover of the watershed were removed, it seems reasonable to assume that this early runoff would be greatly accelerated and the consequent loss of water that much greater.

Present storage capacities are inadequate to hold any increased early runoff and it is highly unlikely that such facilities are in sight in the immediate future. This added to the fact that added water storage will face the problem of evaporation which is high due to terrain features and feasible storage sites.

Damage to the existing watershed cover would affect not only the streams but would in all probability bring about a ruinous waste of other natural resources. Erosion is an ever-present evil with its land-hungry activity and allied flood threat. The eastern portion of the Klamath Reservation is comprised of soils highly susceptible to washing. The northern and western portions are largely pumice in nature and could, possibly, act as a giant sponge for storage and replenishment of the underground water basins. But this soil can be saturated; and when it is, erosion is the result. Denuded of its forest cover it is highly unlikely that storage capabilities would remain at their present levels.

Much of the emphasis on possible sale of reservation timber and other resources has centered on the commercial and industrial side. But there is another face to the coin. Lying within the present boundaries of the reservation are untold recreation and conservation resources which must not be allowed to go up the spout. The area is the site of the vast Klamath Marsh, one of the major nesting and resting areas for migratory waterfowl. This wet-land area covers approximately 85,000 acres, some in marsh, some in improved grazing land, all of it highly productive in the rearing of ducks and geese as well as carrying summer range for cattle.

Some of the finest trout fishing in the West is to be found in the rivers and streams of the reservation area—the Williamson, the Sprague, Wood River, Spring Creek, and others. Certainly any ruthless destruction of precious watershed cover will see an end to these clear, swift streams as anything but gutters to the sea for the flood-washed soils. Existing parks would exchange their towering pines and long vistas of grass and stream for the dusty gullies and flats of high desert scab rock.

It is my opinion that the recreational potential of the upper basin has barely been tapped. Given time, and the preservation of the watershed, it can and probably will equal the more famous summer areas of Tahoe, Arrowhead, Yosemite, and others to the south. The marshlands and lakes of the area can certainly be counted on to provide gunning for waterfowl hunters for years to come provided sufficient water at those periods when it is most needed. Here again, the destruction of watershed cover would result in the loss of our nesting potential. An early runoff in the area would cause flood conditions at the very period of nesting for many species of ducks and geese, followed by drouth conditions when the water was gone and stored capacities had to be pressed into irrigation and industrial use.

As water, the most valuable single resource of the 11 Western States, is currently used in the upper basin, it provides first irrigation for the area's farms and pastureland. This water, with a total consumptive waste which is very low, serves the land and then is led back and dumped into the river or the lake where it serves again in the generation of power. After this double duty there is still a surplus for fish, wildlife and recreation. This power potential will be upped materially when the California-Oregon Power Co. completes its Big Bend project on the river below the Keno shelf, now under construction.

Figures kept over the years prove that this water use depletes less of the supply than would be lost if it were allowed to remain wholly in the marsh areas or were led into holding basins. But we must maintain the source, else there is little future for the upper basin and the downriver prospects are reduced accordingly.

The Klamath watershed, or the upper basin if you prefer, is of great importance not only to the immediate area but to the areas lying to the south as well. Plans are already under way for a future diversion of portions of the Klamath River flow into the Trinity and thus to the parched areas of central California. The waters of the Klamath are protected for the areas of primary use through the agency of the Klamath River compact, an agreement between Oregon and California reserving these rights to the areas of origin.

On the drawing boards are pumping and drainage plans which will add an additional 200,000 acres to the irrigated area of the upper basin. These plans cannot be brought to fruition without the water to work with. And that water will certainly not be available if the watershed itself is sacrificed in a fire sale for the benefit of cash in hand now with no thought to the future.

On the reservation alone present plans call for putting an additional 100,000 acres under irrigation. Some of this land will be highly productive agricultural land. The remainder and greater portion, will be or can be converted from wetland to summer pasture. If suitable arrangements can be made with the Fish and Wildlife Service and related agencies for the propagation of migratory waterfowl and the maintenance of the necessary resting and nesting grounds in this area of the Pacific flyway the upper marsh could be easily and cheaply drained, reclaimed and brought into use as pasture. It is not practical to consider farming in this particular area due to the almost year-round frost which occurs at the high altitude.

I do not wish it said that I carry any brief for the total preservation of the timber stand under the guise of maintaining the watershed. Far from it. But we must accept the fact that unless sustained yield practices are carried out on the huge timber stands contained within the Klamath Indian Reserva-

tion, we are letting ourselves and our neighbors in the West in for trouble. Nor can we afford to overlook the potential value which will accrue to the land itself from such practices.

We have in sight in the immediate future the improvement of 300,000 acres of land. This land if put to productive use will find a ready market for 175 products in the California area which is growing with astonishing rapidity and looks like it is going to continue to do so. With maintenance of the watershed and the presently building dams along the river, we have a prospect of greatly increased flood control for the reaches of the lower Klamath. We have in sight the use of surplus waters from the reservation sources which will add to the industrial, agricultural and recreational potential of southern Oregon and northern California.

TRIAL BY JURY—EDITORIAL

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, history has a way of putting things in perspective. Perhaps it is because time removes the emotions that run so high at the time of an issue. Perhaps history has already started unfolding on one of the most controversial issues that the Senate voted on last year.

There is an indication of this in yesterday's excellent editorial in the Washington Evening Star. The title of this editorial is "Trial by Jury," and it comments very pointedly on the opinions of liberal members of the United States Supreme Court on the right of trial by jury.

I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD, and I invite the reading attention of it to every Member of this body.

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

TRIAL BY JURY

It is too bad that the Supreme Court's latest opinions on the right to a jury trial in criminal contempt cases were not available during last summer's debate on the civil-rights bill. For some of the things said, especially by the dissenting Justices, would have curled the hair of those liberals who opposed jury trials in civil-rights cases.

The case before the Court involved two Communists—Gilbert Green and Henry Winston. They were among the 11 Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act. After their conviction had been upheld by the Supreme Court they jumped bail and went into hiding. When they surrendered 5 years later they were charged with criminal contempt for violating a lower court order, tried without jury, and sentenced to serve 3 additional years. The majority opinion conceded the right of Congress to provide for jury trials in any or all criminal-contempt prosecutions. But Congress had made no such provision in this type of case, and the majority upheld the conviction.

Justice Black, joined by Chief Justice Warren and Justice Douglas, wrote a powerful dissent. Justice Black said the facts of this case "provide a striking example of how the great procedural safeguards of the Bill of Rights are now easily evaded by the ever-ready and boundless expedients of a judicial decree and a summary (without jury) contempt proceeding." He contended that in all criminal contempt prosecutions, whether Congress has agreed or not, the accused is entitled by the Constitution to be tried by a jury after indictment by a grand jury. Then Justice Black added this:

"Summary trial of criminal contempt, as now practiced, allows a single functionary of the State, a judge, to lay down the law, to prosecute those whom he believes have violated his command (as interpreted by him), to sit in judgment on his own charges, and then within the broadest kind of bounds to punish as he sees fit. It seems inconsistent with the most rudimentary principles of our system of criminal justice, a system carefully developed and preserved throughout centuries to prevent oppressive enforcement of oppressive laws, to concentrate this much power in the hands of any officer of the State."

This is a persuasive statement of the principles which led the Senate to adopt an amendment guaranteeing jury trials in all criminal contempt actions arising under the civil-rights law. It is an eloquent rebuke to those who, through political pressures in the House, forced adoption of a so-called compromise which limits jury trials to cases in which the penalty exceeds 45 days in jail or a $300 fine.

The argument in support of this phony compromise was that southern juries could not be trusted to convict the guilty. But Justice Black scorned this argument. What will the liberals say now? Will they say that the dissenting justices are reactionary, or that they are not concerned with civil liberties? They will not say this if they will read the opinion. And we hope they will read it, for if they do it may clear their minds of some of the nonsense they were spouting last summer when the jury-trial issue was up for debate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., is one of the great American newspapers.

Last year during the debate in the Senate on the jury-trial amendment to the so-called civil-rights bill, this great newspaper published a series of forceful and cogent editorials in support of trial by jury in contempt-of-court cases, thereby demonstrating its concern over the erosion of basic constitutional civil rights, as distinguished from the use of the term "civil rights" to justify measures of great political expediency.

In its edition of Wednesday, April 2, 1958, the Evening Star published an editorial entitled "Trial by Jury," which points up a recent Supreme Court decision in this field. I commend to the attention of my colleagues this editorial which the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has just had printed in the RECORD.

WILDERNESS BILL—FACTS AND FANCIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the March issue of the National Resources Report issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has done a disservice to its readers by presenting an entirely erroneous analysis of the wilderness bill, S. 1176, of which I am the sponsor.

I respect the right of the United States Chamber of Commerce to oppose this or any other constructive legislation. However, it would be more fitting for such an organization to inform its members truthfully, whatever its views and opinions may be, rather than to attempt to justify its position on misstatements and misconceptions.

I am pleased that the National Parks Association has effectively refuted the United States Chamber of Commerce report by pinpointing a dozen misstatements of fact and providing the corrections from the bill itself. For my part, I have more respect for the views of the National Parks Association on our natural resources than I do any supposed Natural Resources Report from the United States Chamber of Commerce. It is regrettable that so much misinformation has been deliberately circulated in an attempt to stir up opposition to a constructive proposal for the public's good.

Mr. President, to set the record straight I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter sent to me by the president of the National Parks Association refuting the United States Chamber of Commerce report.

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

NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1958.

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

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The March 1958 issue of the Natural Resources Report issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has come to my attention. It deals entirely with the wilderness bill—S. 1176—and states the chamber's continued opposition to the bill, any revisions thereof, or related bills.

The National Parks Association has endorsed the objectives of this legislation, and in National Parks magazine we have sought to present it clearly to our readers and the public. We consider this an outstandingly important measure.

Since the United States Chamber of Commerce report goes to a wide audience of businessmen over the country, it seems important that any inaccuracies found therein be pointed out and recorded.

We are, therefore, much concerned with this report. Despite continued efforts made by the sponsors and proponents of the wilderness bill to clarify the objectives and purposes of this measure, we find a dozen misstatements or misconceptions set forth in this report. Here they are:

Misstatement No. 1: "The proposed legislation could abolish the long-established principle of multiple use of Federal lands by many citizens in favor of single-purpose, restricted use by a relatively few people."

Misstatement No. 2: "* * * it would provide additional areas of public lands for their exclusive benefit * * *" (meaning the exclusive benefit of outdoor enthusiasts and organized conservationists).

Misstatement No. 3: "At present, our * * * wilderness, primitive, or wild areas include about 14 million acres of Federal lands. * * * An enlarged wilderness system, however, proposes immediate inclusion of a total of more than 55 million acres of Federal land. * * *"

Misstatement No. 4: "Radical changes would occur in the uses which can now be made of those lands."

Misstatement No. 5. "* * * forest access roads required for forest protection are excluded under the wilderness plan."

Misstatement No. 6: "Administration of * * * wilderness areas * * * could be removed from the executive agencies and given to Congress or a Wilderness Preservation Council."

Misstatement No. 7: "* * * the bill would make additions to the system relatively easy and removals extremely difficult."

Misstatement No. 8: "The bill inserts a council between Congress and the executive agencies. * * *"

Misstatement No. 9: "The bill gives Congress an additional administrative responsibility. * * *"

Misstatement No. 10: "Free and effective application of administrative judgment would be seriously hampered."

Misstatement No. 11: "The revised bill * * * contains new language which makes possible the addition of Indian lands * * * with little control by the Indians."

Misstatement No. 12: "* * * land areas now controlled by the States or private interests could be considered by the Wilderness Council for possible inclusion in the national system."

Each and every one of these statements can be proven false or misleading by merely quoting the appropriate passages from the measure itself. The writer of the chamber's attack refers to the revised bill. Therefore, the wording, Committee Print No. 2, dated February 11, 1958, is used in the following point by point discussion of the above objections. Here is the way it looks to us:

Correction No. 1: The wilderness bill maintains and indeed strengthens the long-established principle of multiple use of national forest lands in the following phraseolgy: "* * * it is further declared to be the policy of Congress to administer the national forests with the general objectives of multiple use and sustained yield, and in order to carry out this policy the Secretary of Agriculture is accordingly directed to administer the national forests on a multiple-use basis so that the resources thereof will be used and developed to produce a sustained yield of products and services, including the establishment and maintenance of wilderness areas * * *."

Correction No. 2: The wilderness bill establishes a National Wilderness Preservation System "composed of areas of public lands in the United States * * * retaining their natural primeval environment and influence and being managed for purposes consistent with their continued preservation as wilderness * * *"

It does not provide for the exclusive benefit of any segment of the American public, but rather for the preservation of currently designated wilderness areas "for the health, welfare, knowledge, and happiness of its citizens of present and future generations." These benefits are open to all citizens.

Correction No. 3: The chamber statement No. 3 is simply a twisting of statistics to prove a point. The present 14 million acres of wilderness primitive and wild lands referred to are the Forest Service administered wilderness country. The 55 million acres expected to be included in the total wilderness system includes these 14 million acres of national forest wilderness plus 22 million acres of existing national park wilderness plus 13¾ million acres of existing refuge and range wilderness plus 4¾ million acres of existing Indian wilderness (if—and only if—the Indians themselves want their land included).

Correction No. 4: This is not a reform bill. The chamber fails to point out what the "radical changes" are which they claim "would occur in the uses that can now be made of those lands." As we have shown above, the multiple-use policy of the Forest Service most certainly is not harmed by the bill. Further, the bill provides that, "Nothing in this act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose stated in the establishment of any national park or monument, national forest, national wildlife refuge, Indian reservation, or other Federal-land area involved except that any agency administering any area within the * * * system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area * * *." Special provisions with respect to national forests provide for continuing grazing, use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become well established. Where the interests of the United States will be better served by opening a specific national-forest area of the system to mining or maintenance of reservoirs and water-conservation works, the President will have the power under this measure to authorize same.

Instead of making radical changes, the wilderness bill provides Congressional sanction for the continued preservation as wilderness of those federally owned areas that have so far remained wilderness.

Correction No. 5: Special provisions provide that the President may authorize "such measures as may be found necessary in the control of insects and diseases, including the permanent road construction found essential to such mining and reservoir construction" when in the national interest. The general provision quoted above also applies in answering this misinterpretation.

Correction No. 6: Our quotation in point 4 again answers the question raised regarding removal of administrative authority from the executive agencies and giving it to Congress or the Council. Amplification of this point is given further in the bill. The administration of the areas within the system is quite clearly defined as remaining, as at present, with the executive agencies involved. The fact is that the Council established by the wilderness bill, as the bill says, "shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any unit in the system nor over any agency that does have such jurisdiction."

Correction No. 7: Additions to or deletions from the national-forest areas included in the system are treated equally, as is evident from the following provision of the bill itself:

"Any addition, modification, or elimination of any national forest area, * * * to, in, or from the system, shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish * * *."

With respect to park, monument, and refuge wilderness, where either executive or legislative means may be used to add areas to the system, while only an act of Congress may remove them, the bill simply carries on the present policy regarding monuments, and no area could be put in the system as a national park till after Congress had made it a park.

Correction No. 8: The Council is not inserted between the Congress and the executive agencies. The bill says: "Any proposed addition to, modification of, or elimination from any area of wilderness established in accordance with this act * * * shall be reported to Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, or other official or officials having jurisdiction over the lands involved * * *."

Correction No. 9: The bill gives Congress no administrative responsibility. It does give Congress a chance in the rare instance of an unwise administrative decision to pass "a concurrent resolution opposing such proposed addition, modification, or elimination" within "120 calendar days, of continuous session of Congress." Numerous precedents exist for such review by the Congress. The wilderness bill merely elevates wilderness preservation from the level of administrative policy to that of Congressional policy. Administrative responsibility, as the bill clearly states, is left with the executive.

Correction No. 10: Free application of administrative judgment is in no way interfered with. The veto power of the Congress is likely to be put into use only on rare occasions. Only a decision extremely adverse to the national interest in wilderness preservation could be successfully challenged through the process established by the bill. The protection afforded is thus rather an insurance that the free administrative judgment of the land-management agencies will be protected.

Correction No. 11: The implication that the revised bill takes control of their lands away from the Indians is false. The following provisions of the bill attest to this fact:

"Such designation shall not change the title to the land or curtail or take away any authority or power of the tribe over its tribal land. Any proposed addition, modification, or elimination * * * (of Indian lands) * * * shall be made only with the consent of the several tribes or bands through their tribal councils or other duly constituted authorities."

"Nothing in this act shall in any respect abrogate any treaty with any band or tribe of Indians, or in any way modify or otherwise affect existing hunting and fishing rights or privileges."

Correction No. 12: The only references to State and privately owned land are in a section providing that areas acquired by gift or bequest by any Federal agency for preservation as wilderness be included in this system, and also in a provision that the Council may include maps and information regarding such areas in material furnished the public regarding use and preservation of wilderness. It in no way permits the Wilderness Council to take action leading toward addition of any State or private lands to the system.

You and other supporters of the bill have clarified the above misconceptions and misinterpretations before—some of them many times. Yet the Chamber of Commerce of the United States continues to use these arguments against the bill, and our efforts must accordingly continue to combat the error and to advance public understanding of a proposal that we are sure is in the public interest.

Sincerely,

SIGURD F. OLSON,
President.

DEFENSE REORGANIZATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 366)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair.) The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that the message has been read in the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that the message be considered as having been read, and referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

USE OF INTERPRETERS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a clipping from the Washington Post of March 29, together with a copy of a letter I have written Secretary of State Dulles regarding the matter discussed in the clipping.

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

FORCED INTERPRETER HIRING DISPUTED IN RUSSIANS' PLANNED VISIT TO UNITED STATES

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF., March 28.—A Redwood City physician complained today that the Government asked him to hire a $37-a-day State Department interpreter before he can entertain three English-speaking Russian women in his home.

Dr. Henry Mayer said the condition that he pay out of his own pocket for an unnecessary interpreter was laid down by the State Department before it would grant visas for the visitors.

(In Washington a State Department spokesman said Dr. Mayer has made no formal complaint to the Department. The spokesman said all visitors entering the United States from Russia on official visas were offered an interpreter free of charge.

(He said he assumed Dr. Mayer's guests would enter on official visas because no visitor visas have been issued to Russians in recent years.)

Mayer said his wife, Olive, invited Dr. Larissa Kalmonsen, a Moscow physician, while traveling in the Soviet Union in 1956. Mrs. Mayer also asked the magazine staff of Soviet Women to pick a couple of women engineers to make the trip with Dr. Kalmonsen.

They received Communist permission for the journey within a few days, the Redwood City doctor said, but 18 months passed before he could get the approval of the State Department.

Expecting his guests in May or June, the Mayers have asked their friends for donations to help pay the State Department's bill for the 30-day visit. The Russians will pay their own travel expenses.

MARCH 31, 1958.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The agreement on exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union dated January 27, 1958, contains the following provision:

"SEC. XII. Development of tourism.

"Both parties will promote the development of tourism."

The Department's press release of January 27, 1958, has this to say about its agreement:

"This agreement is regarded as a significant first step in the improvement of mutual understanding between peoples of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and it is sincerely hoped that it will be carried out in such a way as to contribute substantially to the betterment of relations between the two countries, thereby also contributing to a lessening of international tensions."

A report on page 1 of the Washington Post of March 29, 1958, suggests that the Department has acted in a manner which is inconsistent with this policy objective and with the agreement with the Soviet Union. That report indicates that the Department has told an American citizen that three English-speaking Russian citizens may not be his guests here unless he hires a Government interpreter during their stay.

Whether or not the Post story is true, please send me promptly copies of the correspondence in this case and a full report on this case and on the considerations involved in this aspect of foreign relations. I should like such report to include answers to the following questions:

1. What are the statutes, legislative history, executive orders, regulations and executive branch policies which are pertinent to this subject and which could provide a basis for the alleged action by the Department?

2. Is there any substantial statutory barrier to the increased flow of tourists between the United States and the Soviet Union? If so, what legislative language would the Department suggest as necessary to remove such barriers?

3. If the allegation in the Post article is true, is this the final position of the Department? Does the alleged practice of requiring interpreters apply to visitors from non-Communist countries?

4. Is the use of interpreters primarily designed to help with language problems or primarily an internal security device? If it is the latter, what does the Department fear? Do the internal security dangers, if any, outweigh the advantages of the United States of increasing travel here of Russian citizens?

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in recent months, much has been said in this Chamber and elsewhere about our educational system. Many comments have been leveled at our present system. Many constructive criticisms have been freely offered, and many more destructive criticisms have been carelessly hurled.

Most thoughtful observers are aware that our educational system is a product of our own citizenry and, therefore, that the people at large must accept the responsibility for its status today and for its future status.

Many organizations of educators at all levels have, for years, concerned themselves with assuring that our Nation's educational performance will meet the needs of our country.

A prominent organization in this field is the American Council on Education. It was founded 40 years ago, in 1918. Today, under the able leadership of its president, Dr. Arthur S. Adams, it serves in the real sense as a council of national educational associations; organizations having related interests; educational institutions; State, city, and private school systems; selected educational departments of business and industrial companies; voluntary associations of higher education in the States; and large public libraries.

From this enumeration it may be seen that its membership is varied. It is also extensive, reaching every State in the Union. It is my understanding that membership in the American Council on Education is by organization or institution, not by individuals. It is comprised of more than 1,100 associations and educational institutions which represent a diversity which is a great strength of American education.

Mr. President, I have stated this background of the American Council on Education in order to give my colleagues an idea of the nature of the competence of one of the great national organizations which is assuming leadership in the current exploration of the educational needs of America.

Recently, the problems and policies committee of the American Council released a statement entitled "Public Understanding and Support for Education." This is an elected committee of 13 members, whose function is to appraise issues in American education as a basis for long-range planning.

Mr. President, it is noteworthy that these distinguished educators from across our land have set forth so clearly and so responsibly our educational needs. They have given a blueprint for the protection of our educational institutions from hysterical demands and panicky reactions; and, at the same time, they have offered suggestions for conscientious self-examination and courses of action which will insure that American education can continue to serve the best interests of the Nation.

Mr. President, I commend this public-spirited committee for its succinct statement on some of the phases of American education which need public understanding and support. I commend the statement to my colleagues in the Senate; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement and the names of the members of the committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING AND SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

(Statement by the Problems and Policies Committee of the American Council on Education)

PROPOSITIONS THAT NEED PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING

1. Most Americans now realize that our leadership, and indeed our national survival, is being challenged as never before in history. Most Americans must be brought to realize that the survival and well-being of this Nation depend no less upon the strength of our educational system than upon the strength of our Military Establishment.

2. Educational institutions in a democracy are properly expected to meet the fundamental needs of society. If they are subject to passing whims and fancies, schools and colleges cannot perform this function. Responsible citizens share with educators a moral obligation to insist upon wise and careful planning to meet fundamental needs and to protect our educational institutions from hysterical demands and panicky reactions.

3. Critical analysis of our educational system is certainly in order, but mistaken efforts to place blame through name calling and faultfinding should not be permitted to obscure the fact that our schools, colleges, and universities are seldom much better or worse than their respective publics want them to be. The best of our institutions certainly rise above common levels of aspiration, yet the vast majority simply mirror the values most commonly held. If American education is to undergo a general improvement, the people at large must place a higher value upon intellectual achievement and must be prepared to uphold higher levels of educational performance.

4. Lip service to the value of education is not enough. The critical need is for material support. The American people can afford to spend more on education. Doing this, however, will necessitate assigning a much higher priority to the importance of teaching and research as crucial forms of enterprise in a dynamic society. There must be a willingness to practice self-denial in paying higher taxes and in making heavier voluntary contributions to provide greater material support for education.

5. The time factor is extremely important, and basic issues must be faced now. Nothing less than a massive national effort, launched immediately, will do. Local support and control will remain the best safeguards and guarantors of excellence for our diverse educational system. They can and should be preserved, but bickering over forms and sources of financial support necessary to meet the present emergency can be disastrous. Positive and immediate action on all levels—Federal, State, local, and voluntary—is the first imperative.

6. Economic inflation has already levied a heavier toll on educational institutions than on most other forms of enterprise. Still further inflation would be a more serious threat.

If this possible consequence of vastly increased governmental expenditures for education is to be avoided, investment in our schools, colleges, and universities must take precedence over existing expenditures which are of less importance to our national security.

7. The total economic resources available for higher education, whatever they may be, will necessarily exist in limited amounts. One demand upon those resources is to raise the general level of performance in all schools and colleges. If this is allowed to be the only call, however, a tragic mistake will be made. A second, and vital, call upon our economic resources is to strengthen our leadership in all important fields and to add to our best existing institutions the appreciable support needed to meet the demands for the highest order of quality. Statesmanship must see to it that adequate support for the attainment of both goals is provided.

8. A genius of American education has been its unity through diversity. This diversity should be preserved, with strengthening all along the line and greater stress on the importance of quality everywhere. In short, all our human resources must be vastly strengthened through the medium of improved education.

PROPOSITIONS THAT NEED PUBLIC SUPPORT

1. The magnitude of the job to be done can hardly be exaggerated. We are not spending nearly enough on education. Modest measures will not do the job. In colleges and universities alone, the number of qualified students will be doubled by 1970, and a doubling of expenditures will not even perpetuate present inadequate quality levels. To do the job effectively, the following order of priorities should be observed:

Salaries for teachers, scholars, and scientists should on the average be at least doubled;

Existing institutions should be maintained more adequately and some of them greatly strengthened;

Support for the establishment of new institutions will be necessary, but should not be supplied at the expense of existing institutions;

Scholarship programs should stress quality rather than quantity, graduate as well as undergraduate study, and should be accompanied by a parallel system of grants to the institutions in which scholarship holders enroll.

2. Although Federal support for educational activities already exists in many forms, excessive reliance upon it may weaken other sources of initiative. However this may be, we are in a national emergency, and prompt action of unprecedented magnitude is urgent. The truth seems to be that the Federal Government is the only agency which can act with sufficient speed and on a scale large enough to enable schools, colleges, and universities to accomplish their tasks. Action by the Federal Government need not, and should not, extend Federal controls over education. Further, as a partial attack on a problem of such great size, it need not weaken initiative and action at the State, local, and voluntary levels. Federal support should be considered only as a necessary supplement to action by State and local entities, corporations, alumni, parents, churches, foundations, and philanthropic individuals. The initiative and interest of these agencies and individuals are the greatest asset of American education; they must now be exercised to an extent never before demonstrated.

3. Greatly increased amounts of money must be allocated to fundamental research and other forms of creative and scholarly activity. These can be carried on more effectively in our colleges and universities than anywhere else, because in the academic environment the creativity of central figures is reproduced by students who have worked with them.

4. If American education is to continue to serve the best interests of the Nation, drastic measures to increase the supply of highly trained persons are required in many areas other than physical science and engineering. The need for teachers at all levels and in all fields is a compelling illustration. Continued progress in the humanities, the arts, and the social sciences, as well as in science and technology, is highly essential to our national survival and well-being.

5. Totalitarian methods are not necessary to counter the threats of a totalitarian power. These threats can be countered and overcome by our own American strengths, strengths which in education include academic freedom for teachers, scholars, and scientists; freedom of mobility and choice of programs of study and vocations by college students; diversity of programs, forms of control, and philosophies among institutions. These qualities of American education must receive continuous, vigilant support.

The actions called for cannot be postponed. The priorities must be established immediately. Should we fail to do these things, the deferred costs will be too staggering to be met in time. If the Nation is to survive and prosper, we must start making the basic provisions now.

PROBLEMS AND POLICIES COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 1, 1958

William S. Carlson, president (on leave), State University of New York.

Harry D. Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College.

Margaret L. Habein, dean, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Wichita.

Clark Kerr, chancellor, University of California (Berkeley).

Douglas M. Knight, president, Lawrence College.

J. W. Maucker, president, Iowa State Teachers College.

Joseph C. McLain, principal, Mamaroneck (New York) Senior High School.

Leland L. Medsker, consultant, research project in higher education, University of California (Berkeley).

Nathan M. Pusey, president, Harvard University.

Robert J. Slavin, O. P., president, Providence College.

Logan Wilson, president, University of Texas.

MEMBERS EX OFFICIO

Lawrence A. Kimpton, chancellor, University of Chicago; chairman of the council.

Arthur S. Adams, president of the council.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is still in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader whether, following the conference report on the highway bill, he plans to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of an Oregon bill which I am sure is not controversial.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, it is the intention to bring up that bill immediately following the disposition of the conference report on the highway bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the acting majority leader will do me the courtesy of suggesting the absence of a quorum following the conclusion of consideration of the conference report on the highway bill, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1958—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9821) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

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

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of April 3, 1958, pp. 6236–6240, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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. MANSFIELD. 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. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the conferees met on the bill on Tuesday of this week, and after careful consideration reached a satisfactory agreement. The bill passed the House on March 13, 1958, and passed the Senate on March 27, 1958.

The conferees accepted the House figures of $900 million for the fiscal year 1960 and $925 million for fiscal year 1961 for regular Federal-aid highway systems, primary, secondary, and urban systems, the so-called ABC roads. These funds would be apportioned to the States in accordance with existing law, and matched on a 50–50 basis, as at present.

The conferees accepted the Senate provisions for an additional authorization of $400 million for fiscal year 1959 for the ABC roads. These funds would be matched on a two-thirds to one-third basis, and the bill includes $115 million for advances to States to assist them in matching the Federal funds up to two-thirds of the States' share, these funds advanced to be repaid by deductions from the State's apportionment for fiscal 1961 and 1962.

Additional amounts were authorized for fiscal year 1959 for roads on Federal lands, reservations, and the public domain; $5 million for forest highways; $5 million for forest development roads and trails; and $1 million for public-lands highways.

Regular biennial appropriations for these Federal roads for fiscal years 1960 and 1961, as approved by the conferees, are:

	Millions
Forest highways	$33
Forest development roads and trails	30
National park roads	18
Parkways	16
Indian reservation roads	12
Public lands highways	3

The conferees accepted the Senate amounts of increased authorizations for the Interstate System. These increases are $200 million for fiscal year 1959, $300 million for fiscal year 1960, and a like amount for fiscal year 1961. The authorization for fiscal year 1959 would be apportioned to the States immediately upon enactment of this act, in accordance with existing law.

The apportionment for fiscal year 1960 would be made on the basis of the estimates of cost for completing the Interstate System, and the apportionments of all authorized Federal-aid funds for fiscal years 1959 and 1960 would be made notwithstanding the provisions of section 209 (g) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. That is the one referred to as the Byrd amendment.

The conferees accepted the Senate language of the bill relative to stockpiling of material, reimbursement to States for relocation of utility facilities, regulation of outdoor advertising, and holding public hearings on the location of the Interstate System in rural areas; in other words, country roads.

The authorization of funds included in the bill is as follows, and I ask Senators to follow carefully the table I am about to read into the RECORD, because I think it is important to all States:

Federal-aid highways

[Millions of dollars]

System	Fiscal years			
	1959	1960	1961	Total
REGULAR				
Primary	180	405	416.25	1,001.25
Secondary	120	270	277.50	667.50
Urban	100	225	231.25	556.25
Subtotal	400	900	925.00	2,225.0
Advances	115			115
Interstate	200	300	300	800
Subtotal	715	1,200	1,225	3,140
Forest highways	5	33	33	71
Forest development roads and trails	5	30	30	65
Park roads and trails		18	18	36
Parkways		16	16	32
Indian roads		12	12	24
Public-land highways	1	3	3	7
Subtotal (miscellaneous roads)	11	112	112	235
Total	726	1,312	1,337	3,375

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the first purpose of the bill, the conference report, which we are considering, is to build roads.

Passage of the proposed legislation will serve an additional purpose, much needed now, namely, the stimulation of employment.

Mr. President, considering the provisions of the conference report and the 1956 act together, we see the erection of three new landmarks of national progress. For the first time we are to have a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, with a uniform limitation of access. The provisions in this respect are, I believe, realistic and politically feasible and effective. Once the geometric design of a highway is laid out, once the project is submitted by the State and approved by the Secretary of Commerce, no additional access points or egress points for the highway can be constructed or permitted by the State except upon approval by the Secretary of Commerce. This will not prevent needed additional access points, but will safeguard the system by the requirement of national as well as local consideration and approval.

The second landmark of national progress is represented in the accomplishment, for the first time again, of uniform national maximum standards for the width, length and weight of vehicles which can use the National System of Interstate Highways. These standards will be beneficial, in the long run, for the trucking industry and bus transportation systems. This will promote standardization of equipment sizes. More important, these standardized maximum limitations will enable the States to build highways to standards sufficient to enable them to accommodate traffic of known dimensions and weights, thereby preserving and protecting the investment of the people in the highways and promoting safety of traffic.

In the bill the conference report on which is presently under consideration, we find a third landmark of national progress. For the first time there will be provision in law for the promulgation of national standards affecting advertising in the areas adjacent to the right-of-way of the 41,000-mile Interstate System.

I hope I may be excused, Mr. President, for expressing what I hope is pardonable pride in the accomplishment of these landmarks along with the substantive and stupendous highway program. The highway program itself is, of course, the more important, but these new landmarks of progress are important, also for the safety of traffic, the preservation of the highways and scenic beauty.

There has been some misunderstanding with regard to the provisions of the conference report relating to the promulgation of standards and uniform regulation of billboard advertising in areas adjacent to the right-of-way. I have read editorials, for instance, which have contained statements that the proposed legislation excepts approximately 35 percent of the highways from application of the provision. That is not true. The amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] applies only to the portion of the proposal under consideration by which States will be given one-half of 1 percent of the cost of the projects in the event they regulate outdoor advertising in accordance with the prescribed standards. The amendment does not apply to the other provisions, whereby States will be reimbursed for 90 percent of the cost of the purchase of advertising easements, to the extent of 5 percent of the cost of the right-of-way. In other words, under the provisions of the bill any State can comply with the standards to be promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce on 100 percent of the mileage on the Interstate System within its borders.

In some instances perhaps it will be true that a small cost will be borne by the States—at least 10 percent of the cost of acquisition of advertising easement, plus that portion of the cost of the advertising easements which exceeds 5 percent of the cost of the right-of-way on those portions which are excluded from the one-half percent incentive provision by the so-called Cotton amendment.

I opposed the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New Hampshire. However, it does not render the provision inoperative on any portion of the Interstate System provided the State purchases the easement. It will create administrative problems. The entire provision creates administrative problems. It places upon the Secretary of Commerce a great responsibility, and vests in him wide powers of discretion. I hope and believe that the Secretary of Commerce will promulgate realistic and reasonable standards. Only if the standards are realistic and reasonable and promise effectiveness, are we likely to see a large number of States complying. But if they are realistic, reasonable, and promise effectiveness, it is my hope and expectation that many States will conform to the standards and reap for themselves, and render to America, great benefits.

The preservation of safety, the preservation of scenic beauty and of sites of historic value for generations yet unborn, and perhaps for motorists not only from our own country, but from foreign lands for years to come, will result in expressions of appreciation in years to come to the Congress of the United States for the enactment of this provision.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to interrupt the Senator from Tennessee to tell him that I am very proud of the Senate conferees. Three of the five conferees were against this particular provision, but after the Senate took action and adopted the provision, those three fought just as hard to keep it in the bill as those who proposed the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize what the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, has said. I believe that the conduct of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], as conferees representing the

United States Senate, was exemplary. Although, as the Senator from New Mexico has said, three of the conferees voted against this provision in the Senate, they, nevertheless, went to the conference representing the Senate. Not even the authors of the amendment themselves could have stood more firmly or more effectively for this provision and for the position of the Senate than did these Senators. I am very happy to see such exemplary conduct on the part of agents of the Senate. I congratulate the Senate conferees.

The provisions of the highway bill are far reaching and of great proportions. The larger provisions of the bill were supported unanimously. I am grateful for the cooperation of the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee [Mr. CHAVEZ], the ranking majority member of the committee [Mr. KERR], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee [Mr. CASE], and to all members of the committee. Committee work on this bill has been a pleasure; though long hours were required, our labors have borne good fruit.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, with respect to the conference report on the highway bill, I wish to second what has been said by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], chairman of the subcommittee which considers highway legislation for the Senate Public Works Committee.

It is a landmark bill. It is a bill which will be referred to in years to come, not only because of the inclusion of a special ABC fund to provide some immediate jobs in the current situation, but also because of the inclusion of the so-called billboard section, and some modification of the statutes in other respects.

One of the modifications of the bill from the form in which it passed the Senate was of special interest to me. Senators may recall that during the consideration of the bill I had raised a question about establishing a ratio of 70–30 percent for matching in connection with the emergency fund of $400 million for the primary, secondary, and urban roads.

We debated that question at considerable length. I thought that proposal went a little too far toward the liberal side, even in the present situation. The conferees on the part of the House felt somewhat the same way. They wanted to maintain the customary 50–50 ratio.

However, finally, as conferees usually do, we arrived at a compromise. The final decision was that this emergency fund should be available on the basis of a ratio of 66⅔ to 33⅓ percent—in other words, 2 for 1, rather than the 70–30 ratio proposed by the bill as it passed the Senate, or the 50–50 ratio, which is the customary provision with respect to ABC roads.

This is clear from the debate. This provision applies only to the $400 million of special money for the ABC roads. The repayment of any advances is automatic, by the language of the bill as agreed to by the conferees, so that any advances made to States in the nature of loans or advances on their shares must be deducted from the apportionment made to the States in the 2 years for which this bill supplies the normal biennial highway apportionment.

The second point to which I wish to make reference, because it relates to the point on which there was debate in the Senate, has to do with the so-called utility provision. Senators will recall that I defended the action of the committee. As the bill was originally reported to the Senate, it would have rewritten the utility reimbursement provisions of the law and, in the first instance, would have placed a ceiling of 70 percent on the pro rata share which the Federal Government might pay to the States in reimbursement of costs which they had paid in connection with the relocations made necessary by highway construction.

The other, or second, feature of the language reported by the Senate committee provided that clear proof must be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce that the States actually had paid the bill that was being presented for the utility relocation and had paid it out of their own funds.

Reports were reaching the committee that in some instances utilities were suggesting to State highway commissions that if they could collect the share which Uncle Sam would pay, particularly on the interstate 90-percent cost, they would be willing to forget the other part of it, or that it might be provided in some devious way. In any event, the Senate, when it considered that matter, affirmed the proviso. We did that by the adoption of the Hruska amendment. I call attention to that because the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who voted against the Hruska amendment, as I did, and as other Senators did, so voted because the money which was left was the 90-percent ceiling or the 70-percent ceiling. Those who voted against the Hruska amendment must be considered as having voted to establish a 70-percent ceiling rather than a 90-percent ceiling on the share of the utiilty costs which might be reimbursed by the Federal Government to the States.

On the ABC roads that question does not arise, because there the States will not be paid more than 50 percent of the cost by the Federal Government, except where some public land is involved.

I feel that the action of several State legislatures during the past 2 years was sufficient warning that the clause in the 1956 act was being abused, and that they, consequently, felt we should at least place a limit on the 70-percent share which may be paid by the Federal Government. I also felt that there should be certification that the bill paid by the State had actually been paid out of its funds.

But the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] accepted the proviso before his amendment went to a final vote. Therefore that point was no longer in issue. That would have been in the bill whether the Hruska amendment had been adopted or not, because the Hruska amendment was primarily a motion to strike out certain language in the bill as reported. The bill as reported carried that proviso. Therefore the proviso requiring the certification by the State, that is, of the payment of the utility relocation costs on a pro rata basis out of its own funds, would have been in the final act in any event. Therefore that point was not at issue, and the votes against the amendment must be interpreted as votes for holding to the 70-percent ceiling, rather than permitting the 90-percent ceiling. I make that statement because the Senator from Wisconsin told me yesterday he was finding some misunderstanding on that point.

The agreement by the conferees on the 66⅔ percent and 33⅓ percent State proportion was a movement in the direction of the amendment which I had the privilege of offering on the floor of the Senate. The conferees also accepted the proviso on the utility reimbursement. The chairman of the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives said he thought it was a good amendment.

I stress these two points because I believe they indicate a movement in the direction of the position which had great support on the floor of the Senate, and to my mind the changes improve the bill.

With respect to the interstate roads or the System of Interstate and Defense Highways, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has already well said that the provisions in the bill will be regarded as a landmark, not only for that portion of the bill, but also with respect to the section relating to billboards.

With regard to the Interstate System itself, the agreement by the House to the provision increasing the apportionments for 3 years on the Interstate System confirmed the judgment of the Senate and the Senate Committee on Public Works that some increase in the apportionments was needed in order to keep the System of Interstate Highways on a 13-year apportionment basis, or 16 years of possible construction, as was provided in the original act. The apportionments are increased, and while they do not come up to the amount which might be considered necessary to maintain the construction schedule, if one looks at the new estimates of cost submitted by the States in 1956, it is my judgment, and I believe also the judgment of the conferees, that they go sufficiently in that direction to insure the maintenance of the construction schedule. It may be that further acceleration will be needed. However, we found that on the evidence submitted during the hearings we were not warranted in going to the full estimate of costs reported by the States. The Governor of New York had testified that the bids received by his State were running below engineer estimates by from 20 to 25 percent.

Within the past week I have received the daily newspapers from my own State, and I have noted that the Highway Commission of South Dakota has been letting bids—in fact, several million dollars' worth of contracts were let on one day—which run 21 percent under the estimates of costs made by the engineers. Obviously, in the light of the experience in the Northwest, and in the great State of New York, with bids actually running under the estimates of costs, we would not have been justified

in stepping up the apportionments to the full figures which would have been suggested by the estimates of costs submitted in 1956.

With regard to the billboard section, I merely wish to mention one or two points very briefly. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are entitled to the major share of whatever credit this generation or future generations may wish to give for the vigorous fight and the initiative in establishing a way whereby the Federal Government might cooperate with the States, if they desire to do so, to regulate billboards along interstate highways. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], ably seconded their efforts. However, I believe he will agree with me that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from California are the ones who put their name on the bill in the first instance, and really took the brunt of that fight.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GORE. First I wish to thank my able friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, for his very generous references to me. I agree fully that the coauthors of the amendment, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], ably presented the amendment and supported it diligently and effectively. I commend them and congratulate them. I wish also to commend and congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] upon the effectiveness of his support and leadership. The provision does not prohibit billboards or advertising; it will, with the cooperation of the States, bring about reasonable regulation of billboards in areas adjacent to the highways, to the end that such regulation will promote safety and the preservation of scenic beauty and sites of historic interest. I believe that to be in the national interest, and I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota and the coauthors of the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee. I think I should say, frankly, honestly, and candidly, that the junior Senator from South Dakota did not seek any credit in connection with the billboard provision. My position on that subject was dictated by certain objective responsibilities which I felt I had in my position as the ranking member for the minority.

I cannot say that there was any great outpouring of sentiment in my State to support the billboard provision; to the contrary. I live in a section where the tourist industry is most important. Many of our people were inclined to misunderstand any position which savored of support for the so-called billboard provision.

But a person has many responsibilities when he serves in this body, and they are not entirely dictated by the desire to be on good terms with and to please, even in some instances, some of his friends. He has some responsibilities which come from serving as a Senator in the Senate of the United States.

Moreover, I had heard the President of the United States say that, inasmuch as in the case of highways the Federal Government was to pay 90 percent of the cost, he hoped something would be done to preserve scenic beauty and to increase safety, so as to make the interstate highways truly serviceable for the great objectives of a national system of defense and intercommunication.

I had heard both the Secretary of Commerce, the administration's spokesman, and the Administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads, take the position that they felt Congress would be remiss if it did not make it possible for the Federal Government to cooperate with the States which wanted to take some action in this regard.

As the Senator from Tennessee has stated, this section of the bill does not prohibit billboards. I pointed out during the hearings that I thought the Federal Government did not have the police power to prohibit billboards. But I think the States which want to do something about this matter are entitled to the cooperation and the encouragement of the Federal Government. It was on that basis that I voted, when the responsibility was mine, to preserve an opportunity for such cooperation. On that basis, I was glad to cast my vote under whatever responsibilities were involved.

With respect to the operation of the section, there are two or three things I wish to point out. First, with respect to the so-called Cotton amendment, to which the Senator from Tennessee has alluded, the amendment to except the rights-of-way which were acquired prior to July 1, 1956, from eligibility for the incentive fund, was one that I supported. I supported it, not as a means of weakening section 2, but because I thought there was a certain amount of equity involved.

As to rights-of-way acquired years ago, or prior to the consideration of the billboard section, the people who established advertising rights, or purchased them, did so in good faith. It seems to me that it smacked a little bit of ex post facto legislation, or retroactive legislation for Congress to establish an incentive by the Federal Government, and to let a State do anything which might involve the confiscation of those rights; that is, the States might proceed under their police power. However, the Cotton amendment did not interfere with the application of the second part of the cooperation, namely, the sharing of the cost of acquiring rights.

As to the rights-of-way which were acquired prior to July 1, 1956, if a State wishes to acquire or purchase the advertising rights, the Federal Government, under the language agreed to in the conference report, still will act in cooperation with the States.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GORE. By reimbursing 90 percent of the cost of such acquisition, provided it does not exceed 5 percent of the cost of the right-of-way.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. It seemed to me that was a sound and equitable provision. The Federal Government does not then put itself in the position of encouraging the States to confiscate advertising on rights-of-way acquired prior to July 1, 1956. The Federal Government can say to the States, with respect to that, "If you want to buy the advertising rights, we will help you buy them; but we will not be in a position of offering you an incentive to use your police powers to accomplish something in a retroactive, ex post facto way."

The other matter, and the final one, which I wish to speak about concerning the billboard provision, is that it is not automatic. Nothing will really happen unless a State wants something to happen. It is a cooperative venture. In that respect, we sought also to protect the interests of the traveling public, the communities, and businesses near the highway. In the final analysis, I think the language which was adopted for paragraphs 3 and 4 of the section dealing with policies and standards is pretty good language, after all.

Paragraph 4, as it was reported, provided that the agreements between the States and the Federal Government should include signs which were of interest and service to the traveling public.

Subparagraph (3), as it was amended, struck out the impracticable figure of 500 square inches as a measurement of standard, and inserted the same language as was contained in paragraph 4, namely, that signs which conformed to the policy would be permitted for business or for activities which are located within 12 miles of where the sign is to be placed. That was definitely in the interest of protecting communities, facilities, motels, restaurants, and other services, institutions, or businesses which might be bypassed by the relocation of the interstate highways.

On that ground, I think those two clauses—paragraphs 3 and 4—are in the interest of the traveling public and also in the interest of people adjacent to the highways who might have been injured or bypassed. These are definitely constructive improvements over the original language.

I had not intended to speak this long on the conference report, but I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. CHAVEZ] in yielding to me for these comments.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I would not want the opportunity to pass without my paying tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the ranking minority member, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for bringing the proposed legislation before the Senate. It is important, not only to the Nation as a whole, but also to the individual States.

I realize that the enactment of the bill will bring problems to the States. I think some States will have difficulty in obtaining matching funds unless their legislatures are in session. Fortunately, a special session of the Kansas Legislature has been called for April 21. I am certain that the highway measure now before the Senate will be given consideration by the Kansas Legislature at the special session. I am very happy that the Senate by its action today will afford the Kansas Legislature, in special session, an opportunity to vote such special funds as will be needed for matching the Federal contribution, and therefore to take prompt advantage of the new law.

I firmly believe that this is one of the most forward looking steps Congress has taken for the benefit of the Nation in many years.

I again commend the chairman of the full committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee for their sponsorship of this fine measure.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, those words coming from the Senator from Kansas are particularly appreciated. The Senator from Kansas was for many years a Member of the House of Representatives and knows the history of highway legislation for a considerable period.

Moreover, he has served as Governor of Kansas for two terms and knows the administrative problems of States in relation to the whole matter of Federal aid to highways.

It is interesting that the legislature of his State is about to meet and to put itself in a position to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the bill. One of the features which I hope the Kansas Legislature will notice is that the $400 million emergency fund for ABC roads is made available on a basis of complete transferability as among primary, secondary, and urban roads within the States. Once an apportionment has been made, the States may use the money where they have the greatest need for roadbuilding or where they want to provide some good roadbuilding jobs. Complete transferability, I think, is one of the constructive features of the bill.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I express the sincere appreciation of the State of Idaho to the chairman of the committee, to the chairman of the subcommittee, and to the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee for their vigorous defense of the Senate provisions of the bill dealing with the public lands States, so far as public lands funds and forest highways are concerned.

I think there is a misunderstanding frequently concerning the approximately 360 million acres of public domain, federally owned land, in the West. Obviously, the States within whose borders the public domain lies assume a disproportionate burden in trying to keep abreast of the nonpublic lands States in accelerating the highway program.

Again I wish to point out that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who held hearings in the West, and in the State of Idaho last December, had a very thorough understanding of the needs of the highways in the public-land States.

Although the House conferees made material reductions in the amounts of the authorizations voted by the Senate for these categories of highways, I believe we have made a beginning in that direction, so that we in the West can maintain a status comparable to that of the other States in connection with the building of essential highways, not so much to take care of local needs as to provide essential highways for transcontinental use.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Idaho was most persuasive with the committee. He and his associates also were very persuasive with the chairman of the subcommittee when the hearings were held in Idaho. The Senators from Idaho and their associates must really have given the distinguished Senator from Tennessee an excellent view of the situation, because on several occasions he took occasion to say to the committee, "After going there and seeing the situation firsthand, I changed my mind. I found that by building only a few miles of road, hundreds of miles of travel could be saved." I heard the Senator from Tennessee say that, not once, but many times.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Tennessee not only traveled by automobile over the area, but he also flew over it and got a view from the air.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In any event, the Senator from Tennessee became convinced of the importance of that aspect of the program; and he presented effectively, both in the conference committee and in the Senate committee, the point of view which was expressed a moment ago by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for permitting me to proceed at this time.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to add to the very much deserved encomiums which have been delivered here today in connection with the highway bill.

I particularly wish to commend the members of the Senate conference committee who, although they themselves are opposed to the control of billboards by legislation, nevertheless followed the wishes of their colleagues in the Senate. I believe that act by them is fully deserving of the plaudits which already today have been received by them.

I also wish to concur, in particular, in what was said about the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. He and I worked together on the various proposals in the field of signboard regulation. I believe that in the absence of the very friendly bipartisan cooperation which existed between us, it might have been impossible to achieve the results which now have been achieved. I do not think anyone could have been more cooperative than was Senator KUCHEL in compromising certain phases of his own bill. I trust that I was equally amenable in my work with him.

The chairman of the Roads Subcommittee, the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], led the fight on the floor of the Senate and was the field marshal in charge of the operations. Without him, we would not have succeeded.

Mr. President, this has been a long trail. I think the Senator from Tennessee remembers when we brought a very, very mild signboard provision onto the floor of the Senate in 1955, and lost it summarily. But that was the remote beginning of this undertaking.

The ladies of the United States who belong to the garden clubs have not been mentioned in the Senate thus far today. Not only do they share in this victory; but I also believe that they, themselves, won it. They let their Senators know how they felt about signboards which would deface the interstate highways.

In view of what happened in the other body today, it is evident that the ladies who belong to the garden clubs also let their Representatives know how they felt about this matter.

As a matter of fact, I understand that today in the United States, women cast more votes than men do. That situation is in line with the facts set forth in an article by an eminent writer, which recently was published in Harper's magazine. In the article he points out that women live longer than men, and therefore women comprise the majority of the population of the United States.

Mr. President, the overwhelming majority of the letters and other communications which I received in regard to signboards came from women. I think particularly the women of America—the housewives, the girls, the grandmothers—care how our highways look. The men may want to have four-lane highways with easy grades and wide curves, so they can drive on them with safety and at high speeds; but I think the ladies in the garden clubs and in the League of Women Voters and in the General Federation of Women's Clubs care what the highways look like, and do not want them plastered with signboards. They have let the Senate and the House of Representatives know how they felt; and I believe that the vote taken today in the House of Representatives is not only an indication of the wisdom of the Members of the House, but also is an indication of the wisdom of the citizens of this country who got in touch with them.

Mr. President, as has been stated again and again, this measure provides for the making of purely voluntary cooperative arrangements, insofar as billboards are concerned. Not one State will have to take advantage of the one-half of 1 percent donation or of the funds made available through the acquisition procedure. However, I am willing to venture the prediction that many States will do so, because, just as the ladies who belong to the garden clubs are able

to write, and have written, to their Representatives in Congress in Washington, D. C., they can also write to Sacramento, Calif.; to Salem, Oreg.; to Boise, Idaho; to Albany, N. Y.; to Santa Fe, N. Mex.; and to all the other great State capitals of the country.

Today, the Federal Government has provided the machinery by which the roadsides can be protected, so that those who drive over the roads can have a chance to look at the scenic grandeur of America. Today, the members of the American Automobile Association and its affiliated groups and the members of the garden clubs can go to the State capitals and can say to their representatives there, "Uncle Sam has made available this bonus and these acquisition funds. You must set up a cooperative agreement with the Federal Government to protect our roadside beauty."

Mr. President, I predict that the States will act, that they will take advantage of this arrangement, and that it will be a reasonable and, I may even say, a highly effective means of commencing the protection of what we call "America, the Beautiful."

Mr. President, I desire to thank all my colleagues for their wonderful cooperation. I particularly desire to thank my seatmate, the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who, on the floor of the Senate, led the fight by means of which we retained this provision, last week. If the victory belongs to any one person in public life, certainly it belongs to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, written here today is the final, convincing, and successful legislative chapter in a years-long struggle to recognize and promote the people's rights and the people's interests.

This measure is excellent not alone because of its recognition of the needs of highway construction in this Nation, not alone because of its recognition that those needs have been accelerated and, thus, that the program of highway construction likewise must be accelerated.

This measure is excellent, Mr. President, not alone because it constitutes an excellent antirecession bill—probably the outstanding one of this session.

But it is excellent also because it represents, so far as the Congress is concerned, an acceptance of the principle of roadside protection and of preservation of scenic beauty in America through which now, and in the immediate years ahead, a modern, efficient, high-speed 41,000-mile interstate highway system is about to be constructed.

I pay tribute to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. He sits on the other side of the aisle. He began to awaken the conscience of the Senate to the necessity of protecting the beauties of nature alongside our great new Interstate System, in a field in which until now the Congress has failed or neglected to legislate.

I pay tribute to all those on both sides of the aisle who participated in the drafting of the billboard incentive section of the bill, and thereafter stood and were counted on a bipartisan basis, in favor of it; this was no partisan political issue.

Congress has now laid down a national policy. Congress now has supplied an incentive to the States. It only remains for the President speedily to approve the bill, as I most respectfully hope that he will. Then it will be up to the States of the American Union to implement what Congress has done, and, I very much hope, to present, in the years ahead, a convincing demonstration all across the country of the needs of the people and of the wishes of the people, and the response of State governments, under our national policy, to those needs and those wishes.

If that be the case, Mr. President, you and I and every family in this land can look forward to the enjoyment of driving from our States or from any other State in this Union across the country and back again on highways which will be safe and which will afford travelers comfort and happiness as they speed along their way.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the vote on the conference report is taken, I desire to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. CHAVEZ], who has worked long and arduously; to the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who, as chairman of the subcommittee, did much of the groundwork; to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who was a fighter in a good cause; to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who devoted himself to the task with his usual thoroughness; to the able Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], for his drive and great ability; to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who has worked long and arduously; and to all the other members of the committee; but I especially wish to commend the present presiding officer, the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the youngest member of the committee, who did such outstanding work, along with his senior colleague from the State of Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], in securing authorization for the funds necessary to bring about an earlier completion of the Lewis and Clark Highway, in obtaining authorization for funds to accelerate the forest highway program, and for additional money for the forest access roads. I am delighted at this time to pay tribute to this outstanding young Senator, who is the newest member of the Committee on Public Works, and who has done so much to advance the cause of those of us who live in the northwestern section of the country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Montana in paying tribute to the young and new Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. When we talk about the billboard section of the bill, it is well to refer to my friends from Tennessee and Oregon. They were dedicated Senators. It is all right to speak about Senators who were against the billboard section of the bill, as I was, as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] was, and as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] was. But the one who cast the deciding vote to keep the provision in the bill was the junior Senator from Idaho. So I think he deserves special praise.

RECORD OF THE SENATE IN THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when we adjourn today, we will leave here for welcome opportunity to spend some time with the people whom we represent.

This has been a very busy session—one of the busiest in my memory. It has also been a session of accomplishment—as much accomplishment as I can ever recall by this season of the year.

We were confronted with a problem—a problem that involved people and which required an immediate response. The deepening economic recession had put 5,200,000 men and women out of work, and something had to be done.

Under the leadership of LYNDON JOHNSON, a program was put together. It was a program of action—not hasty, not panicky, not ill-conceived—but a program of effective action.

Within the space of a few weeks, the Senate has taken these steps:

First. Approved—by a vote of 93 to 1—the resolution to accelerate civil public works.

Second. Approved—by a vote of 76 to 1—a resolution to accelerate military public works.

Third. Approved—by a vote of 86 to 0—a bill to stimulate the housing industry and create a potential of an additional 600,000 to 800,000 jobs.

Fourth. Approved—by a vote of 84 to 4—a bill to accelerate the highway program and create a potential of some 520,000 jobs.

Fifth. Approved—by a vote of 52 to 11—a conference report on the omnibus flood control bill, which should create a potential of nearly 400,000 jobs.

Sixth. Approved—by a vote of 50 to 43—a farm bill designed to maintain farm income and farm purchasing power.

Mr. President, this is a solid and substantial record. I take special pride in the fact that all of these measures were passed by bipartisan votes. The record represents the Senate responding to the desires and to the needs of our people.

There are still three provisions in the Johnson program to be considered by the Senate. They are:

First, the community public works bill which, unfortunately, was delayed by some unexpected last-minute thoughts.

Second, an expanded airport program which is now before the committee.

Third, a reclamation program whose provisions rest on careful study made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] has conferred with the Speaker of the House and the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. He has asked that the civil functions bill be expedited so that the Army Engineers will know at the earliest possible moment what funds they will have for their planning. There will, of

course, be cooperation because all of us are determined to take effective steps to help our fellow Americans in their hour of need.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that one of the most important measures in this program has been vetoed. I am referring to the farm bill—which was simply an effort to prevent the use of the powers of Government to force farm income below 1957 levels.

It is a sad commentary that we seem able to secure cooperation in our efforts to help almost every part of the economy except agriculture. If farmers come to the conclusion that they have been singled out by the executive agencies to bear the brunt of the impact of the recession, their feelings will be understandable.

At the present moment, there is little we can do about it. Ours is a system of checks and balances, and if one branch of the Government is willing to act and another branch is not willing to act, extreme difficulties can be created.

We can only hope that the determination to block Congress will not be extended to other fields of endeavor. A veto is not the only method which can be used to choke off initiative. Congress can propose, but the laws must be carried out by the men who have the responsibility for administering those laws.

I hope the headlines of the last 2 days, which tell us that the executive branch of the Government is determined to prevent further antirecession legislation, do not accurately reflect the state of mind at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Prosperity may be just around the corner. We may have reached the bottom of the recession, ready for an upswing.

But people do not turn a corner unless they are willing to move. And upswings do not occur if there is a determination to remain on dead center.

We are dealing with people—not with abstract economic theories. I think we will all agree with the President that the best stimulus to an economy is when people spend their own money.

But in order to spend their own money they must first have it to spend. And they will not have money unless there are payrolls, and unless there is adequate leadership which recognizes the true urgencies of life.

This session, I believe, has acted in the finest traditions of Congress. It has faced the issues squarely. By that I mean not only the issues of recession but the issues of the defenses of this Nation.

The exhaustive hearings of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee—which began last November—are now bearing fruit.

The President has agreed with some of the findings of the committee and has indicated that he will strengthen the defenses of our country. The Secretary of Defense has already issued some orders which accord with the recommendations of the Preparedness Subcommittee that our country be strengthened.

We have in front of us not a vacation but an opportunity to talk to our people and learn at first hand of the problems which now are reflected in cold statistics. I know every Member of the Senate will take advantage of that opportunity.

When we return, it is planned to make the community facilities bill the first order of business. This is in accord with the motion offered by the distinguished minority leader on Monday evening, which was agreed to by the Senate. I hope that the other measures will be ready and that we can proceed to complete action on the Johnson program.

There are other measures, which properly are the prerogative of the House and which are receiving serious consideration in that body. No one at this point can foresee exactly how they will come to us or how they will be handled, but I know my colleagues are giving those questions deep thought and will be ready to act with the same promptness with which we have acted already.

Haste and urgency are two different words, even though there are some people who seem incapable of recognizing the difference. What may be haste to the man who is in a comfortable position could seem a proper response to urgency to the man who needs a job.

Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues for the cooperation they have accorded to me and to express my pleasure at the opportunity of working with them.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1958—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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. 9821) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. 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.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

RULES FOR REPAIR OF POWER OR TRAIN BRAKES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1386) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of power or train brakes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) this act may be cited as the "Power or Train Brakes Safety Appliance Act of 1958."

(b) Section 2 of the Safety Appliance Act of March 2, 1903 (32 Stat. 943, chapter 976, sec. 2; 45 U. S. C. 9), is amended (1) by changing the semicolon at the end of the third clause thereof to a period, (2) by striking the remaining language of the section, and (3) by adding at the end of that section the following new language: "One hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of the Power or Train Brakes Safety Appliance Act of 1958, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall adopt and put into effect the rules, standards, and instructions of the Association of American Railroads, adopted in 1925 and revised in 1933, 1934, 1941, and 1953, with such revisions as may have been adopted prior to the enactment of such act, for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of all power or train brakes for common carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad. Such rules, standards, and instructions shall thereafter remain the rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of all power or train brakes unless changed, after hearing, by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission: *Provided, however,* That such rules or standards or instructions or changes therein shall be promulgated solely for the purpose of achieving safety. The provisions and requirements of this section shall apply to all trains, locomotives, tenders, cars, and similar vehicles used, hauled, or permitted to be used or hauled, by any railroad engaged in interstate commerce. In the execution of this section, the Interstate Commerce Commission may utilize the services of the Association of American Railroads, and may avail itself of the advice and assistance of any department, commission, or board of the United States Government, and of State governments, but no official or employee of the United States shall receive any additional compensation for such service except as now permitted by law. Failure to comply with any rule, regulation, or requirement promulgated by the Interstate Commerce Commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be subject to the like penalty as failure to comply with any requirement of this section."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

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

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9291) to define parts of certain types of footwear, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9291) to define parts of certain types of footwear, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CARIBOU AND TARGHEE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1433, S. 1748.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1748) to add certain lands located in Idaho and Wyoming to the Caribou and Targhee National Forests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1748) to add certain lands located in Idaho and Wyoming to the Caribou and Targhee National Forests, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 4, line 16, after the word "Forests", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That any acquired lands hereby incorporated into the national forest shall be subject to the laws and regulations applicable to national forest lands acquired under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended."; on page 5, line 1, after the word "Forest", to insert "and shall be subject to the laws and regulations applicable to national forest lands acquired under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended."; and in line 12, after the word "act", to insert a comma and "nor to prejudice the sale or lease by the Secretary of the Interior of lands for which application is now pending under the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended, or any similar authority."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That the exterior boundaries of the Targhee National Forest, located in Idaho and Wyoming, are hereby extended to include the following described lands:

Lot 1 of section 7; lots 1, 4, 5, 6, and 9, the east half of the northeast quarter, the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter, the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the east half of the southeast quarter of section 8; all of section 15; lots 1, 2, and 3, the northeast quarter, the northwest quarter, the north half of the southwest quarter, the east half of the southeast quarter, and the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, of section 16; lots 1, 4, and 5, of section 17; lots 1 and 2 of section 21; lots 1, 2, 5, and 6, the east half of the northeast quarter, and the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22; lots 1 and 3, the north half, the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter of section 23; the west half of section 24, the west half of section 25; lots 1, 4, 5, and 8, the northeast quarter, and the east half of the southeast quarter of section 26; lots 1, 4, 5, and 8 of section 35; and all of section 36, all in township 1 south, range 45 east of the Boise meridian, in Bonneville County, State of Idaho; and

All of section 1; lots 1, 2, 7, 8, and 11, the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 2; lot 1 of section 11; lots 1, 3, 4, and 7, the northeast quarter, the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the east half of the southeast quarter of section 12; lots 1, 4, 5, and 9, the northeast quarter, and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 13; and lot 1 of section 24, all in township 2 south, range 45 east of the Boise meridian, in Bonneville County, State of Idaho, and

The west half of section 6; all of section 7; the west half of section 8; the west half of section 17; all of section 18; lots 1, 2, 3, and 6, the northeast quarter, the east half of the northwest quarter, the east half of the southeast quarter, and the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 19; all of section 20; the southwest quarter of section 21; all of section 27; all of section 28; all of section 29; lots 1, 4, 5, and 8, and the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 30; lots 1 and 4, and the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 31; lots 1 and 3, the northeast quarter, the northwest quarter, the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter of section 32; all of section 33; all of section 34; all in township 2 south, range 46 east of the Boise meridian, in Bonneville County, State of Idaho; and

All of section 3; all of section 4; lots 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 11, the south half of the northeast quarter, and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 5; lot 1 of section 8; all of section 9; all of section 10; all of section 15; all of section 16; and all of section 22, all in township 3 south, range 46, east of the Boise meridian, in Bonneville County, State of Idaho; and

The southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 17; lots 2, 3 and 4, the west half of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, the east half of the souhwest quarter, the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, and the south half of the southeast quarter of section 18; all of section 19; the west half of the northwest quarter, and the south half, of section 20; all of section 29; all of section 30; all of section 31; and all of section 32, all in township 37 north, range 118 west of the sixth principal meridian, in Lincoln County, State of Wyoming; and

All of section 2; all of section 3, and all of section 4, all in township 36 north, range 119 west of the sixth principal meridian, in Lincoln County, State of Wyoming.

SEC. 2. All lands of the United States located within the exterior boundaries of the Targhee National Forest and all lands which have been, or are hereafter acquired by the United States in connection with the Palisades Reservoir reclamation project (other than the lands referred to in section 3) are hereby incorporated into and made parts of the Targhee National Forest: *Provided*, That any acquired lands hereby incorporated into the national forest shall be subject to the laws and regulations applicable to national forest lands acquired under the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended.

SEC. 3. All lands of the United States within the exterior boundaries of the Caribou National Forest, Idaho, which have been, or are hereafter, acquired by the United States in connection with the Palisades Reservoir reclamation project are hereby incorporated into and made parts of the Caribou National Forest and shall be subject to the laws and regulations applicable to national forest lands acquired under the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended.

SEC. 4. (a) It is hereby declared that the sole purpose of this act is to subject the lands referred to in the foregoing sections of this act to all laws and regulations applicable to national forests, and nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the United States to acquire any additional lands or any interest therein, nor to diminish or in anywise affect any valid rights in or to, or in connection with, any such lands which may be in existence on the date of enactment of this act, nor to prejudice the sale or lease by the Secretary of the Interior of lands for which application is now pending under the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended, or any similar authority.

(b) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture shall make available, from the lands referred to in the foregoing sections of this act, to the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior such lands as the Secretary of the Interior finds are needed in connection with the Palisades Reservoir reclamation project.

(2) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into such agreements with the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the relative responsibilities of the aforesaid Secretaries for the administration of, as well as accounting for and use of revenues arising from, lands made available to the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior pursuant to paragraph (1) as the Secretary of the Interior finds to be proper in carrying out the purpose of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1444, Senate Resolution 273.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 273) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to ask, for the purpose of the RECORD, whether the resolution was reported from the committee with the approval of the ranking minority member.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The resolution was reported by a unanimous vote of the entire committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 273) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 85th Congress, for the purposes specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, $10,000 in addition to the amount authorized in such section.

MARGARET C. PRIDE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1443, Senate Resolution 282.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 282) to pay a gratuity to Margaret C. Pride.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 282) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

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

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1445, Senate Resolution 277.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 277) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 277) authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 85th Congress, $10,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

RECORD OF THE SENATE IN THIS SESSION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself for a few minutes to the remarks previously made by the distinguished acting majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Let me say I do not find any fault with the spirit of his statement when it is directed toward our responsibility respecting the economic downturn. But I want to place in perspective, the unremitting efforts of the President, and his administration, the actions which have been taken by the Congress in respect to the business downturn.

It happens that I have voted for and supported the measures which have been passed by the Senate. A few days ago, when the Senate voted on the question of immediate consideration of the community facilities bill, I found myself one of the two Members on this side of the aisle who voted for immediate consideration of the bill.

I know the work which has been done by the distinguished majority leader, and, I may say, by many on this side of the aisle. I have great respect for the majority leader's patriotism and ability, as well as the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], but I believe it is only fair that the people of the country have the full facts, and see the picture as a whole. It is true that over 5 million people—I do not know the exact number at this time—are out of employment. That is a matter which concerns every one of us deeply. It is a human matter. It is not a matter we can consider lightly. I do not think any Member here considers it lightly.

There is a way in which those people who are out of employment could be helped immediately by Congressional action. They could be helped by the passage of legislation, which would insure funds for unemployment insurance.

A number of bills to provide additional funds have been before the Congress—one presented by the President. No action has been taken on them by the Democratic majority, although they deal with the most immediate human need of this time.

There are facts about our economic condition which the people should keep in mind. Talk will not pull us out of a business downturn, but unwise talk will not help. All the facts should be kept in perspective.

While, unfortunately, 5 million are out of work, 60 million people are employed in this country today.

It is true that the gross national product is down only 1 percent from the highest level on record, made in this administration.

It is true that personal income is down only about 1½ percent, compared with the highest level on record, made in this administration.

We should have confidence that there are forces in the economy which can lead us out of our present downturn instead of taking the position that this is a depression, which will inevitably worsen.

What has the administration done? Before action was taken in the Congress, the President had announced that the rate of spending for defense contracts would be increased by $5½ billion for the first 6 months of 1958, as compared with the first 6 months of 1957. He did not increase actual budget expenses, but he accelerated the rate of spending. Also, before we had acted, the President sent to us a request for more than $1 billion of new expenditures for defense. Before we had passed the acceleration resolution the President had already announced the acceleration of various programs.

I do not derogate the patriotism, the work, or the interest of any Member of this body. I do not speak from a partisan viewpoint. But, I do wish to say that in the context of the statement which has been made, we ought to keep in mind the facts respecting unemployment and income. We ought to keep in true perspective the steps which were taken by the administration, long before the Congress acted.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I must disagree with my good friend from Kentucky about "the steps which were taken by this administration long before the Congress acted."

If I correctly recall, one of the last acts of the former Secretary of Defense was to reduce below the Congressional appropriations the amounts to be expended in the Defense Department.

If I correctly recall, it was the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, under the distinguished majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, which, in effect, applied pressure on the administration to accelerate the expenditure of some of the funds which had been appropriated by the Congress.

I give the Senator from Kentucky full credit for his consistently good record, and his consistently good understanding of the difficulties which confront the people of the country.

I was delighted when, on Monday, the Senator from Kentucky voted, among the few Members of his side of the aisle, for the immediate consideration of the community facilities bill.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that in his statement about the slight decline in income and the slight decline in gross national product, he should refer to the condition in his own State, as I refer to the condition in my State. If I am not mistaken, conditions in both Kentucky and Montana are critical; and the number of those receiving unemployment compensation benefits in both States is above 10 percent, if I am correctly informed.

Also, so far as the country is concerned, it can be thankful that, by reason of the bipartisan action on the part of both parties in this Congress, important steps have already been taken.

The responsibility lies at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Because of his position, the President is supposed to take the lead. But the President has waited and waited and waited. He has told us to keep our chins up and our eyes to the front. We cannot talk the people out of a recession, any more than we can talk them into a depression.

I am very happy that the Congress took the responsible attitude it did in bringing forth legislation in the first 3 months of the year.

The Senator from Kentucky has mentioned the President's proposal as to unemployment compensation benefits. He

knows that the first indication of such a proposal was the proposal made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], joined by 16 other Senators, about 2 months ago. The administration came forward about 2 weeks ago with its proposal.

The Senator from Kentucky knows that, so far as the Senate is concerned, it is prepared to take action at any time. However, under the Constitution, measures of that kind must originate in the House. As soon as the House takes action, I assure the Senator that the leadership in the Senate will schedule action as promptly as possible upon whatever measure is passed by the House relating to unemployment compensation benefits.

I am not here to castigate the administration for not doing the kind of job it is supposed to do, but I am commending the Congress for what it has done in assuming the leadership which has been forced upon it to face up to the conditions which exist at this time.

We may not be in a depression, but I certainly believe that we are in a recession. At the beginning of last month there were 5,200,000 persons out of work. As of the present time, it is my understanding that something on the order of 5,600,000 or 5,700,000 persons are out of work.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to respond briefly to the Senator's statement.

First, I am perfectly aware of the situation in my own State and I am doing my best to help my State. I am aware of the situaton in the Nation. The fact that I am aware of the situation, and concerned has led me to support—and I know the Senator will agree with me wholeheartedly—the antirecession measures which have been acted on by the Congress. Most of these measures have been passed almost unanimously, by both Democrats and Republicans. As the Senator from Montana has stated, and as I have previously stated, I was one of the few Members on this side of the aisle to vote for the immediate consideration of the community facilities bill, which has not been acted upon by the Senate.

Moreover, I joined with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] in the introduction of a bill which would deal with the emergency needs of funds for exhausted unemployment insurance. The majority has taken no action on the bill.

But, I am not here to speak of my own position. I simply ask that we keep the facts clearly before the people.

The Senator from Montana outlined—and, I should say, on the whole correctly—the steps which have been taken in the Congress. However, I could not help know that his speech implied that nothing had been done by the administration.

I challenge the statement of the Senator from Montana that nothing was done by the administration until the Congress acted. To the contrary it was in January that the President made the announcement with respect to the acceleration of defense contracts, to the extent of $5.5 billion, and sent to Congress a request for additional appropriations of about $1 billion for defense spending.

In addition, he has announced a large number of steps taken to accelerating the expenditure of existing appropriations. These facts are known to all of us, and ought to be acknowledged.

The statement of facts and the action taken, does not reach people who are out of work immediately and put them to work.

They do give assurance that the economy will resume its advance. I have not tried to minimize in any way the downturn. What I have not liked in our consideration of antirecession measures, is the attitude that it is inevitable that the economy will go down—the depression talk. There has been a tremendous advance in the last 4 or 5 years in our economy. I believe we ought to have confidence that the measures taken by the administration and by Congress will have a good effect upon the economy, and will initiate the beginning of a new advance. It is my position that the administration has done its part.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for his excellent statement about the positive, constructive, and responsible work of this session.

I agree with him, and I do not see how anyone can disagree that the actions of this Congress have helped to combat the economic slide. Those actions have already made it possible to put people to work in the housing field. We have just a few minutes ago acted to put people to work in the highway field. Our action last night will put men to work in flood control projects.

I am particularly delighted that the acting majority leader pointed out that this is not the end of the road, but the beginning, and that the Senate is determined to move ahead and to push the country out of its present economic plight.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I, too, wish to commend the acting majority leader for the statement he has given to the Senate. I agree with him that most of it was accomplished in a bipartisan manner. However, I notice that he stated that the farm joint resolution was passed by a vote of 50 to 43. Therefore, the action on some of the matters he referred to was not exactly bipartisan, as I recall. That is proper under our form of government. At times we need not follow right down the line and be bipartisan in everything; instead, we must rely on our own way of thinking. When we realize that the farmers of the Nation are in destitute circumstances, if we cannot get the other party to go along with us, we must go our own way, if necessary, or individually as Senators, and do what we think is best for the farmers.

Everyone will agree that they are in a destitute condition, and that they need help, to say the least. I am glad to say that on this particular measure there was not exactly bipartisan action. The Democrats voted to do something in order to alleviate the situation in which the farmers of the country find themselves.

Then, too, if my memory serves me correctly, the President, a member of the Republican Party, vetoed the farm joint resolution which Congress had passed, and by which we tried to hold the line, so to speak, until we could do a better job. The President vetoed it.

I hope after the holidays the Congress will take up the veto message and then we will have a record made in the House and in the Senate of the Democrats and the Republicans, and see how they vote. I want to see then whether the vote will be of a bipartisan nature. I believe the Democrats will vote to override the veto, because the Democrats believe that we should certainly hold the line when we know that the farmers of the Nation are in such destitute circumstances as they are now.

Therefore, I believe the Senator from Montana made a very good statement to the Senate, and it is a statement which is for the good of the Nation as a whole.

DAIRY DEPRESSION IS SPREADING TO MEAT ANIMALS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on the subject on which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has just spoken, I received an announcement today from the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture which shows that the depression in the dairy industry created by Secretary Benson's sharp cut in supports is already starting to spread into the livestock industry.

This announcement, Mr. President, is the fact that Wisconsin farmers are increasing their production of hogs 33 percent faster than are the farmers in the Corn Belt itself.

The spring pig crop in the Corn Belt States this spring is estimated to be 6 percent larger than last year's. But in Wisconsin the increase is one-third greater—totaling 8 percent.

Mr. President, this is just one more illustration of one of the fundamental facts of economic life in agriculture—that our farm economy is indivisible. Farmers, in the long run, must stand or fall together. Their interests cannot be compartmentalized. Any division of farmers into conflicting groups can only result in the ruin of all of them.

The dairy depression is spreading to the meat animals—because it is fairly easy for dairy farmers to raise a few more hogs, or to get a few beef calves, or to raise some crossbred steers and heifers for slaughter.

The relatively good prices for beef cattle and hogs at the present time—although based on nothing more lasting than the misfortune of freakish weather disasters in the recent past—is inviting dairy farmers to try to work a little longer and produce some hogs and beef to eke out their inadequate milk checks.

The same thing happened in reverse just a few years ago, when the hog market crashed in the fall and winter of 1955–56. Hog prices dropped to only 50 percent of parity, and Iowa corn and hog producers scoured Wisconsin in search of dairy cows and heifers so they could

eke out their incomes by milking a few cows.

This is a lesson to consider carefully, Mr. President, when the opportunity presents itself to vote on overriding the President's veto of Senate Joint Resolution 162. A vote to override that veto is a vote for the welfare of every farmer in America—for the depression in dairy, wheat, or cotton that it prevents would soon spread into every corner of the agricultural economy.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF SALEM, OREG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2318) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of Salem, Oreg.

CANADIAN AVALANCHE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most interesting and revealing analyses of the recent Canadian election was contained in an editorial published in last night's Washington Star. In the editorial the Washington Star states that the Liberal Party, which suffered such a decisive and overwhelming defeat, had become in fact a conservative party in domestic fiscal and economic affairs. On the other hand, accrding to the Star, the Conservative Party had become a party dedicated to leading Canada to its manifest destiny of national well-being through a program of great public works, as well as a tougher policy of economic nationalism. The Star points out that Prime Minister John Diefenbaker has been likened to Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman as a progressive candidate.

Mr. President, the implication of the editorial in the Star is that the Canadian people voted for progressive, humanitarian government, determined to solve its economic problems by vigorous and aggressive action. Such an implication, applied to political parties in this country, leads to a very obvious inference for next November.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Canadian Avalanche" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CANADIAN AVALANCHE

The political analysts who had predicted a Conservative Party victory in Canada's national elections this week were only partly correct. It was a Conservative victory, sure enough, but by such massive proportions that the whole political complexion of the Dominion has been changed. Never before in Canadian history has one party so dominated a Parliament, winning 209 seats in the 265-member body. One splinter group, the rightwing Social Credit Party, was eliminated entirely; and another, the Socialist Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, was cut from 25 to 8 seats. The Liberal Party, which had governed Canada for 22 years until last June, was trimmed from 106 to 47 seats—leaving it mathematically powerless, at least, to mount any effective opposition.

An assessment of these results must be based, first of all, on an understanding that the party designations are misleading in themselves. Through its long rule, the Liberal Party in Canada became increasingly conservative under the leadership of William Lyon MacKenzie-King and Louis St. Laurent, particularly in domestic fiscal and economic affairs. Lester Pearson, the able internationalist who succeeded to the party leadership only a few months ago, was not able to persuade the voters that his was the party of reform. By contrast, the Conservative Party won last summer on the time-for-a-change theme and has won even more impressively now as something of a New Deal party. In his campaigning, Conservative Prime Minister John Diefenbaker has been likened to Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman—an evangelist who described himself as a progressive conservative, available to lead Canada to its manifest destiny of material well-being through a program of great public works and a tougher policy on economic nationalism vis-a-vis the United States.

When the Conservative Party won enough seats last June to form a coalition government it was considered something of an upset, probably by the party itself. The margin of the victory this week again was a much greater upset. But victory of this kind is a heady wine, easily interpreted as a mandate to go faster and further than originally planned. The new Parliament probably will be summoned into session next month. The performance of Mr. Diefenbaker and his party at that time will be of great interest and importance to more than Canada alone.

THE EDUCATIONAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss a subject which I think is of tremendous importance. I have deliberately, carefully, and thoughtfully chosen this subject for my first major address on the floor of the Senate since my election.

I shall speak about the most important unsolved problem confronting the American people. To be brutally frank, we, the American people, are not meeting our major responsibility—the responsibility for educating our children.

This failure is the most significant and tragic in American life. If it continues it will mean that America is wasting its most valuable resource—the intelligence of its future citizens. If it continues it will mean America will forfeit world leadership, because America will have wasted the prime ingredient of leadership—human intelligence. If this failure continues it will mean America will lose the struggle for freedom to the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, if we continue to fail in our educational responsibility all the hundreds of billions of dollars this Congress spends on national defense will avail us nothing.

Why do we not legislate aid to education?

Not because we do not recognize the need. Not because our hearts are hard, and we do not love our children.

Not because we are not sufficiently patriotic to save this republic. Not because we are too tight-fisted with our money, too narrow visioned, too lacking in imagination to see that our future lies with education.

No, these are not the reasons.

We fail to pass good bills for education, again and again, I believe, because we have not hit upon a formula which will meet the serious objections and misgivings that attach to almost any proposal. What a tragedy. It is a failure of legislative ingenuity to make the most critical breakthrough for America.

One good bill raises fear of Federal interference in the conduct of local schools. Another becomes involved in the controversy over integration. Another is so involved that it is hard to be sure just how it will work out.

And each year that passes without school-aid legislation is a year lost from the lives of a generation of young Americans. Time does not wait. Youth does not stand still. In their overcrowded classrooms, undermanned with teachers, a generation marches on to meet its destiny—ready or not.

Mr. President, I want to offer another formula here today—not because I believe it is the only way, nor even the best way, to meet the tragic, multiplying needs of education, but because I think it is simple enough and noncontroversial enough that we can vote for it, pass it, and have it signed by the President.

I want to give every member of this body every chance there is to vote for a bill to stem the tide that runs against us in education.

THE NEED FOR CLASSROOMS AND TEACHERS

I begin, Mr. President, with the tragic need for teachers and classrooms. We do not have enough of either now. We are not building enough schools nor training enough teachers to meet the needs of our present school population. Every year we fall further behind as classrooms become unusable and teachers leave the profession. And still the children come, in ever-increasing numbers, a golden horde that piles the appalling deficit higher every year.

What is the situation now?

According to a report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 32.9 million pupils enrolled in the full-time public elementary and secondary day schools last year. The increase in total enrollment was 1.3 million, or 4.3 percent more than a year ago.

What kind of schools did they find? Some of them found very good schools. Many of them did not. Almost 2 million of them were classified as pupils in excess of normal capacity of accessible public schools. That means that 7.3 percent of the pupils in public schools this year are stuffed into overcrowded classrooms or forced to go to school in shifts. By conservative estimate, we need 140,400 classrooms now that we do not have.

If we had the classrooms, we would not have the teachers to go into them. In 1956 the National Education Association estimated the demand for teachers in public schools that year to be 227,500. Ninety-five thousand of those were needed for normal replacement, 132,500 to improve teaching across the country. In that year we trained only 97,600

teachers—just a few more than were needed as replacements—but of that number only 69,000 became teachers.

Think of that. Only 69,000 became teachers, but 227,500 were needed. When they were confronted with alternative opportunities, nearly one in five chose not to teach.

What follows after that is easy to predict. Many of the teachers who are manning our classrooms are inadequately prepared. In the fall of 1957 there were 91,200 teachers with substandard certificates. This is 7.5 percent of all the teachers in the public schools.

If those figures are not enough to spoil the sleep of any responsible citizen or Senator, let us add three more. To the 33 million pupils in the schools today add another 4 million by 1960. Then add still another 4 million by 1965. That, Mr. President, is roughly a 25-percent increase in enrollment in 7 years.

The pupil-teacher ratio now is 26.2 to 1. This ratio, of course, does not adequately state the problem, because it is an average. Where 1 school is able to put a teacher in the room with 20 pupils, it pulls down the average. Some of our most crowded schools will have 40 or more in a single class. Compare that with the pupil-teacher ratio in a good private school and it is easy to see how we are depriving children of a decent chance to learn.

St. Albans School, in Washington, is an excellent private school. It has a ratio of pupils to teacher not of 27 to 1 but 15 to 1. In other words, the children there get the type of personal attention which the children in the public schools do not receive, the type of attention which, I understand, is given in the schools of many foreign countries, including the schools of our principal competitor for world leadership, the Soviet Union, which leads us by almost exactly the same proportion. There they have a ratio of 17 pupils to each teacher.

Even if we were making an all-out effort to take care of that flood of children, Mr. President, we would be hard put to do it. But what will happen, Mr. President, if we do not half try?

Mr. President, there are some useful statistics bearing on the need for aid to education which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD.

One table is found in the preliminary report of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Circular No. 513, entitled "Fall 1957 Statistics on Enrollment, Teachers, and Schoolhousing in Full-Time Public Elementary and Secondary Schools."

The second is table 12, contained in a publication entitled "Advanced Estimates of Public and Elementary and Secondary Schools for the School Year 1958–59," published by the National Education Association. The table gives the "Estimated Extent of Teacher Shortage and Status of Teacher-Education Enrollments, 1957–58."

The third item is an article entitled "Losing Struggle To Find Teachers," and published in the New York Times of January 12, 1958.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the material I have mentioned.

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

TABLE 12.—*Estimated extent of teacher shortage and status of teacher-education enrollments, 1957–58*

State	Teacher shortage						Teacher-education enrollment in 1957–58		Outlook for teacher-education enrollments in meeting need in next 3 years	
	Rural			Urban						
	Elementary	Secondary		Elementary	Secondary		As compared with 1940–41	As compared with 1956–57	Elementary	Secondary
		Regular	Special		Regular	Special				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Alabama	Some [1]	Small [1]	Some [1]	Some [1]	Small [1]	Some [1]	Same [1]	Same [1]	Short [1]	Balanced.
Arizona	do	Some	do	Small	do	Small	Larger	Larger	do	Short.
Arkansas	Large	do	Large	Some	do	Large	do	Same	do	Do.
California	do	do	Some	do	do	Some	do	Larger	do	Do.
Colorado	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
Connecticut	Some	do	do	do	do	Small	do	do	do	Do.
Delaware	do	Small	do	Small	do	Some	do	Same	do	Do.
District of Columbia				Large	Some	Large	Same	do	do	Do.
Florida	Some	Small	Some	Small	Small	Some	Larger	do	do	Do.
Georgia	do	Some	do	Some	Some	do	Same	do	do	Do.
Idaho	Large	do	Large	Large	do	Large	Smaller	do	do	Do.
Illinois	Some	do	Some	do	Small	Some	Larger	do	do	Do.
Indiana	Large	Small [1]	do.[1]	do	do	do	do	do	do	Balanced.
Iowa [2]										
Kansas	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Larger	Larger	Short	Balanced.
Kentucky	do	do	Large	do	Small	do	do	do	do	Short.
Louisiana	do	do	Some	do	Some	do	do	do	do	Do.
Maine	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	Same	do	Do.
Maryland	do	Small	do	do	Small	do	do	Larger	do	Do.
Massachusetts	do	Some	do	do	do	Large	do	do	do	Do.
Michigan	Large	do	do	do	Some	Some	do	do	do	Do.
Minnesota	Some	do	do	Small	Small	Small	do	do	do	Do.
Mississippi	Large	do	do	Large	Some	Some	do	Same	do	Do.
Missouri	Some	do	do	Some	do	do	do	Larger	do	Do.
Montana	Large	do	do	Small	Small	do	do	do	do	Do.
Nebraska	Some	do	do	Some	Some	do	do	do	do	Do.
Nevada	Small	Small	Small	Small	Small	Small	do	do	do	Do.
New Hampshire	Large	Some	Large	Some	do	Some	do	Same	do	Do.
New Jersey	do	do	Some	do	Some	Small	do	Larger	do	Do.
New Mexico	do	do	Large	do	do	Some	do	do	do	Do.
New York	Some	do	Some	Small	Small	Small	do	do	do	Do.
North Carolina	Large [1]	do.[1]	do.[1]	Some [1]	do.[1]	Some [1]	do.[1]	Same [1]	do.[1]	Do.[1]
North Dakota	do	do	do	do	Some	do	do	Larger	do	Do.
Ohio	Some	do	do	do	Small	Small	do	do	do	Do.
Oklahoma	Small	Small	do	Small	do	do	do	do	Balanced	Balanced.
Oregon	Some	Some	do	Some	do	Some	do	do	Short	Short.
Pennsylvania	do	do	Large	do	do	Large	do	do	do	Do.
Rhode Island	do			do	Some	Some	do	do	do	Balanced.
South Carolina	do	Large	Large	Small	do	do	do	Same	do	Short.
South Dakota	Large	Some	Small	Some	Small	Small	do	Larger	do	Balanced.
Tennessee	Some	do	Some	Small	Some	Some	do	do	do	Short.
Texas	do	do	Large	Some	do	do	Same	do	do	Do.
Utah	do	do	Some	do	do	do	Larger	do	do	Do.
Vermont	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
Virginia	do	do	do	Small	do	do	do	Same	do	Do.
Washington	Large	do	do	Large	do	Large	do	do	do	Do.
West Virginia	Some	do	do	Some	Small	Some	do	do	do	Do.
Wisconsin	do	Small	do	Small	do	do	do	Larger	do	Do.
Wyoming	do	do	do	do	do	Small	do	do	do	Do.

[1] Estimated by NEA research division.
[2] No data available.

NOTE.—"Small" means "practically none"; "some" means "considerable"; "large" means "very large." Cols. 8-9: "Smaller" means "much smaller"; "larger" means "definitely larger." Cols. 10-11: "Short" means "large shortage"; "balanced" means "balanced supply and demand."

Fall 1957 statistics on enrollment, teachers, and school housing, in full-time public elementary and secondary day schools

Region and State	Number of pupils enrolled			Number of classroom teachers			Number of teachers teaching under substandard credentials [1]			Degree or number of semester hours required for lowest regular teaching certificate [2]	
	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Continental United States (estimated) [4]	32,899,000	22,832,000	10,067,000	1,255,000	786,000	469,000	91,200	69,800	21,400		
Number of States reporting item [5]	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	46	46	47	47
Total for States reporting item [6]	32,455,368	22,493,930	9,961,438	1,234,847	771,909	462,938	91,237	69,714	21,368		
Total for States reporting, as percent of estimated total for United States,[7] percent	98.6	98.5	98.9	98.4	98.3	98.6	[7] 100.0	[7] 100.0	[7] 100.0		
Northeast:											
Connecticut	421,817	[8] 325,364	96,453	16,886	10,724	6,162	[9] 1,720	[9] 1,307	[9] 413	B	B
Maine	186,318	140,965	45,353	7,466	5,148	2,318	360	273	87	96	B
Massachusetts	[10] 780,893	[10] 524,952	[10] 255,941	[10] 31,851	[10] 18,820	[10] 13,031	562	394	168	B	B
New Hampshire	94,306	65,780	28,526	3,926	2,523	1,403	210	130	80	B	B
New Jersey	925,000	[8] 704,000	[8] 221,000	39,300	24,500	14,800	5,200	4,300	900	B	B
New York	2,530,000	1,570,000	960,000	105,200	56,800	48,400	7,500	4,300	3,200	B	B
Pennsylvania	1,870,702	1,168,084	702,618	68,641	38,327	30,314	536	257	279	B	B
Rhode Island	121,000	74,500	46,500	4,905	2,730	2,175	287	142	145	B	B
Vermont	69,717	50,277	19,440	3,065	2,096	969	490	368	122	60	B
North Central:											
Illinois	1,596,936	1,199,547	397,389	66,264	46,561	19,703	5,992	5,298	694	[11] B	[11] B
Indiana	932,052	[12] 569,039	[12] 363,013	32,171	[12] 17,273	[12] 14,898	3,311	[12] 2,559	[12] 752	B	B
Iowa	541,630	365,373	176,257	24,500	14,672	9,828	254	115	139	60	B
Kansas	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)
Michigan	1,524,213	988,452	535,761	57,000	38,000	19,000	8,000	6,000	2,000	B	B
Minnesota	645,600	400,300	245,300	27,300	14,800	12,500	517	353	164	[11] B	[11] B
Missouri	772,207	592,877	179,330	28,200	20,219	7,981	676	[14] 450	[15] 226	64	B
Nebraska	257,730	183,975	73,755	13,512	9,066	4,446	498	347	151	12	B
North Dakota	[16] 126,848	[16] 96,121	[16] 30,727	[16] 6,950	[16] 5,087	[16] 1,863	545	545	----------	32	B
Ohio	1,722,729	1,161,772	560,957	62,752	38,030	24,722	4,793	3,632	1,161	B	B
South Dakota	138,107	105,040	33,067	7,705	5,574	2,131	166	102	64	[17] 30	[18 19] 60
Wisconsin	656,000	484,000	172,000	25,700	17,700	8,000	1,051	916	135	64	B
South:											
Alabama	754,800	466,089	288,711	26,475	14,775	11,700	3,800	2,850	950	[20] 94	B
Arkansas	418,000	262,000	156,000	13,620	7,920	5,700	3,810	2,248	1,562	[21] B	[21] B
Delaware	69,342	41,985	27,357	3,070	1,671	1,399	354	294	60	[11] B	[11] B
Florida	793,579	487,108	306,471	30,147	17,516	12,631	554	517	37	B	B
Georgia	[22] 939,104	[22] 687,118	[22] 251,986	30,148	20,116	10,032	155	(23)	(23)	60	60
Kentucky	599,516	437,916	161,600	21,966	14,834	7,132	2,850	2,225	625	64	B
Louisiana	629,992	481,932	148,060	23,970	15,096	8,874	1,352	970	382	B	B
Maryland	532,248	334,332	197,916	19,414	10,654	8,760	4,756	3,526	1,230	B	B
Mississippi	547,000	445,000	102,000	16,655	10,671	5,984	4,500	3,825	675	B	B
North Carolina	1,037,362	797,435	239,927	37,146	26,821	10,325	1,930	1,684	246	B	B
Oklahoma	[22] 532,104	[22] 332,565	[22] 199,539	19,609	11,444	8,165	23	6	17	B	B
South Carolina	535,860	359,675	176,185	19,651	12,130	7,521	53	20	33	B	B
Tennessee	753,510	568,000	185,510	26,478	19,263	7,215	702	510	192	B	B
Texas	1,883,881	1,488,266	395,615	72,874	46,750	26,124	3,100	2,760	340	[11] B	[11] B
Virginia	775,230	550,323	224,907	28,608	17,858	10,750	2,319	2,017	302	B	B
West Virginia	454,675	291,877	162,798	16,906	10,340	6,566	1,420	1,040	380	64	B
District of Columbia	110,041	72,766	37,275	3,949	2,226	1,723	650	425	225	B	[23] B
West:											
Arizona	266,617	211,134	55,483	9,486	7,060	2,426	----------	----------	----------	B	M
California	2,815,000	1,975,000	840,000	97,000	63,000	34,000	9,500	7,500	2,000	B	B+30
Colorado	353,146	227,846	125,300	16,081	9,838	6,243	467	374	93	[11] 60	[11] B
Idaho	146,157	90,297	55,860	5,684	3,232	2,452	990	737	253	B	B
Montana	133,384	91,568	41,816	6,492	4,255	2,237	357	311	46	64	B
Nevada	51,545	37,594	13,951	2,200	1,478	722	37	37	----------	62	B
New Mexico	188,244	116,966	71,278	7,107	4,468	2,639	9	9	----------	B	B
Oregon	362,000	257,000	105,000	15,221	10,200	5,021	1,576	1,482	94	B	B
Utah	208,337	127,746	80,591	7,291	4,098	3,193	925	679	246	B	B
Washington	575,706	426,682	149,024	20,775	13,250	7,525	2,000	1,600	400	B	B
Wyoming	75,183	[5] 57,292	[5] 17,891	3,530	2,295	1,235	380	280	100	B	B
Alaska	33,916	28,512	5,404	1,524	1,256	268	117	102	15	90	B
American Samoa	5,235	[12] 3,755	[12] 1,480	225	[12] 176	[12] 49	8	----------	8	(24)	(24)
Canal Zone	11,139	6,878	4,261	376	208	168	55	9	46	[25] B	[25] B
Guam	12,432	10,130	2,302	435	342	93	83	83	----------	60	B
Hawaii	129,510	81,289	48,221	4,234	2,602	1,632	870	620	250	B	B
Puerto Rico	557,381	404,109	153,272	11,800	7,351	4,449	2,831	1,460	1,371	67	B
Virgin Islands	6,166	4,255	1,911	188	120	68	55	55	----------	60	60

[1] Some of the teachers included in cols. 8 to 10 have met the minimum general education requirements given in cols. 11 and 12 but lack either the required semester hours in professional education or directed teaching.

[2] "B" means the bachelor's degree, the equivalent of 120 to 128 semester hours; "M" means the master's degree.

[3] Unless otherwise noted, data for elementary and secondary schools are classified by type of organization of the school, rather than by grade-group.

[4] Estimated total for continental United States (48 States and District of Columbia) includes estimate for nonreporting States.

[5] Excluding District of Columbia.

[6] Including District of Columbia in the case of those items for which District of Columbia made a report.

[7] Percentages computed from unrounded figures.

[8] Data for elementary and secondary schools are reported by grade group: kindergarten through grade 8 for elementary, and grades 9 to 12 for secondary.

Additional footnotes on next page.

[9] State reports that "these teachers are working toward standard certificates; their present certificates are emergency but not substandard."

[10] Data as of June 30, 1957.

[11] Source: National Education Association, A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States, 1957 edition.

[12] Data for elementary and secondary schools are reported by grade group: kindergarten through grade 6 for elementary, and grades 7 to 12 for secondary.

[13] No report received.

[14] Represents teachers in 1-room schools not having the minimum requirement of 64 hours.

[15] Represents teachers who have not completed 120 semester hours.

[16] Data for 1955–56.

[17] Requirement for teaching in rural schools; for city schools the minimum requirement is 60 semester hours.

[18] Requirement for teaching in high schools is the bachelor's degree.

Fall 1957 statistics on enrollment, teachers, and school housing, in full-time public elementary and secondary day schools—Continued

Region and State	Number of pupils in excess of normal capacity of the accessible publicly owned school plants in use			Inventory of instruction rooms				Additional instruction rooms needed at opening of school in fall 1957			Instruction rooms scheduled for completion during 1957–58 school year (not available for fall 1957 shortage) Important: See "Note" below
	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Available, beginning 1956–57 school year	Abandoned for instructional purposes during the 1956–57 school year	Completed during 1956–57 school year	Available, beginning 1957–58 school year	Total	To accommodate excess enrollment reported in col. 13	To replace unsatisfactory facilities (exclusive of those in col. 21)	
(1)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)
Continental United States (estimated [4]	1,937,000	1,373,000	564,000	1,101,000	14,300	68,600	1,155,300	140,400	63,200	77,200	70,800
Number of States reporting item [5]	43	41	41	46	46	46	46	43	43	43	46
Total for States reporting item [6]	1,742,293	1,171,504	521,517	990,380	13,575	60,804	1,038,185	126,429	60,291	62,815	63,096
Total for States reporting, as percent of estimated total for United States,[7] percent	89.9	85.3	92.5	89.9	94.7	88.7	89.8	90.1	95.5	81.4	89.2
Northeast:											
Connecticut	21,834	8,484	13,350	14,214	103	767	[27] 15,530	2,229	1,679	550	1,513
Maine	7,082	4,659	2,423	7,100	48	333	7,385	726	252	474	351
Massachusetts	23,000	15,000	8,000	27,306	268	1,421	28,459	2,263	842	1,421	1,261
New Hampshire	5,655	3,561	2,094	3,496	143	387	3,740	417	165	252	184
New Jersey	78,300	49,300	29,000	29,900	350	1,750	31,300	3,500	2,600	900	1,575
New York	(28)	(28)	(28)	(28)	(28)	(28)	(28)	(28)	(28)	(28)	(28)
Pennsylvania	(28)	(28)	(28)	64,353	635	1,299	65,017	(28)	(28)	(28)	3,750
Rhode Island	5,029	3,501	1,528	3,970	49	166	4,087	660	160	500	144
Vermont	4,588	2,991	1,597	2,999	15	144	3,128	999	210	789	70
North Central:											
Illinois	58,310	46,401	11,909	55,459	611	3,182	58,030	3,315	1,945	1,370	2,940
Indiana	27,000	[12] 16,470	[12] 10,530	30,627	278	2,267	32,616	3,400	900	2,500	2,500
Iowa	29,000	19,000	10,000	20,062	357	325	20,030	(28)	960	(28)	600
Kansas	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)
Michigan	164,800	106,873	57,927	50,751	500	4,126	54,377	10,111	6,592	3,519	4,229
Minnesota	20,300	12,680	7,620	23,530	360	1,715	24,885	5,003	763	4,240	1,603
Missouri	(28)	(28)	(28)	27,217	325	1,563	28,455	4,433	(28)	(28)	1,500
Nebraska	3,363	2,542	821	12,725	251	300	12,774	359	173	186	225
North Dakota	7,500	(28)	(28)	3,318	134	285	3,469	350	250	100	190
Ohio	54,702	39,535	15,167	58,911	328	1,497	60,080	3,925	1,925	2,000	2,699
South Dakota	5,012	3,341	1,671	7,733	271	243	7,705	768	371	397	254
Wisconsin	2,925	1,925	1,000	26,763	175	1,578	28,166	478	128	350	1,600
South:											
Alabama	280,980	210,735	70,245	13,646	100	588	14,134	11,026	9,366	1,660	374
Arkansas	20,900	15,000	5,900	9,355	160	700	9,895	1,226	804	422	500
Delaware	3,585	2,204	1,381	2,444	33	130	2,541	219	124	95	316
Florida	92,152	61,688	30,464	23,780	124	2,101	25,757	5,011	3,129	1,882	1,845
Georgia	106,034	70,689	35,345	28,162	920	3,247	30,489	7,162	3,963	3,199	2,750
Kentucky	54,482	38,945	15,537	20,103	481	973	20,595	9,856	1,756	8,100	1,170
Louisiana	31,290	25,005	6,285	21,956	442	1,163	22,677	2,412	1,081	1,331	1,847
Maryland	67,094	43,566	23,528	15,341	71	1,088	16,358	3,218	2,219	999	1,212
Mississippi	67,060	50,808	16,252	15,498	624	495	15,369	4,987	1,925	3,062	1,677
North Carolina	41,772	(28)	(28)	34,980	853	2,113	36,240	3,919	1,413	2,506	1,599
Oklahoma	(28)	(28)	(28)	23,355	100	[29] 1,601	24,856	(28)	(28)	150	1,122
South Carolina	16,000	6,000	10,000	19,065	646	1,071	19,490	2,135	574	1,561	500
Tennessee	27,390	19,000	8,390	23,160	200	678	23,638	3,857	913	2,944	253
Texas	40,650	32,100	8,550	63,186	698	5,218	67,706	2,763	1,355	1,408	5,170
Virginia	72,094	47,742	24,352	25,137	302	1,239	26,074	5,088	2,585	2,503	1,271
West Virginia	24,952	14,002	10,950	16,133	243	368	16,258	1,946	572	1,374	231
District of Columbia	(28)	(28)	(28)	(28)	(28)	76	(28)	(28)	(28)	(28)	53
West:											
Arizona	32,777	28,044	4,733	7,644	53	542	8,133	1,445	1,093	352	[30] 264
California	90,000	70,000	20,000	81,000	1,000	9,000	89,000	8,000	3,000	5,000	10,000
Colorado	32,392	21,378	11,014	12,230	223	965	12,972	1,338	797	541	500
Idaho	5,834	2,849	2,985	5,570	72	215	5,713	713	223	490	170
Montana	5,149	2,870	2,279	6,218	148	446	6,516	617	245	372	267
Nevada	3,316	2,851	465	1,920	58	160	2,022	228	126	102	145
New Mexico	14,882	10,417	4,465	6,749	----------	220	6,969	1,542	890	652	479
Oregon	9,982	5,650	4,332	13,529	282	814	14,061	763	365	398	573
Utah	11,126	7,198	3,928	6,810	91	345	7,064	592	378	214	200
Washington	70,000	45,000	25,000	19,785	400	1,800	21,185	3,300	1,400	1,900	1,270
Wyoming	2,000	1,500	500	3,190	50	100	3,240	130	80	50	150
Alaska	6,827	5,634	1,193	1,149	11	82	1,220	378	251	127	150
American Samoa	120	(12)	[12] 120	219	19	7	207	50	4	46	45
Canal Zone	----------	----------	----------	374	----------	3	377	8	----------	8	2
Guam	170	170	----------	412	16	74	470	327	8	319	2
Hawaii	3,973	2,943	1,030	4,284	149	260	4,395	506	134	372	310
Puerto Rico	230,343	200,706	29,637	8,824	----------	1,140	9,964	6,420	5,865	555	828
Virgin Islands	949	735	214	181	----------	----------	181	64	27	37	28

[19] Junior high.

[20] Presumably represents requirement for class C certificate; minimum of a bachelor's degree required for class B and higher certificates.

[21] Represents requirement for a regular certificate; requirement for a permit is 60 hours.

[22] Data for 1956–57.

[23] Represents requirement for teaching in junior high schools; master's degree required for teaching in senior high schools.

[24] No standards established for teachers of grades 1 to 9; bachelor's degree and certificate from United States required for teachers of grades 10 to 12.

[25] Represents requirement for teaching in schools for United States citizens; in schools for Latin Americans the requirement is a Republic of Panama Normal School certificate, or its equivalent.

[26] Represents requirement for teaching grades 6 to 8 in schools for United States citizens and in secondary schools for Latin Americans; master's degree required for teaching grades 9 and above in schools for United States citizens.

[27] State explains that apparent arithmetical discrepancy in inventory figures (col. 16—17+18=19) is due to the fact that some previously abandoned instruction rooms have been put back into use and that previously completed rooms are now in use for the 1st time.

[28] Data not available.

[29] Includes 300 rooms in 150 temporary buildings.

[30] Excludes 1 building for which the number of rooms were not reported.

NOTE.—It is estimated that additional instruction-room needs, which will develop prior to the opening of the fall 1958 term, will amount to approximately 58,000 rooms (44,000 for anticipated enrollment increases and 14,000 for minimum annual replacement needs). This is in addition to the fall 1957 shortage of 140,400. If the 70,800 instruction rooms scheduled for completion in 1957–58 are actually constructed, the projected shortage of instruction-rooms in the fall of 1958 could be approximately 128,000, or about 13,000 less than in the fall of 1957.

LOSING STRUGGLE TO FIND TEACHERS

The Nation is losing ground in its struggle to provide schools with competent teachers, according to a recent study made by the research division of the National Education Association. It is increasingly difficult to get enough good teachers in almost every subject. It is just about impossible in the fields of science and mathematics.

In its study, called "The Postwar Struggle to Provide Competent Teachers," the N. E. A. shows that not enough qualified graduates are entering teaching. The report notes that many persons specifically trained for teaching science never enter the teaching field.

LOSS OF CANDIDATES

"Recent developments have greatly increased America's needs for scientists and engineers," the report says. "Here the primary role of the public schools is clear—to identify and encourage the young student with aptitude for and interest in scentific studies. But the diminishing supply of new teaching candidates in science and mathematics fell precipitately from 1950 to 1955, and the modest increase recently does not compensate for that loss.

"Moreover, the aggressive competition of other occupations for this inadequate supply makes even more difficult the task of staffing the schools."

The study shows that while the loss of candidates is substantial in all areas of teaching, it is most acute in the sciences and mathematics. This year, for example, 5,044 graduates are prepared for high-school science teaching. It is expected that the schools will lose more than 40 percent, or more than 2,000, of these graduates to other occupations or activities.

In the next decade, it appears, college enrollments will increase at a faster rate than either elementary or secondary school enrollments.

This will mean that more emphasis will have to be placed on the training of college teachers. At present, not enough students continue with graduate studies and go into college teaching.

Paradoxically, one-half of all new teachers employed in September 1956 came from sources other than the 1956 class of college graduates who prepared for teaching but never taught and persons with temporary certificates.

The outstanding achievement of the postwar era, the report brings out, is the improved status of elementary school teachers. Higher standards have been adopted in almost every State. There is widespread acceptance of the concept of equal pay for elementary and high-school teachers.

B. F.

WHY THE STATES CANNOT MEET THE NEED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if there is one fixed star in the firmament of American federalism it is this: that control of education belongs in the hands of State and local governments. Public education should be controlled at the grassroots. I am sure that every Member of the Senate will subscribe wholeheartedly to that sentiment. I do myself, emphatically and without reservation. I will not support any proposition to meet our educational needs that involves a transfer of responsibility or control, or any part of either, from the States and the local school districts to the Federal Government.

I say that plainly, and repeat it and underline it, because I feel it very strongly. But that is not the same thing as saying that the Federal Government has no responsibility for public education. It is not the same thing as saying that State and local governments must pay the cost of education, without help from the Federal Government. The simple truth, of course, is that they cannot continue to carry the burden of public education without help from the Federal Government—help that is massive and immediate and readily convertible into classrooms and teachers.

Historically, public-school support has come from local communities. In 1890, more than 75 percent of it came from local government. The States paid 18.4 percent and the Federal Government 5.5 percent. Today the States do much more than they did then, putting up 40.6 percent of the total, with local districts still paying 55.8 percent of it. But in the same period, the share paid by the Federal Government has actually declined. Today only 3.6 percent of school revenues comes from Uncle Sam. Most of this is spent for school lunches and other programs not directly related to education.

During the long period that the State and local governments have continued to pay almost the total cost of public education, the source of public revenues has shifted enormously. The property tax is the great prop of the public schools. Fifty-four percent of the cost of public schools today is borne by the property tax. But, as everyone knows, the property tax is relatively inelastic. It is a well that holds just so much water; and to make the pump bigger does not help at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the able Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for the excellent speech he is making.

I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin will agree with me that another point which needs to be stressed in connection with the inadequacy of the general property tax is that it also tends to be regressive.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Illinois that the general property tax is one of the most regressive taxes. Not only is it inelastic, but it falls on those who are least able to pay—on old persons, on those who are ill, on those of small means who wish to own and to hold on to their own homes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Two years ago the Joint Committee on the Economic Report held hearings at which testimony was taken from experts on local taxation. They admitted that the homes of workingmen tend to be assessed at much higher rates than do the homes of the wealthy; and, furthermore, that the residences of the persons in the lower income brackets tend to be assessed at much higher rates than the rates at which industrial property is assessed. I know of a case in one city where a $10,000 house of a working man would be assessed at $8,000 or $9,000, whereas an industrial property with an original cost of $71 million was assessed at only $1 million.

Therefore, is it not true that the general property tax, in addition to being inadequate, does not distribute the burden fairly among the citizens?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is absolutely correct.

As a matter of fact, the calculations I have made on this matter, on the basis of very exhaustive studies in Wisconsin as a member of the legislature and also as a candidate for Governor, show that typically those in the $3,000, $4,000, or $5,000 income brackets pay as much as 10 percent of their income in property taxes, whereas those in the higher income brackets—$30,000 and $40,000 and more and thereabouts—pay only 2 percent or 3 percent of their income in property taxes.

Mr. President, the fabulous increases in public revenues in the last 40 years has come from the income tax, and this is a source that the Federal Government has virtually preempted. Ninety percent of the national income now is comprised of the compensation of employees, corporate profits, and incomes of unincorporated businesses and the professions. This is the ocean the Federal Government has tapped. More than 75 percent of Federal taxes come from these sources. By contrast, the States get only 15 percent of their revenue from income taxes; and local governments, only 2 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the State of Wisconsin and the State of New York were the pioneers in the field of State income taxation?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Wisconsin certainly was. Few persons realize that Wisconsin was 2 years in advance of the Federal Government in that respect. The Wisconsin income-tax law was enacted in 1911, whereas the Federal Government income-tax law was enacted in 1913.

Of course, that development in Wiscousin was part of the great La Follette reform movement, and was one of the reasons why Wisconsin and New York together led the way in progressive, humanitarian government and taxation based on ability to pay.

No one in his right mind would dare suggest that the gargantuan needs of public education can be met from the historic source, the property tax. But no one with the slightest familiarity with public finance would deny that these needs can be met, and met easily, out of the revenues of the Federal Government. The National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools has pointed out that economists' estimates of the gross national product for the year 1965 average $525 billion, an increase of 35 percent over the amount in 1955. Less than 7 percent of the increase in the gross national product would meet the most ambitious program for the schools that anyone so far has even suggested.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two tables which appear in a publication of the N. E. A. Legislative

Commission entitled "The Property Tax and Public-School Financing," written by R. L. Johns.

The first table gives tax collections of different levels of Government, 1953. The second gives sources of national income in 1929 and 1956.

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

TABLE 1.—*Tax collections of different levels of government, 1953*

[In millions]

Type of tax	Total all governments		Federal Government		State governments		Local governments (excluding schools)		School districts	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Personal income	$32,870	35	$31,800	45	$970	8	$100	2+		
Corporation income	22,410	24	21,600	31	810	7				
Other business	1,390	2			990	8	400	6		
General sales	2,730	3			2,430	20	300	5		
Liquor sales	3,520	4	2,780	4	540	4	200	3		
Tobacco sales	2,320	2	1,650	2	470	4	200	3		
Gasoline sales	3,060	3	890	1	2,020	17	150	2		
Other sales	4,970	5	4,620	7	250	2	100	2		
Auto license	1,040	1			1,010	8				
Customs	610	1	610	1						
Property	9,370	10			370	3	4,520	72	$4,480	98
Payroll	7,150	8	5,650	8	1,500	12				
Death and gift	1,110	1	890	1	220	2				
Miscellaneous and unallocated	1,020	1			620	5	340	5	90	2
Total	93,570	100	70,490	100	12,200	100	6,310	100	4,570	100

Adapted from data given in American Public Finance, by William Shultz and C. Lowell Harris, Prentice Hall, p. 252, and Trends in Significant Facts in School Finance by Clayton Hutchins, Albert R. Munse, and Edna D. Booher, U. S. Office of Education, p. 21.

TABLE 2.—*Sources of national income,*[1] *1929 and 1956*

[Dollars in millions]

Source	1929		1956	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Compensation of employees	$51,085	58.2	$241,372	70.2
Corporate profits	10,100	11.5	40,449	11.8
Unincorporated business and professional income	8,791	10.0	28,017	8.1
Farm income	5,968	6.8	11,600	3.4
Rental income of persons	5,425	6.2	10,322	3.0
Net interest	6,445	7.3	11,860	3.5
Total	87,814	100.0	343,620	100.0

[1] Source of data: Survey of Current Business, U. S. Department of Commerce, July 1957.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the estimated expenditures for all education—public and private, elementary schools through college—in 1955–56 totaled $16,996,000,000. By way of comparison, I should like to offer the following estimated expenditures for some other items:

Estimated expenditures, 1955–56

Education, public and private, elementary school through college	$16,996,000,000
Alcoholic beverages	10,129,000,000
Tobacco products	5,373,000,000
Parimutual net receipts	426,000,000
Cosmetics	1,587,000,000
Total	17,515,000,000

Mr. President, these figures are shocking and shameful. The people of the United States spend more on a few assorted social extravagances than they spend on all the education—public, parochial, and private—for all the children of America. Can the United States of America afford to pay for education? Mr. President, these figures provide the answer to that question.

WHY EDUCATION BILLS FAIL

The failure of the Federal Government to do anything effective to meet the needs of education has not been the result of a lack of good Federal-aid-to-education bills. Many of these bills I have the honor to cosponsor. I wish to make crystal clear right now that I will support any good bill that gives Federal aid to schools without Federal control, which comes to a vote in the Senate.

I am proud to be a cosponsor, with the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], of Senate bill 3311, the School Assistance Act of 1957. This bill proposes to authorize appropriations of $25 per school-age child for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958. The amounts will increase by $25 per school-age child each year, until a total of $100 per school-age child is reached.

I also have the privilege of cosponsoring the bill which has been introduced by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], along with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. In the words of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the author of the bill, it brings up to date the bill which Senator Taft originally sponsored for aid to education. This bill is an alternative to the Murray bill, and authorizes the appropriation of $1 billion a year to the States, to enable them to raise their standards and to take a long step toward equalizing educational opportunities. I have also joined the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and other Senators in sponsoring Senate bill 3187, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which would award to college students 40,000 scholarships a year, in each of 6 years. This bill is aimed at securing American supremacy in science for the future.

I have also supported enthusiastically the proposal to permit a teacher to deduct from gross income up to $600 for any single year's expenses incurred in furtherance of his education.

These are good bills, and there are other good bills. Since the end of World War II, there have been many good bills in both Houses. But they have a way, like the French king in the nursery rhyme, of marching up the hill, and then marching down again. What happens to them?

There are two great pitfalls, and several little ones, in the way of any aid-to-education bill. One of the big ones is the fear of Federal control of education. This is a justifiable fear. Unless it can be made clear beyond a peradventure of a doubt that no Federal interference rides along with the Federal grant, the bill is doomed.

A second pitfall is the possibility that the aid-to-education bill will become enmeshed in the titanic controversy over integration in the schools. Some who want Federal aid to help the cause of integration and some who want the cause of integration to hurt Federal aid collaborate to write into the bill provisions requiring integration. Then the foes of Federal aid and the foes of integration join hands to kill the bill. Thus, it is made certain that a maximum number of our children of both races will go to bad schools.

These are large pitfalls to be avoided. Among the small pitfalls are the controversies that divide honest people who want the best in education for our children. What subjects are most important—those in the sciences or those in the liberal arts? Should teachers concentrate on social adjustment or the three R's? How should our teachers be trained—with the emphasis on teaching methods or with the emphasis on subject matter?

These are important questions. One of the healthiest indications of what is right with our educational situation now is the fervor with which these questions are debated.

But these are not questions that need to be settled here, or now, or by the Federal Government. These are questions that can be worked out while the schools are being built and while young people are being attracted to teaching as a profession and a way of life. This much is certain: However the questions of the goals and strategy of education are settled, we will need classrooms, and teachers, and help for college students.

The bill I am about to introduce, Mr. President, is not a perfect bill—far from it. But it has the very substantial virtue, in my opinion, that it sidesteps most of the pitfalls that waylay other bills and makes it possible for us to get on with the job of school construction and teacher recruitment.

The bill also has the unique value of providing that funds available for education will expand as the economy expands. This is a vitally important advantage for this bill. A paramount reason for our educational lag is the dependence of education on the static, rigid,

inelastic, regressive property tax. Education urgently needs a source of funds that will expand as the economy expands. This bill provides it. As the gross national product expands by 35 percent in the next 10 years, as economists predict, the 5-percent share of Federal income taxes will swell from more than $3.3 billion to $4.5 billion.

Mr. President, of course the passage of this bill will help and help materially to provide more jobs and more income. Of course, it will help push us out of the recession.

This is the most constructive kind of antirecession investment this Nation could possibly make. If there is any lesson to be learned in human history, it is that education is a preeminently sound, safe, secure investment. More than that it is sure to be an immensely profitable investment. It will vastly increase the Nation's real wealth, in fact its only ultimate wealth—the ability and intelligence of the human beings who make up this country.

If there is any clarion clear lesson in American history, it is that the unique force and strength of this Republic is in very important part the result of American emphasis on universal, compulsory, public education. There is no better reason for the flowering of this country.

Life magazine has begun a serious and distinguished series of editorials and articles dealing with the crisis in American education. Life tells the story as only the simple language of pictures can tell it.

I should like to quote briefly from that article. Life points out:

> The schools have been overcrowded for years, but children still study in shacks and shifts and hallways and jerry-built classrooms.
>
> Most teachers are grossly underpaid (some are not worth what they get). A great many, who know their jobs well and practice them with devotion, have to work without help, understanding or tools.

I should like to quote briefly from the story about one Donald Pearson, of David Douglas High School, Portland, Oreg.:

> At David Douglas High School, Donald Pearson has a formidable task: to plant some science in the minds of roomfuls of restless teen-agers. For 6 strenuous hours every day—three of freshman general science, 3 of upper class physics—he works earnestly and imaginatively to put across scientific concepts, ranging from calorie measurement to nuclear transmutations. The school is relatively well supplied with science equipment, but whenever he cannot find what he needs, he ransacks hardware and surplus stores for materials, and then invents his own homemade devices.
>
> Pearson never has time during school hours to plan his lessons ahead and set up demonstrations. Even after school he has few undisturbed moments. There are no private offices for teachers, and Pearson works late in his empty classroom. This, he says ruefully, "is as private as a railway station." But every so often something happens in class that makes it all seem worth while—"just to see the expression on a student's face when the light suddenly dawns—that's enough to keep me going."

I should like to point out the very serious personal problem that exists for our teachers. I read from the same article of Life magazine:

> To give his family what he feels it deserves, Pearson recently moved his four children and his pregnant wife, Marian, into a pleasant new $15,000 house near the school. But it has meant drastic cutbacks in the household budget. Since they cannot afford new furniture, the Pearsons spend most of their waking time in the unfinished basement, surrounded by homemade furniture. The livingroom is still completely bare. With no money to spare for domestic help or baby sitters, Pearson pitches in on household chores, and he and his wife have not been out together for over a year. Marian Pearson still recalls 2 precious free days last summer, paid for with birthday money from her mother, when she took a holiday at the YWCA in Salem, 50 miles away. Despite these measures, their monthly budget comes to $500, while Pearson's take-home pay as a teacher amounts to only $372.

Here is how he makes up the difference:

> To earn enough to pay his bills, Pearson has organized every moment outside of class into a frenetic patchwork of "moonlighting" jobs. In addition, he performs a host of gratuitous chores—chaperoning teenage dances, collecting tickets at basketball games and clowning at PTA shows. For extra pay, he tutors, drives the school-activities bus, coaches freshman baseball, and teaches electronics in night school. His weekends he sacrifices for his biggest money maker, driving a commercial excursion bus. It is hard on the children in his own family for him to be away 7 days a week. "But it won't be this way forever," says Pearson hopefully.

Whether it will be this way or not, of course, is in no small part up to the action that will be or will not be taken by the United States Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial appearing in the March 31, 1958, issue entitled "The Deeper Problem in Education." I ask unanimous consent, also, to have printed in the RECORD at this point the first and second of a series of articles entitled "Crisis in Education." This first section of the series appeared in Life, March 24, 1958. The second installment appeared in the March 31, 1958, issue.

An interesting comparison of the American and Soviet systems of education, which shows how wrong we are if we think we should ape the Russians, appeared in the March issue of the Progressive. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the article by Mr. George Fischer entitled "Mistaken Envy."

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

[From Life of March 31, 1958]

THE DEEPER PROBLEM IN EDUCATION

It is still a shock to realize the penalties a good teacher must pay, just to do his country's most important job. We must do something quickly about improving teachers' salaries, training, and status. But teachers and the public must also get together on a problem less tangible but more basic—how to straighten out the debris left by 40 years of the progressive educationists. It is a legacy of distended play facilities, substandard curriculums and principals whose intellectual confusion can no longer be disguised by the compulsory smile on their faces.

American schools have done a tremendous job in educating people at a rate beyond the dreams of most nations. Such a quantitative achievement was bound to hit some snags on the quality side. And it serves no purpose to polarize the educational debate by shouting "un-American" at the late John Dewey's bones (a distinctive Americanism, in fact, was one of Dewey's intellectual boasts), or by making blanket denunciations of frills in education (if How to Run a Beauty Shop has no place in a general high-school curriculum, a good challenging music appreciation course very definitely has). The problem underlying all our confusion is—to use words long out of favor in pedagogical circles—a matter of tradition and philosophy. Only by grasping this can we figure out where and how our education system went wrong.

Until the arrival of Dewey and his disciples, American schools had the stated objective of educating individuals in an inherited and enlarging body of learning. Confident of their own established values in ethics, law and culture, the old-fashioned teachers deliberately set out to pass down these values as part of a living tradition. They held that it was all one cultural heritage—everything from Boyle's Law to Cicero's First Oration against Catiline—and the more of it you learned the wiser and more mentally alert you would be.

Dewey and his disciples revolted against this certitude, which had indeed grown more than a little ossified in its teaching methods. But history records no more egregious case of throwing out the baby with the bath. Instead of modernizing the oldtimers' teaching methods, the new educationists went deeper and denied tradition in anything.

"We agree," Dewey once said, "that we are uncertain as to where we are going and where we want to go, and why we are doing what we do." In a kind of country club existentialism, Dewey and his boys genially contended that the traditional ends of education—and indeed of human life—like God, virtue and the idea of culture were all debatable and hence not worth debating. In their place: enter life adjustment. The alternative to educating the individual thus became, as John Keats puts it in his excellent new book, Schools without Scholars, "to bring the individual by a process of conditioning, to a realization of his functional role in society."

The Deweyites thus transformed conditioning techniques into ends in themselves. As they tracked through United States education, teachers' colleges assumed the dignity of lamaseries. They called their system science, but they worshipped its doctrines like a cult. In thousands of schools teachers were denied the chance of learning more about their subjects in favor of compulsory education courses in how to teach them.

Within the schools discipline gave way to increasingly dubious forms of group persuasion. "With teen-agers," one high school principal said proudly, "there is nothing more powerful than the approval or disapproval of the group. * * * When the majority conforms, the others will go along." It would not easily occur to the modern educationalists that such blind fostering of group pressure is a travesty of free democracy. Such criticism honestly puzzles them, as do suggestions that they might concentrate more on dry-learning subjects, like mathematics and languages, to the exclusion of teen-age problems, beauty care, flycasting. But they try to understand their critics, for understanding is part of the progressive code—a recently popular educational tract is titled "Helping Teachers Understand Principals."

By their own trusted empirical test, the poor performance of their students has proved the educationists wrong. United States high-school students are plain ignorant of things grammar-school students would have known a generation ago. Years of barren discussion courses in English have made a whole generation chronically incoherent in the English language (the mutterings of a United States teen-ager trying to discuss his belief's generally sound like a sanitized version of Elvis Presley). By substituting projects for study, the educationists have soothed students' curiosity, but left them with little intellectual patience for solving problems. Cut off from any but the most obvious contact with his tradition; that is, an occasional project visit to the local courthouse, the student has lost his sense of history, at a time when his country needs this most. Surely the history of the crusades can give a young American a better grasp of the problems implicit in the U. N., or NATO, than dressing up a Pakistani delegate in an imitation U. N. assembly at school.

With Dewey's world so demonstrably in tatters, one might think the educationists would run up the white flag. Far from it. Entrenched in public-school administrations, they defend with the adhesiveness of a band of brothers every article of their gobbledygook canons. In Holland, Mich., the Christian High School, a respected institution of impeccable academic standards, has recently been denied accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools because it refused to dilute its academic standards with shop and cooking courses. A sample of the canons by which such schools are judged: "Is the control and atmosphere of the individual's rooms and classes based upon teacher authority or group self-control and group-defined standards * * *? To what extent are opportunities provided for children to develop moral and spiritual values through the process of direct experience in working with each other?"

We cannot expect to cure such lopsided standards just by giving teachers the pay they deserve, building the schools we need, and ordering up more science courses. A few important steps can be taken by State and local authorities. For one thing, most of our State teachers' colleges should be abolished as such and converted into liberal arts colleges, with subordinate education departments. There must also be some drastic upgrading of curriculum requirements.

But most of all we need to do some thinking about the true ends of education. The worthwhile innovations in method brought by Dewey's educationists should be kept. But their exclusive devotion to techniques and group adjustment should never again be allowed to hide the fact that American education exists first of all to educate the individual in a body of learning, with a tradition and purpose behind it. A man so educated is far better equipped as a democratic citizen than the merely well adjusted. For he will have not only the social ease to make his civilization comfortable, but the intellectual discipline to help save it.

[From Life of March 24, 1958]

CRISIS IN EDUCATION

For years most critics of United States education have suffered the curse of Cassandra—always to tell the truth, seldom to be listened to or believed. But now the curse has been lifted. What they were saying is beginning to be believed. The schools are in terrible shape. What has long been an ignored national problem, sputnik has made a recognized crisis.

The only thing United States schools have plenty of is children. There are 33.5 million of these, sole owners of the Nation's future brains and skills. There are not nearly enough schools. There are not nearly enough teachers. There is nowhere near enough money. The salient points of the crisis, amplified by Sloan Wilson, are these: The schools have been overcrowded for years, but children still study in shacks and shifts and hallways and jerry-built classrooms. Most teachers are grossly underpaid (some are not worth what they get). A great many, who know their jobs well and practice them with devotion, have to work without help, understanding, or proper tools. In their eagerness to be all things to all children, schools have gone wild with elective courses. They build up the bodies with in-school lunches and let the minds shift for themselves. Where there are young minds of great promise, there are rarely the means to advance them. The Nation's stupid children get far better care than the bright. The geniuses of the next decades are even now being allowed to slip back into mediocrity. There is no general agreement on what the schools should teach. A quarter century has been wasted with the squabbling over whether to make a child well adjusted or teach him something. Most appalling, the standards of education are shockingly low.

In this issue Life begins a series of picture essays that will examine the crisis in United States education. The series will limit itself to the elementary and secondary schools, the formative years, because if things go wrong then there isn't much the colleges can do. The first installment, which starts on the next page, explores the field of battle for future brainpower—the United States and Soviet Russian schools. In installments appearing in successive weeks, the series will show what a dedicated high-school teacher has to put up with in order to stay on the job. It will look at the puzzling world of a gifted child who is nearly isolated by his own intelligence. It will point out some educational stirrings—new excitement about science, new courses, new subjects—and will give Dr. James B. Conant's blueprint for a good high-school curriculum.

SCHOOLBOYS POINT UP A UNITED STATES WEAKNESS

Two 16-year-olds, Stephen Lapekas of Chicago and Alexei Kutzkov of Moscow, are getting what their own countries consider a good, standard public education. Stephen is an 11th-grader at Austin High, one of the city's finer high schools. Alexei is in his 10th and final year at Moscow School 49. But the difference in what they learn and the atmosphere in which they learn it measures the frightening scale of the problems the United States now faces in its public schools.

The pictures on these pages reveal candidly what happened in the lives of both boys during a recent school week. Stephen is an average student, likable, considerate, good humored—the kind of well-adjusted youngster United States public schools are proud of producing. Alexei is hard working, aggressive, above average in his grades—the kind of student that the Russian system ruthlessly sets out to produce. For Stephen, the business of getting educated seldom seems too serious. For Alexei, who works in a much harsher intellectual climate, good marks in school are literally more important than anything else in his life.

Stephen hopes to go to college after he finishes at Austin High but knows future success does not depend entirely on this. Alexei is filled with a fierce determination to get to college and become a physicist. In Russia, which desperately needs trained manpower, few can rise above a humble level without a good education. The entire school system has been geared to this. With a curriculum standardized across the country and with no elective subjects, the Soviet 10-year schools are like mammoth obstacle courses for the nation's youth. The laggards are forced out by tough periodic examinations and shunted to less demanding trade schools and apprenticeships. Only a third—1.4 million in 1957—survive all 10 years and finish the course.

For all its laxness, the system under which Stephen studies does develop flexibility and, in Stephen, qualities of leadership. For all its stern virtues, the system under which Alexei studies develops rigidity and subservience to an undemocratic state. But there is no blinking at the educational results. Academically Alexei is 2 years ahead of Stephen. As one example, he has read Shakespeare and Shaw in literature class while Stephen has only just finished reading Stevenson's Kidnapped.

IN U. S. S. R.: ROUGH HAUL ALL THE WAY

In the austere atmosphere of Moscow's School 49, Alexei Kutzkov spends 6 intensive days a week on a formidable array of subjects. They include Russian literature, sixth-year English, fifth-year physics, fourth-year chemistry, electrical technique, mathematics, technical drawing, machinery, and astronomy.

Russian schools put a heavy emphasis on science and more than half of Alexei's classroom time is given over to scientific subjects. But Alexei also has a firm foundation in literature and languages. He has studied all the great Russian writers, including Tolstoy and Dostoevsky, and in his English classes English is spoken more often than Russian. Though the range and depth of the studies is impressive, there is one catch. Russian students learn a great deal by rote and seldom strike out to explore any subject on their own initiative beyond the material printed in their textbooks.

Though Alexei gets no direct political indoctrination in school, he is constantly reminded of his duties toward the state. Pictures and slogans of Lenin are few but conspicuous. The literature courses pay considerable attention to contemporary fiction which glorifies the Soviet way of life. Modern history, which Alexei is studying this year, emphasizes Russia's feats in World War II. For a year after Stalin's death Russian schools stopped giving examinations in modern history, while the party rewrote texts to include Stalin's personal errors.

Alexei's teachers are well trained. They run their classes with a firm hand. Discipline has relaxed a little since Stalin's death, but pupils are still careful not to act up. If a student gets less than an A in behavior, school authorities can suggest pointedly that he reconsider his plans for applying to college.

A PURPOSE IN FUN, TOO

Outside the classroom Alexei keeps moving at the same determined pace. Five years ago he took up volleyball, Russia's number one participant sport. Later he joined the Moscow Spartak Club, to which several of his schoolmates belong. Through tenacious practice he made the club's juvenile volleyball team which plays other teams in the city.

Late in the day, after his long homework chores are over, Alexei often comes back to school for a game of ping-pong, to play the piano for a party or to dance a quiet foxtrot. His interest in girls, by United States teen-age standards, has been slow in developing. He has recently started paying hesitant attention to a pretty classmate, Marina Dubrovnikova. But for solid companionship he prefers his best friend Oleg Koryakovsky. Together they spend hours over the chessboard or go to concerts. Alexei's tickets are paid for by his mother, a cost engineer in the automobile industry. On more frivolous occasions he takes in a movie, as he did recently when he went to see a Finnish film called Hilya the Milkmaid.

IN UNITED STATES: RELAXED STUDIES

Stephen Lapekas, of Chicago, starts out almost every schoolday by meeting his steady, Penny Donahue, and heading for Austin High. Ten minutes later he gets to the typing II class, slips behind a large electric typewriter, and another pleasant schoolday begins.

Classes at Austin are relaxed and enlivened by banter. For Stephen, who is taking an academic course, this year's subjects include English, American history, geometry, and biology, respectable enough courses but on a much less advanced level than Alexei's. The intellectual application expected of him is moderate. In English, for instance, students seldom bother to read assigned books and sometimes make book reports based on comic-book condensations. Stephen's extracurricular activities, in which he really shows talent and energy, leave him little time for hard study. He is the high school's star swimmer and a leader in student affairs. As a result, though the teachers consider him intelligent, he is behind in mathematics and his grades are mediocre. "I worry about 'em," he admits, "but that's about as far as it goes."

IT'S TIME TO CLOSE OUR CARNIVAL

(By Sloan Wilson)

(Sloan Wilson, best know as a novelist (The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit and his forthcoming A Summer Place), is also a well-grounded critic of United States education. From 1949 to 1953 he was assistant director of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. He has also been New York Herald Tribune education editor.)

The facts of the school crises are all out in plain sight—and pretty dreadful to look at. First of all, it has been shown that a surprisingly small percentage of high school students is studying what used to be considered basic subjects. Only 12½ percent are taking any mathematics more advanced than algebra, and only 25 percent are studying physics. A foreign language is studied by fewer than 15 percent of the students. Ten million Russians are studying English, but only 8,000 Americans are studying Russian.

People are complaining that the diploma has been devaluated in this Nation to the point of meaninglessness. Bernard Leibson, principal of a junior high in New York City, recently admitted that while signing diplomas he suffers "great pangs of pedagogical conscience. Although Johnny cannot read above the fifth-grade level and Mary has barely mastered the fourth-grade arithmetic fundamentals, I have with the connivance of the duly constituted authorities helped to perpetuate the fiction that John and Mary have 'completed the course of study with a satisfactory record.' * * *"

Almost every conceivable reason has been offered for this state of affairs. Marion B. Folsom, who as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare is a top man in United States public education, has demanded fewer so-called popular or easy courses and less chrome, less country-clubbing. Admiral Hyman Rickover, father of the atomic submarine, concurs, citing specifically such courses as love and marriage: "You can learn how to make love outside of school in the good old-fashioned ways."

The teachers are to blame, say some critics. Lester Vander Werf, dean of Northeastern University's College of Education, recently accused teachers of not being intelligent enough for the functions they perform.

The students are lazy, says another group. Surveys by Margaret Mead and by a group of Purdue scientists have shown that most youngsters consciously avoid taking science subjects because they do not think a scientific career is worth all the effort. A junior high school teacher recently wrote that students nowadays "are being smothered with anxious concern, softened with lack of exercise, seduced with luxuries, then flung into the morass of excessive sex interest. * * * They are overfed and underworked. They have too much leisure and too little discipline."

It is all the parents' fault, says a third group of critics. Dean Harry D. Bonham of the University of Alabama recently said, "I believe there is altogether too much parental laxity in requiring that the youngsters develop the habit of studying and doing their homework." Dean Thomas Clark Pollock of New York University's Washington Square branch blames the communities. Good high schools, he says, try to get rid of frills, "but too often their communities fail to understand or support them properly."

And finally the whole Nation has been accused. A Dartmouth professor of chemistry wrote recently: "I am concerned about the easy living in this country. In the past, classes relieved from physical labor—the leisure class—always had some demanding ideal, bravery in war, social grace, or the responsible wielding of power. The only corresponding ideal in United States society that I can make out is being a good guy."

This is only a small sampling of the criticism of the schools that has been heard lately. The attack may seem unwarranted to many parents in conscientious communities whose good high schools regularly send graduates to the best colleges, but in the rest of the United States it is amply justified. And its cumulative effect has been devastating.

FALLING BEHIND RUSSIA

Obviously it is impossible to make sweeping pronouncements on the industry or intelligence of some 34 million schoolchildren and more than a million teachers. Some of the criticism is the inevitable blowing off of steam which always accompanies a democracy's efforts toward self-improvement. Still, the statistics cannot be disputed and it would be difficult to deny that few diplomas stand for a fixed level of accomplishment, or that great numbers of students fail to pursue their studies with vigor. Studies show that brilliant children in this country are nowhere near as advanced in the sciences as their opposite numbers in Europe or Russia. Why?

To find an answer it may be useful to go back in history and recall the way the United States school system developed. As recently as 50 years ago our high schools were almost carbon copies of their European counterparts. They offered a narrow selection of strictly academic subjects. The question of whether a youngster attended them depended at least as much on his social and economic station in life as on the intelligence. The age-old custom still held: education beyond grammar school was the privilege of the well-to-do.

Modern America has changed that. This was the land of equality where no class distinctions were tolerated. If a rich man's son could go to high school, so could a poor man's son, and his daughter too. The schools began taking not only those who once would have fallen by the wayside for social or economic reasons, but also those who would formerly have been excluded for lack of aptitude or desire for academic work. It was pointed out that even the least intelligent youngster can learn something. A new dream was born in America, and as a dream it was neither cynical nor naive.

Instead of trying to find students to fit a rigid curriculum, the schools decided to try to hand-tailor a course of instruction for each child. If poor Johnny could not learn chemistry or mathematics, the schools would not throw him onto the street. They would teach him woodworking, they would adjust him to life, they would make him a better citizen. And after he served his 4 years in high school, they would give him a diploma as fancily lettered as everyone else's.

There was a basic humanity in these changes and common sense too. It is true that even the dullest can learn something. Johnny undoubtedly was a better person and a more useful citizen after his 4 years of high school, even if he did not learn much in academic terms. And the destruction of social and economic barriers to education profited the Nation enormously. The schools released a flood of energy and talent such as the world had never seen.

To run the new schools a whole new breed of educator appeared. They were men such as John Dewey and his disciples, who invented some of the silliest language ever heard (the total personality of a child was to be developed through group psychological engineering). The development—their apologists say the distortion—of their aims was disastrous in many cases. But these educators also emphasized some things that good teachers had known for centuries—briefly, that children learn quicker when they are led to understand and to enjoy their studies rather than simply being made to learn by rote, and that teachers should take the child's entire environment and nature into account in deciding how to teach him.

What went wrong?

In the first place, nobody foresaw how enormously expensive such a school system would be. We were already spending more on education than any other nation, but we were hardly able to provide the money needed for so much individual attention to so many. Educators as a result were forced to design programs for the average student. Special courses were provided for those experiencing unusual difficulty, but the gifted students were largely ignored.

The lack of funds was only the beginning of the trouble. One by one the traditional spurs to effort were removed. With students no longer being held to a rigid level of accomplishment, report cards, as well as diplomas, became almost meaningless. Laws were passed requiring even the dullest students to remain in school until their middle or late teens, and the educators found they could expel almost no one. Soon they discovered that it was less damaging to all concerned to let dullards progress through the grades with their contemporaries than to hold them back and let them disrupt classes of younger children. Automatic promotion, automatic graduation, and report cards on which rarely was heard a discouraging word became the rule, and it was not one which inspired every student to do his best.

The fountainhead of the new education became Columbia University's Teachers College, which exaggerated the bad aspects of progressive education at least as much as it emphasized the good. This led in due course to the greater glory of the professional educationist and the increasing disillusions of many parents and teachers.

Unless a youngster arrived at school with a genuine desire for knowledge, there was very little incentive for him to study hard. And as we were to discover, precious few youngsters came equipped with anything like a real drive to learn.

In Russia and in Western Europe children had more reason to study. In the Soviet Union, especially, scientists and technicians were the new aristocrats, and the only way to join their ranks was through academic accomplishment. Today if a Russian boy fails in school he may face the bleak prospect of being a day laborer or serving in some other lowly capacity. No one in Russia can entertain the dream of leaving school early and making a million rubles as a salesman.

In Europe the possession of a diploma has continued to be a social distinction, and the educated man there is respected even if he is poor. And in both Russia and the other

European countries the bright student, because he is very likely to become an important man, is widely admired by his contemporaries.

The American youngster who miraculously does arrive in school with an honest drive to learn finds himself having to play the role of "queer duck"—a difficult role indeed for most adolescents. Most of the public schools are simply not geared for him. True, he can usually find a chemistry or trigonometry course, and if he is lucky he may find a knowledgeable teacher who will greet him with open arms. But he must also contend with hordes of youngsters drifting through school in search of easy roads to high pay and with the bland disregard of intellectual values which has affected many school administrators and teachers, along with most other Americans.

Upon arriving at high school today an American youngster is faced with a bewildering choice of literally scores of subjects, many combinations of which can lead to a diploma, and many of which are far easier than physics, mathematics, or a foreign language. He can study marriage, chorus, or advertising arts. In some schools he must give time to the study of safe driving and the evils of alcohol. Courses in typewriting and dancing vie for his time.

DOING ALMOST NOTHING WELL

With the accident rate and the divorce rate as high as they are, a good case can be made for instruction in both driving and marriage, and there is no real reason why a youngster should not be taught dancing if the school has the extra money and the pupil has the extra time for it. But all too often the school provides courses in safe driving when it doesn't have the money for adequate courses in chemistry. The schools are becoming increasingly vulnerable to the charge that in trying to do everything for everyone, they are succeeding in doing almost nothing well.

The upshot is that many a brilliant youngster finds that his school has assumed the aspects of a carnival. In one room pretty girls practice twirling batons. The sound of cheers is heard from the football field. The safe-driving class circles the block in new automobiles lent by an enterprising dealer. Upstairs funny Mr. Smith sits wearily on a stool in the chemistry lab trying to explain to a few boys that science can be fun, but who pays any attention to him?

It is hard to deny that America's schools, which were supposed to reflect one of history's noblest dreams and to cultivate the Nation's youthful minds, have degenerated into a system for coddling and entertaining the mediocre. It is one thing to establish courses of varying purpose and of varying degrees of difficulty to fit the talents of various individuals, but it is quite another to run schools in which most of the students avoid the tough courses—and get away with it.

There is no point in trying to return to the 19th century to find a cure for these ills. No one could seriously suggest nowadays that high schools should be restricted to the brilliant few, or to a small social or economic group. No, what we have to do is to recapture the enthusiasm for the great dream we once had, and to pursue it with a better sense of values. We must quit perverting it as we have in the past.

In the midst of the blare of commercial success we must recapture an honest respect for learning and for learned people. Abandoning that basic virtue in the first place was never meant to be a part of modern education and is part of no theory. It is one thing for us to glory in the tradition of the frontiersman in his buckskins who shouted "I'm as good as you are" to the whole world of bewigged and beribboned aristocracy, but it is quite another to allow a callow adolescent to slouch in his jeans and motorcycle jacket in smirking disrespect for a good and earnest physics teacher.

Democracy was never supposed to substitute license for discipline. Instead, it was meant to substitute self-discipline for oppression. But not even the most doctrinaire psychologists say that children can be expected to survive with self-discipline alone. Often they have to be told by both parents and teachers what to study and how to behave.

If we are going to start insisting upon honest respect for learning, hard work and good conduct, most of us will have to get tough with ourselves as well as with our children and the schools. A child who hears eggheads derided at home, and who sees his parents caring for little more than economic success and entertainment, can hardly be expected to excel as a scholar. And those who administer the schools cannot be expected to provide an education suited to each child's ambitions and needs if the money for small classes and good teachers is not forthcoming.

The sort of effort that is required is one which can only be expected in time of emergency. Such a time is, however, at hand. In past decades we could pride ourselves on the multitude of untutored geniuses who could and did devise the reaper, the electric light bulb, the airplane and countless other mechanisms which are now part of civilization. But times have changed. Space ships and intercontinental missiles are not invented by self-educated men in home workshops. They are developed by teams of highly trained scientists, most of whom must begin (and get much of) their education in the public schools.

It goes without saying nowadays that the outcome of the arms race will depend eventually on our schools and those of the Russians. It is just as obvious, if less often pointed out, that the kind of understanding between peoples which someday may perhaps make arms races unnecessary also depends in large part upon education.

The United States was the first nation in the world to provide schools for all children, and that is one reason we have prospered. If our schools fail, it will not be because we care too much for our ideals but because we care too little. We should not need the threat of Russia to be convinced that it is time to close the carnival and go to work.

[From Life of March 31, 1958]

CRISIS IN EDUCATION, PART 2—AN UNDERDOG PROFESSION IMPERILS THE SCHOOLS

"Sure I've thought of quitting. But how can I walk out in the middle of a battle?" These words of Donald Pearson, of Portland, Oreg., explaining why he goes on teaching, have a heroic ring. But it takes a kind of heroic resolve to be a teacher in the United States today.

Among the many problems of the public schools which Life listed last week in the first article of this series on the Crisis in Education, the weakness in teaching is one of the most crucial. Teachers hold in their hands the malleable minds of the Nation's children. But despite the immense importance of what they do—or should do—they are wretchedly overworked, underpaid, and disregarded. And a discouraging number of them are incompetents. The shortage of teachers, which now amounts to a staggering 227,000, is particularly felt in the all-important fields of science and math. Forty percent of those trained to teach science are snapped up by industry and never get to a classroom.

Donald Pearson, who is on the science staff at David Douglas High, is a cut above most teachers. He has his master's degree, knows how to teach, and loves his work. The school is a new one in a suburb, whose citizens are generous with school funds. Yet Pearson's teaching load hardly allows him time to draw breath in school hours. Afterward he rushes to his different "moonlighting" jobs, trying to add enough to his $4,700 teacher's salary to keep a decent roof over his family's heads.

A ROUGH TIME OVER THE UNITED STATES

The problems which beset Donald Pearson are even worse for thousands of other teachers across the United States. With the number of children entering school increasing by a million and a quarter every year, the classroom shortage is skyrocketing, and more and more teachers must spend extra hours in school teaching double shifts. Where real classrooms simply do not exist, teachers do their makeshift best in basements, shacks, buses and abandoned railway cars. In some big cities, where delinquents terrorize teachers and other pupils, it often takes physical courage to teach.

Most teachers would gladly disregard these hazards if only they could make a decent wage and be spared time-consuming duties of record-keeping, clerking, janitoring, chaperoning and traffic-directing. They become public drudges, forced to do peripheral work that a community would not expect of any other professional people. While teaching generally imposes less of a financial strain on women teachers, an astounding 75 percent of the Nation's male teachers, like Donald Pearson, have "moonlighting" jobs, which drain away the energy and interest that should go into their teaching. As one New York City teacher recently confessed, "We rest up in the daytime for our jobs at night."

At David Douglas High School, Donald Pearson has a formidable task: to plant some science in the minds of roomfuls of restless teenagers. For 6 strenuous hours every day—3 of freshman general science, 3 of upperclass physics—he works earnestly and imaginatively to put across scientific concepts ranging from calorie measurement to nuclear transmutations. The school is relatively well supplied with science equipment. But whenever he cannot find what he needs, he ransacks hardware and surplus stores for materials and then invents his own homemade devices.

Pearson never has time during school hours to plan his lessons ahead and set up demonstrations. Even after school he has few undisturbed moments. There are no private offices for teachers, and Pearson works late in his empty classroom. This, he says ruefully, "is as private as a railway station." But every so often something happens in class that makes it all seem worth while: "Just to see the expression on a student's face when the light suddenly dawns—that's enough to keep me going." To give his family what he feels it deserves, Pearson recently moved his four children and his pregnant wife Marian into a pleasant new $15,000 house near the school. But it has meant drastic cutbacks in the household budget. Since they cannot afford new furniture, the Pearsons spend most of their waking time in the unfinished basement, surrounded by homemade furniture. The living room is still completely bare. With no money to spare for domestic help or baby sitters, Pearson pitches in on household chores, and he and his wife have not been out together for over a year. Marian Pearson still recalls 2 precious free days last summer, paid for with birthday money from her mother, when she took a holiday at the YWCA in Salem, 50 miles way. Despite these measures, their monthly budget comes to $500, while Pearson's take-home pay as a teacher amounts to only $372.

AND AFTER SCHOOL: MORE CHORES

To earn enough to pay his bills, Pearson has organized every moment outside of class into a frenetic patchwork of "moonlighting" jobs. In addition, he performs a host of gratuitous chores—chaperoning teen-age dances, collecting tickets at basketball

games, and clowning at PTA shows. For extra pay, he tutors, drives the school-activities bus, coaches freshman baseball, and teaches electronics in night school. His weekends he sacrifices for his biggest money-maker, driving a commercial excursion bus. It is hard on his children for him to be away 7 days a week. "But it won't be this way forever," says Pearson hopefully.

[From the Progressive of March 1958]

SOVIET AND AMERICAN EDUCATION: MISTAKEN ENVY

(By George Fischer)

(Few Americans are better qualified to compare Soviet and American education than Mr. Fischer. Son of long-time Moscow correspondent Louis Fischer and Markoosha Fischer, he spent a decade, 1929–39, as a pupil in a Soviet public kindergarten, grade school, and high schools and another decade in the United States completing high school and obtaining a bachelor's degree at the University of Wisconsin and a doctorate at Harvard. For the past 10 years he has been an associate of Harvard's Russian Research Center and currently combines this assignment with a professorship of history at Brandeis University. He is the author of Soviet Opposition to Stalin, and, just published, Russian Liberalism, to be reviewed next month by Justice William O. Douglas.—The editors.)

In the brief half year since the first sputnik, most Americans have swerved from disdain for Soviet education to almost defeatist frenzy. The many millions of words said and written on the subject failed to make clear how Soviet education really compares with American, or what the United States should do. But they did spread and deepen the country's concern.

Nor have the experts resolved this anxiety. Newspaper readers could detect repeated disagreements even among top American scientists, educators, and specialists on Soviet affairs. And statistics, that last refuge of modern polemics, failed to help. To cite a stark example, statistics tell us on the one hand that the U. S. S. R. has twice as many engineering students as the United States, but on the other, statistics tell us that the total number of Soviet engineers remains smaller and that in total university enrollment the United States has a per capita lead of two and a half times.

Over the years, a few contrasts between Soviet and American education have stood out again and again in my mind:

My Soviet schoolmates were much more studious and conscientious in school work than my American companions.

Although having fun is in no way an American monopoly, the quantity and quality of American athletic, extra-curricular, and social activities would appall even the most sybaritic among Soviet students.

A Soviet student's view of his own future is likely to be earnest and determined, an American's casual and not quite crystallized.

In the realm of morals, Soviet students are either charmingly innocent and primly moral, or uninhibitedly coarse. Young Americans are relatively more sophisticated and outspoken, but also more uncertain about how to behave.

There is an important contrast between the American's frequent and unself-conscious chatter about material goods and his liking of them, and the Soviet schoolboy's attitude—a priggish disdain about discussing such things, but, in fact, much more avid preoccupation with them.

Soviet students are likely to be proud of their country, including the achievements of the Soviet system, to the point of thin-skinned sensitivity. Their American counterparts as often as not will manifest a quite similar chauvinism, but also emphasize doubts, dislikes, cynicism.

I shall never forget how full of quick and independent opinions I thought my American schoolmates were when I first encountered them after a decade with Soviet pupils. Sweeping, pointed, sharply clashing judgments and attitudes seemed to pour out at a rate that was completely unknown to me in Russia.

Why do Soviet students appear to be so much more studious, earnest, determined, puritan than American students?

Because—

Under the Soviet system Russia has focused all its life on one objective: overcoming its position as a have-not, underdog, late comer. Just as naturally the United States, the most prosperous, productive, and powerful society of the 20th century, has engendered a work atmosphere that is at once more chaotic, less single-minded, and leisurely.

It is this, together with a dictatorial government whose central slogan is increasingly that of overtaking America, that molds Soviet education. No wonder, then, that such a society could start with vast poverty and vast illiteracy and yet before long end up with a vast number of specialists. For these are all specialists in the country's number one item of business—industrialization and material progress. Success should not cause nearly so much awe and dismay when everything in a huge country with fabulous natural and human resources is geared to one such task.

In concrete terms, the Soviet drive and political system are reflected in a wholly centralized and one-purpose type of education. All important, too, is the absence of a free labor market and geographic mobility, as well as the often-mentioned encouragement and sometimes mollycoddling of scientists and engineers. When these special privileges for the educated elite are combined with the still strikingly low standard of living of others in Russia, it is no wonder at all that students there will be endlessly more conscientious and grimmer about their schoolwork than Americans.

Since the U. S. S. R. today remains in large measure a latecomer society in a great hurry, it has reduced to a minimum the activities—and people—occupied with affairs other than the bare essentials of technology, management, and the Soviet versions of Hollywood and Madison Avenue. While we complain about the tastelessness of American mass culture, life here is not nearly so standardized or gray as in the single purpose Soviet society.

Yet the present population of the U. S. S. R., lacking the prosperity and old culture of the West or its own pre-Stalin Europeanized minority, does not find all this nearly so frustrating or repugnant as Westerners might. The Russians are deeply gratified by the material progress their country is making. Since most of them now come to education and the professions from distinctly lower class backgrounds, the resulting rise of status and income justifies most if not all of the hardships imposed on them and on the rest of the country.

Hence Russia, including its schoolboys, has only a minimum of need, disposition, or people to engage in the kind of independent living, thinking, and politicking which are an American trademark. Here and there the Russians covet more freedom especially in professional and personal domains. But the Americans' luxurious trust in drawn out public disagreements and little regulated human relations is something few Soviet citizens can ever accept or envy, not excluding the restive students and writers our press has been making so much of. It also explains why Soviet students are liable to be still more puritan, gauche, provincial, and chauvinistic than their American counterparts usually seem in the eyes of European critics.

These traits appear to be counterbalanced by attractive traits in Soviet youth: determination and absolute certainty about their own future, a high degree of pure idealism, an uncomplicated faith in many of the old verities that Americans either scoff at or inwardly doubt. But these attractive features are based on a narrowness which Americans, fortunately, do not possess.

What conclusions can we then draw from these inferences about Soviet and American education?

Above all, that the basic difference is one between the countries as a whole, between overall ways of life and stages of developments. These determine how students work, and what they want to be, more than any specific aspects of school itself. The Soviet Union is geared to telescoped modernization to the exclusion of all else; the United States wants to retain world leadership without sacrificing its free way of life. These are vastly different goals, and they cannot but be reflected in all aspects of life, including education. Until this is generally accepted in the United States, we are liable to overemphasize short run education gadgeteering and court failure in our long-run objectives.

Thus the United States need not and cannot insist on a wholly centralized and uniform curriculum. Nor can we adopt the old Prussian emphasis on rote learning and rigid discipline which dominates Soviet schools today, or imitate their neglect of independent thinking and broader vistas. Above all, we cannot consider a program of the Soviet type that keeps other parts of the population much poorer and almost eliminates personal choices on careers. All these things we should not do, and the sooner we decide not to do them (or to envy a society that does), the better.

This does not mean, however, as too many Americans are proclaiming these days, that we are hopelessly handicapped. If anything, the contrary is more true. The U. S. S. R.'s achievements are attained at so vast a cost and strain on individuals and all society that its present drive can persist only as long as these achievements appear greater than the hardships, and so long as hope exists of overtaking America, the U. S. S. R.'s present drive is liable to persist. But so much of this in turn depends on the United States either standing still, or declining, that any effort on our part, even a partial one, will bear much more fruit than statistics or logic might indicate.

Specifically, the educational system of the United States, as well as its science and technology, today remain on a considerably higher level than those of the U. S. S. R. The Soviets are advancing more rapidly, and in certain carefully selected areas they have recently outdistanced us. Yet our continued overall lead should remind us that the measures required are not nearly so extreme as pessimists and alarmists have been urging.

Therefore, I would suggest the following approach to the improvements generally desired in the country today:

Precollege instruction, in the sciences and elsewhere, is much worse today than it need be. With more money and a modicum of less indulgence (and blaming each other) by parents and teachers, a change for the better should not be at all impossible. We can do this without centralizing education, adopting Prussian methods, or sacrificing either nonscientific subjects or the student's individuality.

The fact that scientists will feel less indispensable, and less universally respected, in a society that already has reached high prosperity and power than in one which is seeking these urgently, is hard to avoid or to alter. But the American public, the Government, the press, and educational institutions can well start giving more approbation to scientists, scholars, and intellectuals than

we have in the past. Nor need this be motivated and manifested by the narrowly utilitarian considerations prevalent in the U. S. S. R. On the other hand, it may well be that some of our scientists and eggheads in general—like so many other Americans—crave more outside love and approval than they need or can ever get, and that some experts' present criticisms might possibly be turned inward. In any event, again no Soviet-type procedure seems at all necessary.

Much has been made of the financial considerations which keep gifted students out of science, scientists out of the essential noncommercial, pure research, and intellectuals in general from doing long-range and high-quality work. This is unquestionably valid, and large new amounts of money must be made available for each of these purposes.

The current administration proposal for Federal aid to education consists of tiny grants to prospective students, and much too little money for advanced research. So endlessly wealthy and productive is this country that this, too, can be changed without any of the primitive and dictatorial practices on which Soviet advances have been based.

Crash program has become a favorite term in current American discussions. In the realm of education, science, and research, such an approach would be little short of fatal. Perhaps we could risk it if we did not care about the people involved, used dictatorial methods, and would accept shoddy products as the Soviets often do. Barring this, there is no reason to embrace the desperate technique of crash programs, all the more so because other methods of improvement have hardly been tried.

The same is true of the teaching of science. After underfinancing and neglecting our educational system, we now want to produce, almost exclusively, Albert Einsteins. This is not only impossible but unnecessary. Neither mass production of scientists nor a large number of science courses in any way insures high quality. It remains to be seen whether such methods in the U. S. S. R. will produce a new post-1917 generation of outstanding scientists, of the relatively very few topnotch scientists and engineers that a great society requires. What we need, instead, is money and support for the gifted students and scientists that America possesses in quite ample numbers. On the crucial elementary and high school levels, this might well call for the establishment in all larger communities of special publicly supported schools for the scientifically gifted, as New York has done with the Bronx School of Science. In college, and particularly in graduate teaching, the key lies in a great deal more time and leeway for immersion in a complex specialty.

This is true, likewise, of advanced research. What is required is not one grandiose scientific "West Point" of science but large—not ruinously large—amounts of additional funds to the dozen or more already existing research centers across the country that are outstanding and capable of much more research, and especially more daringly pure research.

Perhaps most important, as long as we want the products of our schools to be not only good technicians but free men as well, we should never even consider stripping the curriculum of all but the bare utilitarian essentials as the Soviets have done. This is all the more true since a majority of our students will not be scientists anyway, and to impose a heavily scientific curriculum on them would be a waste of their time and their country's money.

In sum, my personal experience only confirms that we are mistakenly envying Soviet education for things wholly out of step with both our free society and our actual needs. American education indeed requires many improvements, to help make free citizens no less than more and better technicians. But these improvements depend on our own way of life and its continuing greatness, not on imitating or overtaking Soviet education.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the last article was written by a young man who has had a greater opportunity to study the two systems of schooling than possibly any other man in America. He was the son of a great United States correspondent, Louis Fischer. He was brought into Russia, went to kindergarten, grade school, and high school in Russia. Then, at the age of 17 or 18, he returned to this country and finished high school here, and then went to college. He is an intelligent young man, dedicated to the free enterprise and free political systems. His observations are extremely useful in seeing what is of value in the Soviet system and what is greatly mistaken, what is wrong, and evil and improper, and what we should not attempt to ape or mimic.

REMISSION OF INCOME TAXES TO THE STATES

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, the Educational Financial Assistance Act of 1958, a bill to provide financial assistance to the States for educational purposes by returning to the States a portion of the Federal income taxes collected therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3606) to provide financial assistance to the States for educational purposes by returning to the States a portion of the Federal income taxes collected therein, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I expect that my bill would provide about $1 billion for schools this year. It would return 1½ percent of income-tax collections in each State to that State in the current fiscal year. The amount would go up to 3 percent in fiscal 1959 and to 5 percent for fiscal 1960 and thereafter.

The States would be required to certify only that their allocations will be used to support public education. They could spend their sums for school construction, teachers' salaries, or any purpose they choose within their school programs.

As I have said, the American people are not now meeting their most important public responsibility—providing the money necessary for an adequate program of public education. Unless some entirely new approach is made, almost all observers agree, Congress is not going to meet this responsibility this session, and chances for our grade and high schools receiving any Federal money are close to nil.

The bill I am introducing constitutes just such a new approach. This bill will eliminate two major obstacles to previous aid-to-education proposals.

Because it would simply provide the people of each State with a share of their own Federal income-tax payments to pay for education, there is no basis for imposing any Federal restrictions whatsoever.

This will also eliminate any controversy over the racial issue, which has killed education-aid bills in the past. It will end the sincere fears of those who object to Federal aid on the grounds that it might lead to Federal control.

I realize that my bill does not provide aid primarily on the basis of greatest need. It is true that the larger and richer States would indeed enjoy a larger share than the poorer ones—because they pay a larger share of taxes. But all States will receive very substantial assistance under this bill.

What my bill does provide is immediate, substantial aid. Moreover, it assigns the responsibility for administering that aid to State educational agencies that can put it to work at once on the programs the States themselves believe to be most urgent. There will be no wait for new administrative machinery to be provided, no wait for new plans to be drawn up—in a word, no wait.

My own State of Wisconsin offers a notable precedent for my proposal. Our State returns a percentage of its State income-tax collections to the local government for local needs. That arrangement has worked extremely well for many years.

Actually, the principle is very widely accepted among the States. William J. Schultz and C. Lowell Harriss, in the sixth edition of their authoritative book, the American Public Finance, state that almost all States share one or more taxes with their local units of government. They say that the amount and importance of this sharing have grown very substantially in recent years, with more than $2 billion annually turned back to local units.

I might say that this is a way in which we can provide for the kind of progressive taxation we must have in this country if we are going to have justice in our tax system.

A return of this kind, whether it is made by the Federal Government or the States, is no grant at all. It simply is a return to the people of their own money, to be used for educational purposes as they think best.

THE URGENCY OF THE PROBLEM

Mr. President, when we solve the problems and meet the needs of education we go to the heart of the matter.

If we tune our ears to the faint beep of the circling sputnik we hear with foreboding the challenge of the future. But if we would tune our hearts to the cry of the schoolboy in the street we could intercept our answer to that challenge.

Will our swift messenger probe the mystery of the outer planets?

If so, that schoolboy must send it there.

Will possession of their secrets mean a more bounteous life and not extinction? If so, that schoolboy must know how to use them.

More than a century ago a wise Englishman said:

> The schoolmaster is abroad, and I trust him, armed with his primer, against the military man in full array.

He was right. I share his trust. We must send the schoolmaster out into the land, skilled in his craft and armed with

the truth, fortified with the knowledge that he is trusted and respected.

It is easy today to defend a program of aid to education on the ground that it is an answer to the challenge of Soviet Russia. That is a valid defense—we must win the battle of the blackboards, which is where the real battle will be fought—but it is not the best defense, nor even a necessary defense. Education for the good life in a free land is still the noblest enterprise men can embark upon.

Education is indispensable to the preservation of freedom. As Thomas Jefferson put it:

> Enlighten the people generally and tyranny and oppressions of both mind and body will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day.

The general enlightenment of the people which Jefferson spoke of has kept us free. More than that, it has assured to us that equal chance to grow to full stature which the word "America" means to the world, and which is still the most revolutionary concept at work in the world.

Mr. President, the hour is late. The need is great.

More than roads—more than dams—more even than the weapons of defense upon which life itself may depend—we need to look to the minds and the character of our children.

For what does it avail us if we guard the ramparts, and lose the citadel within?

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for the very able and inspiring address he has delivered—for what I believe is his maiden speech in this body—which certainly lives up to the high expectations we have always had of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The Senator has made a most intertesting suggestion, as to returning a given percentage of the receipts from the income taxes to the States. I take it the Senator wishes to make clear he refers to a percentage of the tax collected from each of the various States?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is no equalizing principle?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no equalizing principle. It is the money which the people of Illinois, of Mississippi, of South Carolina, of Kentucky, or of Wisconsin pay. A portion of that money would be returned to them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I presume the Senator from Wisconsin probably would agree with my wish that it might be possible to have an equalizing principle.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I firmly and certainly do. I would be delighted to work with the distinguished Senator from Illinois and anyone else who is interested in the matter, to draft some kind of a provision to achieve equalization. I think we would then have a near-perfect bill. The bill is deficient in that respect, and I recognize the deficiency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We from the North are sometimes accused of not being sympathetic with the South. The truth of the matter is that we would like to help States with low per capita income such as those of the South, by the use of some form of an equalizing principle. My State each year has large numbers of southerners, both black and white, move into it. These people are frequently handicapped by the fact that the State from which they came has not been financially able to give them an adequate education, and we therefore inherit many of the problems which arise because of the comparative poverty of those States.

In order fully to protect our citizenry, I have always felt it is not enough merely to raise the level of education for those who grow up in the State of Illinois, but that we should join in some effort to raise the level of education for the people of the country as a whole.

I take it the Senator from Wisconsin agrees in principle with such an approach.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree firmly and fully. I think the heart of the American dream is the equality of opportunity—and especially equality of educational opportunity. We cannot have equality of opportunity when there are schools in one section of the country which are inferior to schools in other sections.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe it should be said, moreover, that the Southern States probably devote a larger share of their income to education than a great many of the Northern States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure that is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Southern States are not lacking in a desire to support education; they are merely lacking in the ability to support education.

I have frequently made myself somewhat unpopular in my own State by saying I thought the citizens of our State ought to contribute to a national fund, even though we would receive from such a fund a smaller amount than our citizens actually contributed. The basis upon which I made the suggestion was that educational problems are national and must be settled on a national basis, in part; and, as I have said, the mobility of our population today requires that national minimums of education be financed.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin has made a very good first step. As I read the Senator's speech and listened to him I was reminded of the recommendation which a great authority on public finance made a generation ago. Professor Edwin Seligman of Columbia was for many years the foremost authority on public finance in this country. I can remember hearing Professor Seligman lecture, and reading some of the pamphlets he wrote, in which he advocated a coordinated system of finance for the country, under which the Federal Government would collect income taxes and then distribute a portion of the income taxes back to the States.

As I listened to the Senator from Wisconsin I realized he had reached, independently, the same conclusion which a most eminent pioneer had reached many years ago.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I certainly have. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his extremely helpful comments. I consider him to be one of the wisest men not only in the Senate, but in America. I am deeply flattered whenever the Senator assists me or has any regard for a proposal which I introduce.

I should like to say to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois that I think it is overwhelmingly important that all of us get a sense of urgency about the question of education. We simply must enact an aid-for-education bill of some kind. I hope it will be the Murray bill, which I believe is an excellent measure. Perhaps the Murray bill cannot quite make it, for various reasons. Perhaps it cannot be signed into law. Perhaps this bill or a modification of it could become law. There are evident, practical reasons why this is so. The important thing is to try and try and then try again until we succeed.

I think we have an absolute duty to the children of America to enact into law in the present session of Congress a substantial, yes a massive, aid-to-education bill. I think we must do it.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. First of all I desire to commend my colleague and good friend from the State of Wisconsin, and tell him I feel privileged in having been present in the Chamber to hear him deliver his maiden address on so timely a subject. I would have risen to participate in one or more colloquies with the Senator from Wisconsin during the course of his address had it not been for the fact that I was a captive in the chair presiding over the Senate.

Now that I have been relieved from that captivity——

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that I am very familiar with that position. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHURCH. Now that I am relieved from that captivity, I wish to commend the Senator from Wisconsin for a very able and eloquent address, which is most important and most timely. I want him to know that my heart is with him.

I would only raise the same question which has been raised by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] because, although I am a firm believer in Federal aid to education, I also believe that we must take great pains to maintain and preserve inviolate the principle of equalization in any program of Federal aid. Originally the public schools were financed from ad valorem taxes imposed by the local communities and counties, and it became evident that this was unfair, because the poorer counties could not furnish sufficient money to maintain adequate schools, while the richer counties could maintain such schools.

As a result, the State, which could draw its revenues from rich and poor counties alike, begin to contribute to public education. So equally, I believe that the principle of Federal aid to edu-

cation rests upon the sound principle that the Federal Government, which can draw its revenues from rich and poor States alike, thus is in the peculiar position of being able to distribute money in aid to education in such a manner as to help to equalize educational opportunities throughout the land.

So I want the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to know that I commend him for making this particular topic the subject of his maiden address. I wish to assist him in every way I know how to accelerate the enactment of a Federal aid to education program which will preserve local control and supervision over our public schools. However, in enacting such a program, I hope the Congress will retain a formula which will preserve the principle of equalization, upon which I think the validity of Federal support necessarily should depend.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the eloquent and brilliant Senator from Idaho. I am deeply grateful for his comments. I agree wholeheartedly that it would be desirable to have a bill which contains the equalization provision, but I wish to make it clear that I think it is more important to enact some kind of aid to education bill at this session. It can be improved later. But some such bill should be enacted during this session, even if we must sacrifice the great principle of equalization. I believe that we can somehow achieve that principle. With the enactment of this bill into law it will become overwhelmingly obvious to the American people and the Congress that there should be equalization.

However, if the only bill we can have enacted is a bill without such a provision, I will support such a bill, although, as I have stated, I believe that the Murray bill would be my first preference. On the other hand, I wish to show consideration for those of my brethren who may feel that there is something about the Murray bill which they may not like. I have heard some of them—many of them—express their support for a bill of the kind I am now introducing. I wish to give them an opportunity to support it.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to join my colleagues in commending the Senator from Wisconsin upon the originality of his proposal; but, even more, upon the sense of urgency with which he has stated his position and challenged the Congress.

I was privileged to have a copy of the Senator's address some time before he delivered it. He waited patiently in the Senate for quite a while before he was able to obtain the floor.

The Senator from Wisconsin was also kind enough to share with me a copy of his proposed bill, which I read during the noon hour and had an opportunity to study, at least briefly, if not in detail.

What I like best about the Senator's proposal is that, while it is, in a sense, new as regards the Federal Government relationship to the educational problem, it is tried and tested at the State level. Many times we have said that our State governments were the laboratories of practical experimentation for designing programs and policies which could be adapted or adopted by the Federal Government. I think that is particularly true of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is certainly true. In Wisconsin we have distributed our income-tax revenues to municipalities and counties on the basis of the origination of the income. Of course, this gives the rich counties and municipalities an advantage.

In addition, in order to equalize the situation, we have provided grants on the basis of need. I believe that we need both plans. However, this policy represented a breakthrough, which has enabled the State to assist local communities to raise tax money without the competition, which is virtually impossible to avoid, between counties and cities if they all have their individual income taxes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was impressed with the history of the State of Wisconsin in the legislative field, particularly with relation to Federal legislation in the field of unemployment compensation, for example, old age, and survivor's insurance, housing, and other legislative policies which ultimately became Federal. They had their days of incubation and original trial and experimentation in States such as Wisconsin and New York. The great social welfare programs for which Wisconsin is so well known became patterns which were adapted to the Federal structure.

The Senator from Wisconsin points out the experience in his State relating to the sharing of income tax revenues with localities and municipalities. What the Senator is now saying is, "Let us apply this principle one step higher, for the purpose of education, by sharing Federal income tax revenues with the States, the States, in turn, of course, to distribute such benefits among their local school districts."

The concluding paragraphs of the Senator's remarkable address are within the spirit of the philosophy of the Senator and of the State which, in part, he so ably represents. Let me read the concluding paragraphs again, because I believe that they deserve further consideration. The Senator from Wisconsin says:

> Mr. President, the hour is late.
>
> How right he is.
>
> The need is great.

He has documented that statement convincingly and certainly in his address. He continues:

> More than roads—more than dams—more even than the weapons of defense upon which life itself may depend—we need to look to the minds and the character of our children.
>
> For what does it avail us if we guard the ramparts, and lose the citadel within?

Those words are almost poetic. I hope they are not prophetic, in terms of the question which is asked.

The Senator from Wisconsin gives an answer to that question by calling the Nation, if not literally to arms, at least to a state of realization with respect to the condition of the schools of our country.

I am delighted to join the Senator in his efforts. One of the first bills I was privileged to hold hearings upon in 1949, when I first came to the Senate, was the bill which provided Federal aid for school construction in federally impacted areas, or areas which were under the impact of Federal activities. That was the first Federal-aid-for-school-construction legislation enacted by the Congress.

That law was supplemented by one providing Federal aid with respect to the costs of operating such schools in areas where there were heavy Federal activities.

Under those two acts—I believe they are Public Law 875 and Public Law 815—hundreds of millions of dollars have been given to school districts throughout the land where there are large military reservations and large defense installations and Atomic Energy Commission activities, and where there has been an increase in population, particularly in the school population, due to those Federal activities. Those Federal activities in recent years, of course, have been essentially caused by the heavy burdens of defense and national security. We made a beginning.

The record is clear that in those areas where the Federal Government has contributed literally hundreds of millions of dollars for Federal aid to school construction and Federal aid to teachers, and for the operation of the schools, there is not one scintilla of evidence of Federal domination of those schools.

When I hear the argument that the Federal Government will dominate the curriculum, that the Federal Government will dominate and supervise the teachers, or take over the responsibilities of the locality, I realize that it is an argument which many people make with a good deal of conviction—and there is genuine reason to be concerned—but the evidence to date is that despite the expenditure of almost a billion dollars in Federal aid for schools in areas there are Federal activities, which have placed an impact upon the school facilities, and in spite of the expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars, there is not one scintilla of evidence, not one iota of evidence, that the Federal Government, through its Office of Education, has in any way, shape, or manner, or form dominated either school construction programs or school teaching programs.

Therefore I salute the Senator from Wisconsin. I am happy to be associated with him. Of all the speeches the Senator could make as more or less his initial endeavor, this is his finest speech, because the topic is one of the most important and because of the attention the Senator has given to it, as is evident from the words that he has used and the feeling with which he delivered the speech.

I hope that every citizen of Wisconsin will have an opportunity to receive a copy of the speech, and I hope that the editors of the newspapers of his great State will review his comments very

carefully and give the public an opportunity to read what the Senator proposes, and of course I hope that Congress will take it seriously. I join the Senator in this most important piece of legislation that Congress can pass in behalf of the well-being of the Nation.

I hope we shall not have to have another sputnik, and I hope that Nikita Khrushchev will not have to again take us by the nape of the neck and shake us into sensibility before we do what should have been done under leadership and under the inspiration of American tradition rather than under the threat of evil forces from abroad.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. It is very interesting to me that he should discuss the great pioneering progressivism of Wisconsin. I appreciate the fact that he is a real student of Wisconsin government. It is one of the most important ingredients of the modern day liberal to understand the history of this Wisconsin movement and Wisconsin government. I also think that he is dead right that there is not a scintilla of practical evidence that Federal aid to education means Federal control. Lastly I believe he is so right in stressing the urgency of the proposed legislation. If we do nothing else before we adjourn in July or August, we should enact a law which will provide some kind of massive assistance for education in this country.

PAY TELEVISION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the past few weeks there have been a number of comments, in the press and elsewhere, about the tactics of the television networks in opposing pay television.

The charge, in brief, is that the networks have shaped public opinion against pay television and that, in so doing, they have shown that they have a tremendous power over public opinion, which, in the long run, may prove to be dangerous.

Recently, an interesting exchange of correspondence on this subject has been brought to my attention. It consists of a widely circulated letter from Commander E. F. McDonald, Jr., of Zenith Radio Corp., charging the networks with dominating their affiliate stations in leading a pressure campaign against pay television, and a reply to this letter by Mr. Richard S. Salant, vice president of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Mr. Salant quite eloquently defends his particular network against the charges brought by Commander McDonald. I think his defense would apply to the television broadcasting industry in general.

Because of the great public interest in this controversy, and in an effort to present both sides of the argument, I ask unanimous consent that both of these letters be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

ZENITH RADIO CORP.,
Chicago, March 21, 1958.

DEAR MR. ———: It would be presumptuous on my part to try to point out the extent to which the first article of the Bill of Rights, guaranteeing free speech, has been undermined by the overpowering and frightening development of TV. Free speech is not primarily the right of the publisher to print but the right of the public to hear and read all sides of a question.

So long as the newspapers held leadership at the bar of public opinion, every possible viewpoint could be presented. There are about 1,800 daily newspapers, about 7,000 weeklies, and many magazines of national circulation. Among these, the reader could select the medium that presented the news and viewpoints in which he was interested. Great press associations and columnist added their expressions of other, differing viewpoints and opinions.

Newspapers and magazines were supported in part by advertising and to a considerable extent by purchase of subscribers, who, through their subscription dollars, expressed their choice. But now the TV networks, supported entirely by advertisers, have developed a dangerously powerful position at the bar of public opinion. Their appeal is emotional. They reach their public not only through the ear but through the eye. Pictures were the cave man's mode of communication. Even children nowadays are strongly influenced by TV.

TV appeals to the emotions and emotions exert a tremendous influence. Radio and TV could give overwhelming advantage to a political candidate and assure him of public support.

Unfortunately, this vast power is wholly concentrated in the hands of 2 or 3 men heading the networks in New York. The networks have life and death power over nearly all TV stations, which, without affiliation, can hardly survive. The net result today is that two men, controlling NBC and CBS, have absolute power over what can be seen and heard in tens of millions of homes. No such concentration of power ever existed in the press and Congress did not intend to give it to the networks. Network control can be broken down, but only if independent stations are given additional sources of programs and revenue, which will free them from the present absolute power of coercion wielded by CBS and NBC.

The two men who head CBS and NBC control TV broadcast policies throughout the country by their economic domination of affiliated stations. Outside of a very few large markets, no TV station can prosper, and few can survive, without a network affiliation to provide programs and advertising revenue. Any station that gets too far out of the network party line is in danger of losing its affiliation, and facing bankruptcy.

This year, there was a frightening demonstration of TV's tremendous power to shape public opinion, and of the ruthless way in which two men who control TV broadcasting in the United States, can use this power to their own monopolistic advantage. One of the two men decided to use his power to kill off the limited test of subscription TV that had been authorized by the Federal Communications Commission. He figuratively pushed a button, and within a few days the Members of Congress were flooded with hundreds of thousands of letters opposing subscription TV.

CBS is the network that decided to demonstrate publicly this sheer power by killing off subscription TV. It called an affiliates meeting in Washintgon in early January, just as Congress was getting organized. It started the campaign on January 13 with a tremendous banquet for Members of Congress and other important people, and seated affiliate executives beside Congressmen to lobby against subscription TV. Then it sent affiliates home with instructions to go on the air with their TV stations and conduct concentrated propaganda campaigns.

The results were startling. One station in Champaign, Ill. (WCIA), ran a 3-day campaign, telling the public that even a limited test of subscription TV would result in its taking over all broadcasting and depriving them of their advertising sponsored programs. Listeners were urged to write to the two Congressmen in its service area who happened to be members of the Commerce Committee; which was right then conducting hearings on subscription TV, and urge them to bar subscription. Little children were told to have their parents write to Congress to save them from having to pay to see youngsters' programs.

Variations of this campaign ran in different sections of the country, with the net result that many Members of the Congress were swamped with more antisubscription TV mail than they had ever received on any one subject. If the issue involved had not been subscription TV, it could have been any other issue. The following are the important facts:

1. It took a decision by just one man to flood Congress with mail on one side of a controversial subject.

2. The campaign was based on fear, with utter disregard for the fact that subscription TV could no more take over what they call free TV than a few toll highways would take over our whole system of Federal and State highways.

3. Similar campaigns can be used to make the public believe almost anything that the network chiefs want them to believe.

Suppose for example, we were to elect the wrong man to the Presidency. Suppose he decided to use the tremendous power of TV to promote a nonpartisan issue, and enlisted the aid of the network chiefs. Suppose the issue were one comparable to the campaign being headed by Eric Johnston, on behalf of the foreign-aid program. Suppose TV stations all over the country went on the air with fear propaganda supporting foreign aid. Whether foreign aid is good or bad is beside the point. I daresay that such a campaign would produce millions of letters to Congress. Fantastic? The power is there, and it could be made use of if the wrong man came to power.

An effort has been made by the TV networks to repeal section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, which requires that stations shall give equal opportunities to candidates for public office. If this section is removed, the TV networks can not only control who is elected to public office, but what measures Congress shall enact. They will control public opinion on the dominant issues.

The power of TV to reach tens of millions of American homes and to control what they hear is similar to the radio power that enabled Hitler to overwhelm the thinking of the German people with the big lie and build his power. The networks are striving to maintain the most dangerous monopoly over American public opinion that has ever existed. Their broadcasting stations have used the big lie and hammered home the false statement that subscription TV and advertising paid TV cannot exist together.

Subscription TV was never intended to, nor could it, replace advertising sponsored TV. You and I know, and anyone else experienced in business knows, that you can never charge the public for the programs they now get free, and which are the programs they will continue to get free, along with subscription TV.

It is just as ridiculous to say that paid advertising programs cannot exist with subscription TV (which will carry no advertising) as to say that State roads and county roads and Federal roads cannot exist alongside the toll road.

The networks have been able to sway many Members of Congress to oppose even a trial of subscription TV. The networks know that this new service would lessen their coercive power over affiliated stations and give inde-

pendence to stations that are now dependent on the networks for their economic existence. Their opposition to subscription TV arises from just one thing—the fear of competition.

This network monopoly, is in fact, a threat to freedom of speech—of vital interest to every printed publication.

Ever since the Republic was founded, newspapers, magazines, and books have made it possible for every citizen to see all sides of a question. As Thomas Jefferson wrote his friend, Lafayette. "The old security of all is in a free press. The force of public opinion cannot be resisted when permitted freely to be expressed."

Sincerely yours,

E. F. McDONALD, Jr.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 26, 1958.

Comdr. E. F. McDONALD, Jr.,
Zenith Radio Corp.,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR COMMANDER McDONALD: I have just been shown the letter sent by you on March 21, 1958 to newspaper publishers and editors, in which you construct a highly imaginative set of situations indicating that CBS, through the facilities of broadcasting stations affiliated with it, is in a position to control the views of the American people—and that CBS has in fact improperly used such an alleged power to induce the American people to disagree with you about pay television.

You have lent your name to the propagation of nightmarish fantasy.

It is inconceivable that you as the organizer and the first president of the National Association of Broadcasters or anyone remotely acquainted with both the statutory and practical safeguards under which the broadcasting industry in this country operates could voice such charges. Your recital of the potentials of thought control betrays a total lack of confidence in the Congress, the rest of the Government, hundreds of independent broadcasters, and the American people. None of these has been or can be manipulated as you suggest.

Under the Communications Act, all broadcasters operate in the public interest, convenience and necessity. Their activities are subject to the continued surveillance of the Federal Communications Commission, which exists to carry out the intent of the statute. The FCC's statutory charter is such that it is legally impossible—even if any broadcaster wished—to operate contrary to the public interest, and it has long been recognized that a basic element of operating in the public interest is to present all significant viewpoints on any matter of public controversy.

There are, moreover, even more powerful safeguards against any such danger of thought control. The immediacy of the relationship between the broadcasters and the public would not let unfair play go undetected and unprotested, without quick and vehement public reaction. No broadcaster could survive the ill will that favoritism would justifiably create. It would be contrary not only to his economic interests but to his very survival, for he cannot survive without viewers and listeners. Indeed your fantasy is refuted by the facts—the record of the broadcasting industry in controversial matters is conspicuous among all media for the diversity of views that it presents.

You are, therefore, wrong about the potentials. You are equally wrong about the facts of CBS' position and activities concerning pay television.

We at CBS have spent a great deal of time and effort over the past several years in examining all the proposals that have been made regarding over-the-air pay television. The issue is not whether there should be pay television, but whether it is in the public interest to authorize the use, for pay television, of existing channels now carrying free programs. CBS has never sought legislation barring pay television systems, such as direct wire service, that do not involve the invasion of channels now devoted to free television. As Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, testified in January, we regard such systems merely as additional competition in the field of entertainment. We ask for no Federal prohibition of such competition. However, the proposals under consideration asked authorization to use the air waves, particularly during the prime evening hours through stations now serving viewers without charging them. On these proposals we wanted to reach a sound judgment as to our own interests and the best interests of the American people. After this examination, we came to the following conclusions:

1. Pay television does not threaten the economic interests of CBS or its stockholders. If pay television begins to supplant free television, we will offer pay television programs ourselves. Furthermore, we believe that we are in an advantageous position from which to move into any such development.

2. The use of any of the limited air channels now available for pay television would inevitably result in the end of free television as the American people now know it, with most American people who could not afford to pay for their programs having to put up with markedly inferior fare. The suggested tests of pay television would be so broadly conducted that in many areas there would be a blackout of any free television service to hundreds of thousands of viewers. In any event, there would be no turning back from such tests, which would establish nothing about majority public choice, except how many people would be willing to pay and that as few as 5 percent of present viewers would make it profitable to its promoters. Meanwhile, during the 3-year tests the channels used would be serving only the few who could pay during the prime evening hours.

3. The decision regarding over-the-air pay television therefore cannot be made by tests. It must be made, after thorough exploration of all the factors and effects involved, by the American people through their elected representatives, since the air waves belong to the American people.

On the basis of these conclusions, we faced a duty to do what we could to make known our views and the data on which they were based.

Since 1954, we have presented those views in Congressional hearings, in briefs submitted to the FCC, and in articles and speeches by CBS officers—all in the full public view.

You are also mistaken in your statements concerning the CBS Television Affiliates Fourth General Conference in Washington, January 13–14, 1958. CBS did not call this meeting or give any instructions of any sort. The facts are these:

In August 1957, long before the hearings conducted by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce were even scheduled, the CBS Television Affiliates Advisory Board, elected entirely by and from the representatives of the independently owned affiliated stations, met at Colorado Springs and voted—on the suggestion of one of its members—to hold their annual meeting in Washington and to advance its date from April to January. The idea was not ours; it was the affiliates'.

At the Washington meeting CBS was obliged to and did report to its affiliates its conclusions on the use, for pay television, of the air channels now devoted to free television. At the same session, the affiliates heard a report from their own spokesman, selected by them, on the subject. The affiliates, on their own resolution passed in closed session not attended by CBS personnel, opposed over-the-air pay television and urged that "all stations affiliated with the CBS television network immediately proceed to use their facilities to seek the will of the people, and that the reactions of the public be faithfully transmitted to the members of the FCC, Congress and other responsible Government agencies."

Some of the stations broadcast programs devoted to the subject. We at CBS had absolutely no control over such local programs. But we did suggest to the stations that they present both sides. Thus, a telegram sent on January 23, 1958, by the president of the CBS television network to all affiliates explicitly emphasized "the importance of having the true feelings of the public expressed to their representatives. Forums, panel shows and debates presenting both sides have proven extremely effective in illuminating the issues" concerning pay television.

As far as the CBS television network itself is concerned, we have devoted time on the air to this subject as follows:

1. CBS news coverage: The CBS news coverage of pay television has been in complete balance. Douglas Edwards With the News covered the Congressional hearings on 3 days: January 17, January 21 (there were no hearings on January 18–20), and January 22. On January 17 coverage was devoted almost exclusively to a detailed interview of W. Theodore Pierson, your own counsel, who testified in support of the pay television tests.

There were 29 lines of interview with Mr. Pierson. At the conclusion of the interview, there was a brief reference to testimony of Harold Fellows, president of NAB, that pay television "would offer the public nothing that is not already available on regular TV."

On January 21, Douglas Edwards devoted 6 lines to a summary of the testimony of Robert Sarnoff, president of NBC, against pay television. This was followed by a 14-line statement by Congressman ALBERT opposing pay television. On the same program there was a 4-line summary of Soloman Sagall's testimony in favor of pay television, calling it a natural result of what he called the dissatisfaction of the American public with the substandard television programs they have been receiving.

On January 22 about six lines were devoted to the testimony of Leonard Goldenson, president of AB-PT, and Dr. Stanton in opposition to the pay television tests.

The full transcripts of these broadcasts are available for inspection at any time.

CBS has never used its right to editorialize to take a position on the air in opposition to pay television.

2. Special programs: The CBS television network has carried three discussions of pay television on special programs. The first was See It Now, June 14, 1955, on which Dr. Stanton appeared against pay television and the following appeared for pay television: Paul Porter, counsel for International Telemeter; James M. Landis, counsel for Skiatron; Robert Sherwood; and Walter O'Malley. There was also a special film clip supplied by Skiatron. On May 1, 1956, there was as special 45-minute program called Public Hearing on Pay Television. It was moderated by Dwight Cooke. Appearing for pay television were: Mr. Pierson; Mr. Landis; Ralph Bellamy, president of Actors Equity Association; and Elfred Beck, owner and operator of a UHF station in Oklahoma. Appearing against pay television were: Victor A. Sholis, vice president of WHAS, Inc.; Truman Rembusch, Theater Owners of America; Leon P. Gorman, Jr., general manager of WABI–TV; and Sherwood Dodge, vice president of an advertising agency.

The most recent discussion of the issues was presented on the CBS television network Sunday, February 2, in a half-hour program moderated by Prof. George Williams, of the New York University Law School. He substituted for the program's regular moderator since we thought it inappropriate for a CBS employee to act as

moderator. The proponents of pay television were represented by Bob Hall, a director of Skiatron Electronics & Television, Inc., and the opponents by myself. Incidentally, CBS' mail directly in response to this debate, in which both sides had equal time, was 998 letters against pay television proposals, 17 for, and 5 neutral.

The only ways that CBS presented its own views unilaterally have been in printed publications, in speeches not broadcast, in briefs submitted to the FCC, and in open testimony at public hearings. The only ways that the CBS television network has presented the subject at all on the air have been in debates presenting both sides of the subject—with spokesmen from each side—and in news reports of public hearings that have given equal space to both sides.

Since the air waves are the property of the American people, any decision concerning their use must be made by them. To make a wise decision, they must have a full knowledge of the facts and their implications. The pressure campaign you have conducted for many years has presented only your side of the case. CBS has presented both sides in nationwide broadcasts.

While you have avoided personal appearances before Congressional committees and other bodies seeking to determine whether your proposals were in the public interest, this has not been true of the presidents of the broadcasting companies to whom you now attribute sinister motives.

Finally, we at CBS have far too much respect for the integrity of the Congress of the United States to share your conviction that at a dinner devoted solely to entertainment and attended by over a thousand people the votes of any Senator or Representative could be compromised.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD S. SALANT.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, during the past 4 or 5 years I have taken the floor of the Senate on several occasions in an effort to call to the attention of the Senate and of the Nation, the serious condition of the textile industry. I suppose that I am a little bit closer to the textile workers than is any other Senator, because I was a worker in a cotton mill for approximately 10 years. It grieves me today to see, as I look around, that during these 4 or 5 years, while I have been calling to the attention of the Nation the serious condition of the textile industry, approximately 400,000 fewer people are employed in that industry than were employed in it when I started to make the situation known.

In South Carolina there are 60 percent more unemployed textile workers than there were a year ago. That is how serious the condition is. I call attention also to the fact that in South Carolina there are approximately 28 percent of the idle textile spindles in the United States. That is why we in South Carolina are so vitally interested.

Another point is that with the drift of American manufacturers away from the textile cloth field, the business will go to other nations and we shall have to import textiles, instead of exporting them.

What is causing this unfortunate condition? Well do I remember, some 10 or 12 years ago, meeting in a room just outside the Senate Chamber to discuss with textile mill owners with officials of the State Department and others, the subject of rehabilitating the textile industry of Japan. At that time I called to the attention of the group the highly detrimental effect which would ensue if we spent money to put the Japanese into the textile industry in competition with the American textile industry. My words were not heeded.

A tidal wave of imported textiles is flooding the domestic markets, seriously endangering this basic American industry, and adding to the already alarming totals of jobless in our land. The condition of this industry demands immediate remedies.

From the figures on cotton spindles alone we get an idea of what is happening to American textiles. There has been a decrease of cotton spindles in place in the United States of 2.7 million since 1947. More than a million of the 21 million remaining in place are idle today. The ominous fact is that since 1949, the cotton industry in the United States has lost approximately 13 percent of its total market. With this decline has come a corresponding loss of jobs in the industry, plus the additional economic losses such dislocation induces.

Mr. President, it is especially noteworthy that while this loss of jobs was taking place, imports of cotton textiles increased materially, products which are manufactured abroad at wage scales one-tenth of those paid American textile workers.

Mr. President, what is being done about all this?

Actually nothing is being done about it.

For the record, Mr. Sherman Adams, assistant to the President, said in 1956, after the White House announced the Japanese cotton goods quota agreement:

> We shall not permit the United States Government to stand idly by while industries wither and job opportunities are destroyed.

Unfortunately, this is just what is happening to American textiles. Industries are withering and job opportunities are being destroyed as imports engulf the domestic market.

Despite the well-meant promise of Presidential Assistant Adams to protect American industry from inequitable foreign competition, the arrangement on Japanese textile quotas has been meaningless.

Mr. President, a few figures illustrate the story:

In 1956, the Japanese export quotas on velveteens were fixed at 5 million yards and reduced to 2.5 million yards in 1957.

Note the stipulations, and now witness the totals allowed to come into the United States:

In 1956 a total of 6 million yards of Japanese velveteens were imported here, and in 1957 the import shipments amounted to 3.3 million yards.

From these figures it can readily be seen that the quotas were futile despite the so-called protective machinery in the Reciprocal Trade Act which is supposed to prevent excessive imports. We have all heard much about the peril point and the escape clause, but to all practical purposes these devices are virtually non-existent because they are so seldomly invoked.

The history of the American cotton industry's effort to gain relief under the law is interesting. In 1954, the industry sought relief through the peril-point procedure. The United States Tariff Commission gave notice that peril points had been established, but the level was kept secret. It was later learned that the reason for withholding the information was the level was fixed at an unrealistic low point.

The following year, 1955, the industry sought relief by petitioning the Secretary of Agriculture under Section 22 of the Agricultural Act. It is important to understand the circumstances attending this appeal. That was the year reductions up to 50 percent were effected in tariff schedules which were too low even before the cuts. A long delay ensued—much too long—and when it was broken, it came in form of an adverse decision by the Department of Agriculture that no action was needed. So the flood of imports continued unabated.

The cotton industry then invoked the escape-clause procedure. In one case the finding of the Tariff Commission was against the petitioners. In the issue involving velveteen imports, the Tariff Commission, by unanimous decision, recommended relief, only to be reversed by the President, who held that relief could be obtained through Japan's voluntary quotas.

Mr. President, we all know the result from the figures I quoted earlier in my remarks.

The harsh fact is that the textile industry in this country simply cannot continue successful operation under these conditions. Relief is needed immediately: Action which will permit the industry to compete against foreign competition.

The present unfavorable condition of the national economy makes such textile relief imperative. Otherwise conditions in a basic American industry will worsen, swelling unemployment rolls, seriously impairing consumer buying power, and creating a psychology of depression which will inevitably spill over into other segments of the Nation's economic life.

In South Carolina, a center of textiles, we see these sorry results first hand. We are not discussing theories. We in South Carolina know what textile imports are doing to our industry, our workers, and our regional and sectional economy. We have no monopoly on this sorry situation. Everywhere in America the textile picture is the same.

Mr. President, let us make no mistake about it: The American textile industry is in trouble—serious trouble; it simply cannot survive indefinitely under present conditions. Time is running out. Until such time as Congress acts on legislation pertinent to these problems, the Administration has the stern obligation to administer the existing applicable laws in a constructive spirit, with due regard for the American interest.

REORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the President of the United States, in his state of the Union message, named de-

fense reorganization as one of the immediate and necessary tasks of the administration and the Congress. The President told the Nation that he would make this task his immediate concern.

Today the President sent to Congress his recommendations for defense reorganization. The recommendations undoubtedly will be amplified by testimony before the appropriate committees of the Congress and in the form of draft legislation.

But, from reading the recommendations which the President has made, I would like to say that I believe the President has met fully his responsibility as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the armed services of the United States. Anyone who reads the President's message will agree that it represents a grasp of the problem of defense reorganization which could come only from one who had been the military commander in chief of the armed services in time of war, had dealt with the practical problems of defense organization in time of war, and from one who is serving in his constitutional capacity of Commander in Chief as President of the United States.

There has been much speculation about the nature of the recommendations the President would make—whether they would be comprehensive and meet the needs of our time. I believe his recommendations meet the test in every way.

I have been interested in the subject since the President delivered his State of the Union message. As the Senate knows, I have introduced a bill dealing with the civilian reorganization of the Department of Defense, and have also spoken in the Senate upon the matter. I felt that after 11 years of trial and testing of the National Security Act and after the Korean war, questions have been posed by developments in modern weapons, including those made by the Soviet Union, which demand a reorganization of the Defense reported, and considering the continuing issues of security and peace, and of the maintenance of our economic stability, I believed the time had come for an extensive reorganization of the Department of Defense.

In the last few weeks, after the President had expressed his deep concern over the matter, and when plans were going forward toward reorganization, it seemed to me that the traditionalists inside and outside the services had begun to put up signposts against an adequate reorganization of the Department of Defense. But, from my reading of the recommendations and I cannot know now all of its implications—I am convinced that the President has met his responsibilities, and in a superb way, because of his unique and unparalleled experience, in war and peace.

While the President's message does not abolish the separate Departments, or the Services, or the Joint Chiefs of Staff, yet it seems to me that the functions in the Department of Defense, of the Department of Joint Chiefs of Staff, will be greatly changed, if the President's recommendations are adopted. The powers of the Secretary of Defense, both military and civilian, would be enlarged.

The President makes it clear that modern warfare and weapons require unified command of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The President points out that if unified commands are to be established, there must be a direct channel of command from the President, as the Commander in Chief, through his agent, the Secretary of Defense, through the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to the unified commands—in place of the present arrangement by which the channel of command is through the Secretaries of the respective services and the Chiefs of Staff of the services, to the military force.

This is an extensive change, which he has proposed in connection with the principle of unified forces and the command function of unified forces.

The President also pointed out that modern warfare, requires that strategy—and it seems, by implication, roles and missions—must be initiated by the Secretary of Defense, as the agent of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, rather than by the separate services. Obviously this is a major change, if it is accepted by the Congress. Perhaps it is not necessary that it be accepted by the Congress, because the President is the Commander in Chief; and I assume he has the right to fix the roles and missions, through his agent, the Secretary of Defense, within the broad limits laid down in the National Security Act.

The President's recommendations apply also to the civilian side and organization of the Department of Defense. The Hoover Commission and former Secretary of Defense Lovett, have reported the division of authority in the civilian administration of the Department of Defense. The law provides that the three services shall be separately administered; yet it purports to give the Secretary of Defense control and authority over the entire Department of Defense.

The President, too, names this divided authority as a weakness in the Department of Defense, and he unequivocally recommends that any doubt about the authority of the Secretary of Defense over the civilian administration of the three services should be settled once and for all. This will require legislation—to strike the requirement that the Army, Navy, and Air Force be separately administered.

The President pointed out correctly that this split in authority obstructs procurement budgetary organization, and in a field presently very important, research and development. In consequence, he recommends that the provision which calls for separate administration of the three services be eliminated, so there will be no question that the Secretary of Defense has authority over the entire administration of the Department of Defense. This is the core of the bill I introduced 2 months ago, and of the statements I have made.

Now the matter will come before the Congress.

Mr. President, the National Security Act was based upon compromise; and, at the beginning, compromise was necessary. But, after 11 years of experience, in view of new conditions, I hope the Congress will follow the recommendations of the President, and will support a reorganization of the Department of Defense.

It is necessary that this be done in order to preserve the economic stability of the Nation. The United States spends more than $40 billion annually for defense, and each of the three services spends more than does any other agency of the United States Government. In the interest of economy and for the maintenance of the fiscal stability of the Nation, the President's recommendations should be followed. And, as I have said, it is clear that, on the basis of security, the Congress should adopt his recommendations.

The President, with broad vision, says in his message that the question of security is really the question of peace, because an effective military organization is the deterrent to war. He has offered a plan which can operate effectively in the interest of the Nation's security, and in the interest of economy; and his plan will have a definite effect upon the issue of peace.

I hope the Congress will ignore traditional positions, that it will consider objectively and fully the recommendations of the President.

As for myself, I hope that in substance, and spirit, they will be enacted into law.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF SALEM, OREG.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the city of Salem, Oreg., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "approximately", to strike out "13.1" and insert "28.84"; at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "that part of"; on page 2, line 5, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "after independent appraisal thereof"; and after line 11, to insert:

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to relieve the city of Salem of any liability existing on the date of approval of this act with respect to the land described in section 1.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Salem, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of revested Oregon and California railroad land containing approximately 28.84 acres. Such tract is lot 9, section 13, township 9 south, range 1 west, Willamette meridian, in Linn County, Oreg., which includes Stayton Island and the left bank of the North Santiam River.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be conditioned upon the city of Salem paying to the Secretary of the Interior as consideration for the tract conveyed an amount equal to its fair market value as determined by the Secretary. The

deed of conveyance of such tract shall contain such other terms and conditions as may be considered by the Secretary to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 3. If a sale is not made hereunder within 3 years after the date of enactment of this act, all authority conferred by this act shall terminate.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to relieve the city of Salem of any liability existing on the date of approval of this act with respect to the land described in section 1.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I interrupt long enough to ask that the office of my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] be notified that the bill is being considered by the Senate. I think he may wish to be in the Chamber at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not have any further amendment to propose. But I wish to state briefly, on behalf of my colleague and myself, the reasons why I believe the bill is a very sound one.

The bill has been reported to the Senate with a unanimous committee report; and the amendments also received the unanimous approval of the committee. I find myself in complete agreement with the amendments.

Mr. President, Senate bill 2318, which was introduced by my junior colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] and myself, authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey at fair market value a tract of land, consisting of 13.1 acres, to the city of Salem, Oreg.

The city of Salem constructed waterworks facilities on the island, not knowing that the property is federally owned. After learning that the tract of land in question is federally owned, the city offered to pay the Federal Government the appraised fair market value.

Senate Report No. 1405 indicates that, under the Oregon law, the city of Salem incurred a timber-trespass, double-damage liability by reason of having cut the timber without permission of the Bureau of Land Management. Section 4 of the bill makes it clear that the city's liability in this respect is not released.

The Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget have no objection to the enactment of the bill.

The bill meets the requirements of the Morse formula. It is another example, as I have said so many times in the Senate over the years, that whenever a piece of proposed legislation involving the principle of the Morse formula arises from my own State, I can guarantee to the Senate that the Morse formula will be strictly adhered to, if I have any knowledge of the bill. The Morse formula is contained in the pending bill.

The bill, I think, is a very fair solution of a situation we regret, in the sense that we regret the property was taken over—shall I say—in the way it was taken over by the city of Salem; but the parties were innocent and there was no design to do it with knowledge that the property was owned by the Federal Government. The only fair thing is to pay the Federal Government for the property. That is what the bill does, and I urge its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2318) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAPAN-RED CHINA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was very much interested in noting in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 2, page A3172, a statement by the Committee of One Million, inserted by Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, the able Representative from Pennsylvania, concerning the current negotiations between Red China and Japan for a multi-million-dollar trade agreement.

I certainly hope that every Member of the Congress will give attention to the statement; indeed, it is my hope that Americans will become fully aware of this trade agreement. In my opinion, it is a dangerous situation where in Japan, which is a friend of the United States, and which is so closely identified with this country, is about to enter into a contract with a Communist puppet government which would enhance the latter government's military strength.

This situation reminds me of the time back in 1937 when I warned against the shipment of strategic materials, especially scrap iron and steel, to Japan. A few short years later came the infamous attack on Pearl Harbor.

Last month, Communist China's controlled radio broadcast the terms of the agreement, and the broadcast, according to monitored records, showed that there were two classes of commodities to be exchanged between Japan and Red China. Class A is particularly interesting. Communist China agrees to export to Japan such commodities as soybeans, iron ore, manganese ore, pig iron, and tin. In return, and this is very important, Japan agrees to export to China the following: Rolling stock and other railway equipment, power-generating equipment, ships and other vessels, various types of heavy and precision machinery, ingot copper, aluminum materials, steel plate, steel tubes, tinned iron sheet, thin steel plate, steel building materials, and sheet iron for oil drums.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks the text of the agreement as recorded by a monitoring station.

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

SINO-JAPANESE TRADE AGREEMENT

PEKING, March 5.—The full text of the Sino-Japanese trade agreement signed in Peking today follows:

"The China Committee for the Promotion of International Trade, on the one side, and the Japanese Diet Members Union To Promote Japan-China Trade, the Japanese International Trade Promotion Association, and the Japan-China Import and Export Association of Japan, on the other side, in order to further the growth of trade between China and Japan and to strengthen friendship between the peoples of the two countries, after consultations, have reached agreement based on the principles of equality and mutual benefit, as follows:

"ARTICLE I. During the period of validity of this agreement, the total amount of exports and imports will be 35 million pounds sterling for each side.

"ART. II. In accordance with the principle of exchanging goods of the same categories, the categories of commodities to be exported by either side—see annexed tables—and the percentages of each category in the total amount are as follows:

"To be exported by the People's Republic of China: Category A, 40 percent; category B, 60 percent.

"To be exported by Japan: Category A, 40 percent; category B, 60 percent.

"ART. III. This agreement will be carried out through specific business contracts to be signed between the state foreign-trading companies. Joint state-private and private foreign-trading companies of the People's Republic of China and the manufacturers and businessmen of Japan.

"ART. IV. Transactions between both sides will be evaluated in pounds sterling of the currency of another third country as agreed upon between the two sides.

"ART. V. Matters relating to payments and settlement of accounts in the transactions between both sides will be arranged by the People's Bank of China and the Bank of Japan through the signing of a payments agreement and the opening of clearance accounts.

"Before the signing of a payments agreement between the state banks of the 2 countries, direct business relations will be established between the foreign-exchange banks of the 2 countries. For the time being, transactions between both sides will be paid for in cash.

"ART. VI. Matters relating to transport will be determined through consultations by both contracting parties when business contracts are signed.

"ART. VII. On matters relating to the inspection and testing of commodities: goods exported from China will be paid for against certificates of quality and weight issued by the commodity inspection and testing bureau of China; goods exported from Japan will be paid for against certificates of quality and weight issued by Japanese commodity inspection and testing organizations. Inspection and testing fees for exported goods will be borne by the selling side. But the purchasing side has the right to reinspect and retest the goods after they reach the ports of destination. Reinspecting and retesting of goods imported by China will be done by the commodity inspection and testing bureau of China. Reinspection and retesting of goods imported by Japan will be done by Japanese commodity inspection and testing organizations. Reinspection and retesting fees will be borne by the purchasing side. In the event that the quality and weight of goods are found not to conform with the stipulations of the contracts, the purchasing side has the right to demand compensation from the selling side. This, however, does not include natural losses in quality and weight during transport. The period in which compensation can be demanded will be fixed by the two contracting parties in their contracts.

"ART. VIII. Any disputes arising in the course of carrying out the contracts or relating to the contracts will be settled by both contracting parties through consultation. If such disputes cannot be settled by the contracting parties after consultation, they can be submitted for arbitration. Arbitration shall be conducted in the country of the defending party.

"In China, arbitration shall be conducted by the foreign trade arbitration committee of the China Committee for the Promotion of International Trade in accordance with the committee's rules of arbitration procedure.

"In Japan, arbitration shall be conducted by the Japan International Trade Arbitration Association in accordance with the association's rules of arbitration procedure. The arbitrators chosen for the purpose are not limited to those on the list of arbitrators of the Japan International Trade Arbitration Association but are limited to persons of the nationalities of the People's Republic of China and Japan and those of a third nation agreed upon between both sides.

"Decisions made in arbitration will be final and the two contracting parties must observe them.

"The two sides should secure the concurrence of their respective governments to provide all facilities for conducting arbitration, for personnel of the other side to travel and to insure their security.

"ART. IX. Both sides agree to exert themselves to promote and strengthen technical exchange and technical cooperation between the two countries.

"ART. X. Both sides agree to establish, when needs arise and conditions permit, long-term relations to insure the supply of needed important goods for either side and agree also to hold talks on this question as soon as possible.

"ART. XI. Both sides agree to set up a permanent people's commercial agency in each other's country. The commercial agencies of both sides will be dispatched by signatories of both sides to this agreement, to be set up respectively in Peking and Tokyo.

"The two sides agree to obtain the concurrence of their respective governments to insure the security of their commercial agencies and their personnel and facilities for carrying out their work.

"Both sides agree that the tasks of the commercial agencies of both sides will be as follows: (1) To establish contacts and deal with all matters arising out of the carrying out of the agreement; (2) to provide information on the market conditions of their respective countries; (3) to investigate and collect information on the trade and market conditions of the country in which the agency resides; (4) to assist manufacturers and businessmen of the two countries to conduct transactions and trade exchange; (5) to establish contacts for and promote technical exchange between the two countries; and (6) to deal with other matters relating to trade assigned by the organizations which dispatched them to each other's country.

"ART. XII. The two sides agree to hold commodity exhibitions in each other's country separately. The commodity exhibitions of the Chinese side will be held in Nagoya and Fukuoka in 1958, while those of the Japanese side will be held in Wuhan and Canton in 1958. Each of the two sides should secure the concurrence of its government to insure the security of the working personnel of the other side in holding the commodity exhibitions, and conditions for carrying out their work smoothly.

"ART. XIII. The two sides will exert themselves to urge their respective governments to hold negotiations as soon as possible between the two governments on the question of trade between China and Japan and to sign an agreement.

"ART. XIV. This agreement will come into force from the date of its signature and will remain valid for 1 year. This agreement can be extended or revised after consultation and concurrence between the two sides.

"ART. XV. This agreement was signed in Peking on March 5, 1958, in two copies each prepared in both Chinese and Japanese, the texts in both languages being equally authentic.

"The China Committee for the Promotion of International Trade: Chairman, Nan Han-chen; vice chairmen, Lei Jen-min, Li Chu-chen, and Chi Chao-ting; negotiators, Li Hsin-ning, Hsiao Fang-chou, Chan Wu, Sun Chun, and Shu Tzu-ching.

"The Japanese Diet Members Union To Promote Japan-China Trade: Chief delegate, Masanosuke Ikeda; delegates, Koshiro Ueki, Seiichi Katsumata, Einosuke Maeda, Yoshie Morita, and Kamichi Kawakami.

"The Japan International Trade Promotion Association: Delegates, Kumaichi Yamamoto and Don Kawakatsu.

"The Japan-China Import and Export Association of Japan: Delegates Sanuro Nango and Hiroshi Nita.

"Appendix to the Sino-Japanese trade agreement on the classification of commodities:

"EXPORTS FROM THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

"Class A: Soybeans, coal, iron ore, manganese ore, pig iron, and tin.

"Class B: Rice, beans, coarse grain, fats and oils, tung oil, salt magnesite, magnesite ore, alumina, poshan bauxite, barite, clay, fluorspar, apatite, asbestos, antimony, kaolin clay—China clay—pig bristle, sheep wool, cashmere, feathers, various types of skins and hides, tobacco, bone gelahemp, meats, lard, intestines and casings, industrial chemicals, petrole products, varnishes and paints, talc, graphite, gypsum, realgar, marble, float stone, rugs, pig skin, various types of cotton waste and silk wastes, tussah silk, wheat bran, tung wood, straw braid, resin, nutballs, crude lacquer, musk, star anise, casia lignea, various kinds of spices, essential oils, fresh and dried fruits, wines and spirits, tinned foods, egg products, marine products, vegetable medical substances, prepared Chinese drugs and medicines, artistic handicraft articles, sundry goods, films, and so forth.

"EXPORTS FROM JAPAN

"Class A: Rolling stock and railway equipment, power-generating equipment, ships and vessels, various types of heavy and precision machinery, various types of complete sets of equipment, ingot copper, aluminum materials, steel plate, steel tubes, tinned iron sheet, thin steel plate, steel building materials, and sheet iron for oil drums.

"Class B: General machines and tools, various types of ferroalloys, chemical fertilizers, kiln products, medicines and materials thereof, chemical preparations and materials thereof, dyes, dyestuff intermediates, various types of chemical fibers and their products, various types of animal and vegetable fibers and their products, timber and wood products, paper, domestic animals, foodstuffs, marine products, sundry goods, films, and so forth.

"MEMORANDUM

"To insure the smooth implementation, on the basis of reciprocity and mutual respect, of the provisions contained in article XI of the Sino-Japanese Trade Agreement signed in Peking on March 5, 1958, both sides will adopt the following measures:

"1. To insure the security and working facilities of the permanent people's commercial agency and its personnel of the other side, each of the two sides should secure the concurrence of its government to give them the following treatment:

"(a) Both sides will take appropriate measures to guarantee the security of the commercial agency and its personnel of the other side. In the event of any legal dispute, it should be handled in accordance with the method agreed upon by both sides through liaison.

"(b) Both sides will provide facilities for the personnel of the commercial agency of the other side to enter and leave the country, give them favorable customs treatment, and freedom of travel for trade purposes.

"(c) The commercial agencies may use telegraphic codes needed for business operations.

"(d) The commercial agencies have the right to hoist the national flags of their own countries over their buildings.

"2. The respective sides shall decide the number of personnel in the commercial agencies of each side based on the (needs of?) carrying out their work. There will be no fingerprinting for the personnel of the commercial agencies or members of their families.

"3. Both sides will recognize that the present memorandum is equally valid with the Sino-Japanese Trade Agreement and is a component part of the trade agreement.

"Signed in Peking on March 5, 1958.

"The China Committee for the Promotion of International Trade: Chairman, Nan Han-chen; vice chairmen, Lei Jen-min, Li Chu-chen, and Chi Chao-ting. Negotiators, Li Hsinhung, Hsiao Fang-chou, Chan Wu, Sun Chun, and Shu Tzu-ching.

"The Japanese Diet Members Union To Promote Japan-China Trade: Chief delegate, Masanosuke Ikeda; delegates, Koshiro Ueki, Seiichi Katsumata, Einosuke Maeda, Yoshie Morita, and Kanichi Kawakami.

"The Japan International Trade Promotion Association: Delegates, Kumaichi Yamamoto and Den Kawakatsu.

"The Japan-China Import and Export Association of Japan: Delegates, Saburo Nango and Hiroshi Nita."

ORDER OF BUSINESS—COMMUNITY FACILITIES BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that, pursuant to the motion of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], which was adopted on Tuesday last, the pending business before the Senate on Monday, April 14, will be S. 3497, the community facilities bill. Will the Chair advise me if that is correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would it be in order to make that bill the unfinished business at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that it would not be appropriate, inasmuch as its consideration, under the terms of the motion, was postponed until April 14.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF COMMITTEE PRINT "RECRUITING AND TRAINING FOR THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1447, Senate Resolution 281, authorizing the printing of a Senate document, be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 281) authorizing the printing of the committee print "Recruiting and Training for the Foreign Service of the United States," as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—POSSIBILITY OF LATE SESSIONS IN WEEK BEGINNING APRIL 14

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would it be possible, under a unanimous-consent request, to lay aside the unfinished business and to make the pending business, S. 3497, the community facilities bill?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask that the request be in accordance with the action which the Senate has taken.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct; in accordance with the motion of the distinguished minority leader and the action of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that S. 3497 be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is again advised it would be inappropriate to make S. 3497 the pending business at any time prior to the 14th of April.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well. Then I wish to make another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The unfinished business, then, at the present time, is Senate Resolution 281. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to give notice now that on Monday, April 14, as soon as the Senate meets, Senate Resolution 281 will be displaced by S. 3497, provided the Senate agrees, so that we can keep the commitments made by the Senate in response to the motion made by the distinguished minority leader.

In addition, I think it might be well to inform the Senate now that the sessions that week may continue until a late hour.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST POWER CORPORATION MIDDLE SNAKE DAM APPLICATION

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 3 or 4 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Oregon so that he may make remarks which he has indicated to me will not take as long as 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I assure him I will not take that much time, and I invite him to watch the clock. I have 2 or 3 brief matters to discuss.

I am pleased to cover the first matter with the present Presiding Officer in the chair, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. I want the RECORD to show that I have examined the Pacific Northwest Power Co.'s recent application for license on the Middle Snake River, and question whether it is an application to construct Mountain Sheep Dam, as reported by the press.

The application seeks a license—

> Comprising such project works as shall be, in the judgment of the Commission, best adapted to a comprehensive development of that portion of the Columbia River system beginning at a point approximately at the confluence of the Salmon and Snake Rivers.

That language is contained in item 1 of the application.

Further, the application states:

> The applicant proposes to construct a project best adapted to the comprehensive development of the Middle Snake River. A structure * * * could be located above the mouth of the Salmon River (item 6).

The data on Mountain Sheep is merely "included" by Pacific Northwest Power Co. which states that it "proposes to prepare and present to the Commission appropriate information on alternative developments."

It seems pretty clear that the company is not presently applying for a license for a Mountain Sheep Dam. Instead, it seeks a license for the project which "in the judgment of the Commission" is "best adapted to comprehensive development of the Middle Snake River."

The Commission recently found that Nez Perce was the project best adapted to such development. The question arises whether the application is loosely or artfully drawn so as to include a Nez Perce license for Pacific Northwest Power Co. The company specifically excluded Lower Canyon Dam from its application. Whether the words describing the area covered by the application—"approximately at the confluence of the Salmon and Snake Rivers"—includes or excludes the Nez Perce site is not clear.

Clarification of this point should be made by the company so that the public, the FPC, and all others interested will know what is covered. There is little doubt that the application is not for nor limited to a high Mountain Sheep Dam.

Our experience with these people has been such, Mr. President, that I am well warranted in the suspicions I imply here this afternoon. I want to see the application tied down to specific language. So I raise that point for the RECORD this afternoon so that it can be said due notice has been served in the Senate that at least some of us are aware of the possible ambiguities contained in the language of the application.

I should like to make one other point very quickly, Mr. President. I have an interesting document in my hand, from the ticker tape. It reads:

> A Republican Party official said today the Democrats have a one-point program for resource development—"the Federal Treasury, which also must meet massive defense needs and other huge programs."
>
> In contrast, I. Lee Potter said, the Eisenhower administration has four points: "The Federal Treasury in degree—plus individual initiative, private enterprise and teamwork at all levels of government."
>
> Potter, special assistant to Republican National Chairman Meade Alcorn, discussed water resources and administration anti-recession plans in a speech prepared for a six-State regional conference of GOP women.
>
> Comparing Democratic and Republican policies as they relate to the Columbia River Basin, Potter said:
>
> "Between 1933 and 1953, the Federal Power Commission licensed basin projects with a generating capacity of 1,757,000 kilowatts. Since 1953, generating capacity of over 5 million kilowatts has been licensed.
>
> "In other words, 5 years of grassroots teamwork between the Republican administration and local agencies produced about three times as many kilowatts as did the talkative Democrats in two decades which ended in a basin brownout.
>
> "We've broken the grip of the dead hand of Federal monopoly on project sites, a monopoly which guaranteed only that those sites would remain undeveloped when vitally needed, as the Congress couldn't be talked into providing the necessary billions each year."

Mr. President, this kind of misrepresentation of the Eisenhower administration's power program has been characteristic of its spokesmen for some time, including now the new Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton.

I answered such misrepresentations, on March 22, in a speech at Portland, Oreg., when I had this to say about a remark to Mr. Potter's remarks, made by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton:

> Every year during the week of Lincoln's Birthday, the Republican orators take to the trail. With growing unemployment and business failures, the delays and snafus on satellites, the repeated failures of foreign policy, I wondered what a Republican speaker could possibly think of to say this year. In Texas, the fat cats wanted to talk out gas—and talked themselves out of a giveaway the Eisenhower administration was perfectly willing to perpetrate.
>
> In Oregon, the Secretary of Interior tried to make Republican hay out of Democratic seeds. Seaton boasted that the Republican administration was doing a fine job in power development, claiming that more electric power capacity had been installed in the Columbia Basin since 1953 than in the 20 years before. And he went on to say that most of the additions were Federal power.
>
> His figures were right.

What he forgot to tell the people of this country, was, as I then stated:

> The additions were made because the Dalles Dam and McNary Dam were started during the Presidency of Harry S Truman. It is amazing that Seaton would have the gall to claim for the Eisenhower administration progress in Federal power when his crowd only continued dams under way, and fought every possible new Federal start including John Day, Cougar, Green Peter, and Hells Canyon.

In fact, we had to ram some of those starts down their political throats, in order to get the projects started. That has been the record of the Democratic Congress under this administration.

Mr. President, in the speech I made on March 22, I answered further the kind of propaganda Mr. Potter released today, and I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from the speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

> In 1954, I twice succeeded in obtaining a Senate O. K. for planning funds for John Day Dam, which had been authorized in 1950. In that Republican controlled Congress of 1954, however, the planning funds were knocked out.
>
> In 1955, things were different. Instead of a Republican controlled Congress we had a Democratic controlled Congress. In the Senate, the balance was tipped by DICK NEU-

BERGER. In the case of John Day alone, we were able to obtain a 10 percent increase in what the administration had allowed for John Day planning. In 1956, Congress tripled the President's request. In 1957, when we asked for $8 million for construction, the administration wanted nothing. We got $1 million.

This year, your Democratic delegation asked for $10 million for construction at John Day because that was the amount the Army Engineers have said could be used. The administration budget proposed only $2 million. With the urgency for public works growing all across the country, and facing a fight with us for a more reasonable appropriation, last week the administration loosened up and proposed to spend $8 million for John Day construction.

From nothing, even for planning, in 1954 to $8 million for construction in 1958—that is the progress we have been able to make on John Day Dam against a heel-dragging administration.

For Cougar Dam, for Green Peter, for Hills Creek, and Holley Dams, the record has been the same. From an uphill fight in 1954 to increases over the administration budget in 1957 and 1958—that is the record we have made on power and flood control facilities in Oregon.

In each case, Oregon Democrats have joined in asking for amounts the Army Engineers have said could be used effectively and efficiently.

Mr. MORSE. I close, Mr. President, by saying that the press in my State today is carrying an interesting story to the effect that my junior colleague is in favor of a public works antirecession program whereas the senior Senator from Oregon is only in favor of tax cuts.

I am used to that sort of misrepresentation, Mr. President, from the press of my State, but I am always glad to put the record straight.

Let the RECORD show again—because it is replete with the evidence—I am in favor of both a tax cut and a public-works program. I take the position that the economy of the United States cannot only stand it, but the best interests of the economy call for it.

What the press forgot to point out is that my junior colleague is against a tax cut and only in favor of the public-works program, while I happen to be in favor of both these antirecession programs.

As I say, the RECORD is full of a series of speeches in recent days in the Senate in which I have taken such position. I supported the Douglas tax-cut amendment. I supported the Yarborough-Proxmire-Morse tax-cut amendment. I favored the elimination of many excise taxes, and the reduction of most of them. I have also, Mr. President, time and time again, urged—and I am ready to continue to support—a massive public-works program which seeks to bring some relief to the present very serious slump in the national economy.

In my judgment we will not accomplish what is in the best interest of our economy unless we travel both these roads—the tax-cut road and the public-works road.

SOVIET ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUSPENSION OF ATOMIC TESTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this will be my fourth commentary on the recent Soviet announcement of the suspension of atomic bomb tests.

I speak not in the role of a partisan critic, but in the spirit of bipartisanship which has surrounded our foreign policy in the past. I speak in the spirit of extending a plea for cooperative, consultative, constructive bipartisanship.

The Congress will be in recess for the next 10 days. Because of the period of recess, I feel the necessity today to lay before the Senate—and I hope before the executive branch of the Government—some thoughts and suggestions which will perhaps be of help. At least they are offered in a spirit of helpfulness.

It is now generally agreed, even by the President and the Secretary of State, that the Soviet announcement to suspend tests of nuclear weapons has resulted in a tremendous propaganda victory for the Soviet Union. Our response to the Soviet announcement has consisted of our top officials frankly admitting that the Soviet has performed a propaganda coup, to the President's announcement that it was a gimmick, to the Secretary of State's announcement that the President himself had considered such a gimmick, too, but rejected it as only propaganda.

The time for explanations, rationalizations, and recriminations is long past. The time for action and a clear-cut statement of policy and purpose is long overdue. I have been asking for that as one Member of the Senate. I have pleaded for it day after day. Any further delay can only lead to an even greater Soviet victory in the cold war and a further weakening of our position of political and moral leadership on the world scene.

What do we do now? How do we proceed?

OPERATION DISCLOSURE

First of all, in the administration's efforts to underplay the Soviet maneuver, it has completely failed to reveal to the world the scope, the intensity, and the dimensions of the recent Soviet nuclear and thermonuclear tests.

Mr. President, I venture to say that except for a handful of Members of Congress who serve on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and a few members of the Subcommittee on Disarmament—outside the Pentagon and most secret of our security agencies—there are few men who know of the dimensions, the proportions and the nature of the recent Soviet nuclear and thermonuclear tests.

Despite our Government's detailed knowledge of the nature of these tests, and of the type and design of weapons being tested, our officialdom has kept this a carefully guarded secret.

What should we do? Our first act should be to tell the world what we know of the Soviet tests; to tell in meticulous detail all that we know of the Soviet tests in terms of energy yield, design of weapons, size of weapons, and radioactive fallout. We know of this, Mr. President. We have kept it a secret, and thereby have permitted the Soviets literally to get by with political murder.

I suggest that we label the first exposé "Operation Disclosure."

In the month of August 1957, the Soviet tested successfully an ICBM. It is reported that two such tests have been made. It is known that the Soviet Union has developed powerful engines for rockets and missiles, capable of propelling massive warheads tremendous distances.

This was the significance of Sputniks I and II. To put into orbit a thousand-pound space satellite required rocket engines with powerful thrust, insofar as I know beyond anything we have developed to date. To be sure, sputnik was a nonmilitary device, but the propulsion system that made possible sputnik has military potentiality. It has terrible military reality when it is accompanied with a nuclear or thermonuclear warhead.

It is this warhead that the Soviet has been testing. It is a warhead of design suitable for the long-range missiles that the Soviet has been developing and testing. It is a warhead of such design as to threaten the peace of the world and places every free nation in mortal jeopardy unless it can be successfully destroyed in flight or counterbalanced by developments in the Free World.

Operation Disclosure, therefore, could reveal—if our Government would only speak out—that the Soviet Union has been engaged in horrible, terrible, and deadly business in these recent tests; and having accomplished its mission, it would now like to take off the armored plate of the warrior and cloak itself in the feathers of the dove of peace.

Yes, it would like to fly away from the clear and terrifying facts of its own recent actions.

I feel we should have exposed this information rather than guarding it as though it were a top state secret. It is these facts relating to Soviet tests that the world should know, back into the smallest village in the faraway corners of Asia and Africa.

It is commonly known that the recent Soviet bomb tests have literally poisoned the world's atmosphere with radioactivity. In hurriedly completing their nuclear testing program last month in time for the dramatic bomb test ban announcement—and, I may add, at the time great political changes were taking place in the Soviet Union, and at the time when the Supreme Soviet, its alleged parliament, was in session—the Soviet Union sent very heavy doses of radioactive debris into the atmosphere. This debris is now circulating around the globe. It is reported that informed scientists believe the Soviet explosions spewed into the atmosphere at least twice and possibly three times more radioactive material than ever before.

Why is it necessary for a United States Senator to make this revelation? Why does it not come from the Atomic Energy Commission? Why do we receive this information from foreign sources, rather than American sources?

Sweden has announced that radioactivity in her area has risen to within 25 percent of the maximum permissible

level. The head of the Swedish Atomic Research Institute has said:

There is no doubt that the alarming increase was caused by the intensified Russian nuclear tests.

Last week in San Francisco radioactivity in rainfall rose 200 percent. It was 10 times the normal level in Colorado.

I notice from the press this morning indications of high radioactivity in Missouri, in terms of tests which were made there.

Japan, too, has reported massive amounts of radioactivity in recent weeks. The Japanese reports indicate that radioactivity was the largest and heaviest ever measured.

In the 4-week period leading up to the last Russian shot on March 22, at least 8 Soviet weapons were fired. Three, according to reliable reports, set off within a 5-day period in late February, released the equivalent of a million tons of TNT or more, with all the subsequent and collateral radioactive debris.

Operation Disclosure would reveal that the Soviet Union, with total disregard for the welfare of mankind, despite its hypocritical pronouncements as to the danger of radioactive fallout, and its alleged desire of banning the bomb, a slogan it uses freely, has in recent tests polluted the atmosphere with radioactive debris while it tested and perfected its new lethal-warhead weapons, the long-range and intermediate-range missiles and rockets.

Operation Disclosure, if our Government would but engage in it, would reveal that the Soviet Union has also conducted explosions underground. Our Government should reveal this information also. We know this because these explosions have been conducted in areas where there have been no earthquakes of comparable size in 40 years.

These explosions have been measured and have been accounted for through the system of detection which is presently known.

What should we do on the basis of these known facts?

First, we should tell the world what we know of the recent Soviet tests. We should publish all nonclassified scientific information that we have acquired as a result of our study of recent Soviet tests and make this material available to the United Nations.

We should have done it during all the time the tests were under way.

Second, we should call upon the United Nations Special Committee, designated to report on the effects of radioactive fallout, to make an immediate and intensive investigation of radioactivity as a result of the recent Soviet atomic tests.

Of course, one reason why our Government has not engaged in "Operation Disclosure," and revealed the full scope and danger of Soviet radioactivity, is that this administration has consistently played down the fallout danger. Administration scientists have reassured us for 2 years that radioactive fallout is not a problem worth worrying about. It is difficult for the administration to expose the dangers of Soviet fallout when administration spokesmen go on TV every Sunday night minimizing the dangers of American fallout.

Meanwhile, we are permitting the Soviet to parade before the world in the cloak of peace when in fact under that cloak is the modern armor of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons.

Just as our Government should reveal what it knows about Soviet tests, so it should also state quite candidly to the world that our responsibility to our own national security and to the security of our friends and allies requires us to maintain at least a parity in arms—a parity based on the latest advances in weaponry and, above all, in the field of rockets and missiles. It is in this latter field that the Soviet has made outstanding advances and, as I have indicated, it is in rockets and missiles that recent Soviet atomic tests have been concentrated.

Despite accelerated efforts on our part, it is generally conceded that in certain types of missiles and rockets, we are behind the Soviet. This very fact threatens to change the power relationships. If the Soviet Union is able to perfect a nuclear or thermonuclear warhead for its advanced rockets and missiles, the power relationship in today's international scene could be seriously thrown out of balance to the Soviet's advantage. This fact alone could destroy any hope of disarmament and peace. It is impossible to overemphasize the train of events and developments that would follow from an appreciable further change in the power relationships favorable to the Soviet Union and her satellites.

With these disagreeable, but realistic, facts facing the United States and other nations, and with considerable information as to the nature of the recent Soviet tests, it is to be presumed that the United States Government will proceed with its proposed series of tests as announced.

However, the suggestion of President Eisenhower relating to these tests should be emphasized and reemphasized and implemented. The President issued an invitation to the Soviets and to others to witness the forthcoming tests. In other words, he has lifted the ban of secrecy. For this he is to be commended. I suggest that it be reiterated and restated and reemphasized.

I respectfully suggest that we go one step further—that we place before the United Nations the schedule of our proposed tests and call upon the United Nations to appoint an appropriate committee or commission to witness the tests and to review and analyze their results. At the same time we should call upon the United Nations to assign its Committee on Radioactive Fallout to make an intensive survey of the radioactive results of our tests with the full cooperation of American scientists and atomic technicians.

This would be the second step in Operation Disclosure.

Let me summarize what I have proposed so far: We should reveal all of what we know of the recent Soviet tests and then call upon the Soviet to place before the appropriate instrumentality of the United Nations her own reports and analyses of such tests. Then in the spirit of fair play and equity, we renew the invitation of the President to the Soviet and others to witness the forthcoming United States tests and also bring into play the agencies and instrumentalities of the United Nations wherever they seem appropriate and required.

Operation Disclosure, however, would not prevent the possibility of destruction and disaster. The world wants to know more than the nature and size of tests. It wants to know more than what new weapons have been developed. It wants to have a greater demonstration of cooperation between the United States and the U. S. S. R. than our willingness to stand side by side as we witness explosions of each other's weapons. It wants a broader area of agreement than merely studying the fateful consequences of radioactive fallout. It wants the United Nations to be more than a depository for information on atomic test schedules and the results of analyses and review from a remote point of observation.

PROGRAM FOR SURVIVAL

What the people of the world want is an assurance of survival. They wish to look forward to a future in which this tremendous new force of nuclear energy can be directed to peaceful pursuits. Humanity cries out for peace—peace that includes hope for the future, peace that includes the sunlight of freedom and opportunity rather than the dismal and dark night of war and tyranny.

Our present position of indecision, inaction, and confusion reveals us to the world as lacking in both effective leadership and constructive policy. There is an ugliness and an unwholesomeness about all of this. Our very image is distorted, twisted, and immobilized.

We still have time for constructive action if we will only resolve our indecision and decide where we want to go. Here is my suggestion:

We should immediately offer to negotiate with the Soviet Union a test suspension with inspection under U. N. supervision that would go into effect upon the ratification of the agreement. That is nothing new. I call upon the President and the Secretary of State to accept that position and to make it our official policy.

We must recognize that even under the best of circumstances, however, such an agreement might well take several months to negotiate. Thus, the present test series of the United States would and could be concluded in the interim.

But what is needed above all is a clear-cut statement of policy to the effect that the United States is prepared to negotiate, separately and distinctly from all other matters, a ban on further nuclear tests for weapons purposes, provided that an effective system of international inspection and detection is designed and agreed to. We should make it quite clear that inspection is essential.

We should request immediately that the United Nations appoint a special task force of scientists and technicians to prepare and design a detection and inspection system. Such a system should be in addition to our own detection and inspection facilities. This would not

have to wait the consummation of an agreement. Preliminary plans for a detection and inspection system should be in being ready to be used upon the completion of negotiations and agreements.

Therefore I suggest that we get on with the task.

It is not necessary for us at this time to specify whether negotiations for an inspected test ban should take place at a summit conference, a foreign ministers meeting, a meeting of ambassadors, or a meeting of the United Nations Security Council.

What is important and must be unequivocal is that we are prepared to negotiate through whatever channels seem most appropriate. The time, the place, and the participants must be left up to the President and the other heads of State.

If the Soviet Union refuses to negotiate and this by no means should be taken for granted, the world would have evidence that she is not interested in submitting to a truly responsible and honorable agreement on the limitation of these deadly weapons.

I repeat that it should not be taken for granted that the Soviet Union would not negotiate. She has given indications that she is prepared at least to begin negotiations.

If the executive branch of our Government continues to delay and hesitate, the Congress may wish to register its judgment through appropriate action on this vital matter.

The responsibility for our foreign policy, however, still rests with the executive branch—with the President and the Secretary of State. We have every right to expect them to lead and to act; in other words, to make decisions and to implement the decisions through the channels of normal diplomacy and the United Nations.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. First, I associate myself with the remarks being made by the Senator from Minnesota. To everything he has said thus far in his speech, I say, "Amen."

I call his attention to a resolution I introduced in July 1957, which is pending before a Senate committee, and which calls for a cessation of nuclear testing. To that extent, I may go further than the Senator from Minnesota; I do not know. But the Senator is talking now about the obligations of Congress possibly to take some action. I think we have already delayed too long in taking action.

I think it is interesting to consider the backing which my resolution has received. I have never received so much mail on any other subject in 13 years. The mail is tremendous from the United States, but it is also tremendous from around the world, because there is a great interest in the policies of the United States concerning nuclear testing.

I think it is a commentary that, although such a resolution has been introduced in the Senate and has received overwhelming backing, there has not even been a hearing scheduled on the resolution. That, I think, is some indication of how completely the United States Senate is out of step with American public opinion.

I say to my colleagues in the Senate, "When you go home—and you should not be going home; you should be here passing antirecession legislation—but when you are at home during the Easter recess, try out the question at the grass roots of America. Try it out on the university faculties. Talk to the scientists in the physics departments on the campuses of the State universities and colleges. Listen to what they tell you."

The sad fact is that the administration is out of step with the overwhelming body of American scientists. Oh, there are a few very able scientists whose judgments I respect who hold a contrary view, but they are in the minority among American scientists, because the overwhelming scientific opinion is that future generations are being endangered by the continuation of nuclear tests, and that such tests cannot be justified in view of what they are doing to the future health of the people of the world.

Nuclear testing cannot be justified on moral grounds. Neither can it be justified on religious grounds. As we rededicate ourselves at Eastertime to the great moral concepts, I suggest that we give some heed to the spiritual facets of the issue. I am a Christian who takes the position that a Christian cannot support a continuation of nuclear testing and still be true, in my judgment, to the Christian faith.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his very sincere and courageous remarks. One of the reasons I am speaking today on this subject is that I feel it is within the spirit of the message of the Prince of Peace.

As I said the other day in the Senate, what irony it is, what a paradox it is, that the Soviet Union, the nation which professes atheism, the nation which, in its official organs, at least, repudiates the traditions of Judaic Christianity, should today, in its propaganda maneuver, be able to parade through the world and make the people by the millions believe that it is the agent of peace; while the United States of America, a nation which prides itself upon its churches and its church membership, a nation which has many of the religions of the world within its borders, and is surely a predominantly Christian nation, should find itself in the position of being at least described before the world, or viewed by the rest of the world, as being unsympathetic to the efforts to attain peace.

The Senator from Oregon and I know that that is not our position. But, as I said yesterday, when the President and the Secretary of State branded the Soviet maneuver as propaganda, I said, "Yes; but it is effective propaganda."

Regrettably, what we are saying is not very good propaganda and is not very good argument.

I return to my theme. There are those who see little, if any, constructive good—many, indeed, see harm—from a test suspension, even with inspection. I repeat my earlier observations—observations, by the way, which seem to go unheeded in the official channels of the Government—namely, that to obtain an international inspection and detection system within the Soviet Union would be a political breakthrough which would have the most constructive and positive consequences.

The implications of inspection go far beyond mere science. If the Soviet Union were to agree to any reasonable form of inspection, which she indicates she would at least consider, it would mean a lifting of the Iron Curtain, a breakthrough of monumental proportions in the political structure.

Let me say, however, a few words about the merits of a test suspension policy. It would tend to retard the spread of nuclear-weapons development throughout the world. This is what we should hope and pray for. It would give time for scientists to study further the effects of radioactive fallout, a study which is desperately needed. But a test suspension will not reduce any of the deadly weapons in the nuclear stockpiles of the Soviet Union, the United States, and the United Kingdom. It will not necessarily stop the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes.

Therefore, I think it would be imperative that during a test suspension period, prolonged and concentrated work be devoted to determining other measures which might bring under control the threat of nuclear war with highly radioactive weapons. A test suspension of limited duration could put pressure on the major powers to suggest other workable proposals.

I believe that if we could get one step of agreement which was safe and real, we would be at least on the threshold of making more agreements.

A cessation of the tests of weapons would not call for an end to the testing of nuclear and thermonuclear devices for peaceful purposes. We must differentiate between the testing of weapons and of nuclear devices and materials for peaceful purposes; in fact, we should contemplate a policy which would allow testing under international auspices or international observation for peaceful purposes. We should make this quite clear in any agreement or in any series of negotiations.

I believe there is validity to the argument that an agreement which purports to stop scientific progress in peaceful pursuits will not be effective in the long run. It is claimed that if nuclear explosives can be used in peaceful projects, all mankind would benefit. This argument has merit. I also recognize that the same technology which might make nuclear explosives usable in peaceful pursuits might also be applied to making weapons with vastly diminished radioactive fallout. Therefore, I think that while it may not be necessary for nations to continue to develop so-called clean weapons, it would be desirable to allow an international agency or nations under international supervision to conduct research and tests to develop nuclear explosives for peaceful pursuits.

The so-called clean-weapon argument merits further comment.

The concept of a clean bomb has been ridiculed by the U. S. S. R., has been declared a contradiction in terms by some groups in this country, and has been declared by many scientists to be impossible of attainment.

All of these claims have some validity. Mr. Khrushchev, the Soviet First Minister, makes a telling point in saying that the word "clean" should never be ascribed to a weapon which will always have dirty or destructive results if used.

It also appears clear that even the AEC scientists most dedicated to the need for continued testing, do not claim that all the radioactive byproducts of a test can be eliminated.

But it is important to try to state the case of those who advocate continued testing in order to minimize fallout. To state such a case is difficult because the administration in general, the Defense Department, and the AEC in particular, are mysteriously reluctant to share information on this matter with the American people. I hope my comments do not mislead. But if I am in error to any great extent, I invite the executive branch to clarify any misstatements of fact, for the benefit of the American people as a whole, as well as myself, in particular.

Under present circumstances, all of the bombs and nuclear weapons in the stockpiles of the United States and the U. S. S. R. and, I suppose, the United Kingdom consist of materials which would emit dangerous radioactive substances if exploded. If an armed conflict were started and if these weapons were used, there would be two unique results in addition to the awful specter of conventional warfare.

In the first place, if the United States and the U. S. S. R. used these highly radioactive weapons on targets in each other's territory, the prevailing winds would destroy areas far beyond the scene of the conflict. It is said by some that if the United States and the U. S. S. R. wish to kill off each nation's population, that is one thing; but the people of India, Egypt, Norway, and Brazil, to mention but a few of the bystanders, should not die in the process from the lethal radioactive dust that would slowly encompass the earth. Therefore, it is argued by some, if the two giants must be destroyed, let the rest of the world be saved; and the way to do this is to have weapons with a minimum of fallout.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In December, when I was in New Delhi, India, I heard representatives of Asian and African countries make the same argument the Senator from Minnesota has made just now. They pointed out that their countries simply cannot stand by, as innocent bystanders, because if Russia and other nations were to engage in atomic warfare, even though they did not drop a single bomb on Asia or Africa, the people of those areas would die by the thousands.

That point raises again this question and the disarmament issue, on which the Senator from Minnesota is one of the leading authorities in the Senate of the United States.

I believe we are wasting time, whereas we should be pursuing a course which would enable us to find a moral answer to this question. We shall not find it by continuing these tests.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his contribution.

Mr. President, if anyone has any doubt as to the validity of the observation the Senator from Oregon has just made, it is only necessary to study any of the public-opinion polls which have been taken anywhere in the world on this question. The results of the polls are overwhelming. For instance, I have in my folder a copy of a poll which appeared in January. It is most disturbing. The headline under which the poll was published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune on January 8, 1958, is: "Most of World Sees United States Losing Cold War." The samplings for the poll were taken in Washington, Chicago, Copenhagen, Paris, Helsinki, London, Stockholm, Athens, Toronto, Vienna, New Delhi, Berlin, and Johannesburg. As a result, a fairly good cross section of public opinion was obtained. In fact, most of those cities are in territory which is rather friendly to the United States. The poll shows that 48 percent of those whose opinion was sought thought Russia was ahead in winning the cold war; 22 percent thought the United States and the rest of the Western World were ahead; and the rest were undecided.

One of the points brought out vividly in the various polls is the terrific public-opinion resistance to the United States because of the question of radioactive fallout from the testing of nuclear weapons.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator from Minnesota have in his file the testimony which Lt. Gen. James Gavin gave a year or so ago? At that time he stated, as I recall, that the direction in which the wind happened to blow at the time would determine what people would be affected by any atomic holocaust.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Montana is correct; that testimony was brought to our attention. I remember the immediate press reaction and the noitces which properly were given to it. General Gavin stated that the number of persons who would be the casualties in such an event would be enormous.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The number he gave was in the tens of millions, as I recall, depending on which way the wind happened to blow at the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota is rendering a great service by the series of speeches he is making, and certainly this is the time when they should be made.

I wonder whether he will obtain a symposium of the testimony which has been given by Lieutenant General Gavin and others.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and I think it will be very helpful to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall have the staff obtain it, so it can be presented here following the Easter recess.

The second argument made in behalf of weapons of reduced radioactivity is that such weapons are needed for self-defense at home. If the Soviet Union were to launch to a large-scale missile and long-range bomber attack on this country, I am told our only hope of defense against such an attack would be defensive missiles with nuclear warheads. Although it seems highly unlikely that we can ever erect an adequate missile-defense system, nevertheless the nuclear warheads now produced for defense missiles are full of radioactive substances. Thus, any defense against missiles at the present time would result in showers of radioactive debris all over our cities and towns where a missile and antimissile battle would take place. This is an important point. The one defense against Soviet missiles would, if used, kill many of our own civilians in the process. Therefore, our missile defenses, so the argument goes, must have warheads with as little radioactivity involved as is possible.

This is a serious problem. It should not be discounted. Mr. President, I do not claim to have any expert, scientific knowledge in this field, but I do not think that in order to obtain weapons with reduced radioactive fall-out, we should refuse to seek an agreement to suspend the tests of such weapons. This is why I stress the point that research should continue, in order to perfect nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes.

But, Mr. President, that is a great deal different from testing nuclear weapons of the large megaton and kiloton size, which are being tested and are filling the atmosphere with radioactive debris. There is a great deal of difference between underground tests and explosions and those in the air or on the surface of the land.

Of course it is true that the knowledge gained in perfecting the use of such explosives for peaceful purposes could be applied to weapons. Therefore, during the period of test suspension, research under international auspices should proceed for clean explosives; and at the same time the major powers should decide to what extent the stockpiles of dirty weapons can be eliminated or controlled, or used for peaceful purposes, and, if necessary, whether there should, and could, be a way to substitute weapons with reduced fallout for the present killers in the stockpile. These are some of the possibilities.

Mr. President, let me review what I believe a test suspension would amount to. A test suspension would undertake to postpone tests for weapons purposes, but it would not stop research for peaceful purposes. A test suspension would not preclude the development of nuclear explosives with reduced or vastly eliminated radioactivity. A test suspension would not change the present state of

United States deterrence, relative to that of the Soviet Union, in the nuclear field. Allegedly, we are out in front, anyway. A test suspension would not be total disarmament. A test suspension would be, at best, a trial experiment.

Mr. President, a test suspension on our initiative, with our leadership, would indicate to the rest of the world that the people of the United States seek to turn powerful atomic energy into use for peaceful purposes, in peaceful pursuits; to turn it from death and destruction to hope and opportunity; to turn the powerful weapons we have created into peaceful instruments, so we can literally move mountains and irrigate the land and reclaim the countryside by means of the great energy of atomic power.

Mr. President, let us at least try to effectuate this proposal. Let us hope that during this Easter season, the President of the United States and those associated with him in carrying forward our state policy and our national security measures will call upon the rest of the world to join with the United States of America in abandoning these weapons, in terms of the testing of weapons, and in using them for peaceful purposes, under effective international inspection in which we cooperate, and to which we offer our wholehearted support.

Mr. President, following the Easter recess, I intend to discuss in more detail some of the developments in the field of detection and inspection which I believe this country ought to know. I have been encouraging, to the best of my ability, the executive branch to release information to the American people as to the reliability of our inspection and detection system. I know that there is a necessity for security in many of these matters, and I shall always abide by it, but I am afraid sometimes our addiction to secrecy and security prejudices the possibility of the American people to make an honorable and justifiable decision. Yet, the people of the world today are looking to America for a ray of hope. They are looking for us to give them some leadership, some sense of direction out of the morass of despair into which the world has fallen.

I hope the Easter season will remind us again of the teachings of the Prince of Peace and of the necessity for acting within the spirit of His teachings.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION BY SENATOR HOLLAND OF RICHARD A. MACK TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the resignation of Mr. Richard A. Mack as a member of the Federal Communications Commission, which was publicly stated as having been requested by representatives of the President, and which occurred during the pending hearings of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, chairmaned by the Honorable OREN HARRIS, places upon me the duty of incorporating in the permanent record of the Senate a short statement of the facts upon which I recommended Mr. Mack to the President for appointment to this highly responsible office. I feel that I owe this duty not only to the President, but also to the Members of the Senate who voted to confirm Mr. Mack and to the members of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who voted to recommend confirmation. Of course, I feel that I owe this duty likewise to the Florida people, to Mr. Mack himself, to my colleague, Senator SMATHERS, and myself, inasmuch as we joined in recommending Mr. Mack to the President and to the members of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and through said committee to the full membership of the Senate.

In 1947 Mr. Mack, then a complete newcomer to public office whom I had not previously known, was appointed to the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission by the then Governor of Florida, Hon. Millard Caldwell, to fill out an unexpired term. He was nominated to the office for a full 4 year term in the Florida primary elections of 1948 by an impressive statewide vote.

Mr. Mack became Chairman of said Commission in 1951. In 1952 he was renominated in the first primary for a second full term by a substantial majority over 3 opponents. I met Mr. Mack both socially and at public meetings on infrequent occasions after his appointment in 1947 and prior to the date of his appointment to the FCC. On every such occasion and in every way Mr. Mack impressed me most favorably.

In February of 1951 Mr. Mack approached my colleague, Senator SMATHERS, and me with regard to his desire to receive an appointment to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Many recommendations from outstanding citizens of Florida came to me in Mr. Mack's behalf, and in addition his official performance of his duties on the Florida commission was generally recognized as of the highest caliber. As a member of the National Association of Railroads and Public Utilities Commissioners, Mr. Mack represented said association as a cooperating member of ICC and FCC panels. He was a member of the executive committee of said national association. He was a member of the committee set up by ICC Commissioner James K. Knudson to assist him in his capacity as Administrator of the Defense Transportation Administration. In view of his excellent performance in his Florida office, Senator SMATHERS and I jointly recommended him, under date of April 24, 1951, to President Truman for consideration for appointment to ICC or to FCC if a Democratic vacancy should develop in either body.

On October 17, 1951, I received a resolution from the Southeastern Association of Railroads and Public Utilities Commissioners endorsing Mr. Mack for appointment to an impending vacancy on the Federal Power Commission. Many highly responsible Florida people joined in this endorsement. Realizing that no vacancies existed or were in immediate prospect on either ICC or FCC, for which we had previously recommended Mr. Mack, Senator SMATHERS and I jointly on October 25, 1951 recommended to President Truman that Mr. Mack be considered for appointment to any appropriate vacancy that might occur on the FPC. Nothing materialized from either of these two efforts, although I continued to receive from time to time additional strong endorsements from Florida people of Mr. Mack's availability for appointment to these Commissions.

The matter lay dormant until April of 1955, when the report reached me that a Democratic vacancy on the FCC was about to occur because the President did not intend to reappoint a Democratic member whose term was expiring, and that the President would like to consider making an appointment from our State or from the southeastern area. I called Gov. Sherman Adams at the White House and, failing to reach him, talked to Mr. Charles Willis, who confirmed the report which I had heard and referred me to Chairman McConnaughey of FCC, who advised me within a few days that Mr. Mack was 1 of 2 persons from the southeastern area, the other being from another southern State, who were being considered for the FCC appointment.

Mr. McConnaughey told me that he would ask Mr. Mack to come to Washington for an interview with him to determine his qualifications and his ability to fit into the Commission. Mr. McConnaughey called me later to say that he was favorably impressed by Mr. Mack.

Within a few days I was told by the White House that Mr. Mack's candidacy had the support of the Florida State Republican officials. He was also supported by various segments of the communications industry and numerous Florida officials and individual citizens.

We gladly recommended Mr. Mack for appointment to the FCC because we heard from every source available to us that he was recognized as one of the ablest young men in his field of service. We felt that he was well qualified to render outstanding service to the Federal Government such as he had rendered to the State of Florida in a similar regulatory position for about 8 years. We learned nothing whatever of a derogatory nature either about his personal life or about any business or other connections of his that would in any way interfere with the honorable discharge of his responsibilities.

Still later I was advised by Governor Adams that a thorough FBI investigation had been completed and that Mr. Mack had received an excellent report from the FBI. There was every reason, therefore, why the Florida Senators could and should support the appointment of Mr. Mack, a seemingly qualified applicant, a Democrat and a respected Floridian, to this important Federal post. Similar reason existed for the approval of Mr. Mack by the officials of the Republican organization in Florida, his nomination by the President, the approving report on his nomination by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and his confirmation by action of the full Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1740. An act to authorize the payment from the employees' life-insurance fund of expenses incurred by the Civil Service Commission in making certain beneficial association assumption agreements and to extend the time for making such agreements;

H. R. 776. An act to permit temporary free importation of automobiles and parts of automobiles when intended solely for show purposes;

H. R. 5005. An act to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude chicory and to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to chicory;

H. R. 8794. An act to provide exemptions from the tax imposed on admissions for admission to certain musical and dramatic performances and certain athletic events;

H. R. 9821. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, and the act approved June 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 374), to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 347. A joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the several States and foreign countries to take part in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to June 13, 1958.

EXERCISE OF EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from time to time I have spoken harshly of certain newspapers. In my judgment, they have deserved the criticism because they have failed upon occasion to honor the trust that they enjoy in our country. The trust and responsibility is theirs of reporting fairly, accurately, and objectively. Such objective reporting is indispensable to the citizen if decisions on public matters are to be informed decisions.

Because I have been critical in some instances, it is incumbent upon me to give deserved praise when such is due. It is an even greater joy to me to be able to commend honestly a newspaper with whose editorial judgments I am in general disagreement.

This morning, Mr. President, a newspaper representing the viewpoint of the financial community, the Wall Street Journal, published two items which deserve widespread and thoughtful consideration.

The first story concerns the Office of the President of the United States, and is a factual description of the organizational changes which have taken place under the present holder. The second piece is an editorial entitled "Power and Privilege." This is a discussion of the constitutional aspects of what has come to be termed "executive privilege."

These two items are interrelated and both address themselves to a problem which is causing an increasing sense of concern to many people. This is the problem of executive responsibility or more precisely, presidential responsibility.

When it is openly stated by the Secretary of the Cabinet, Mr. Rabb, that the President has concentrated upon 5 percent of his tasks giving what time he has to spare to the other 95 percent, there is indeed a grave cause for concern. Let us hope, in the name of charity, that Mr. Raab overspoke. But even if only 50 percent of the delegated or discarded duties—and here, Mr. President, I use the words that were used by Mr. Raab in the interview—were to be vested in appointed personnel, the thesis of the editorial in the Wall Street Journal still remains striking.

Mr. President, I should like to quote from the editorial:

> Executive privilege is a matter that the Congress and the executive branch have locked horns on a number of times, and unless we are greatly mistaken, Congress has never conceded that, as a matter of broad policy, the executive branch has a blanket right to refuse information to the lawmakers. Presidents have done so—mostly for political reasons to keep the opposition from making too much sunny hay—and when Presidents have refused, the majority in Congress did not think the issue important enough to settle the question whether there is actually any legal right to executive privilege, or like Topsy, it just grew.

My comment here, Mr. President, is that the strictures of the editorial do fairly reflect the situation.

There have been many individual Senators, on both sides of the aisle, who from time to time, have raised their voices in warning, but whose advice was not taken, and thus, Mr. President, in one sense the Congress is open to the charge that we have permitted the practice of executive privilege to grow completely out of bounds. I might add that if we have been guilty in the past we owe it to the people and to our own institutions to make sure that we do not continue to do so in the future.

I desire to make very clear, that I have always recognized—and I recognize today—the power of the President of the United States under the separation of powers doctrine to refrain from giving to the Congress of the United States information the publication of which he believes would in any way impede him in performing his executive functions and powers granted to him by the Constitution of the United States.

As a matter of constitutional law there is no doubt that such inherent power vests in the Office of the President of the United States under the separation of powers doctrine.

What has been overlooked in so much of the debate on this matter is that it is not a constitutional mandate—it is what we lawyers call a permissive power. There is nothing which prevents the President of the United States from making available to the Congress so-called executive information, if Congress in good faith seeks that information and believes it is necessary as an aid to Congress in carrying out the legislative process.

The exercise of such permissive authority on the part of a President in no way weakens the executive branch of Government under the Constitution. To the contrary, in my judgment, if Presidents had more frequently exercised this permissive right, it would have, in fact, strengthened them with the Congress and with the country.

What we see developing now is rather frightening. We have the secretary to the Cabinet saying, in effect, that the President of the United States concentrates his time and effort on about 5 percent of his executive duties, which means, of course, if the figures used by the White House spokesman are correct, the President delegates to others the rest of his duties. So what we really have going on in the Government is a procedure whereby much of the executive administration is being handled not by persons elected to office by the people of the United States, but by appointees in the various echelons of executive organization. When the Congress seeks a review, in effect, of what those persons have been doing, and asks for information which pertains to their activities, what are we met with? We are met with the plea of executive privilege.

I shall not say, Mr. President, that under the separation-of-powers doctrine the present President or any other President does not have a constitutional right to raise such a plea. I doubt if I would go so far as the Wall Street Journal goes in its editorial this morning on this point. But what I wish to suggest is that one can abuse a permissive grant. The fact that under the Constitution a discretion is granted to the President of the United States does not mean that in the exercise of such discretion he may not become guilty of its abuse.

I think that is what is happening, because whenever there is a denial of information to the Congress of the United States under the plea of executive privilege, the denial should not be based on an attitude of jealousy over the protection of a jurisdictional domain. It ought to be based on an honest belief on the part of the President that making such specific information as is called for available to the Congress or to the public would, in fact, impair his administrative functions as Chief Executive in regard to the particularly limited domain.

That is quite different, Mr. President, from taking a stiffnecked, stubborn attitude that, "We are not going to release any information because if we release any information we will, in effect, be weakening executive prerogatives."

I cannot follow such logic, if it can be described as logic.

I am perfectly willing—as I have been willing in past instances, one or two of which I shall cite in a moment—to defend any President, Republican or Democrat, who, in effect, pleads Executive privilege, when the President believes that to make available the information which is being asked for would, in fact, impair the carrying out of his Executive duties under the Constitution.

It will be recalled that in the MacArthur hearings, on which committee I sat as a Republican at the time, there

was a Republican move in the committee to force General Bradley to give to the committee information as to what transpired at the White House in the conference with President Truman in respect to conversations which took place prior to the calling for General MacArthur's resignation.

General Bradley in effect pleaded executive privilege, which he had the right to do. The record is clear. The rollcall is clear. The majority of Republicans on the committee took the position that General Bradley ought to be required to testify and give the information asked for, which clearly implied that if they should prevail, the next course of action would be to initiate contempt proceedings against General Bradley.

Fortunately the majority of the committee, including both Democrats and Republicans, prevailed, and, in effect, sustained the constitutional doctrine of separation of powers and privileges. The debate was very interesting. How well I recall it.

There have been other times in my 13 years in the Senate when I have defended the doctrine of separation of powers and the privilege of the President, under the Constitution, to withhold information the publication of which he honestly believed would impair his Executive functions. But I have always tried to make clear, as I am trying to do again this afternoon, that this is permissive, not mandatory. There is nothing to prevent the President from cooperating with the Congress and supplying information. Many Presidents have done so on many occasions.

What concerns me is the degree to which Dwight D. Eisenhower, through his spokesmen, has, in effect, pleaded executive privilege, and has consistently—I think it can be fairly described as rather stubbornly—refused to exercise the permissive aspect of this doctrine.

When we have the secretary to the Cabinet saying, in effect, that the President is focusing attention primarily on 5 percent of his executive duties, and that 95 percent are, in effect, delegated, it is well to have a great newspaper such as the Wall Street Journal, as it did this morning, pointing up this issue. Although, as I have tried to point out, I find myself giving a little different emphasis to this problem than does the editorial, nevertheless, I think the Wall Street Journal is to be commended for raising the issue, as it raised it this morning.

I continue to quote from the editorial:

> Certainly there are no words in the Constitution that permit a President—or his bureau chiefs—to say Congress can't look into this or that just because somebody wants Congress not to look there.

This puts the matter in a nutshell, Mr. President. If there is no warranty under the Constitution or in the laws of this country, for executive privilege of this magnitude, then there is no authority for its assertion, and there is justification for the criticism contained in the editorial.

My difference with the editorial, however, is that I think the basic right of the President exists under the Constitution, and that what we should be stressing is not the question of the right of the President to exercise the privilege, but the issue as to the advisability and desirability of the President's abusing the permissive power to the extent of constantly pleading executive privilege.

I remember when the Secretary of State was on the stand before the Foreign Relations Committee not many weeks ago. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is present in the Chamber, was present upon that occasion, and he will recall the incident.

I was seeking to elicit from the Secretary of State the differences which had arisen between him and Governor Stassen over disarmament. At that time Governor Stassen was still a member of the White House entourage. I was having difficulty finding out what those differences were, and I never did find out. The Secretary of State said, in effect, that it had been resolved, at a recent meeting of the National Security Council, not to divulge such information. I sought to find out whether it had been "resolved" or whether the Security Council had merely endorsed the Secretary's point of view. I became satisfied, from his reply, that the latter was the case.

Then when I sought to find out what the differences were, the Secretary, in effect, pleaded executive privilege. He said, in effect, as the transcript will show, that the Scretary did not make available to Members of Congress or to committees of Congress executive business transacted in the National Security Council.

I told him that I respected the right of the executive branch to plead executive privilege, but that in this instance I also had the right—and I considered it a duty—to describe what I thought the plea was. It was the administration's fifth amendment plea. That is what the administration is doing in many instances. The plea of executive privilege has become the administration's "fifth amendment plea." In many instances, in my opinion, the reason the administration pleads executive privilege is that it would not dare exercise the permissive authority to which I have referred, and give the American people the facts, because if the American people could obtain the facts in connection with some of these matters, I am satisfied that within a fortnight they would be insisting upon some changes. That is particularly true in the field of foreign policy.

So I say that, although I highly commend this editorial, I want the RECORD to show the variance in emphasis which I would give this problem, as compared with that given to it by the Wall Street Journal.

Were it not for the serious nature of the content of these two items—and I repeat the Wall Street Journal in publishing them deserves high commendation, I would still have called to the attention of the Senate the editorial, if only for the praise given to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], that is by implication therein contained. The Senator from Missouri is one of the small band of legislators whose vigilance in such matters places all of us deeply in his debt.

The Senator from Missouri, in his work as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, has done a remarkably fine job for the Senate in focusing public attention on just such problems as I raise this afternoon.

His devotion to the principles of our Constitution and his unremitting efforts to translate those principles into concrete legislative action deserve our profound thanks. In this present task of resisting executive encroachment upon the legislative branch, he is a leader under whom each of us should be proud and honored to serve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article and the editorial to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 3, 1958]

POWER AND PRIVILEGE

Some Members of Congress are feuding with the United States Attorney General over whether people in Government agencies and bureaus may refuse access to information.

The controversy came about as the result of testimony before Congressional committees on an 18th century law that some Congressmen say has been used by public officials to keep secret department business that is also public business. The Congressmen say the statute was merely intended to authorize Government agencies to "keep record," and that it was not intended to permit Government agencies to keep the records secret from the public—or from Congressional investigations. They want the law made clear.

Among those who had something to say about this particular law—section 161 of the Revised Statutes—was Attorney General William P. Rogers. When he appeared before a Senate committee, Senator HENNINGS says the record shows Mr. Rogers said: "This is a bookkeeping statute, which says they keep the records, then hold them physically. It doesn't relate at all to executive privilege."

But now, Senator HENNINGS says Mr. Rogers has written him a letter asking that it be made part of the record. Mr. Rogers says. "Section 161 is a legislative expression and recognition of executive privilege."

Mr. HENNINGS says he is "completely baffled" by Mr. Rogers' written words compared to his spoken words. He appears to have answered "No" one day and "Yes" another to the same question about executive privilege.

Executive privilege is a matter that the Congress and the executive branch have locked horns on a number of times, and unless we are greatly mistaken, Congress has never conceded that, as a matter of broad policy, the executive branch has a blanket right to refuse information to the lawmakers.

Presidents have done so—mostly for political reasons to keep the opposition from making too much sunny hay—and when Presidents have refused, the majority in Congress did not think the issue important enough to settle the question whether there is actually any legal right to executive privilege or like Topsy, it just grew. Certainly there are no words in the Constitution that permit a

President—or his bureau chiefs—to say Congress can't look into this or that just because somebody wants Congress not to look there.

But there is a great deal in the Constitution to back up the powers of the Congress to demand Government documents in its investigations. For how can the legislators determine facts on which they may or may not wish to legislate unless they have the right to conduct inquiry? How can Congress determine whether the executive branch is carrying out the laws Congress passed in the manner Congress wished unless Congress can check on the administrators.

The Constitution is pretty plain, we think, as to who has the power in any ultimate showdown between the executive and the legislative branch. It is to Congress, for example, that the Constitution gave the power of impeachment—and that is a power not even a President is above.

So it is not likely that Congress will accept Mr. Rogers' view on the 1789 law, for that would be granting a limitation on its investigative rights and thus a diminution of its own powers. These are things Congress has, fortunately, heretofore been unprepared to grant. And certainly it may be doubted that Congress meant to grant them when it passed a law saying bureaus must keep records.

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 3, 1958]

CHANGING PRESIDENCY: HERE'S HOW A SWELLING WHITE HOUSE STAFF CUTS EISENHOWER'S BURDENS—BUT NEW LACK OF LEADERSHIP CRITICISM SPURS PRESIDENT TO GREATER ACTIVITY AGAIN—IKE REPLIES ON PALACE GUARD

(By Lester Tanzer)

WASHINGTON.—As the familiar figure of Sherman Adams continues to preside over the White House entourage year after year, the lesser known bureaucracy of Presidential aides and advisers around him has swollen mightily—and, in the process, absorbed much of the job of the Presidency.

This trend has brought down on President Eisenhower a growing amount of criticism, including charges he has surrounded himself with a palace guard which is grabbing an improper amount of Presidential power. For this reason, it's worth taking a closer look at the growing White House staff and its methods of operation.

From the day he took office more than 5 years ago, Mr. Eisenhower has been building up the staff around him, from secretaries and statisticians to special consultants. The growth dramatizes the way in which Mr. Eisenhower has chosen to run the institution of the Presidency—delegating more and more authority to trusted subordinates to hold down the size of the Presidential workload.

The total White House office force, including both regular civil-service workers and the President's personal staff, numbered some 250 in 1953, after Mr. Eisenhower took over. At latest count, the number had grown to just under 400. By mid-1959, it's scheduled to reach 422. That would constitute a steep 70 percent boost over a 6-year span.

THE TEAM GROWS

Even more dramatic has been the rise in the President's personal staff. An even two dozen when Mr. Eisenhower first set up shop, his team of personally picked associates has multiplied to 46, largely through the addition of specialists in one field or another. Latest examples: Science adviser James R. Killian, foreign aid drum-beater Eric Johnston, and Appointments Secretary Thomas Stephens, who has just taken that post for the third time in the Eisenhower regime.

The Chief Executive's personal staff ranges from chief usher J. Bernard West to chief of staff Adams. It also embraces such diverse men and jobs as former Boston banker Robert Cutler, special assistant for national security; former California Congressman Jack Z. Anderson, White House liaison man to Congress on farm, postal and veterans' affairs, and the Reverend Frederic Fox, the second minister to serve as a regular White House employee. Mr. Fox handles correspondence and other relations with community, charitable, and social organizations—the Red Cross, for example.

The total staff directly under the Presidential wing has, of course, long since overflowed the White House itself. Roughly half the work force is now installed in the old gray Executive Office Building, next door to the White House on Pennsylvania Avenue. But Presidential aides no longer consider this housing adequate; a new modern office building has been proposed to replace it.

COSTS CLIMB, TOO

The big buildup in the total White House staff, says the President's press secretary, James C. Hagerty, "stems from the growth of Federal Government and its responsibilities. The Presidency has grown along with it." As the staff has multiplied, the cost of running the Presidency has climbed, from $1.6 million in fiscal 1953-54, the first full year after Mr. Eisenhower took office, to an expected $3.4 million this fiscal year.

Actually, however, the expansion of the White House staff has come while the rest of the executive branch of Government has been trimmed. The 2.6 million Truman-era Federal civilian work force of 1952 was slashed below 2.5 million soon after the Eisenhower administration assumed power. During February of this year, the Government's civilian workers numbered just a shade over 2.3 million.

When reporters raised the question of the "palace guard" charge at yesterday's presidential press conference (see transcript on P. 12), Mr. Eisenhower explained anew some of his reasons for putting much reliance on staff members: "Now, since 1941 I have been in a position where I have had to use staffs and certainly if I were not kept well acquainted with the basic facts of my problem, then I would have certainly been ineffective." He added: "Now, they do sort out the things that are interesting to Government and to me and make certain that I get them, whether they are recommendations from important people or ideas or facts or statistics, anything else."

While Mr. Eisenhower's aides insist they have taken over no responsibilities that properly belong to the President himself, they do make many lesser decisions that, say, former President Truman would have resolved personally. They fill in all but the broadest details of many major decisions the President himself arrives at. In the normal course of events, the staff, rather than the President himself, often deals with Cabinet members and other top administration officials. They take from the President's shoulders much of the task he finds so distasteful of listening to lawmakers' complaints and persuading them to back administration programs.

SEEING THE STAFF

As the White House bureaucracy has swelled, the President's contact with the world outside of Government has diminished. Much of his day is taken up with his staff; he sees few others who are not high administration officials or foreign dignitaries. Since the beginning of the year, for example, Mr. Eisenhower has been paid just a score of publicly announced White House visits by people outside Government or politics—and more than half of these have come in the past 3 weeks. On many such occasions, of course, more than a single visitor has seen the President.

The growth in the President's staff has prompted Republican legislators for several years to grumble over the President's inaccessibility. Recently, the nature of the criticism has changed: Now Democrats—and a sizable bloc of Republicans—reprove the President for what they claim is a lack of leadership and an indifference to his job.

Under such criticism, and prompted by the antirecession fight, the Chief Executive has stepped up his activities in recent weeks. He's making more speeches, holding more press conferences. His daily list of appointments has grown to include more frequent sessions with top economic advisers and more visits from outside callers, including executives of veterans' groups and financer Bernard Baruch, who showed up at the White House yesterday.

Along with the publicly announced visits, the President has quietly resumed his stag dinners, informal off-the-record sessions with business leaders and others at the White House to talk over current problems—notably the recession. More GOP legislators now get in to see him.

SPEEDUP AND SLOWDOWN

Such calculated bursts of activity by the President have been frequent in the past, to be sure, usually following a steady accumulation of criticism of Mr. Eisenhower. And, just as freqeuntly, the President has rather plainly slowed down again.

The White House staff assembled by the President back in 1953 actually was smaller by a dozen than the 262-man brigade run by Harry Truman the year before. From the beginning, however, Mr. Eisenhower's own personal staff has been larger than that of any previous Chief Executive. Mr. Truman, for example, had 15 handpicked assistants at hand before his term expired; Franklin Delano Roosevelt built his personal staff to 14 shortly before his death in 1945 from the half-dozen he took into the White House in 1933.

Messrs. Roosevelt and Truman, of course, already had watched over the sprouting of a White House bureaucracy. F. D. R.'s predecessor, Herbert Hoover, maintained a mere five-man personal staff, the same as Theodore Roosevelt had in 1907. Woodrow Wilson's White House intimates totaled just three in 1916. But not until President Eisenhower occupied the White House was the Presidency transformed to an intricate staff operation.

The trend to bigger staff and more delegation of duty began long before Mr. Eisenhower's heart attack in September 1955. He set out deliberately, to replace President Truman's highly personalized operation of the Presidency with a complex staff system headed by former New Hampshire Governor Adams.

THE TREND QUICKENS

His heart attack, however, quickened the trend. The total White House work force had climbed from 250 to 294 just before Mr. Eisenhower was stricken. By mid-1956, it had jumped to 375. Moreover, the President's intimates began casting about for ways to reduce their ailing Chief's workload—a task they're still concerned with now.

Among his personal staff, the big growth has come in a breed known as special assistants or consultants. In 1953, only one of the President's 24 close associates really came under this category; he was C. D. Jackson, psychological warfare adviser. Two others, economic aid Gabriel Hauge and national security expert Cutler, now listed as Special Assistants, were then administrative aids. Now the special consultants number more than 15, including Meyer Kestnbaum, who keeps track of Hoover Commission recommendations on reorganizing the Government; Lt. Gen. Elwood Quesada, Adviser to the President on Airports and Air Traffic Controls, and Arthur Larson, nominally an adviser on cold-war propaganda, but actually a speechwriter and idea man.

The special consultants, by and large, coordinate Government matters that involve

more than one Federal agency. Retired Maj. Gen. John S. Bragdon, for example, keeps an eye on public works planning by some 42 branches of Government. Clarence Francis, retired chairman of General Foods Corp., tries to compromise the oft-conflicting views of the State and Agriculture Departments on United States surplus farm disposal programs.

A BRANCH IS BORN

As the special consultants took on assistants of their own as well as clerical help, a new White House branch was born—known as special projects—with a budget all its own. Almost 100 people went to work for this branch when it was started in 1956, drawing $866,000 in salaries and expenses that fiscal year. By June of 1959, special projects is due to account for 145 workers—one-third of the total White House payroll—at a cost of $1,450,000 for the year. Experts in science and personnel management will make up most of the increase from the current level of about 120 employees.

Special consultants and other White House staff members take up much of Mr. Eisenhower's time each day. Chief of Staff Adams, press aids and confidant Hagerty and Maj. Gen. Wilton (Jerry) Persons, the President's Ambassador to Capitol Hill, drop in to see him several times daily; the door is open to him at all times. Other staff men who specialize in one field or another may see him just a few times a week—sometimes even less frequently—depending on the current issues.

Theoretically, any staff member can see Mr. Eisenhower at any time. But since his illnesses, most aids, in practice, have been more cautious about barging in on the President. "You just don't go in to see him on every little thing," one Eisenhower lieutenant explains. Since the President's stroke, another aid says, "the tendency has been to check more often with Adams before you go in to see the Chief."

Nevertheless, staff members may drop by to check something with the President 10 or 20 times, all told, on a given day. By contrast, Mr. Eisenhower usually has three or four official visits by others on his appointment book on an average day, besides a regular meeting with, say his Cabinet, the National Security Council or GOP legislative leaders.

Mr. Eisenhower's staff serves as a sort of intermediary between him and the rest of his administration—an increasingly important role these days as the President lets Cabinet members run their own departments with less and less direct guidance. Sometimes, Mr. Eisenhower personally settles a dispute within his administration, such as the Dulles-Stassen dispute that ended with Harold Stassen's resignation as disarmament consultant to the President. But more often, Sherman Adams and company thrash out the issues with the officials involved.

Mr. Eisenhower's lieutenants insist they don't make the decisions. What they do, as they see it, is study an issue, pull together the facts, toss out the insignificant alternatives and boil down policy recommendations to a few real choices, or perhaps a single recommendation for their Chief to approve.

Many major issues that cross department lines are brought before the Cabinet, if they touch on domestic matters—how to cope with the recession, for example—or to the National Security Council, if they involve strategy planning. The pattern here is much the same as the one evolved for staff-level decisions—intensive preparation to boil down the alternative solutions to a minimum. More than his two immediate predecessors, Mr. Eisenhower relies on his Cabinet for actual policymaking. Usually, he abides by majority sentiment.

The President has turned the Cabinet into a highly formalized organization. He has appointed the first secretary the Cabinet has ever had, ubiquitous Max Rabb, to help him manage the Cabinet's affairs. And Mr. Rabb has an assistant, career civil servant, Bradley Patterson, Jr. For the first time, a written agenda for each Friday morning Cabinet session is prepared and circulated to Cabinet officials in advance.

BRIEFING THE BOSS

The extent of the staff work in the Cabinet, however, goes far beyond the two full-time Cabinet officials. Between meetings, Mr. Rabb and other White House staff members, depending on the issue, consult with the sub-Cabinet, a group composed of departmental under secretaries, to screen issues that will be brought before the Cabinet. Mr. Rabb works with Cabinet members beforehand to help sharpen their presentation at the meeting. He even briefs Mr. Eisenhower just before the Cabinet session itself.

To carry out Cabinet decisions, a new group of highly placed officials in each Federal department—known as the special assistants for Cabinet coordination—has been created These men meet with Mr. Rabb right after a Cabinet session; records of decisions calling for action are compiled and distributed and Mr. Rabb rides herd on these special assistants to see that new policies are implemented, and to drum up suggestions for future Cabinet topics.

Mr. Rabb is proud of the Cabinet organization. "Hardly a week passes," says the former Massachusetts lawyer, "without briefings on the new White House staff techniques being given to students of political science or to key Government administrators coming to us from foreign countries."

Mr. Eisenhower is turning over more of his duties as leader of the Republican Party to his assistants, too. The White House answer to charges from GOP politicos that the President is inaccessible has chiefly been to make, not Eisenhower, but Mr. Adams more available to them. Mr. Adams now greets more Republican lawmakers with gripes at the White House and, moreover, meets with small groups of GOP legislators from time to time over afternoon cocktails elsewhere in Washington.

The President's associates still are searching for ways to cut his workload further, though they're soft-pedaling talk of such activities because of the widespread attacks on Mr. Eisenhower as a "do-little" leader.

Aids would like, for instance, for Congress to authorize the Attorney General to sign private relief bills applying only to individuals and relieve the President of approving over 300 such measures each year. White House officials complain, too, Mr. Eisenhower wastes time on such chores required by law as personally reading and O. K.'ing specifications for fish hatcheries or the schedule of concerts by the Marine Band.

"Even if one should take away 95 percent of the tasks the President performs and discard them or delegate them to others," contends Mr. Rabb, "the remaining 5 percent of the tasks of the President would still make it the most difficult job in the world." He adds, "It's that 5 percent of hard, tough decision making on which the President himself has concentrated in the past 5 years—giving what time he has to spare to the other 95 percent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

NUCLEAR TESTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that in the matter of testing nuclear weapons we have allowed the Soviet Union to secure a psychological advantage. We all know that the people of this Nation and of the Western world stand for freedom and peace and the individual worth of the person. It is particularly unfortunate that during this time, when the people of the United States and of the Western World will be attending Easter services in their churches and temples and synagogues, that we have allowed ourselves to be placed in a rather unfortunate situation in connection with the H-bomb.

Of course, it may be that this is a trick on the part of the Soviet Union, and that the attitude of Mr. Dulles and of the President may be to some extent justified.

It may also be that the Soviet announcement, after the Soviet Union had completed its nuclear tests, was prompted by the fact that they now have nothing to lose.

In any event, it would certainly seem that even if the administration is adamant in wishing to go ahead with its tests this summer, it should reconsider its position after those tests are over.

Unless we take the leadership on plans for disarmament before the United Nations and other public forums of the world, and unless we take the leadership in trying to stop explosions of atomic bombs, it may not be possible to stop the atomic race later on. We know that Britain already has the hydrogen bomb, and that France is desperately trying to develop one. Other nations also may eventually have the hydrogen bomb, and then the situation may be out of control.

I was impressed by what the noted columnist, Walter Lippmann, had to say about the matter in his column, published in the Washington Post this morning. He said that the issue had not been dealt with forthrightly.

I was also impressed by what Drew Pearson said in his column in the Washington Post this morning. It contains valuable public information, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Pearson's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES LET RUSSIA SCORE TEST BEAT

(By Drew Pearson)

United States experts on public opinion admit privately that Moscow scored the No. 1 propaganda victory of the year with the announcement of a unilateral ban on H-bomb tests. It almost equals the No. 1 victory of last year—launching the sputnik.

The Moscow announcement coming on top of the steady drumbeat of Bulganin notes urging a summit conference and the banning of missile bases in Europe, more than ever has pictured the United States as a warmonger; pictured Russia as the disciple of peace.

The real inside story of how badly the United States muffed the ball on banning H-bomb tests is known only to a few people. As early as September 11, 1956, President Eisenhower and the National Security Council had decided to propose more or less what Moscow proposed this week—a ban on H-bomb tests.

What actually happened at the September 11, 1956, meeting was that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles urged a moratorium on the nuclear tests, pointing out that it would win friends for us abroad, would give us the diplomatic initiative, would help convince the world that we are more peace-loving than Moscow.

Harold Stassen immediately agreed with Dulles. Secretary of Defense Wilson and Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, did not. They warned that Russia might violate any agreement, would test small atomic weapons. They admitted we could detect all large explosions.

In the final voting, Secretary of Treasury Humphrey concurred with Dulles, and the President finally did, too. As is customary in National Security Council meetings, the decision was made unanimous. Though final details were to be worked out later, the tentative plan was to ask Russia to join in suspending H-bomb tests for 1 year as a peace experiment. This was to be coupled with a moral agreement to outlaw the intercontinental ballistic missile in the same manner poison gas has been outlawed.

IKE REVERSES IKE

Approximately 1 week later, Ike's political advisers warned that Adlai Stevenson had made speeches as early as April, 1956, proposing the end of H-bomb tests, and that he had made another fulldress proposal in early September. The advisers urged that it would be a political mistake to play into Stevenson's hands by going ahead with the Security Council's decision of September 11.

Eisenhower then reversed himself. On September 19 he came out with a vigorous statement attacking Stevenson's H-bomb proposal as a theatrical gesture. In speech after speech following this, Mr. Eisenhower attacked the Stevenson proposal as political grandstanding. He made it clear he did not consider Stevenson qualified to discuss atomic energy.

On October 26, the President stormed into the National Security Council meeting and angrily lectured them about leaks. He said he had heard that the September 11 decision regarding H-bomb tests had become known to people outside the Council, and as a result he was ordering a full investigation.

On October 29, this column queried the White House as to whether the Security Council had made a decision and then reversed itself. The reply was "no comment." A day or two later, four Democratic Senators made the same inquiry and got a categoric denial.

SURVEY SUSPENDED

Meanwhile, the White House was so embarrassed over Stevenson's proposal to ban nuclear tests that it even played politics with the Public Health Service's survey of radioactivity. Suddenly on September 26, 1956, and without explanation, the survey was canceled.

Ike's blast at Stevenson's proposal had been made on September 19. One week later, Assistant Surgeon General Otis L. Anderson wrote State health officials:

"Field sampling operations in connection with radiation surveillance network will terminate at the close of business Thursday, September 27, 1956."

Twenty-four hours is an extremely abrupt cancellation notice. Many State officials didn't receive the notice before September 27. Anderson was obviously in a hurry. The date of October 1 was scratched out and September 26 typed in. The termination date of September 27 was also typed in.

Previous surveys showed increases of radioactivity as high as 15 to 25 times normal by some monitoring stations. An increase of 10 times normal, according to statements by the Atomic Energy Commission, was considered the alarm point.

Stevenson had proposed the end of H-bomb tests because, he said, the air was becoming dangerously contaminated with radioactive fallout. This was denied by Atomic Energy Chairman Strauss. The surveys made by Public Health Service substantiated Stevenson, contradicted Strauss. The surveys were canceled.

PROPOSED NATIONAL ASTRONAUTICS AND SPACE AGENCY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, yesterday the President sent to Congress a message stating that a new agency is being established, to be called the National Astronautics and Space Agency. This agency would absorb the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and I suppose that the Advisory Committee would be the nucleus of the new agency. There will be a director and members of the board, to be taken from the Government and to include also scientists from outside the Government, and men of qualified experience. The new agency would have assigned to it some of the nonmilitary activities of the Defense Department having to do with the exploration of space and scientific development now being carried on by the Department of Defense.

I wish to applaud the President for this step. It is very necessary that we have a civilian agency to develop certain aspects of space exploration in connection with satellites and missiles in this latter part of the 20th century.

These matters have to do with weather, they have to do with scientific research, and they go far beyond merely military considerations.

I had hoped that the President's recommendation would be for the establishment of a new Cabinet position of a new Department of Science, and that under such new Department there would be included not only the functions which will be transferred from the Department of Defense, but also the various scientific efforts in the Government, such as the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and many others, which would be placed under the supervision and direction of this new civilian Secretary of Science.

In any event, the President's suggestion is a very good step in the right direction, and it might develop along the line I have suggested.

The President in his message says that the Bureau of the Budget is preparing legislation to put his recommendations into effect. We shall await with interest the detailed suggestions.

Last fall and in the early part of January I had the opportunity of discussing this problem with a number of scientists and other thoughtful persons, both in and out of government. As a result of the conversations I had with and suggestions I received from a number of those who have been thinking deeply and seriously about civilian control of this new and important part of our scientific development, the exploration of space, I had prepared a bill, which I introduced on January 28. It is to establish a United States Department of Science and to prescribe the functions thereof. It is known as S. 3180.

Since it deals with the same subject matter, except that it goes further than the President's recommendation, and since the Bureau of the Budget is in the process of drawing up legislative proposals, and for what other value it may have for public discussion and for consideration by Congress and the Bureau of the Budget, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point. It is rather brief, and it will be informative.

There being no objection, the text of the bill (S. 3180) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Department of Science Act of 1958."

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT

SEC. 2. There is hereby established an executive department of the Government to be known as the United States Department of Science (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"), at the head of which shall be a Secretary of Science (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate provided by law for heads of the executive departments.

UNDER SECRETARY AND ASSISTANT SECRETARIES

SEC. 3. There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary of Science, such Assistant Secretaries as shall be determined by the President to be necessary, and a General Counsel, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall perform such functions and duties as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall receive compensation at the rate provided by law for under secretaries (other than the Under Secretary of the Department of State), assistant secretaries, and general counsels, respectively, of the executive departments. The Under Secretary (or, during the absence or disability of the Under Secretary, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary determined according to such order as the Secretary shall prescribe) shall act as Secretary during the absence or disability of the Secretary or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Secretary.

FUNCTIONS OF SECRETARY

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to establish and carry out (1) such programs for developing missiles, rockets, and other means of conveyance to, and carrying on research in, outer space, and (2) such programs of research with respect to outer space, as he may determine to be in the national interest.

TRANSFERS FROM DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SEC. 5. (a) There are transferred to the Secretary such functions of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments of the Department of Defense as the President determines to relate primarily to the development of missiles and rockets not intended as weapons and to research into the problems of outer space.

(b) All personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds, which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily in relation to any function transferred under the provisions of this section, are transferred to the Department.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SEC. 6. The National Science Foundation, together with its personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and the unexpended balances of its appropriations, is transferred to the Department where it shall exercise its functions subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Atomic Energy Commission, together with its personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and the unexpended balances of its appropriations,

is transferred to the Department where it shall exercise its functions subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

TRANSFER MATTERS

SEC. 8. All laws relating to any agency or function transferred under this act shall, insofar as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect. Any transfer of personnel pursuant to this act shall be without change in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned. All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by any agency or in connection with any functions transferred by this act, and in effect at the time of the transfer, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any agency or any officer of the United States acting in his official capacity shall abate by reason of any transfer made pursuant to this act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the appropriate agency or officer of the United States.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

SEC. 9. The Secretary may establish such advisory committees on science as he may determine to be desirable and in furtherance of the purposes of this act. The members of any such committee shall be reimbursed for actual travel and subsistence expenses incurred in attending meetings of the committee.

PROVISIONS OF LAW APPLICABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 10. Except to the extent inconsistent with this act, all provisions of law applicable to the executive departments generally shall apply to the Department.

SEAL

SEC. 11. The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 12. The Secretary may, without being relieved of his responsibility therefor, and unless prohibited by some specific provision of law, perform any function vested in him through or with the aid of such officials or organizational entities of the Department as he may designate.

EXPENDITURES AUTHORIZED

SEC. 13. The Secretary is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, for lawbooks, books of reference and periodicals, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 14. The Secretary shall make at the close of each fiscal year a report in writing to Congress giving an account of all moneys received and disbursed by him and the Department, describing the work done by the Department, and making such recommendations as he shall deem necessary for the effective performance of the duties and purposes of the Department.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES

SEC. 15. Section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"Eleventh: The Department of Science."

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 16. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Department to carry out the provisions of this act and to perform any other duties which may be imposed upon it by law.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 17. The provisions of this act shall be effective on the date of enactment except that sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 shall be effective after 90 days following such date of enactment.

RELIEF OF CALE P. HAUN AND JULIA FAY HAUN—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point the brief message from the President of the United States, dated March 17, 1958, in which the President vetoed a bill which I had sponsored in the Senate for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun.

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

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 674, entitled "An act for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun."

The bill would provide that, for the purpose of determining the individual liability for income taxes for the taxable year 1953 of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun, sole stockholders of River Grange Co., Inc., which was liquidated pursuant to a plan of complete liquidation adopted on December 24, 1953, the elections of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun to have the benefits of section 112 (b) (7) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code shall be considered to have been filed within 30 days after the adoption of such plan. The bill states that the mailing of such elections was delayed, without negligence or fault on the part of such stockholders, beyond the 30th day following the adoption of such plan.

Section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 provides a special rule in the case of certain complete liquidations of domestic corporations occurring within 1 calendar month for the treatment of gain on the shares of stock owned by qualified electing shareholders. The effect of this section is to permit deferral of tax upon unrealized appreciation in the value of the property distributed in liquidation. An election to be governed by section 112 (b) (7) must be filed by the shareholder or by the liquidating corporation with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on or before midnight of the 30th day after adoption of the plan of liquidation. The bill would waive this requirement for the named taxpayers.

The records of the Treasury Department show that River Grange Co., Inc., adopted a plan of complete liquidation on December 24, 1953. The Internal Revenue Service began an examination of the return of this corporation on September 9, 1954, and a question arose as to whether the stockholders had filed an election under section 112 (b) (7). It was found that no such election had been filed. A representative of the taxpayers has advised that an election was mailed on or about September 10, 1954, which date was more than 7 months after the expiration of the statutory period for filing the election.

Except in the case of special circumstances, the enactment of special legislative relief for a taxpayer who has not made an election within the time prescribed by law constitutes an inequitable discrimination against other taxpayers similarly situated. The primary extenuating circumstance on which the taxpayers appear to rely in this instance is that a professional adviser, upon whom the taxpayers were accustomed to depend in legal matters, was incapacitated by illness 6 months prior to the adoption of the plan of liquidation so that the taxpayers were compelled to rely on other professional advisers. The circumstances of this case do not seem to justify special legislative relief.

The granting of special relief in this case would constitute an inequitable discrimination against other taxpayers similarly situated and would create an undesirable precedent which might encourage other taxpayers to seek relief in the same manner.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 17, 1958.*

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the bill was vetoed on the basis that it would be special legislation, and that there were no precedents for it. The bill sought equitable relief for shareholders of a domestic corporation completely liquidated on January 24, 1958. The bill sought equitable relief for Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun, the shareholders of a domestic corporation which was completely liquidated on December 24, 1953, who were denied by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the right to avail themselves of the benefits of section 112 (b) (7) (E) of the Internal Revenue Code as to the computation of unrealized gains on the shares of stock distributed to them in liquidation, because of their failure to file with the Commissioner notice of election within the required 30 days from the date of liquidation as required by section 7 (D) of the cited provision of law.

The delay in filing the election was caused by the serious disability of counsel and the failure of other retained attorneys and accountants to act on behalf of the taxpayers.

It was established to the satisfaction of Congress that there was no fault or negligence on the part of the taxpayers in not complying strictly with the statute, and the proposed legislation was deemed by Congress to be meritorious.

Mr. President, on one occasion Congress passed, and the President signed, a bill which was exactly on all fours with the bill which was vetoed by the President. It granted to N. H. Kelley et al. the same relief proposed in S. 674, the bill vetoed by the President.

Congress in both cases answered the question in the affirmative. It is difficult to understand how, on the same set of circumstances, one bill was approved by the President and the other bill was vetoed by him. I cannot help feeling that the matter was not fully presented to the President and that the precedents in Congress were not explained to him.

I make this explanation because in the next Congress, I intend to introduce a bill for the same relief. I hope that the next time the President may have before him the precedents in which relief was granted in bills approved by the President.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 3, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 497. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

S. 2120. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, Mercedes division.

HOLY WEEK

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as we conclude our deliberations in the Senate this evening, in the midst of Holy Week, it is appropriate that we free our thoughts from the burden of concern with the material problems and reflect on ills of the spirit which are a heavier weight on man.

In this hour of confusion and uncertainty, Holy Week holds the answer to our problems.

It is the week of the year when we beg for grace to accept our crosses, our sorrows, and to let our thoughts and actions be guided by the principles advocated by the Man who walked the shores of Gallilee 2,000 years ago, when He taught and practiced humility, justice, equality, and peace.

It is my hope that when we return to our legislative duties we shall have been strengthened in the faith we have in the wonderful heritage given to us by those who founded this great Nation, with its freedoms and its opportunities, and that we shall rededicate ourselves to the principles for which our country stands.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 303, agreed to by the Senate on Thursday, March 27, 1958, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday, April 14, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, in accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 303, agreed to by the Senate on March 27, 1958, until Monday, April 14, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 3, 1958:

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for terms expiring March 31, 1964:

Marvin J. Briggs, of Indiana. (Reappointment.)

Frank Stubbs, of Texas, vice C. E. Matthews, term expired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Robert E. Hauberg, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 4, 1958.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Rupert Hugo Newcomb, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Mississippi for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 11, 1956.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named person to be a chief warrant officer, W-4, in the United States Coast Guard:

Richard F. Eiden.

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-3, in the United States Coast Guard:

John S. Cameron, Jr.
William A. Mauch.

The following-named person to be a chief warrant officer, W-2, in the United States Coast Guard:

Keith H. Jorgenson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1958

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

John 14: 19: *Because I live, ye shall live also.*

Most merciful and gracious God, may these days of Holy Week fill us with a new appreciation and understanding of Thy divine love which transcends all human love.

We thank Thee for the King of Kings, who, on Palm Sunday, proclaimed His sovereignty and the High Priest who, on Good Friday laid upon the altar the acceptable sacrifice of His own life for the salvation of the world.

Grant that Easter Sunday, commemorating His resurrection, may give us the assurance of immortality and inspire us to rise with Him into newness of life and seek those things which are above, where Christ dwelleth.

During the Easter recess may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with us all. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 497) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 72) entitled "An act to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. MORTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

A PLAN TO PRESERVE THE NATURAL BEAUTY OF OREGON'S ROGUE VALLEY

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. If the extension is not over 300 words, and there is no objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced in the House a bill (H. R. 11834) to authorize the exchange of land or timber within the Siskiyou National Forest of Oregon and for certain other land adjacent to the national forest. My colleague from Oregon, Senator NEUBERGER, introduced identical legislation in the other body.

The purpose of this bill is to help preserve the natural beauty of the Rogue Valley in the area of the Siskiyou National Forest by authorizing and encouraging the Forest Service to exchange timber and land with private concerns and individuals who hold property along the banks of this famous fishing stream. As things now stand loggers can and probably will cut the timber right down to the water's edge, a practice which not only goes counter to the best principles of conservation but which is sure to detract heavily from the scenic grandeur of this verdant, almost virgin, area of southwestern Oregon.

Officials of the Forest Service have been most cooperative in securing for me the legal descriptions of the land involved. These same officials deserve commendation for their current efforts to negotiate similar exchanges of land along the Rogue River within the exterior boundaries of the Siskiyou National Forest, under authorization contained in existing law. The legislation which I have introduced will extend this authorization to areas along the banks of the Rogue which are not at this time within the national forest boundaries. It is the first step toward eventual preservation of the entire stretch of the Rogue from Lobster Creek east to the point where the Rogue enters the national forest and to the point where its tributary, the Illinois River, also enters the forest boundary. The bill introduced yesterday covers only the area from Lobster Creek upstream to the community of Agness, but I expect to introduce further legislation on the subject when research is completed on legal descriptions and ownership of the lands involved.

THE STORY OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. ALGER. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, two little items in current newspapers, it seems to me, describe and sum up our present economic situation better than any or all the remarks addressed to the subject on this floor. They serve to underline the fear and timidity evident in the Congress in stark contrast with the confidence and courage of the folks back home whom we are supposed to represent.

The first, an editorial comment, went this way:

His (Bernard Baruch's) testimony was a timely reminder of the strength, vitality, and confidence of America—a gentle reproof of panic among men of lesser faith.

The other, an anecdote, told the story of the poll taker who asked an old Texan if he thought the recession would have major political influence in the Lone Star State. "Son, we don't have a recession down here," replied the oldster, "though our boom is wors'n it's been in a good while."

EXTENSION OF EAST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke briefly and said that I agreed very heartily with the Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], and others in their opinion regarding extension of the east front of the Capitol. My remarks do not appear in the RECORD, but I want to reaffirm my very firm conviction that this improvement should be made. I should like to direct the attention of every Member of the House to the remarks of the Speaker the other day and others in the recent debate. Yesterday the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] showed certain conditions indicating the danger of accidents by the cracks and crumbling of the walls and so forth on the east front. For instance the arm of one statue is wired on. I tremble to think what would happen in case of hurricane or very high winds and very heavy snow. There would be great danger to life and limb. I wish everyone would also make an inspection of the dangerous conditions. We would always reproach ourselves if any calamity happened because of our negligence. It is certainly necessary that something be done immediately.

Mr. KEOGH. 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. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, one of the great strengths of our free enterprise system is the inventiveness and efficiency of our construction industry. It is significant, in this time of business recession, that the economists are watching closely the behavior of the indices of new construction starts.

As the skylines of our cities, large and small, are reshaped by new structures designed for the increased living and working convenience of our citizens, millions of jobs are provided not only for the skilled craftsmen of the construction trade but also for the mechanics and artisans of the myriad industries supplying the tools, equipment, and materials.

One of the pillars of our construction industry is the firm of Fischbach & Moore, for years a leader in the field of electronic engineering. This organization has met many challenges and has contributed much to the advancement of electrical systems. On March 27, 1958, friends in and out of electrical engineering met on the Starlight Roof of the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City to honor Harry F. Fischbach on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the founding of Fischbach & Moore. This was a most pleasant occasion, as it gave opportunity to pay tribute to an important and popular figure in electrical engineering, who continues to look for new tests by which to prove again and again the ingenuity and competency of his organization.

I am sure it was a happy and rewarding occasion for Harry Fischbach and his attractive wife, Stella—as it was for all who were privileged to attend.

Mr. CELLER. 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. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to associate myself with my distinguished colleague, GENE KEOGH, in paying tribute to Harry F. Fischbach in commemoration of his 40th anniversary of the establishment of Fischbach & Moore at the Starlight Roof of the Waldorf Astoria, March 27, 1958.

Harry is a dear friend and I wish him and his charming wife, Stella, great happiness and good health. Some friends are like sundials—useless when the sun goes down. Harry is a friend—ever—under any and all circumstances.

Harry bestows good will wherever he goes. He has in the truest sense developed a good name. A good name is like an acrostic. Read it up or down. Read it left or right, it spells goodness. Small wonder that his firm of Fischbach & Moore has become the foremost electrical engineering entity in the United States. We hope this firm continues to go from strength to strength.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 521

Resolved, That ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY FREE IMPORTATION OF AUTOMOBILES AND PARTS OF AUTOMOBILES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 776) to permit temporary free importation of automobiles and parts of automobiles when intended for show purposes, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 11, after "purposes" insert "; except that (A) the privileges granted by this subdivision in respect of imports from a foreign country shall be allowed only if the Secretary of the Treasury shall have found that such foreign country allows, or will allow, substantially reciprocal privileges in respect of similar imports to such country from the United States, and if the Secretary of the Treasury finds that a foreign country has discontinued, or will discontinue, the allowance of such privileges, the privileges granted shall not apply thereafter in respect of imports from such foreign country; and (B) articles imported under this subdivision shall be admitted under bond for their exportation within 6 months from the date of importation, in lieu of the period specified above, and such 6 months period shall not be extended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was concurred in.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of the Senate amendment to the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 776, in the form in which it passed the House of Representatives, was to include in section 308 of the Tariff Act of 1930 an additional category of articles which might be imported without payment of duty, under certain conditions. This additional category consists of automobiles, automobile chassis, automobile bodies, cutaway portions of any of the foregoing and parts for any of the foregoing, finished, unfinished, or cutaway, when intended solely for show purposes.

The Senate amended this bill in two respects: first, the bill was amended to provide for a time limit of 6 months on the importation for show purposes of any one shipment of automobiles or parts

and, second, the bill was amended to provide that temporary free entry would be permitted only from countries that permit similar temporary free entry of cars made in the United States.

Mr. REED. 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. REED. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 776 at the time it was favorably considered in the House of Representatives provided for the temporary free importation under bond of certain automotive equipment where such equipment is to be used for show purposes. There was specified in the bill a requirement that the imported articles would have to be exported within 1 year or within such longer period as the Secretary of the Treasury might allow except not to exceed 3 years. The Senate in acting on the bill amended the House-passed version to provide that the time limit on the importation for show purposes of any one shipment of automotive equipment was to be 6 months. In addition the Senate also provided that this privilege would be available only with respect to articles originating from countries that accorded a reciprocal privilege to United States manufactured articles of a comparable character. I have supported the House adoption of the conference report.

SUSPENDING FOR 2 YEARS THE DUTY ON CRUDE CHICORY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5005) to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude chicory and to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to chicory, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "chickory" and insert "chicory."

Page 2, line 8, after "act" insert "and prior to the expiration of two years after such date."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, in the form in which H. R. 5005 was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House of Representatives, it would have accomplished two purposes: First, it would have suspended for a period of 2 years the duty on crude chicory, except endive; and second, it would have established a new basic permanent statutory rate of 2 cents per pound for chicory, ground or otherwise prepared.

The Senate amendment to H. R. 5005 provided that the rate of duty of 2 cents per pound for chicory, ground or otherwise prepared, should merely be established for a period of 2 years, corresponding to the period during which the duty on crude chicory is suspended by the bill, rather than establishing the rate on a permanent basis.

As indicated in the Senate Finance Committee report on the Senate amendments, at the end of the suspension period, the duty on ground or prepared chicory would be restored to 2½ cents per pound.

Mr. REED. 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. REED. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that the House-passed version of this legislation had as its purpose the suspension of duty on crude chickory other than endive and in addition would establish a new basic statutory rate of 2 cents per pound for chickory ground or otherwise prepared. The Senate in acting on this legislation adopted an amendment to the House-passed version which would make both changes contained in the House bill temporary in character so that they would be applicable for a period of 2 years. Other than for altering the effective period of the bill as I have described the Senate has made no substantive changes in this legislation. For that reason I have concurred with my distinguished chairman and urged House concurrence in the Senate amendments.

DEFINING PARTS OF FOOTWEAR FOR TARIFF PURPOSES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9291) to define parts of certain types of footwear.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 1530 (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding thereto the following: "and footwear having soles as herein described and with uppers composed in greater area of the outer surface of wool, cotton, ramie, animal hair, fiber, rayon or other synthetic textile, silk, including substitutes for or combinations of any of the foregoing (but excluding any other material superimposed), shall be deemed to have uppers in chief value of the material as enumerated in this paragraph."

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the foregoing amendment shall be considered as having been in effect continuously since the original enactment of section 350: *Provided*, That, for the purposes of including a continuance of the customs treatment provided for in such amendment in any trade agreement entered into pursuant to section 350 prior to the entry into force of the amendment pursuant to subsection (b), the provisions of section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1354), and of sections 3 and 4 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1360 and 1361), shall not apply.

(b) The foregoing amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall enter into force as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury following such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligations of the United States with which the amendment might conflict, but in any event not later than January 1, 1958.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "and" and insert: ", and."

Page 1, line 8, after "textile," insert: "or."

Page 2, line 22, strike out "January" and insert: "July."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 9291, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to close certain loopholes in the tariff laws through which foreign producers have continued, through artful manipulation of products, to avoid an import duty imposed specifically for the protection of the domestic rubber-soled footwear industry. This bill was introduced by our colleague on the committee, the Honorable ANTONI SADLAK, and an identical bill was also introduced by our colleague on the committee, the Honorable AIME J. FORAND.

As Members will recall, in approving H. R. 6465 of the 83d Congress, which passed this body and became Public Law 479, 83d Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means made an effort to prevent avoidance of the tariff duties on certain footwear products by foreign producers by redefining the footwear products concerned. It has developed since enactment of this law that the foreign producers have devised still further means of avoiding the duties intended to be imposed on these imports. H. R. 9291 is designed to further close these loopholes in our tariff laws.

Rubber-soled footwear with uppers of fabric and certain other materials, including tennis shoes, and so forth, was originally dutiable under paragraph 1530 (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 at the rate of 35 percent ad valorem. Following an investigation and recommendations of the Tariff Commission, the President issued on February 1, 1933, a proclamation that such rubber-soled footwear be valued on the basis of American selling price under section 402 (g)

of the Tariff Act. Public Law 479 was enacted to close a loophole through which foreign producers had avoided the duties by, among other things, inserting a leather filler between the insole and the outsole of the tennis shoe type of footwear so as to produce shoes with soles in chief value of leather, rather than wholly or in chief value of rubber or substitutes of rubber and, therefore, not within the Presidential proclamation.

A Presidential proclamation of July 22, 1955, modified the rate of duty on rubber-soled footwear under paragraph 1530 (e) to 20 percent on the American selling price. Recently, there has been an avoidance of duties under paragraph 1530 (e) on the American selling price by the addition to the uppers of tongues, eyelet reinforcements, ankle patches, and so forth, of leather, thus making the footwear either (1) in chief value of leather as a whole, or (2) with uppers in chief value of leather.

The committee report on the bill explains in some detail the manner in which the loopholes would be closed by the bill. Among other things, attention is invited to the fact that the bill adds to the chief value of the entire upper test a new alternative test of "composed in greater area of the outer surface," and the committee report explains the intent of the committee with regard to this and other provisions.

The purpose of section 2 (a) of the bill is to permit any future modification of the duty on rubber-soled footwear with textile uppers, pursuant to trade-agreements legislation to apply without question to the type of footwear which will be added to this classification by the amendment in the present bill. This would be accomplished by stating that the amendment would be considered for the purposes of section 350 of the Tariff Act, as having been in effect since the original enactment of that section.

Section 2 (b) would delay the entry into force of the amendment to give the President a period during which to negotiate with other countries parties to such trade agreements in order to obtain a modification or termination of any international obligations of the United States with which the increase in duty made by the amendment might conflict. Provision is made for the entry into force of the amendment on a date to be specified by the President to the Secretary of the Treasury, and in any event not later that July 1, 1958. A comparable provision was contained in the 1954 legislation increasing the duty on certain rubber-soled footwear (68 Stat. (pt. 1) 454).

The Committee on Ways and Means received favorable reports on this legislation from the interested Government departments and agencies and the committee was unanimous in urging enactment of this legislation by the House of Representatives.

Mr. REED. 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. REED. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9291 has as its purpose the clarification of the existing definition of certain types of footwear. The clarification is necessary for tariff and customs purposes and would close certain loopholes through which foreign producers have avoided the application of customs duty as intended by Congress.

My distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], have worked effectively and diligently to bring this legislation to its present posture. The legislation is meritorious in character and would give to our American producers the protection that Congress has consistently intended that they should have. The legislation is extremely technical in nature but the committee report accompanying the legislation provides an excellent statement of purpose and intent.

Mr. SADLAK. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, it seems that foreign manufacturers have discovered a loophole through which hundreds of thousands of pairs of rubber-soled fabric shoes have entered this country as leather footwear during the past few years. Footwear that should be properly designated as rubber footwear when being imported into this country is being classified as footwear with upper in the chief value of leather.

This loophole is being exploited by applying pieces of leather to the uppers—a tongue, a backstay, eyelet-stays, ankle patches, and so on, so that the uppers would be classified in chief value of leather. These additions provide no real improvement, but they keep the appearance of the footwear similar to that of the popular American-made rubber-soled fabric-upper footwear and yet give the benefit of a lower rate of duty.

It is certainly evident that this is merely a subterfuge on the part of foreign producers to allow them to import this footwear into this country at a lower rate of duty than they would have to pay if the footwear was properly designated as rubber.

Through this unfair competitive advantage foreign manufacturers have been able to make serious inroads into the footwear market and have caused serious damage to the domestic footwear industry resulting in unemployment to many in that industry.

I felt that this inequity should be corrected and for that reason, I introduced H. R. 9291 which is designed to close the loophole I have mentioned and put footwear imported from foreign manufacturers on the same competitive basis as the footwear manufactured by our domestic producers. It would provide that for any shoe to be classified as a leather shoe the major area of the uppers would have to be leather.

As I have said before and now wish to reiterate, unless we provide certain safeguards for our domestic producers against unfair competition from foreign imports, we will destroy the very foundation of free enterprise our economy is built on.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, considering the situation in general, and the unfair circumstances involved there are few indeed who will not join with me in asking favorable consideration of such legislation by the Congress.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NIMTZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, because of a loophole in our tariff regulations which permits certain types of rubber-sole fabric shoes to be classified as footwear with uppers in the chief value of leather, our domestic rubber-footwear industry has been unfairly subjected to low-price competition from foreign manufacturers. This is due to the fact that under present regulations a rubber-sole shoe with fabric upper which includes a small piece of leather, such as a tongue, an ankle patch or eyelet stay or back stay, is not designated as rubber footwear and therefore is imported at a lower rate of duty than would have applied if the item had been properly designated as rubber footwear.

H. R. 9291 would close this loophole and thus would put an end to the use of the subterfuge which has permitted foreign manufacturers to evade the duty Congress intended to apply on rubber-sole footwear with fabric uppers.

It has been my privilege to work with members of the House Ways and Means Committee concerning this legislation. On February 6, I introduced H. R. 10573, which is similar to and would accomplish the same purpose as H. R. 9291, the bill under consideration today.

Mr. Speaker, the rubber-footwear industry is vital, not only for the health but also for the defense of our country, and should be provided with reasonable safeguards against such unfair competition.

For these and other equally valid reasons, I respectfully urge the enactment of the legislation provided in H. R. 9291.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 14, 1958, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY BILL OF 1958

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9821) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1591)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9821) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, 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 to the text of the bill 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:

"SEC. 1. Federal-aid highways.

"(a) (1) Authorization of appropriations: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $900,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; and the sum of $925,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961. The sums herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

"(A) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

"(B) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

"(C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of these systems within urban areas.

"(2) Apportionments: The sums authorized by this section 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).

"(b) Availability for expenditure: Any sums apportioned to any State under this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided,* That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums herein and heretofore apportioned to the State is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for construction, reconstruction, or improvements of specific projects as provided in this Act and prior Acts: *Provided further,* That in the case of those sums heretofore, herein, or hereafter apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may, upon the request of any State, discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, specifications, estimates, surveys, contract awards, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects by his receiving and approving a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of such State applicable to projects in this category approved by him: *Provided further,* That such approval shall not be given unless such standards and procedures are in accordance with the objectives set forth in section 1 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950: *And provided further,* That nothing contained in the foregoing provisos shall be construed to relieve any State of its obligation now provided by law relative to maintenance, nor to relieve the Secretary of Commerce of his obligation with respect to the selection of the secondary system or the location of projects thereon, to make a final inspection after construction of each project, and to require an adequate showing of the estimated and actual cost of construction of each project. Any Federal-aid primary, secondary, or urban funds released by the payment of the final voucher or by modification of the formal project agreement shall be credited to the same class of funds, primary, secondary, or urban, previously apportioned to the State and be immediately available for expenditure.

"SEC. 2. Additional authorization of appropriation of Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban funds.

"(a) Amount and apportionment: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, $400,000,000 in addition to any sums heretofore authorized for such fiscal year. The sum herein authorized shall be apportioned: (A) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system, (B) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, and (C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of these systems within urban areas among the several States immediately upon enactment of this Act 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), using the same percentage distribution as was used in the apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds heretofore authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

"(b) Availability for expenditure: The amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 2 (a) herein shall be available for expenditure pursuant to contracts awarded or work commenced by the State highway departments prior to December 1, 1958, for completion of construction prior to December 1, 1959, 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. Any amounts apportioned to a State under provisions of this section remaining unexpended on December 1, 1958, shall lapse: *Provided,* That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when covered by contracts awarded or work commenced prior to December 1, 1958, and on account of which formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce are entered into prior to January 1, 1959, for specific projects.

"(c) Expenditure without limitation as to system: The sums apportioned under this section shall be available for expenditure for projects on the primary or secondary Federal-aid systems, including extensions of these systems within urban areas, without limitation as to the amount of any class of funds, primary, secondary, or urban, apportioned for projects on any system.

"(d) Federal share: The Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall not exceed 66⅔ per centum of the total cost thereof plus, in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, a percentage of the remaining 33⅓ per centum 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 per centum of the total cost of such project.

"(e) Authorization of appropriation for increasing Federal share: For the purpose of assisting any State in meeting the requirements for State funds to match any sums apportioned to such State under the provisions of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $115,000,000 which sum may be used by the Secretary of Commerce upon the request of any State to increase the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section: *Provided,* That the amount of such increase of the Federal share shall not exceed two-thirds of the State's share of the cost of such project.

"(f) Repayment of amounts used to increase Federal share: The total amount of such increases in the Federal share as are made pursuant to subsection (e) above, shall be repaid to the Federal Government by making deductions of sums equal to the amounts so expended for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system, the Federal-aid secondary highway system and extensions of such systems in urban areas in two equal annual installments from the amounts available to such State for expenditure on such highways under any apportionment of funds herein or hereafter authorized to be appropriated therefor for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1961 and June 30, 1962.

"(g) Contract authority: Approval by the Secretary of Commerce of any project on account of which the Federal share is increased under the provisions of this section shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of such increase in the Federal share, and its expenditure shall be governed by the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"(h) Declaration of intent: It is hereby declared to be the intent of the Congress that the sum authorized under subsection (a) of this section shall be supplementary to, and not in lieu of, any other sum heretofore or herein authorized for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary or secondary systems, including extensions of these systems within urban areas, and is made available for the purpose of immediate acceleration of the rate of highway construction on these systems beyond that being accomplished with funds heretofore authorized.

"SEC. 3. Forest highways and forest development roads and trails.

"(a) Authorization of appropriations: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the additional sum of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the sum of $33,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the additional sum of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the sum of $30,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961: *Provided,* That, with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings may be

held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for forest highways and forest development roads and trails shall also be available for adjacent vehicular parking areas and for sanitary, water, and fire control facilities: *Provided further*, That the additional sum authorized under this subsection for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, shall be apportioned for expenditure in each State, Alaska, and Puerto Rico immediately upon enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the additional amount herein authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the amounts authorized herein for forest highways for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, shall be apportioned for expenditure in each State, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in same percentage as the amounts apportioned for expenditure in each State, Alaska, and Puerto Rico from funds authorized for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958: *And provided further*, That when approved by the Secretary of Commerce, a State may use not to exceed the lesser of $500,000 or 5 per centum of the amounts apportioned to such State under section 1 hereof for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of forest highways on any of the Federal-aid highway systems and such sums may be expended in the same manner as funds authorized by this section.

"(b) Forest highways study: The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the appropriate officers of each State containing a national forest, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territory of Alaska, shall make a study to determine—

"(1) the roads of primary importance to a State, county, or community which are within, adjoining, or adjacent to a national forest and have not been designated as forest highways;

"(2) the amount necessary to complete construction of all designated forest highways;

"(3) the amounts necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for each of the nine succeeding fiscal years to survey, construct, reconstruct, and maintain (A) roads described in paragraph (1) of this subsection if such roads were forest highways, and (B) roads designated as forest highways, in accordance with a program to be recommended by the Secretary of Commerce after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture; and

"(4) the method by which the amounts determined pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection should be apportioned for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico.

"The Secretary of Commerce shall report the results of such study to the President and the Congress on or before January 1, 1960.

"SEC. 4. Roads and trails in national parks, etc.

"(a) National parks, etc.: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

"(b) Parkways: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

"(c) Indian reservations and lands: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

"SEC. 5. Public lands highways.

"For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the additional sum of $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the sum of $3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961.

"SEC. 6. Special provisions for Federal domain roads, etc.

"Any funds authorized herein for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be available for contract upon apportionment, or a date not earlier than one year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized if no apportionment is required: *Provided*, That any amount remaining unexpended two years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized shall lapse. The Secretary of the department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter in contracts under such authorizations, and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated. Any funds heretofore, herein, or hereafter authorized for any fiscal year for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums authorized for such fiscal year and previous fiscal years since and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, shall have been obligated. Any of such funds released by payment of final voucher or modification of project authorization shall be credited to the balance of unobligated authorizations and be immediately available for expenditure.

"SEC. 7. (a) Authorization of appropriations for interstate system.

"Section 108 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Authorization of appropriations: For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization heretofore made for that year, the additional sum of $1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the additional sum of $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the additional sum of $1,025,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.'

"(b) Apportionments: Any portion of the additional sum authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, by section 108 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended by this section, that has not been apportioned heretofore shall be apportioned immediately upon enactment of this Act, using certifications previously furnished by the States pursuant to section 108 (j) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and using the same percentage distributions as were used heretofore in the apportionment of funds authorized by section 108 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

"SEC. 8. Approval of estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System.

"The estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System in each State, transmitted to the Congress on January 7, 1958, by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the provisions of section 108 (d) of the Act approved June 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 374), and published as House Document Numbered 300, Eighty-fifth Congress, second session, is hereby approved as the basis for making the apportionment of the funds authorized for the Interstate System for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960.

"SEC. 9. Apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds for fiscal years 1959 and 1960.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 209 (g) of the Act approved June 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 374), the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to apportion among the several States in the manner provided by law, all of the funds authorized for the fiscal years 1959 and 1960, for the Interstate System and the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems, including extensions thereof within urban areas.

"SEC. 10. Payments for stockpiled materials.

"The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: 'plus the United States pro rata part of the value of the materials which have been stockpiled in the vicinity of such construction or reconstruction in conformity to said plans and specifications'.

"SEC. 11.

"Subsection (a) of section 111 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Availability of Federal funds for reimbursement to States: Subject to the conditions contained in this section, whenever a State shall pay for the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal-aid primary or secondary systems or on the Interstate System, including extensions thereof

within urban areas, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such cost in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project: *Provided,* That Federal funds shall not be reimbursed to any State under this section when the payment to the utility violates the law of the State or violates a legal contract between the utility and the State: *Provided further,* That such reimbursement shall be made only after evidence satisfactory to the Secretary shall have been presented to him substantiating the fact that the State has paid such cost from its own funds with respect to Federal-aid highway projects for which Federal funds are obligated subsequent to the date of enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958 for work, including relocation of utility facilities.'

"SEC. 12.

"The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374) is amended by renumbering section 122 as section 123 and inserting a new section 122, as follows:

"'SEC. 122. Areas adjacent to the Interstate System.

"'(a) National policy: To promote the safety, convenience, and enjoyment of public travel and the free flow of interstate commerce and to protect the public investment in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, it is hereby declared to be in the public interest to encourage and assist the States to control the use of and to improve areas adjacent to the Interstate System by controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices adjacent to that system. It is hereby declared to be a national policy that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, or devices within six hundred and sixty feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main-traveled way of all portions of the Interstate System constructed upon any part of right-of-way, the entire width of which is acquired subsequent to July 1, 1956, should be regulated, consistent with national standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary, which shall include only the following four types of signs, and no signs advertising illegal activities:

"'(1) Directional or other official signs or notices that are required or authorized by law.

"'(2) Signs advertising the sale or lease of the property upon which they are located.

"'(3) Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization or permitted under State law, and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, advertising activities being conducted at a location within twelve miles of the point at which such signs are located.

"'(4) Signs erected or maintained pursuant to authorization in State law and not inconsistent with the national policy and standards of this section, and designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public.

"'(b) Agreements: The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to enter into agreements with State highway departments (including such supplementary agreements as may be necessary) to carry out the national policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section with respect to the Interstate System within the State. Any such agreement shall include provisions for regulation and control of the erection and maintenance of advertising signs, displays, and other advertising devices in conformity with the standards established in accordance with subsection (a) and may include, among other things, provisions for preservation of natural beauty, prevention of erosion, landscaping, reforestation, development of viewpoints for scenic attractions that are accessible to the public without charge, and the erection of markers, signs, or plaques, and development of areas in appreciation of sites of historical significance. Upon application of the State, any such agreement may, within the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, consistent with the national policy, provide for excluding from application of the national standards segments of the Interstate System which traverse incorporated municipalities wherein the use of real property adjacent to the Interstate System is subject to municipal regulation or control, or which traverse other areas where the land use is clearly established by State law as industrial or commercial: *Provided, however,* That any such segment excluded from the application of such standards shall not be considered in computing the increase of the Federal share payable on account thereof.

"'(c) Federal share: Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), if an agreement pursuant to this section has been entered into with any State prior to July 1, 1961, the Federal share payable on account of any project on the Interstate System within that State provided for by funds authorized under the provisions of section 108 of this Act, to which the national policy and the agreement apply, shall be increased by one-half of one per centum of the total cost thereof, not including any additional cost that may be incurred in the carrying out of the agreement: *Provided,* That the increase in the Federal share which is payable hereunder shall be paid only from appropriations from moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, which such appropriations are hereby authorized.

"'(d) Whenever any portion of the Interstate System is located upon or adjacent to any public lands or reservations of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce may make such arrangements and enter into such agreements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands or reservations as may be necessary to carry out the national policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section, and any such agency is hereby authorized and directed to cooperate fully with the Secretary of Commerce in this connection.

"'(e) Whenever a State shall acquire by purchase or condemnation the right to advertise or regulate advertising in an area adjacent to the right-of-way of a project on the Interstate System for the purpose of implementing this section, the cost of such acquisition shall be considered as a part of the cost of construction of such project and Federal funds may be used to pay the Federal pro rata share of such cost: *Provided,* That reimbursement to the State shall be made only with respect to that portion of such cost which does not exceed 5 per centum of the cost of the right-of-way for such project.'

"SEC. 13. Public hearings.

"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 Secretary of Commerce 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 contiguous to whose property the highway will pass to express any objections they may have to the proposed location of such highway.'

"SEC. 14. Relationship of this act to other acts: Effective date.

"All provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, together with all Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and effect and be applicable hereto. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed. This Act shall take effect on the date of enactment.

"SEC. 15. Short title.

"This Act may be cited as the 'Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958'."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved June 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 374), to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
MYRON V. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ROBERT S. KERR,
ALBERT GORE,
EDWARD MARTIN,
FRANCIS CASE,
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. 9821 amending and supplementing the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the House bill strikes all after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in the conference are noted in the following outline except for incidental minor differences made necessary by reason of technical and clerical conforming amendments.

SECTION 2. ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION OF FEDERAL-AID PRIMARY, SECONDARY, AND URBAN FUNDS

There is no provision in the House bill comparable to section 2 of the Senate amendment.

(a) Amount and apportionment: Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Senate amendment would authorize the appropriation of an additional $400 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, for immediate apportionment for projects on the ABC systems at the percentages and in accordance with the normal procedures now provided by law.

Subsection (a) of section 2 of the proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(b) Availability for expenditure: Subsection (b) of section 2 of the Senate amendment provides that the $400 million shall be available only for expenditure on contracts awarded by the State before December 1, 1958, which provide for completion of construction before December 1, 1959, subject to delays not the fault of the contractor or created by acts of God. The subsection also provides that the amount apportioned to a State not expended on December 1, 1958, shall lapse.

Except for minor technical changes subsection (b) of section 2 of the proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(c) Expenditure without limitation as to system: Subsection (c) of section 2 of the

Senate amendment provides that when the $400 million has been apportioned, a State may spend its share of these funds without limitation as to the percentage to be utilized on any one system.

Except for a technical amendment, the proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(d) Federal share: Subsection (d) of section 2 of the Senate amendment provides that the Federal share payable on account of any project the funds for which are provided out of the $400 million authorized by this section shall be 70 percent and thus the State's share will be 30 percent. A provision for increasing the Federal share up to 95 percent of the total cost in States having more than 5 percent public lands and nontaxable Indian lands is also included in this subsection.

Subsection (d) of section 2 of the proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that the Federal share shall not exceed 66⅔ percent.

(e) Authorization of appropriation for increasing Federal share: Subsection (e) of section 2 of the Senate amendment authorizes the appropriation of $115 million, which may be used by the Secretary of Commerce to increase the Federal share payable on any projects the funds for which are provided in this section when the State requests such increase in the Federal share. The increase in the Federal share is limited to not to exceed two-thirds of the State's share of the cost of the project.

Subsection (e) of section 2 of the conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(f) Repayment of amounts used to increase Federal share: Subsection (f) of section 2 of the Senate amendment provides that if the Federal share is increased under subsection (e), the Federal Government shall be reimbursed by deducting the amount of the increase in two equal installments from the amounts to be made available to the State under the apportionments for ABC systems for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1961, and June 30, 1962.

Except for technical amendments, subsection (f) of section 2 of the proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(g) Contract authority: Subsection (g) of section 2 of the Senate amendment provides that approval by the Secretary of Commerce of a project under this section shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the increased Federal share and further provides that such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated. This language is a technical requirement made necessary because the funds being advanced are not to be distributed by apportionment.

Except for technical amendments, the proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(h) Declaration of intent: Subsection (h) of section 2 of the Senate amendment declares it to be the intent of Congress that the $400 million authorized by this section shall be in addition to and not in place of any other money authorized for the ABC systems and that the purpose of providing this $400 million is to immediately accelerate construction of the ABC systems beyond that being accomplished with the funds now authorized.

Except for technical changes, the proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

SECTION 3. FOREST HIGHWAYS AND FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

(a) Authorization of appropriation: Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Senate amendment authorizes appropriations for forest highways and for forest development roads and trails. It differs from the House bill in that it provides for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, an additional $10 million for forest highways. The House bill does not provide such an authorization. The proposed conference substitute would authorize an additional $5 million for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. The Senate amendment provides $36 million for such highways for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961. The equivalent provision in the House bill is an authorization of $30 million for such highways for such fiscal years. The proposed conference substitute authorizes $33 million for such highways for such fiscal years. The Senate amendment provides for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, an additional authorization of $13 million for forest development roads and trails. The House bill does not provide such an authorization. The proposed conference substitute would authorize an additional $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, for forest development roads and trails. The Senate amendment authorized $34 million for such roads and trails for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961. In connection with the Senate amendment for forest development roads and trails, the Forest Service is requested to give due cognizance to the need to provide all-weather roads to recreational areas under Federal jurisdiction. The House bill provides $28,500,000 for such roads and trails for such fiscal years. The proposed conference substitute provides $30 million. The Senate amendment provides that with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber-access road advisory public hearings may be held. The House bill with respect to such proposed timber-access roads provides that advisory hearings shall be held. The proposed conference substitute adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

Section 3 of the Senate amendment also provides that in apportioning the funds for forest highways authorized under this section for fiscal years ending June 30, 1959, 1960, and 1961, the same percentage shall be apportioned to each State, Alaska, and Puerto Rico as was apportioned from the funds authorized for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958. The House bill provides that the apportionment for forest highways for fiscal years ending June 1960, and June 30, 1961, shall be in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

The proposed conference substitute, except for technical changes, is the same as the Senate amendment.

Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Senate amendment further provides that a State may transfer not to exceed the lesser of $500,000 or 5 percent of the amount apportioned to it under the first section of this act (relating to apportionments for the ABC systems) to augment its apportionment for forest highways and when transferred such sums may be expended as any other funds authorized for forest highway purposes.

The proposed conference substitute, except for technical changes, is the same as the Senate amendment.

(b) Forest highways: Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Senate amendment requires the Secretary of Commerce to make a study in cooperation with the appropriate officers of each State containing a national forest, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territory of Alaska, to determine forest roads of primary importance, including those within, adjoining, or adjacent to national forests, which have not been designated as forest highways, together with the amounts necessary for survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance for 10 fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1961, and the method by which such amounts should be apportioned for expenditure and requires a report to be made to the President and Congress on or before January 1, 1960. The House bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except for certain technical amendments, the principal one being to include the Secretary of Agriculture in the group to cooperate with the Secretary of Commerce in making the study, recommendations, and report.

SECTION 4. ROADS AND TRAILS IN NATIONAL PARKS, ETC.

(a) National parks, etc.: Subsection (a) of Section 3 of the House bill authorizes the appropriation of $16,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, for roads and trails in national parks. The Senate amendment provides an increase of $4,000,000 over this amount thus authorizing $20,000,000 for each such fiscal year for roads and trails in national parks.

The proposed conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $18,000,000 for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, for roads and trails in national parks.

(c) Indian reservations and lands: Subsection (c) of section 3 of the House bill is the same as subsection (c) of section 4 of the Senate amendment, both relating to Indian reservation roads and bridges, with the exception that the House bill provides for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and bridges on Indian reservations and lands and the Senate amendment provides for the construction, reconstruction and improvement of Indian reservation roads and bridges.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

SECTION 5. PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS

Section 4 of the House bill relating to public lands highways authorizes the appropriation of $2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961. The Senate amendment provides an authorization of an additional $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the appropriation of $4,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961.

The proposed conference substitute authorizes an additional $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and authorizes the appropriation of $3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961.

SECTION 7

The House bill contains no provision comparable to section 7 of the Senate amendment.

(a) Authorization of appropriations for Interstate System: Subsection (a) of section 7 of the Senate amendment amends section 108 (b) (relating to the authorization of appropriations for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase the authorization presently contained in that section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, by $200 million and for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, by an additional $300 million for each such fiscal year. This would be a total increase in authorization for the Interstate System for these 3 fiscal years of $800 million. The total authorization for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, would thus be $2.2 billion; for fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, $2.5 billion; and for fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, $2.5 billion.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(b) Apportionments: Subsection (b) of section 7 of the Senate amendment provides that the additional $200 million authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, for the Interstate System shall be apportioned immediately upon enactment of this act.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except for technical amendments.

SECTION 8. APPROVAL OF ESTIMATE OF COST OF COMPLETING THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

The House bill contains no provision comparable to section 8 of the Senate amendment.

Section 8 of the Senate amendment approves as the basis for making the apportionment of funds authorized for the Interstate System for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the estimate of cost for completing such Interstate System which was transmitted to Congress January 7, 1958, by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with section 108 (d) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

SECTION 9. APPORTIONMENT OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1959 AND 1960

The House bill contains no provision comparable to section 9 of the Senate amendment.

Section 9 of the Senate amendment has the effect of suspending for the fiscal years 1959 and 1960, the operation of section 209 (g) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, which requires the adjustment of apportionments whenever amounts in the Highway Trust Fund are not sufficient to defray expenditures required to be made from that fund. It further requires the Secretary of Commerce to apportion among the several States all of the funds authorized for the fiscal years 1959 and 1960 for the Interstate System and the ABC Systems.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

SECTION 10. PAYMENTS FOR STOCKPILED MATERIALS

The House bill contains no provision comparable to section 10 of the Senate amendment.

Section 10 of the Senate amendment amends section 13 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921, to provide that progress payments made in connection with construction or reconstruction projects may include the United States pro rata share of the value of materials stockpiled in the vicinity of such construction or reconstruction in conformity with the approved plans and specifications for incorporation in such projects.

Except for technical amendments, the conference substitute is the same as section 10 of the Senate amendment.

SECTION 11

The House bill contains no provision comparable to section 11 of the Senate amendment.

Subsection (a) of section 11 of the Senate amendment amends section 111 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 by adding a proviso at the end thereof which would require that reimbursement for the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by construction of a Federal-aid highway project be made only after evidence has been presented to the Secretary of Commerce that the State paid such cost from its own funds and the Secretary is satisfied of that fact by that evidence. Except for this new proviso, this section continues in effect the present law as set forth in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 insofar as Federal funds are used for reimbursement to the various States for their payment of the cost of utility relocation.

Subsection (b) of section 11 of the Senate amendment makes the proviso added to section 111 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 applicable only with respect to those Federal-aid highway projects for which funds are obligated for work, including relocation of utility facilities, after the date of enactment of this act.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that certain technical amendments were made, and the provisions of subsection (b) of section 11 of the Senate amendment are made a part of a new proviso added to section 111 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

SECTION 12

The House bill contains no provision comparable to section 12 of the Senate amendment.

Section 12 of the Senate amendment would renumber existing section 122 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 as section 123 and would insert after the existing section 121 of such act of 1956 a new section 122.

Subsection (a) of this new section 122 states as a new national policy that it is in the public interest to encourage and assist the States to control the use of and improve the areas adjacent to the Interstate System by controlling outdoor advertising in those areas. It specifies as national policy that outdoor advertising along Interstate System highways which is visible from the main portion of the highway and within a distance of 660 feet should be regulated consistent with standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce, which shall include only the following four types of signs: (1) Directional or other official signs and notices required or authorized by law; (2) signs advertising the sale or lease of property upon which they are located; (3) signs permitted by State law advertising activities within 12 miles of the point at which the signs are located which signs are consistent with the national policy and standards; and (4) signs designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public which are erected pursuant to State law and which are consistent with the national policy and standards. It is the intent of this subsection to eliminate all signs advertising illegal activities. The application of subsection (a) is restricted to rights-of-way on the Interstate System the entire width of which is acquired subsequent to July 1, 1956.

Subsection (b) of such new section 122 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to enter into agreements with State highway departments to carry out the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section with respect to the Interstate System. Any such agreement would include provisions for regulation and control of the erection and maintenance of advertising signs, displays, and other advertising devices in conformity with the standards established under subsection (a). It further provides that upon the application of any State any such agreement may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, exclude from the application of the national standards set forth in subsection (a) of this new section 122, those portions of the Interstate System which pass through municipalities wherein the use of real property adjacent to the Interstate System is subject to municipal regulation and control, or which traverse areas where the land use is clearly established by State law as industrial or commercial. Subsection (b) further provides that any section of the Interstate System so excluded from the application of the standards provided under authority of subsection (a) shall not be considered in computing the increase of the Federal share payable because of the control of advertising on the Interstate System.

Subsection (c) of such new section 122 provides that if an agreement to control advertising is entered into between the Secretary of Commerce and any State pursuant to this section before July 1, 1961, the Federal share payable on account of any project on the Interstate System within that State provided for by funds authorized under section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to which this new national policy shall apply shall be increased by one-half of one percent of the total cost thereof. This in effect would increase the Federal share for payment on the Interstate System to ninety and one-half percent. This subsection further provides that the increased one-half percent shall be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and such appropriations are authorized by the subsection.

Subsection (d) of such new section 122 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to enter into an agreement with any agency having jurisdiction over lands and reservations of the United States which are public in nature and adjacent to the Interstate System to carry out the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section. It further authorizes and directs any such agency to fully cooperate with the Secretary of Commerce.

Subsection (e) provides that whenever a State shall acquire by purchase or condemnation the right to advertise or regulate advertising in an area adjacent to the right-of-way on a project of the Interstate System for the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in this new section 122 the cost of such acquisition shall be considered as a part of the construction cost of the project with the limitation that Federal funds not in excess of 5 percent of the cost of the right-of-way for such project may be used to reimburse the State for the acquisition of such adjacent area.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

SECTION 13. PUBLIC HEARINGS

There is no provision in the House bill comparable to section 13 of the Senate amendment.

Section 13 of the Senate amendment amends section 116 (c) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 by inserting language which provides that whenever a State highway department submits plans for an Interstate System project in a rural area it shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has held a public hearing within that rural area at a convenient location or afforded an opportunity for such hearing for the purpose of hearing testimony from interested persons within the rural area through or by whose property the Interstate System project will pass.

Except for technical amendments, the proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Under the conference agreement the title of the bill is "An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, and the act approved June 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 374), to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes."

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
MYRON V. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us today has two major points in it that were not considered in the House at any time. The ABC bill that passed the House just two weeks ago is identical to the corresponding part of the bill that is before us now with the exception of an increase in forest and park highways and roads, an increase of $400 million emergency fund for ABC roads for 1959 which would be advanced to the States. In ad-

dition there is $115 million that will be available for advancement to the States.

This money can be borrowed by the States and paid back by subtracting the amount of money borrowed from their fiscal year 1961 and 1962 allotment out of the ABC funds.

The formula of distribution of the money is two-thirds to one-third; two-thirds supplied by the Government and one-third supplied by the States.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Did the gentleman have reference to the $400 million on the two-thirds to one-third basis? Is that contrary to past procedure?

Mr. FALLON. In the past procedure, the regular Federal-Aid Highway Act, is fifty-fifty.

Mr. ARENDS. That is what I thought. This is a new procedure. Where does this $400 million come from?

Mr. FALLON. Out of direct appropriations to be repaid out of the trust fund.

Mr. ARENDS. This is a new appropriation which it would be necessary for the Congress to make?

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

The $115 million to be advanced to be paid back by the States can be borrowed from the Government out of this fund up to two-thirds of the States' share, so that the work that is already planned and ready to put under contract can be started immediately.

This easy method of borrowing is used because many of the States have obligated all of their money and this makes it more simple for them to raise additional money.

The conferees of both the House and the Senate felt in this connection that this would be an orderly manner in which to get money into all of the counties in the country. It can be controlled by the governors or the State highway officials of the individual States by allocating the money in distressed areas of their States. The money will be controlled almost exactly the same way that all ABC money has been controlled in the past.

Except for the additional $400 million, the amount of money under the ABC program remains the same as passed the House, that is, as it is contemplated in the regular Federal-Aid Highway Act.

The other major change was on forest and park roads and trails. This amount was increased in conference. Forest roads were increased $5 million for 1959 over the bill that passed the House, and $3 million for 1960 and 1961 over the amount that was passed by the House.

Forest roads and development trails was increased $5 million for 1959 and $1,500,000 for 1960 and 1961.

Funds for park roads were increased $2 million over the House figure for 1960 and 1961.

Parkways remained the same.

Indian roads remained the same.

Public lands, $3 million was added, $1 million in 1959 and $1 million in 1960 and 1961.

These were the major changes in the public domain roads.

The difference in the House bill and the conference substitute is that funds for the Interstate System were not included in the House bill. The Senate added $200 million for 1959. The House receded and concurred with that additional amount. In 1960 and 1961, $300 million annually was added to the 1956 act, in which the House receded and concurred.

These were the major changes in the financing authorization and development of the highways.

The other major change, and it is new legislation, is the section which limits the construction of billboards on approximately 25,000 miles of road in the Interstate System. It pays to the States an additional sum of one-half of 1 percent of the total amount of money that is allocated to them by the Federal Government if they will control billboards on this 25,000 miles. This is 25,000 miles out of approximately 776,000 miles of Federal-aid highways. The only thing it does is to limit it to these 25,000 additional miles.

Under the appropriation for ABC roads, many, many miles will be built with Federal-aid money that will allow the advertising people to extend their business for many miles along those roads. We are only restricting them on the Interstate System. The initiative starts with the States. The Government does not state that billboards cannot be built on the Interstate System. They merely pay a premium to the States, if they can comply with the act. That, gentlemen, is a description of the major changes that have not been considered by the House previously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, our colleague on the committee, such time as he may desire.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time allotted to me by my distinguished friend and chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works who was also chairman of the conferees on the part of the House. I, personally, feel it is to be regretted that this bill comes before us with so many important changes which were not in the House bill which was passed unanimously by this body, and now presented to us in this conference report. There are many items in the legislation that have never been considered by this body or by the Committee on Public Works. You will recall some days ago we passed a bill which was authored by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], which is known as the ABC bill. That legislation simply renewed the existing law. This was done because we felt that the law had only been in operation for 15 or 16 months and we did not care to make any direct changes until it had had a little greater opportunity to work.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. FALLON. I said previously that many changes had been made that the House had not considered. Would the gentleman tell us if there were any changes in the conference report other than what I have explained to the House?

Mr. McGREGOR. I regret very much that I did not hear what the gentleman said was in difference. But I will enumerate some and, if I am in error, I certainly will stand to be corrected.

The first matter which we did not give any consideration, either in the House or our Committee on Public Works, is the one that is in so much controversy, namely, the billboard provision. In checking the records of the other body, we find that they had about 15 or 16 hours of debate on the billboard section, and about 20 minutes' debate on several million dollars' worth of highway construction and highway program. That subject is one of the various problems in the bill that we have never considered. I might also add: In this bill there is a change in the utility section from what we passed in the House when the 1956 act was before us for consideration.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman will remember that when we came to the utility section in conference, we accepted that because we thought it improved the legislation that had been passed heretofore.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. FALLON. It merely states that a State must show proof that they have advanced money to a utility company. They must show proof. Under the existing law, they did not have to show proof but just had to say that they had advanced money.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman is correct. But I still contend that my statement is correct because with the amendment put in by the other body, there is an inference there that the States have not been playing exactly cricket so far as the intent of the Congress is concerned. The accusation was made that some States were not paying their proportionate share and that it might be being paid by some utility. I repeat this subject was not discussed this year or at any time this legislation was before us. We are entitled and the Members are entitled to express their views on this and other subjects.

Mr. FALLON. Does the gentleman feel that this will correct any future accusations on the State, that this keeps this from happening?

Mr. McGREGOR. I think it is a good amendment, but I repeat my statement that that particular subject has never been considered either by the committee or by this body. We did not question the actions of the States—as the other body seemed to do.

There were some other changes made.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. GARY. I am particularly glad to hear the gentleman's statement. This method of procedure on this bill has given me great concern. It is the second time this year it has happened. Last year we passed a postal-rate-increase bill. It came back to us with a salary bill attached to it which was entirely different

from the bill we passed. Here we passed a simple bill, patroned by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and it comes back to us as an entirely new bill. Under that procedure the House does not have an opportunity to consider these controversial questions in the proper committee or to debate them on the floor of the House. Our only opportunity is to vote for or against the conference report. This, in my opinion, is a very poor way to legislate.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman. The records will show that I took the initiative and made a motion in the conference that the House conferees return to the House for instructions on certain portions of the bill which we had never considered. Of course it was turned down and by the majority conferees.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I would like to raise one point.

Are we here today, without ever having had an opportunity to consider the matter of going to the Treasury for $400 million, which comes out of the general fund, and then changing the formula of the amount of contribution made by the Federal Government?

Mr. FALLON. The $400 million comes out of the trust fund and will be paid back to the Treasury.

Mr. McGREGOR. I hope the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] will check his statement on the $400 million coming out of the trust fund. The $400 million comes out of the general fund and it is a debt against the general fund. It does not come out of the trust fund.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman is correct, if he wants to put it that way. The $400 million will not be a burden on the taxpayers. It will be paid back out of that trust fund.

Mr. McGREGOR. It will finally come out of the trust fund, but the $400 million that is going to be used for a boost to road construction at this time is coming out of the general revenue fund, which is putting us in the position that we may have to increase our debt limitation again. I personally feel that some in this body are spending many hours to force this administration into deficit spending. Do not forget we, the Congress, appropriate the money—it is our responsibility.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman knows that this will not affect the 1959 budget at all.

Mr. McGREGOR. Well, I do not see how it would not affect the 1959 budget. It would not if we stay put as we are, but experience has proven to me—and I am complimenting the gentleman from Maryland—this body passed his bill, and now we come back with more than $400 million additional. We are changing from a 50–50 matching basis to 66⅔ and 33⅓. And then giving the States an opportunity to borrow $115 million. We give them an opportunity to borrow $115 million if they do not have the money to match. They borrow that money from us so that they can qualify and come back and ask us to loan them some more. In other words we set rules for them to qualify under, then if they do not have the money to qualify, we loan it to them, so they will qualify to borrow some more.

Mr. FALLON. I know the reason why this bill is here today. Most of the talk has been that the committee or the House has not had a chance to express its will. The bill is here today because we are in an emergency, as far as unemployment is concerned. This bill is designed purely to get into the hands of the State officials money so that they can put it into their counties and cities so that they can improve conditions that have been reported to us as widespread unemployment.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman takes the position that this money is going to build roads?

Mr. FALLON. That is exactly what I say.

Mr. McGREGOR. In this particular bill there is a clause that provides an incentive of one-half of 1 percent to the States, if and when they do certain things as ordered by the Federal Government. We who serve in this great body resent any implication by anyone that we might materially gain if we followed their desires and dictates.

Here we are in this legislation as an agency of the Federal Government offering a bribe to the States if they do what we want them or tell them to do—we will give them free of charge one-half of 1 percent—of your money. That is bribery pure and simple.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman is not talking about the $400 million.

Mr. McGREGOR. Just a minute. The States are now on a 10-percent contribution basis, but we say to them, "If you will pass legislation that will coerce and regulate the billboard industry we will give you a bribe of one-half of 1 percent."

Mr. FALLON. May I say to the gentleman that the one-half of 1 percent that is given to the States as an incentive to do a job that we ask them to do in this bill goes entirely to the building of roads; it does not go into any other State fund.

Mr. McGREGOR. It goes to the State and it is used for the specific purpose of paying farmers and other property owners for the option so that they will not allow billboards to be displayed.

We passed the 1956 Highway Act, introduced by the gentleman from Maryland, so we could build highways, and that is what we wanted. Now we are asked to take some of that highway money and give it back to the States to get them to do what? To get them to legislate out of business a legitimate operation. Put out of employment thousands of people who pay taxes—and want to work and earn a living for their families.

We had never discussed this billboard subject and that is the reason that a little later I hope to make a motion to recommit this conference report so we may have an opportunity to hold hearings and be heard on these various matters that are very controversial and appear in this legislation as reported by conference committees.

Mr. FALLON. Is the gentleman going to make his motion to recommit with instructions?

Mr. McGREGOR. No; for the simple reason that it would take so long to pick out the defects in this bill that we would never get to a vote in the time required under the rule. It will be a straight motion to recommit; then we can hold hearings and let all have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. FALLON. In conference the gentleman made a motion to go back to the House for instructions.

Mr. McGREGOR. I shall make the motion without instructions, because I do not think we can give instructions without hearings first.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman made that motion in conference.

Mr. McGREGOR. I moved to ask the House for instruction and I do not think we can give instructions until we have a hearing—why not let people be heard? What is there to be afraid of?

Of course I made the motion in conference that the conferees go back and ask for instructions. We could go back to our committee and open it up for hearings and then we would have a sound basis on which to give instructions—certainly the Members of Congress have a right to be heard.

I certainly feel that my good friend from Maryland does not want to relinquish the rights of the House to the other body. I think it is time we exercised our rights on this and other subjects.

Mr. FALLON. I explained to the gentleman that the only reason this is here today is because of the emergency in this case. I feel as the gentleman does; I would like to hear these things in committee and bring it out on the floor where we could discuss the thing for hours and hours in the House, but, under the circumstances, we had no alternative.

Mr. McGREGOR. I agree with my friend from Maryland; but here again, as has happened before, the House passes and sends over to the other body a piece of legislation; they make extreme alterations in it, and it comes back to us under the plea of emergency and we are told we have to go along with their wishes. We should not relinquish our jurisdiction. I think it is time this body handled its own affairs, and if the other body does not want to agree we can argue it out further.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman is saying that if we are to have a conference report the conferees of the other body will recede all the time.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am not asking the Senate to recede on a thing, although I am hopeing that when we get to the conference we will have an opportunity to make a full report of the wishes of those we represent. After we have had a public works hearing and if the chairman will call our Committee on Public Works together and let some testimony be taken we can have a basis for action.

Mr. FALLON. Even if this report is sent back to conference we will have to

accept the bill of the conferees, because we will not be under instructions from the House.

Mr. McGREGOR. That will be perfectly all right; and if the conferees do what they did the other day, I will be here ready to take the floor again and send it back to conference. Why stop receiving information on subjects so important to all of us?

Mr. FALLON. Will the gentleman yield? I wish to yield some time to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes; I will be glad to.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota such time as he may desire.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman yielded me such time as I desired and I have not yielded back my time. I would like to finish my statement.

Mr. FALLON. We have already used over half the time and I would like to yield to other Members, some on the gentleman's own side, but I will let the gentleman finish his statement.

Mr. McGREGOR. I seemingly do not have the time to list other items that are certainly in controversy between the views of the House and the views of the other body.

I have named 2 or 3, but I reiterate, I think the time has come when we should be given an opportunity to give consideration to these controversial subjects. I shall ask to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement made by the conferees which gives a comparison of the bill as it passed the House, the House bill, the Senate bill, and the bill agreed to in conference. I am sorry that is not in the report but the report was just printed yesterday.

I again repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope to be able to offer a motion at the proper time that this bill be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The question I desire to ask is this: Most of the bill is acceptable or a great part of it is acceptable to most Members of the House. There are objectionable features. If the motion to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] to recommit is carried, may I ask the gentleman from Ohio how long he thinks it will delay a conference report coming back to the House after the 10-day recess and being agreed to by the Congress?

Mr. McGREGOR. In reply to the gentleman from Washington may I say that would be determined by when the chairman would call a committee meeting. I am of the definite opinion it would not delay it over 2 or 3 days, then we would be given an opportunity to do what the testimony calls for. I see our friends on the other side smiling, but if they are willing to have a meeting we will meet tonight. We do not want to delay the program but we do want to exert our will and pass legislation that is wanted by all—not just a few.

Authorizations in H. R. 9821

[Millions of dollars]

	House	Senate	Conference
ABC Federal-aid roads:			
Fiscal year 1959	--------	[1] 400	[1] 400
Fiscal year 1960	900.0	900	900
Fiscal year 1961	925.0	900	925
Forest highways:			
Fiscal year 1959	--------	[1] 10	[1] 5
Fiscal year 1960	30.0	36	33
Fiscal year 1961	30.0	36	33
Forest development roads and trails:			
Fiscal year 1959	--------	[1] 13	[1] 5
Fiscal year 1960	28.5	34	30
Fiscal year 1961	28.5	34	30
Park roads:			
Fiscal year 1960	16.0	20	18
Fiscal year 1961	16.0	20	18
Parkways:			
Fiscal year 1960	16.0	16	16
Fiscal year 1961	16.0	16	16
Indian roads:			
Fiscal year 1960	12.0	12	12
Fiscal year 1961	12.0	12	12
Public-land highways:			
Fiscal year 1959	--------	[1] 2	[1] 1
Fiscal year 1960	2.0	4	3
Fiscal year 1961	2.0	4	3
Interstate highways:			
Fiscal year 1959	([2])	[1] 200	[1] 200
Fiscal year 1960	([2])	[1] 300	[1] 300
Fiscal year 1961	--------	[1] 300	[1] 300
Total	2,034.0	3,269	3,260
Totals by fiscal years:			
Fiscal year 1959	--------	[1] [3] 625	[1] [3] 611
Fiscal year 1960	1,017.0	[4] 1,322	[4] 1,312
Fiscal year 1961	1,017.0	[4] 1,322	[4] 1,337

[1] Added.
[2] No interstate funds.
[3] Includes $200 million added for interstate.
[4] Includes $300 million added for interstate.

Unprogramed balances of Federal aid highway funds, as of Feb. 28, 1958

[Thousands of dollars]

State	ABC	Interstate	Total
Alabama	1,538	32,055	33,593
Arizona	2,775	7,683	10,458
Arkansas	14,764	9,644	24,408
California	32,606	23,017	55,623
Colorado	13,680	23,876	37,556
Connecticut	26,554	24,948	51,502
Delaware	2,008	20,758	22,766
Florida	6,441	4,507	10,948
Georgia	11,643	6,881	18,524
Idaho	7,466	29,803	37,269
Illinois	30,907	15,558	46,465
Indiana	28,249	66,700	94,949
Iowa	4,350	26,637	30,987
Kansas	6,026	21,178	27,204
Kentucky	6,629	43,148	49,777
Louisiana	9,753	9,586	19,339
Maine	7,607	18,887	26,494
Maryland	3,818	6,153	9,971
Massachusetts	11,441	17,215	28,655
Michigan	23,316	39,347	62,663
Minnesota	17,375	39,511	56,886
Mississippi	8,048	4,232	12,280
Missouri	12,314	19,514	31,828
Montana	12,579	51,357	63,936
Nebraska	10,240	46,094	56,334
Nevada	8,821	22,623	31,444
New Hempshire	2,945	15,942	18,887
New Jersey	28,967	56,963	85,930
New Mexico	4,166	5,479	9,645
New York	62,799	63,913	126,712
North Carolina	20,791	44,449	65,240
North Dakota	4,327	14,134	18,461
Ohio	15,393	1,601	16,994
Oklahoma	5,470	10,723	16,193
Oregon	7,748	23,452	31,200
Pennsylvania	27,473	73,199	100,672
Rhode Island	4,422	5,018	9,440
South Carolina	8,869	12,725	21,594
South Dakota	2,861	1,060	3,921
Tennessee	13,427	20,775	34,202
Texas	36,287	26,480	62,767
Utah	2,666	4,356	7,022
Vermont	3,696	1,265	4,961
Virginia	7,756	10,876	18,632
Washington	10,617	25,837	36,454
West Virginia	11,084	28,592	39,676
Wisconsin	11,171	69,789	80,960
Wyoming	1,020	5,364	6,384
District of Columbia	12,252	11,923	24,175
Hawaii	2,835	----------	2,835
Puerto Rico	7,589	----------	7,589
Alaska	13,809	----------	13,809
Total	651,387	1,164,827	1,816,214

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, only one provision in this bill will put very many people to work immediately. This is the provision increasing the forest access road and trail authorization that is now $27 million a year to $32 million.

The spending of this extra forest access road money can be started almost immediately after appropriations for it are available on next July 1.

The Forest Service is prepared and ready to start letting contracts for building these access roads at once. These roads are of a type that require the use of tremendous amounts of hand labor, and their building therefore will be most helpful in creating jobs almost immediately for unemployed persons. Among the labor required to build such roads is that of timber fallers, buckers, logging-truck drivers and caterpillar operators. Many of these are unemployed in Washington and Oregon due to the current slump in the lumber and plywood industries.

I hope the Forest Service will give special attention to building first forest roads in areas where unemployment is greatest.

Owing to the tremendous holdings of Federal timber in Oregon and Washington about one-half of this extra money will be used to build forest access roads in these two States. Unemployment in Washington and Oregon is far above the national average. Washington and Oregon on March 15, according to a report of the Department of Labor, had 102,619 unemployed on that date, as compared to only 30,779 on the same date a year ago.

GENERAL HIGHWAY FUNDS

While the sums provided by this bill for the construction of interstate roads and of State roads—primary, secondary, and urban—is enormous, there is small prospect that the funds will be used quickly to increase road construction although we all hope it will be used quickly.

In most States, governors have been dragging their feet on building roads with the Federal funds already available to them for such road construction. The Federal Bureau of Public Roads report for March 1, 1958, shows that there now is more than $1.1 billion of Interstate Highway Federal money available to the States but which has not been requested by the States for use on road jobs.

The same report shows that $600 million of Federal funds that are available to the governors for the asking for State primary, secondary, and urban roadbuilding are still lying here in Washington awaiting requests for their use from the governors.

The greatest help to create roadbuilding jobs for the unemployed would be for the governors to request and use

Federal money now available to them which they so far have not requested.

Great sums authorized by Congress to help the States build roads do no good unless the governors ask for it and use it.

Some States are doing a good job on the roadbuilding program. California, Kansas, Ohio, Illinois, Oklahoma, and Michigan are using all of the money or nearly all of it allocated to them by the Federal Government. Many of the other States have used only from 25 to 50 percent of the money allocated to their States.

I urge governors who have been dragging their feet on the roads program to make a greater effort to speed up use of the Federal road funds which are available to them for the asking.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I shall not go into any very detailed discussion about the provisions of this bill, which is pretty well understood by most of this body, so I shall dwell largely on the most controversial section of the bill, section 12, known as the billboard section.

However, at the outset, I want to say that I agree in part with the gentleman from Ohio, and I feel, as does our very able chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], that it is rather regrettable that the House Public Works Committee was not given an opportunity to work on a bill which has had weeks of hearings on the Senate side, and several days of debate on the floor.

But the circumstances were such that we were rushed into conference early this week in order to have the conference report up before the House before the Easter recess, so here we are. So I agree that there are sections of this bill which should have had thorough hearings and discussion in committee, and perhaps some of the matter should not, and perhaps under normal circumstances, would not, be included in this bill.

But be that as it may, the important part of this bill is that part which provides the moneys for highway construction, especially the supplemental funds which will be advanced to the States to help them accelerate an already lagging road construction program, and also to give a boost to the economy and provide employment which is badly needed in so many parts of the country. The overwhelming substance of this bill lies in its fiscal provisions, and it is important we move this right along, and that we not be distracted or delayed by the 1 or 2 sections about which there is difference of opinion.

The most controversial section is section 12.

Section 12 of H. R. 9821, known as the billboard section, sets up a new section 122 in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and provides as follows:

States as a new national policy that it is in the public interest to encourage and assist the States to control the use of, and improve the areas adjacent to, the Interstate System by controlling outdoor advertising in those areas. It specifies as national policy that outdoor advertising along Interstate System highways which is visible from the main portion of the highway and within a distance of 660 feet should be regulated consistent with standards to be prepared and promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce, which shall include only the following four types of signs:

First. Directional or other official signs and notices required or authorized by law;

Second. Signs advertising the sale or lease of property upon which they are located;

Third. Signs permitted by State law advertising activities within 12 miles of the point at which the signs are located which signs are consistent with the national policy and standards; and

Fourth. Signs designed to give information in the specific interest of the traveling public which are erected pursuant to State law and which are consistent with the national policy and standards. It is the intent of this subsection to eliminate all signs advertising illegal activities.

Application is restricted to rights-of-way on the Interstate System the entire width of which is acquired subsequent to July 1, 1956.

Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to enter into agreements with State highway departments to carry out the policy set forth in this section with respect to the Interstate System. Any such agreement would include provisions for regulation and control of the erection and maintenance of advertising signs, displays, and other advertising devices in conformity with the standards established under this section.

It further provides that upon the application of any State any such agreement may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, exclude from the application of the national standards set forth in this section those portions of the Interstate System which pass through municipalities wherein the use of real property adjacent to the Interstate System is subject to municipal regulation and control, or which traverse areas where the land use is clearly established by State law as industrial or commercial.

This section further provides that any section of the Interstate System so excluded from the application of the standards provided under authority of this section shall not be considered in computing the increase of the Federal share payable because of the control of advertising on the Interstate System.

Provides that if an agreement to control advertising is entered into between the Secretary of Commerce and any State pursuant to this section before July 1, 1961, the Federal share payable on account of any project on the Interstate System within that State provided for by funds authorized under section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to which this new national policy shall apply shall be increased by one-half of 1 percent of the total cost thereof. This in effect would increase the Federal share for payment on the Interstate System to 90½ percent. It is further provided that the increased one-half percent shall be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to enter into an agreement with any agency having jurisdiction over lands and reservations of the United States which are public in nature and adjacent to the Interstate System to carry out the policy set forth in this section. It further authorizes and directs any such agency to fully cooperate with the Secretary of Commerce.

Provides that whenever a State shall acquire by purchase or condemnation the right to advertise or regulate advertising in an area adjacent to the right-of-way on a project of the Interstate System for the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in this section the cost of such acquisition shall be considered as a part of the construction cost of the project with the limitation that Federal funds not in excess of 5 percent of the cost of the right-of-way for such project may be used to reimburse the State for the acquisition of such adjacent area.

Thus, this bill offers Federal financial assistance to the people of any State, who, through their State government, want to protect the strips adjacent to the Interstate System from indiscriminate encroachment by billboard signs. There is no imposition of any Federal controls, but this leaves it up to any State or States to decide upon their own if they shall enter into agreements with the Secretary of Commerce to control and regulate the roadside strips; and if they agree, they would be entitled to an extra one-half percent above the 90-percent Federal share of the cost of the Interstate Highway for those stretches that are so protected.

The decision whether to act, and through what means, is left to the individual States. Some State governments have found that they can control billboards and other roadside development by direct laws and regulations. They may continue to do so and qualify for the one-half percent incentive bonus provided in this bill. Other State governments may wish to purchase the legal right to such controls under State laws, legal rights such as acquisition of protective easements or the purchase of advertising rights, in conjunction with buying the Interstate Highway rights-of-way themselves. They may follow this approach under the bill and include the added costs—up to 5 percent—in computing the reimbursable Federal share. Some State governments may not wish to participate in any plan of roadside protection. This bill will not touch them. So in this bill there is no Federal compulsion with respect to the highways in any State. There is only an offer of assistance to any State wishing to act under its own laws to protect the Interstate Highway roadsides within its borders.

In this, I feel, the Federal Government also has an interest and a responsibility in encouraging the States to take such protective measures to safeguard and preserve the scenic aspects along the Interstate System.

The Congress has in its initial Highway Act of 1956 laid down certain criteria and standards to be followed in the construction of the gigantic Interstate Highway System.

First, for example, we made it very clear that access shall be controlled and limited. We thus denied some property rights and personal rights when people could get across the system only at certain specified points determined in agreement between the States and the Federal Bureau of Roads; even a farmer, in many instances, cannot get to his field on the other side of the road unless he crosses at a certain designated access point of our choosing.

Next, we have prohibited any business activity on the right-of-way. Even provision for gas stations, restaurants, and rest stations have been held in abeyance and some future determination of control and limitation on this will be made by Congress.

Congress clearly indicated intent to regulate and control or limit the weight, size, or length and width of trucks which will use the Interstate System, and a commission is now under way making a study of what the specific figures shall be recommended to the Congress.

Now we come to the question of controlling advertising on the properties adjacent to the highways. The Federal Government is going to spend over $37 billion collected from the highway users of America, just for the Interstate System alone. The highway user who is making this terrific investment has a right to get some protection of the roadside areas. The courts have affirmed the power of the people, through their governments, to protect their investment in the public highways. Esthetic and scenic values, as well as safety, economy, and efficiency, have been recognized as proper and legitimate areas for control to provide such protection.

As a measure to protect the interests of the traveling public in the appearance of and the view from the new highways being built with their taxes, this section is a modest one and still leaves plenty of room for use of and the expansion in the use of billboard signs, which do have a purpose and function and can serve it well in the proper areas.

The exclusions in section 12 would not affect the use of outdoor advertising where it now exists on rights-of-way on routes of already existing roads to be included in the Interstate System. Based on the section 108 (d) studies submitted by the Secretary of Commerce to Congress on January 7, 1958, approximately 9,500 miles of rural location and most of the 4,568 miles of urban location will not be affected by section 12. While I have always been a strong supporter of programs to preserve and protect the scenic and esthetic aspects of the system, I never did believe that it was realistic or fair to completely ban all advertising from the roadsides. And as the above figures show, there will be plenty of space for advertising along about 14,000 miles of the Interstate System, or roughly about one-third of the total 41,000 miles. In addition to being permitted on about one-third of the Interstate System, such outdoor advertising can still continue as at present, under State laws, on the entire rest of the Federal-aid system of highways and roads, totaling about 735,000 miles. So, of the total of some 776,000 miles of the entire Federal-aid system, only some 25,000 miles on the Interstate System will be affected by section 12.

This is truly the least we can do to protect the remaining stretches of scenic highway of the Interstate System yet to be built. Thus, the mileage to be placed under control, and the means of working out the agreements with the States, are most modest.

The estimated maximum cost of section 12 is approximately $161 million. This is based on the estimated cost of constructing the Interstate System on 24,000 miles of new rural locations. The cost of constructing the system along these 24,000 miles is estimated at $18½ billion. The increase in the Federal share due to section 12 to control outdoor advertising along this mileage is $93 million. The estimated total right-of-way cost for locations is $1.374 billion, while the Federal share up to 5 percent of the cost of this right-of-way is equal to $68 million. These cost figures include both old and new locations in rural areas, so the cost is a most modest one.

This is very little to invest to protect the enormous investment of the driver himself in the gigantic Interstate System, which will serve generations of drivers and their families.

Americans in our time have become a traveling people, and we travel largely by private automobile. With the prospects for greater leisure time, this will be even more true of the coming generation, for whom we today are planning and building this magnificent road system.

This remaining stretch of the Interstate System is our last chance to develop and preserve scenic and beauty values and areas adjacent to modern expressways.

The Interstate System is expected to be completed by roughly around 1975. By that time our rapidly increasing population will number between 225 and 230 million persons. The automobile population, likewise, will skyrocket from the current approximate 65 million vehicles to about 100 million vehicles in 1975.

Of this explosive population growth, about 97 percent of the increase will occur in urban areas. The pressures of work and of population will be heavy to get out into the open spaces, and with more people traveling more miles per capita than ever, the Interstate System will be not only a means for high-speed travel, but it will be a major access to the scenic grandeur and beauty of America. To preserve this and pass it on to the next generations, is the goal of section 12.

As I said in the opening statement, I do so regret that the House Public Works Committee did not have an opportunity for full hearings and consideration of this and other sections. However, the major weight should be given to the fiscal sections of this bill so that we can really get this most massive public-roads undertaking of all time in high gear and really on the road. I earnestly ask the House to accept the conference report and reject any motion to recommit, which would only seriously delay the program.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I share the gentleman's views about this billboard amendment. I am very anxious to see some provision similar to the one that has been written into this bill incorporated in the final measure.

I wonder, however, how many other Members are worried, as I am, about other features that have been added by the other body with which we do not agree. I am particularly disturbed by this new approach of allowing a Federal grant of 66⅔ percent on certain of these highways. It seems to me that it sets a bad precedent for the future. Would the gentleman deal with the quandary in which I am sure there are others besides myself?

Mr. BLATNIK. I shall try to answer that, although the gentleman from Maryland is the best informed man on all fiscal provisions.

First of all, that section carries for only 1 year, and the purpose of that is to make the money quickly available to the States that are ready to proceed on stretches of their Federal aid systems. Those are States that do not have enough State funds to match the Federal funds. Then this money is deductible from future apportionments. This is merely an advance to help accelerate whatever projects the States may have ready for construction.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, do I understand that it provides that in future years it can be averaged out so that on the overall basis the Federal grant-in-aid will only be 50 percent?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct. This amount that is provided for this year under the 66⅔ provision is deducted from the future apportionment which will be on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on balance and in the light of the statements made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] I believe this conference report should be adopted. There are feautres in it I do not like, especially the departure, even on a temporary basis, from the 50–50 matching formula.

But the provision relating to billboards which has been the principal subject of discussion and bone of contention represents a reasonable and sound approach to a highly controversial issue. It recognizes the interest of which I am convinced is the great majority of the public in seeing that this great highway system not only makes the cities of America more accessible to all her citizens, but opens up the natural beauties of the countryside to uninterrupted view.

But this provision does not dictate any policy to the States. It gives ample recognition to the fact that, while the Federal Government is contributing the lion's share of the funds, the States also have a substantial pecuniary interest. Each State is simply offered an incentive to go along with reasonable regulations formulated by the Federal Government. The final decision rests with the people of each State through which these highways will pass.

This is by no means a scheme to buy off the States which may favor the unrestricted erection of billboards. In offering to shoulder a greater share of the financial burden for these States, Congress merely offers to act upon its conviction. An expression of policy, without more, would be an empty gesture. Some incentive must be given the States. And the inducement offered by this provision certainly is not so great that no State can find it more profitable to refuse it.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to appropriate a great deal of money for what can be the most beautiful highway system in the world. We all know how disconcerting it can be to drive through the countryside only to face one commercial eyesore after another. On the other hand, most of us have experienced the job of traveling through our States able to witness all the beauties this land has to offer. The modern Thruway in my State of New York affords this opportunity because the people of my State favor the very policy this provision would adopt as a Federal policy. I am sure that the majority of the citizens of every State will feel the same way.

The choice is clear. It is not whether we in Congress wish to extend the control of the Federal Government into the States. It is whether we will take this opportunity to express a national policy which will encourage the States to help make this highway system the most majestic in the world.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], and like the gentleman from Virginia, my colleague Congressman GARY, I am disturbed about some of the various provisions of this conference report beside the question of whether or not we can satisfactorily settle the billboard matter. There are changes in the bill, changes as to the formula which I, as an individual Member of Congress, have never had the opportunity to express myself on. There are some of these other changes under which we would be doing something wholly apart from what we thought we were going to do when we passed the House bill. Mr. Speaker, I recommend that this conference report be recommitted so that we may have the opportunity here in the House to thoroughly discuss and consider every angle of this very involved matter.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I want to urge the adoption of this conference report. To me it would be unthinkable for this conference report to be rejected for reasons largely technical. It would cause an indefinite delay in the much-needed construction authorized under this program.

I feel particularly deeply about the billboard amendment to this bill, which I think is a very salutary and necessary amendment. I have three billboard measures pending in the House. I regret that there was no opportunity to consider these. However, the whole billboard matter was very extensively considered and debated in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope this conference report will be adopted.

In urging this action, I realize that the billboard provision has not had the benefit of the normal hearings and consideration in committee. But I believe the circumstances warrant bypassing this procedure. Let us consider the following facts:

First, time is running out on efforts to control billboards on the 41,000-mile Interstate System. The Bureau of Public Roads reports that 3,481 miles were either completed or under construction by January 31 of this year. If appropriate legislation is not passed, these roads and those to be constructed will soon be lined with unsightly and garish billboards. This is exactly what is happening now in the beautiful State of Maine, which annually attracts thousands of tourists because of its climate and unrivaled scenery. Maine's first stretch of Interstate Highway, located between Freeport and Brunswick in my Congressional District, is already being defaced with billboards. The tourists who spend $200 million in Maine each year certainly do not come to gaze on toothpaste and beer ads.

Second, the public is demanding action now, not sometime in the future when it is too late. I have received more spontaneous mail on this subject than any other during my entire 16 years in Congress. Most of this mail has come unsolicited from the public, not from lobbies and pressure groups. I pay a great deal of respect to that kind of mail. This public sentiment has been verified in a nationwide poll and by countless newspaper editorials throughout the country.

Third, Congress has an obligation to insure the efficiency, safety, and beauty of this public investment. As representatives of all the people, we are expected to legislate in the public interest. The people obviously want safe, efficient, and scenic interstate highways. It is up to us to make sure they get them.

Fourth, although this legislation has not been considered by a House committee, it was subjected to long and exhaustive hearings in the other body in each of the last 2 years, and a lengthy debate on the floor of the other body last week. The merits of the legislation were clearly shown at those times.

Fifth, this legislation has the strong support of both parties, including President Eisenhower and former Governor Adlai Stevenson, titular head of the Democratic Party. The vote on this bill in the other body was a nonpartisan vote. The vote which saved the amendment was almost evenly split between Democrats and Republicans.

These are the facts which speak so strongly for the adoption of the Senate amendment. The only objection I think could honestly be made is that the amendment is not strong enough.

Last year I introduced a bill which would have withheld all Federal highways funds from States not banning billboards on interstate roads. This probably would be the only 100 percent effective way of protesting our highways. But the question of States rights made it unlikely to be passed, so this year I introduced legislation embodying the carrot rather than stick approach. That bill would have provided a three-fourths of 1 percent incentive payment.

The amendment before us today has been watered down even more. It provides for an incentive payment of only one-half of 1 percent. It does not cover interstate highways constructed before July 1, 1956. It allows billboards within 12 miles of business establishments. In other words, the process of compromise has removed many of the teeth from this legislation. There are many loopholes. For example it is estimated that from 30 to 35 percent of what will be the Interstate System, was constructed before July 1, 1956, and thus will be open to even more billboards than may already exist.

But in spite of the weaknesses in this legislation, I strongly support it. It is better to have some controls than to have none at all. That is what we are faced with if we disagree to the conference report. Even if the legislation will not be 100 percent effective, it will do some good. The incentive payment undoubtedly will encourage many States to act. For example, for the first time in history, the State of Maryland passed an antibillboard bill this year, probably in anticipation of a several million dollars bonus it will receive as a result. Other States will do the same.

Of course this legislation has drawn strong objections, even in its present state. The billboard lobby is still crying States rights, although in this case the States are entirely free to accept or reject billboard controls and the resulting bonus payment. The lobby also has raised the issue of job losses. Yet how can jobs which do not now exist be lost? We could create jobs by having people dig holes in the pavement of our highways. But certainly the highway users would object. Why add a handful of jobs involved in putting up billboards which are just about as much of a detriment to interstate highways? The billboard industry will have plenty of room to expand on the primary and secondary roads, which also are being increased.

Another objection has been that motels, restaurants, and other roadside businesses will be wiped out or ruined by not being able to advertise. This could hardly be true. In the first place, since these are to be limited access highways, there will be few establishments on the roadway. Those which are can advertise within 12 miles. Those which are

located off the highways at access points can advertise as authorized by the State in accordance with the interest of the traveling public.

In short, this legislation is the minimum Congress can do to protect this multi-billion-dollar public investment. The only opposition to the bill is the extremely selfish opposition of the billboard lobby.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I favor the motion to recommit this bill to the committee of conference. This bill has been so changed since it was before the House that I can no longer support it.

In my opinion the Congress is moving too far and too fast in its provision for highways. This bill adds about $1.3 billion to an already enormous highway program.

It may be doubted whether this bill will put as many people to work as has been claimed. Consider the amounts now available to the States for highway work.

This bill will raise inflationary pressures not only for the present but for the future.

It assigns too high a priority to what this country is doing for highways. Let us remember that there are other critical needs facing this country at this time, needs for defense, needs for science and education. We are going too far and too fast in support of the objectives of this bill.

I now quote from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on this bill while it was before the Senate. He stated that one of his objections was that "It would destroy the pay-as-you-go policy for Federal highway aid established by the Highway Act of 1956, which set up the road trust fund to assure that Special taxes on highway users would be used for highway construction."

Mr. Speaker, the new provision added by the Senate increasing the Federal share of matched grants for ABC highways from 50 percent to 66⅔ percent is highly objectionable. This new provision applies to a $400 million appropriation for ABC highways added by the Senate.

Matched grants on the basis of 50 percent Federal and 50 percent State have been the rule for many years in appropriations for the ABC highways, which are the primary, secondary and urban roads.

To change this basis from 50–50 to two-thirds Federal and one-third State is most unfair to many sections of the country. Even under the 50–50 matching, the more thickly populated, more highly Federally taxed areas have suffered. This is due to the formula under which the money is divided up among the States, which gives almost equal weight to area, road mileage, and population. A State like Massachusetts gets back in Federal grants for ABC highways a proportionately smaller share of the money contributed by its taxpayers to the Federal Government for highway construction than do many other States.

This inequality is of course greatly increased when the matching basis is changed from 50 percent Federal and 50 percent State to ⅔ percent Federal and ⅓ percent State.

Federal grants in aid for highway construction were originally intended to help to build roads of national importance. The Federal money was provided out of an appropriation for post offices and post roads. But this program has naturally been popular in many areas, and the tendency has been constantly to extend it, both in the amounts of money appropriated, and in the types of roads covered.

Under a Senate amendment the States were permitted 100 percent transferability of the new funds as between primary, secondary and urban roads.

When Federal aid was confined to post roads and the matching basis was 50–50, some inequality in distribution was tolerable. It becomes much more burdensome when the matching basis is ⅔ Federal and ⅓ State. And it becomes yet more burdensome when these funds are made applicable not just to post roads and through routes, but to roads that are primarily of local interest. With unlimited transferability permitted, these funds can now be used predominately for such roads. This places an unfair burden on some of the States.

While sectional interest should not be overemphasized, the taxpayers of the more thickly populated States should not be asked to contribute on a basis of 66⅔ percent Federal grants for aid given under these provisions.

This new matching grant basis should not be accepted. We should continue with the 50–50 sharing which has been in effect for so many years.

It is desirable and necessary that the Federal Government take part in the financing of post roads and through routes. In this way the States having large needs for such highways and less ability to pay are in effect aided by States having lesser needs and greater ability to pay. But it is unsound, un-American and contrary to the proper relationship between the States and the Federal Government to have this sound principle carried further than is required for the above purpose.

The late Senator James W. Wadsworth, of New York, in an article on the Federal aid system said:

> There may be some functions performed under it which can be done better by the Federal Government than the States. But I do believe that it could and should be radically curbed, both in the interest of economy and sound policy, and that steps should be taken to place a check upon its growth before it undermines our whole system of dual sovereignty of the State and Nation.
>
> But questionable as these features of the system are, the most dangerous phase of it in my opinion in its tendency toward the breaking down of the principle of local self-government, and the creation of an all-powerful Federal bureaucracy.

It is interesting to note how greatly the present practice of distributing Federal funds to the States conflicts with fundamental principles enunciated by past leaders of our country. Over 100 years ago the Federal Government not only had a balanced budget but had a sizeable balance on hand from the proceeds of sales of public lands. It was proposed that this money be distributed to the States. Both Daniel Webster and John C. Calhoun vigorously opposed this.

Webster proposed that the money be put to a different use, saying:

> This, in my opinion, would be a less evil than that extraordinary and dangerous state of things in which the United States should be found laying and collecting taxes for the purpose of distributing them when collected among the States of the Union.

John C. Calhoun, speaking in Congress, said that he "dreaded the force of precedent; the time would come when the example of the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands would be urged as a reason for distributing the revenue derived from other sources."

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the conference report be recommitted to the Committee on Conference.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, let us make no mistake about this bill. Those who advocate recommitting this bill are merely trying to stop any antirecession measures that may come before this House.

This matter of highways is no new matter. As a member of the Committee on Public Works I have debated and listened intently to witnesses since 1955 concerning the need for highways. Here is a bill before you today that is going to allow the States to put people to work. It will allow America to have the roads so badly needed and to which we are entitled.

Two years ago I stood in this very well and urged this House to vote for the 1956 Highway Act. On the day I spoke tragedy struck my family by killing my aunt and uncle on a small two-lane highway. They were going to a picnic with some Sunday-school children, a drunk pulled around from behind a truck and hit their car head on.

As I left the office this morning, I read where an 18-year-old boy from my district was found in the same circumstances.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Does the gentleman recall that day he was in the well of the House—I remember it very well—whether he voted for or against the bill?

Mr. GRAY. Most certainly for the bill.

Mr. AVERY. That was not the impression I had. I was quite surprised by the gentleman's statement that he had voted for the bill.

Mr. GRAY. If the gentleman will check the record, he will find out that not only did I vote for the bill, but I brought out a bouquet of roses here to illustrate my point and it was later written up in Newsweek magazine concerning my efforts in behalf of the bill.

Anyway, going on, this morning I read of an 18-year-old boy being killed in my district. He was going down a small two-lane highway under the same circumstances. Someone passed another car, or tried to, and could not make it and hit him head on. It is time that we give America the roads the people are entitled to. It is time that we stop this slaughter on the highways of America. Let us stop letting the tail wag the dog. This matter of the billboards is aside from the true facts of this legislation. We need an expanded highway program. I talked with the chief highway engineer of the State of Illinois last night. He told me that 25,000 new jobs will be created if this bill is passed today. In addition, many engineering surveys are already completed and ready. We can let contracts immediately. So let us get on with this and quit haggling about little things that amount to nothing. Give us the roads and jobs that the country needs. Let us stop this slaughter on these small highways.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. No one wants highways any more than I do and any more than the minority does. I have been one of the staunchest supporters of the interstate and ABC highway programs. The majority leader has indicated that, so far as this bill is concerned, he would have much preferred to have more time to consider it. No one is in opposition to the purposes of this bill as it relates to spurring employment. I think that should clearly appear in the RECORD. The question I wish to ask the gentleman is: Is it not true that the issue facing us is just simply this: Must we vote today on a bill which even the majority leader admits there has not been an adequate opportunity to consider in conference, and no opportunity to consider before our Public Works Committee; or can we afford to wait another 30 days and get, perhaps, a better bill back here? Now, I ask the gentleman with regard to that, is it not true that at the present time, as of February 28, as is reported to the Committee on Public Works in our hearings, there is a present uncommitted, unprogramed balance of $1,164,827,000 on the interstate program and $651,387,000 on the ABC program, and, therefore, no real emergency consideration of this bill is as justified as has been represented?

Mr. GRAY. Is the gentleman making a speech or asking a question?

Mr. CRAMER. I am asking a question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to ask what I believe to be a crucial question in this matter of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] the question I asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY]. Is it not true that there is presently $1,164,827,000 in the Interstate System unprogramed and and $651,387,000 in the ABC unprogramed, and if that is true, why must we consider this legislation on an emergency basis at this time rather than to work for a better bill that would be considered a few days after the recess.

Mr. FALLON. If the gentleman will check the figures, he will know that I used that same figure on the Senate side when we were in conference, and I was told that this money, the $400 million, can be put in areas where they are in distress and where the money is very much needed, and that the ABC money for these areas has run out or will be all programed by July 1.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kansas yield to me further?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it not true again as to where this money is allocated and where there are workers in distressed areas that that is a question strictly within the jurisdiction of the State road department?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. And is it not true, if the State road departments were inclined to put this unprogramed money in distressed areas, all they have to do is to put it there and there may be little or no need for any additional Federal money because this unspent money between now and the time it would take to confer further on this report which they have at the present time can be used?

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman is claiming that there is no need for additional money to be spent at this time, but all the testimony in the other body shows clearly that there is a need for additional money to be spent in the many counties of the United States at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this is my first experience as a conferee. It has been an enlightening experience especially when we go into conference with the House having worked its will on a piece of legislation. There seems to be some disturbing opinion about the fact that the bill provides two-thirds Federal participation and one-third State participation on the $400 million that goes out in the States, that may reach into every Congressional District in the United States. Most of the people who are disturbed about that feature are the ones who receive the benefits of this interregional system. In addition to expanding this highway program $400 million on the ABC system in the first year there is $200 million added to the interregional system and the second year $300 million.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FALLON. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute in order to ask him a question.

Do I understand the gentleman from Kansas is for the emergency fund and the formula under which it is to be distributed?

Mr. GEORGE. I intend to support the bill that is now on the floor. It is not exactly what I would like to have. I think our committee could have done a much better job if we had a chance to work our will.

Mr. FALLON. I understand also that the gentleman said the money that is advanced to the States under the law will be paid back under future allotments?

Mr. GEORGE. That has been in the bill. It requires that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the discussion here today on the merits of accepting this conference report has revealed that Members are sharply divided on certain provisions in this bill. Ideally there might be further consideration given to these provisions, concerning some of which many of us have reservations. Most of us would probably agree that this is not an ideal way to legislate. However, I do not feel we could get a better bill by sending it back to the conference committee.

I personally feel that this conference report should be adopted. In my opinion the merits of the bill outweigh its weak points. Its adoption will accelerate a program of tremendous value to the Nation.

I recognize that others will feel these matters need further consideration. Therefore I cannot agree with the contention that those who vote to recommit will be opposing the highway program itself, or will be refusing to back an important antirecession measure. In fairness, I think we should frankly admit that this measure could be improved. Sending it back to conference, however, is not likely to alter it much and I trust that a majority will agree with me that the merits of the bill outweigh its weaknesses.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding, I should like to mention one provision in the Highway Act of 1956 about which I have reservations. Section 112 of that act provides that no service stations or other commercial establishments for serving motor vehicle users are to be constructed or located on the rights of way of the Interstate System. If this provision cannot be modified in some way, motorists may be seriously inconvenienced. Furthermore, local and State highway connections at various interchanges may be heavily overloaded with passengers turning off temporarily to stop at service stations.

In New Jersey a plan was developed in 1946 with respect to service areas which has worked well. After deciding on suitable locations for gas stations, additional land was acquired, properly designed exits and entrances were built, and sites were prepared under the construction contract.

After construction, these sites were sold at public auction. Each purchaser agreed to certain conditions of sale, restricting, for example, the type of buildings which could be constructed, and insuring competition between various operating companies. Being privately owned, these areas come under the ratable structure of the community in which they are located. The sites have

been so located that screening planting keeps the service stations from being readily visible from the highway. Despite heavy traffic, these stations have been so designed that the chances of accidents are minimized.

By encouraging convenient, privately owned facilities the State has been relieved of the necessity of providing its own facilities and of policing these facilities, and it has not been necessary to concentrate such facilities at the major interchanges.

The Bureau of Public Roads seems to feel that Congress, by enacting section 112, has taken a position inconsistent with a program which has proven successful in New Jersey. They recognize that experience may eventually lead them to recommend a change in this policy, if time proves that motorists cannot be adequately served with the present restrictions in effect. The only trouble with this position is that there will be an immediate necessity for gas service, restrooms, and telephones. If, for example, we build 50 or 60 miles of an interstate highway without such facilities, we should not be required actually to experience the difficulties which would result. Our commonsense should tell us that more needs to be done to consider the comfort, convenience, and safety of our motorists.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. We have to consider the report on its merits as it appears before us at the present time.

I would like to comment on a section which has not received any comment up to this time but I think is a vital section of the bill, and that is section 8.

Under section 8 of this bill the needs formula for the allocation of Federal Interstate Highway System funds will go into effect with the allocations for the fiscal year 1960. This needs formula is something for which your roads subcommittee has been fighting for a number of years. In the bill that was passed by this body in 1956 and brought to the floor by the House Public Works Committee we had provided that the needs formula should go into effect immediately for the Federal Interstate Highway System. However, at that time the bill which was passed by the other body did not provide that formula and used the old formula of allocation on the basis of population, area, and post roads. As a result, the conference report 2 years ago, which became the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, was a compromise on the issue, saying that the old formula would be used through fiscal year 1959, but that beginning in 1960 the needs formula would go into effect.

Your committee has been fighting to obtain this formula for a number of years, because this is the only formula that will actually complete the Federal Interstate Highway System at one simultaneous time.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. FALLON. Does not the gentleman agree with me in the statement I made in the conference, that this formula should be extended for 3 years, and that we were limited to 1 year because we could not expand the figure in conference. Does not the gentleman agree that it should be for a 3-year period?

Mr. BALDWIN. I fully agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is that not another reason why this bill should go back to conference?

Mr. FALLON. If the gentleman will yield, the subject matter the gentleman is talking about was adopted in this House in 1956. We are still limited to the 1-year rule.

Mr. McGREGOR. If it goes back to conference we can bring the subject up for general discussion. Will the gentleman not agree to that?

Mr. FALLON. I think we had it up for general discussion when we were in conference. I suggested that it should be on a 3-year basis rather than 1 year, and I was told that we were limited to 1 year only in conference.

Mr. McGREGOR. But the gentleman did not make a motion to make it a 3-year period.

Mr. FALLON. I would have been out of order had I made such a motion and I was told so.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE], and say that this is not a perfect way to legislate. However, in the 6 years that I have been privileged to serve in this body we have passed an awful lot of bills that have not been legislated perfectly. We have done it here on the floor of the House of Representatives. These laws, admittedly not perfect, have helped the people.

I represent a wonderful area on Long Island, N. Y. It is a narrow, 100-mile strip filled with roads. Frankly, it is a billboard jungle. New York City may have its blackboard jungle, but we have a billboard jungle. Here we will be making an attempt, a small attempt, a rather weak and pitiful attempt in the right direction. What a shame that pressure has been exerted by powerful and wealthy lobbies and by people in high places to defeat the anti-billboard philosophy of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT], that I have not been pressured upon this bill and I resent his imputation that Members of the House have been lobbied and high-pressured as he said they have been.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, those who oppose this conference report are in essence trying to delay the spending of funds that would be used directly to fight the growing depression. The effort by some to say that a smile a day will chase the depression away is a cruel joke on the ever increasing human tragedies that are taking place across our country. Today's New York Times carries a story, as follows:

> The number of workers drawing unemployment insurance in this city rose by nearly 10,000 last week, the largest increase since the beginning of the year.
>
> Officials predicted that the situation would get worse in the next few weeks as a result of post-Easter layoffs in the apparel trades, New York's principal industry.
>
> Gloomy employment news came from other major centers, despite White House hopes for a seasonal upturn in jobs. The Labor Department's chief manpower expert reported that the national unemployment total for March would show an increase of about 200,000 over the February figure of 5,173,000.
>
> The estimate was made in St. Louis by Seymour L. Wolfbein, head of the Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics of the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics. It contrasted with a statement Monday by James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, that he did not expect the March figure would be much different from the previous month's total.
>
> A further rise in unemployment insurance was reported in Chicago, Boston, Cleveland, Philadelphia and Los Angeles. Other key industrial centers showed a leveling off in joblessness, but no pickup.

Who can read those words and doubt the very real seriousness of what our Nation faces?

Much as many of us would want the House to give direct consideration to the provisions of this conference bill originating in the other body, the fact is neither we nor our committees can do so. Those who have read the evidence presented on the other side of the Capitol agree it fully justifies what we are now asked to approve. Let us do so wholeheartedly and convincingly. The country looks to us for leadership and understanding for it is getting only hesitation and optimistic platitudes from the executive branch.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not happy with the manner in which this legislation has been presented to the House today for action without having ample time for the Members to throughly debate the changes that were made by the Senate when it substituted the provisions of S. 3414 for the bill that passed the House.

Additional time certainly is needed to provide an opportunity to discuss the important changes, such as the revision in the formula for primary, secondary, and urban roads, and the inclusion of provisions for the Interstate System.

I know that during my 12 years of service in the Congress, we have acted on legislation—possibly much less important legislation—in this same manner, but I cannot say that this procedure meets with my approval.

However, I cannot see where we would accomplish anything by recommitting this report to the conference committee.

There is a need for expeditious action on this legislation so that we may be able to get some of our vital road programs off dead center, such as in my State, and in other States as well.

Therefore, I feel compelled to vote against recommittal.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I favor most of the general purposes and most of the principal provisions of this legislation. It seems clear, however, that we are involved in an irregular procedure. The other body has so amended the bill originally passed by the House that it bears only the most superficial resemblance to that measure on which the House acted.

The Senate attached, and the conference committee agreed to, a number of extraneous provisions which by right should have been the subject of separate legislation. At least, the regular procedure should have been followed and the House given an opportunity to consider these matters in the regular deliberative process and to work its will.

These extraordinary provisions authorize among other things additional deletions from the highway fund for other than roadbuilding purposes. It seems to me that we should be very careful about allowing such expenses to come out of this fund. At the very least we should have such matters fully discussed in the Public Works Committee of the House and understand exactly what effect they will have upon this fund before summarily approving them.

I am not unmindful of the need for moving with deliberate speed in getting useful and constructive public works underway in the present national economic climate. Yet there is no need so very urgent as to allow ourselves to be stampeded into taking inadequately considered legislation simply to save a few days.

It would seem logical to me that, if this motion to recommit should be adopted, the conference committee could delete these more technical and controversial matters, bring the bill in its main provisions back to us within a few days, and let us approve it. Thus work could be authorized and underway. Then, these extraneous features could be taken up in the regular way as separate legislation and the House could work its will on each in turn.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN.]

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] and I do not believe this bill is perfect but I am supporting it.

One of the prime blessings of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is the absence of stop lights. They are so planned and constructed as to give the motorist the maximum safety and the minimum inconvenience. Should we not, therefore, as we appropriate millions of dollars for further construction, protect the natural beauty of the country side and give lie to the heading of a recent cartoon: "Coast to Coast Without Seeing a Stop Light—or Anything Else."

The reason we cannot see "anything else" of course being the pleas to buy "Burp's Pills" for indigestion or "Glop Hair Oil" strung end to end along the highway shoulders. They mar the beauty of our roadsides and menace the safety of motorists. The rural vistas require no enhancement by pictures of pretty girls. Drivers of our modern high-powered cars are better undistracted.

To prevent the erection of the billboards would not be depriving the advertisers, who play a vital role in our economy, of necessary display sites. Certainly the media of radio, television, newspapers, magazines and other devices are ample and equally effective. But I do not believe the Federal Government should be party to making the driver a captive audience.

The 41,000 miles of highways, of course, do not go through my Brooklyn district. But the residents of the district have in great numbers informed me of their deep concern with the maintenance of high standards of beauty and safety on them.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of their comments.

One woman wrote:

> My friends and I feel strongly that the scenery on our highways should remain as it is, and not be made the tool of commercial interests.

Another:

> The billboards are generally pointless, often creating driving hazards and certainly defacing the countryside.

Still another:

> I believe that drastic legislation should be passed to prevent the further desecration of our beautiful scenery. I find it disgusting to have my scenic view blocked.

They all ask why our lawmakers cannot do anything. Of course we can. Their tax dollars are helping to construct these roads and there is no tenable reason why their wishes and interests should not be considered. They will continue to buy nationally advertised wares even if not reminded to do so while motoring across the land. In their name, I earnestly ask positive action to permit us a hazardless, happy drive "coast to coast without seeing a stop light," but seeing everything else our beautiful country displays.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have attempted in the debate today to point out that there are unprogramed funds presently available in both the Interstate and ABC Systems and according to information presented to our Public Works Committee this money could have been used in the past to create more jobs. It has been of concern to many of us who have been so vitally interested in the highway program and the action taken under the 1956 act that the States seem in many instances to drag their feet in getting the program underway in full force.

All the States that testified before our committee when the 1956 act was under consideration indicated that they could match the Federal funds or would make provisions for matching funds if the bill were approved. Now we see that many have not yet lived up to this moral commitment. Even some State governors are trying to blame the administration for holding onto some of the funds until contracts are completed and thus making State matching fund amounts that must be made available too burdensome. A full investigation of this has proven that this is not true—and, if any Federal program has been expedited on the national level since its inception it has been the 1956 Highway Act. Under section 6 the States can even borrow from the Federal Government some of the State matching funds to tide them over—and no such request has been denied.

The point I am making is that the States, not only under the present program, but under the accelerated program under consideration today must accept their full responsibility and get their programs fully underway. The States further have the authority to place this construction money in employment distressed areas if they so desire—in that the decision as to where the money is spent is strictly within the discretion of the State administrations. I think it unfortunate that those States complaining the loudest about distressed employment areas and asking for further Federal assistance in those areas are States that have not used all the Federal money available under the present highway act and have not, apparently, considered this program as a means of channeling jobs into these areas.

I trust that under the accellerated program, as well as the existing one, the States will go ahead and use the tools available and help themselves to the maximum with this road program.

I am supporting the conference report, although I think the manner in which it arose without full Public Works Committee consideration in the House, is most unfortunate and legislatively poor practice.

Some of the reasons why I am supporting the bill is because it contains some provisions essential to our highway program, such as the extension of the ABC system under the 1956 act and increasing funds for that purpose by the annual $25 million contemplated in the 1956 act; further because the accelerated program on the interstate system of $800 million authorization over a 3-year period is the program requested by the President as a sound antirecession measure which does not require further appropriations but permits States to call upon the trust fund for more money during these years if the programs within the States are far enough advanced to permit the States to make good use of additional money.

The bill does provide for $400 million authorization for appropriation for the ABC system acceleration during fiscal 1959 which shall be repaid by the States into the trust fund in the 2-year period following by deducting from the ABC allocations to the States during those 2 years an amount equal to that ac-

celeration amount made available in fiscal 1959.

There is an additional $115 million authorization for appropriation for further loans to cover the State shares in matching Federal money if the States have difficulty in providing adequate matching funds.

Thus it is seen that although there is a tremendous immediate acceleration impact on the road program of about $1.5 billion in available highway funds, the appropriation impact is comparatively small.

I trust the passage of this bill will signal full speed ahead on this, the largest public works program in the history of the world. The administration's road program put into effect in 1956 by Congress, is a proven national necessity for safety and commerce as well as defense and its acceleration at this time further fortifies the wisdom of the President in recommending it some 2 years before Congress took action on it as an important element in stabilizing our economy.

Let us hope the States accept the challenge, accept their full responsibility and make full use of the program—particularly at this time.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I might say that I think the House would be wise in adopting this conference report today. We could not, in my opinion, improve on the legislation that is here before us. Some of it is new, and some of it is old. Certainly the old legislation has proved tried and true; the new legislation comes to us at a period when we are asked to proceed with as much haste as possible.

If we send this bill back to conference there will be no hearings on any of the subject matter that is in the bill; it will come back to the House in the same manner in which it came back today. If this conference report is sent back to the committee we have no instructions from the House on any section that they want to change. We have had limited debate from individual Members who expressed their own opinions on it; hence the will of the House is not expressed on any subject in this bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McGREGOR. I certainly am sure my good friend from Maryland did not mean to say that if this were sent back to the conference committee it would be under no instruction and would come back in the same form it is now.

Mr. FALLON. No.

Mr. McGREGOR. We have 10 members on the conference committee. I am sure it will be discussed.

Mr. FALLON. I am sorry the gentleman did not understand. I said that if this bill were sent back to conference the House Committee on Public Works would not have an opportunity to express its will on any subject; the House would not have a chance to express its will on any subject, or vote its will on any subject.

Certainly, as conferees we would come back to the House and bring in what the conferees thought the House might want, but we have no expression from the House on any subject in this bill, except what the individual members have discussed.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Suppose this were sent back to conference and we held hearings, it would certainly be the right of the gentleman from Maryland to call his subcommittee in session and we could invite any Member who wanted to come and give us his views. Then we would know where the House stands when we went back to conference and have some knowledge and idea of what the House wanted.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Someone said this might come back in the same form. Let us take that statement at its face value. It would certainly not be in the same form because if we recommit the report our conferees will go back and say nothing. The House may not accept this in its present form so let us send it back and have it reconsidered. Let us recommit the conference report.

Mr. FALLON. I would like to get an expression of the House as to what the Members might like to change. We are back in the House but we have no instructions from the House. We do have the views of a few Members who have had a limited time to speak.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. We certainly are not going to hold hearings over this week. If the gentleman wants to hold Public Works Committee hearings for 2 days it will give us an opportunity to come before our Committee on Public Works and let this matter be taken up, then the conferees will have some ideas about the matter.

Mr. FALLON. That is still not an expression of the House.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, just as I have consistently supported the highway program, both interstate and primary, I am for an expansion of the highway construction program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, for which provision is made in this conference report. Nevertheless, I intend to vote for the motion to recommit this conference report, if such a motion is offered. I have consistently urged upon the committee and this body the necessity for adequate provision for more forest highways. In 1956, when the Highway Act of that year was under consideration, I attempted to increase the authorization for forest highways to $45 million. I still think that this amount or more is necessary for an adequate program.

Forest highways are an integral part of many of our most important Federal routes, and are quite frequently the most scenic. Adequate highway integration depends on good connecting links through the national forests. In providing this, even with our expanded highway program, we have been going backward instead of forward. Our failure to make adequate provision affects highway users throughout the country.

The Senate bill provided an additional forest highway authorization of $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. The conference report reduces this to $5 million. The Senate amendment further provided an authorization of $36 million for the years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961. The conference report reduces this to $33 million for each year. In my opinion, the funds provided by the conference do not represent a fair and proper increase in this category, even when considered in relation to the increases otherwise made. When one considers the inadequacy of present levels of forest highway construction, this is even more serious. To make our highway system adequate, we must correct this situation. I think it is obvious that in the rush of considering this bill with so many Senate changes, full consideration was not given to this most important item. The fact that the increases were cut in half would suggest that this was a hurried compromise. From talking with some members of the committee, I am convinced that if this bill is returned to conference for further consideration, then the merits of the situation can be presented, with a good chance of providing the additional $10 million for the year ending June 30, 1959, and the authorization of $36 million for the years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961. I am sure that other items in the bill with which I am not so familiar, but which has been mentioned here on the floor, can also be improved.

I will continue to support the highway program and its acceleration, but I think that the best interests of a sound highway program would be served through further consideration by the conference. I therefore intend to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. H. R. 9821, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, as adopted by the Senate, disagreed to by the House and now recommend to the House for adoption by the conferees, continues in effect a distinct inequity to Hawaii.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, Public Law 627, 84th Congress, appropriated greatly increased funds for the Interstate Highway System. Since Hawaii did not have roads which were a part of the Interstate Highway System, she received no funds from the moneys apportioned thereto, nor was Hawaii granted any other consideration to compensate for this lack of interstate highways. On the other hand, Alaska—included in the Federal-Aid Highway System for the first time—was given a 90–10 ratio of participation.

The provisions of title II of Public Law 627, 84th Congress, do apply to Hawaii. By virtue of the revenue provisions of this title, Hawaii is paying increased automotive user taxes in excess of $2 million. This goes to build roads on the mainland when Hawaii's Americans are in desperate need of roads.

In order to remove this inequity, H. R. 8922, a bill to provide that Hawaii would be granted the minimum set forth in section 108 (c), Public Law 627, 84th Congress, was introduced. Said section 108 (c) contains the following:

> That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system.

The House Committee on Public Works, at my request, conducted an investigation of matters coming within the jurisdiction of that committee on the ground in Hawaii. On highways and highway conditions, the committee report contains the following:

> Highway conditions on the islands of Oahu, Hawaii, Maui, Molokai, and Kauai, were observed by the committee members. * * * None of the islands has an adequate mileage of improved highways for current demands of commercial, military, and tourist traveling.

As regards the island of Hawaii—area more than 4,030 square miles—the report points out:

> Much of the mileage is substandard and in some instances the roadway is only wide enough for one-way travel. * * * Similar highway deficiencies were noted on the islands of Maui, Molokai, and Kauai.

The inspection committee of the Committee on Public Works, in its summary, reports that the members are in general agreement on "participation by Hawaii to a greater extent in highway funds to bring the islands' road system to meet current and prospective needs."

I am positive that the Members of the Congress want to be fair. We of Hawaii ask for no more than justice and equity. We realize that many times our taxes must contribute to projects benefiting the mainland. When, however, our automotive user taxes, estimated in 1955 as $7,275,000, are increased to something like $10 by the provisions of title II of Public Law 627 and we receive the same apportionment as that prevailing prior to passage of Public Law 627, we are convinced we are not being treated fairly. We were not being treated fairly priorly since no adjustment was made for our lack of interstate highways. Our desperate need for adequate highways for our economic and social development heightens our sense of injury.

I hope that before this Congress adjourns legislation will be passed by the Congress correcting the manifest injustice done Hawaii. The expressions of concern on the part of the Committee on Public Works of this House and of the other body are deeply appreciated and welcomed. I am sure this concern will be translated into relief for Hawaii.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, H. R. 9821, with accompanying conference report, is substantially the same as the measure, H. R. 11418, which I introduced and in support of which I submitted testimony before the House Public Works Committee recently.

The fundamental purpose of this bill is, as you know, to provide authorization for the immediate acceleration of the rate of highway construction on the Federal-aid primary and secondary road systems that is already in progress. There is certainly no dispute about the long-range economic or security value of this program.

It is, admittedly, an emergency antirecession measure. I do not think there is much doubt in this body about the current existence of an economic recession, readjustment, transition, "slight depression," or whatever other name you please to attach to describe the alarming fact that millions of Americans are out of work. In my State and area we are unfortunately too familiar with this recession which is visiting severe economic hardships upon thousands of families whose working heads have long exhausted their unemployment compensation allowances, meager as they are and brief as they last.

It may be there are a few provisions in the bill and report that we cannot all agree upon. The fundamental fact is that by passage and initiation of the bill into action it is authoritatively estimated hundreds of thousands of creative work opportunities will be promptly developed for American taxpayers now unemployed. The economic emergency is here whether we like it or not; millions of workers are without weekly pay envelopes now; this is a sound economic recovery assistance step; we have a moral responsibility and a high legislative duty to our own people in this catastrophe. I most earnestly hope this House will promptly act without extended delay to grant the help this bill will give to so many of our citizens who are desperately in need now.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest the manner in which this legislation has been considered by the House of Representatives. We realize that this bill may be the only chance we will have to consider highway legislation in this 2d session of the 85th Congress. This bill has been written on the other side of the Capitol and the House of Representatives has not been given an opportunity to revise or implement the Senate amendments. Only the conferees have had an opportunity to offer amendments.

I have been requested by the Governor of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Highway Commission, Wisconsin County Boards Association, and the Wisconsin Roadbuilders Association to present their views and recommendations on amendments to our Federal highway program.

This bill as originally passed by the House was a simple extension bill. Every Member of the House understood that later in this session amendments to our Federal Road Act would be considered. Now we are faced with a parliamentary situation where the other body has considered and acted upon amendments to the Federal Road Act as amendments to the House extension bill. The entire Federal Road Act has been rewritten without giving consideration to amendments by Members of the House of Representatives. We are required under the rules of the House to consider this bill this morning in the form of a conference report without amendment in a period of 60 minutes. As Members of the House of Representatives we are not given an opportunity to present the recommendations and amendments suggested by our State and the people we represent. This is important legislation and should not be treated in this manner. I shall vote against this conference report as a protest against this procedure.

At this point I would like to read into the RECORD several of the many letters I have received on this legislation. You will note that several suggested amendments have been recommended by various groups in Wisconsin. It is regrettable that the House will not have an opportunity to consider these amendments.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, March 27, 1958.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MEL: Governor Thomson has asked me to send you a copy of a letter sent by the State Highway Department to the Federal Highway Administrator.

The letter is self-explanatory and the Governor hopes you will be able to take some action in giving support to this request. He feels very strongly that Wisconsin does not have a fair share of the "I" system within its borders, and the commercial as well as strategic value of this route justifies every possible effort in obtaining it.

Please advise us of any other information we may be able to provide, or any further action by the Governor you may feel will be helpful.

Thanking you in advance for your assistance,

Sincerely,

PHILIP M. SELLINGER,
Executive Secretary.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
HIGHWAY COMMISSION,
Madison, March 25, 1958.

Mr. B. D. TALLAMY,
Federal Highway Administrator, United States Bureau of Public Roads, General Services Building, Washington, D. C.

(Through Mr. R. H. Paddock, district engineer in Wisconsin.)

DEAR MR. TALLAMY: The State Highway Commission of Wisconsin, believing that certain mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways authorized to be designated by the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944 and 1956 remains to be designated (and believing that a less than equitable mileage of interstate highway routes was designated in the State of Wisconsin), herewith requests that the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, designate and authorize establishment of an Interstate System route extending from Milwaukee, Wis., to Marinette, Wis., and Menominee, Mich., a distance of approximately 180 miles, and presents herewith factual data in support of such request.

Such a route, with its connection in Michigan, was a part of the strategic network of principal traffic routes of military importance approved by the Secretary of War.

Such a route was included in the studies of the National Interregional Highway Committee which led to the creation of the National System of Interstate Highways by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944. Such route

was included in the 78,800-mile system studied and the 48,300-mile system, but was dropped out of subsequent lower mileage systems as studied by the committee. In the Interstate System as later approved, such route was omitted.

The facts are these:

1. The locks at Sault Ste. Marie are one of the most vital defense areas. Chicago is another. There is no Interstate System direct route between them. In the spirit of the Congress which added the words "and Defense" to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. Wisconsin requests that such route be added.

2. The Great Lakes, as the St. Lawrence seaway project is completed, will be opened to ocean shipping. The Lake States will become inland ports. In the interest of closer integration between sea transportation and highway transportation, the Interstate System will need a route serving the areas in proximity to the ports on the west shore of Lake Michigan.

3. The Fox River Valley in Wisconsin is the site of many essential industries. Its manufactures are growing rapidly and its population increases are impressive. An interstate system route northerly from Milwaukee would bring these vital industries several hours closer to Chicago and to Sault Ste. Marie.

4. The planned growth and further development of the vast area in Wisconsin and Michigan north of Milwaukee and east of the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul is evidenced by the planning, construction, and opening of the Mackinac Bridge. An interstate system route such as Wisconsin now requests would correlate advantageously with the planning for this entire area.

5. Northern Wisconsin and upper Michigan are superb vacationlands. An interstate system routing such as Wisconsin suggests would bring these areas half a day nearer to the rest of the Nation.

6. Such an interstate system route as Wisconsin requests north of Milwaukee is already a part of the Interstate System south of Milwaukee to Chicago. It is such an important segment of the Interstate System that Illinois is building its section as a toll road in order to get it done even faster than Interstate System financing would permit it to be built as a freeway. The Wisconsin section is of equal urgency and the State is concentrating a big share of its Interstate System money on early construction. The entire route south of Milwaukee County will be under contract this calendar year. The route north of Milwaukee is of such similar importance that the State, with primary Federal aid, is in the process of providing dual roadways, planned access, and interchanges for 114 miles.

In the light of these facts which show a development beyond all expectations or considerations given at the time the master plan for the Interstate System was first proposed nearly two decades ago, Wisconsin respectfully requests an additional route for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways between Milwaukee, Wis., and Menominee, Mich.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD L. PLUMMER,
Chairman.

WISCONSIN COUNTY
BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., January 17, 1958.

The Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Congressman, Seventh District, Wisconsin, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: Enclosed herewith you will find a copy of a resolution on the above subject that was passed at the annual convention of our association held at Superior, Wis., on October 9, 1957.

It is our understanding that undoubtedly several bills will be introduced into this session of Congress proposing to increase mileages in various States to the present system of interstate highways. We feel that Wisconsin has a very limited amount of mileage in this Interstate System as it now stands, and in view of the conditions as set forth in the resolution believe that our State is entitled to primary consideration in the event that any additional mileage is to be added to the system.

We fully realize that Congress is faced with increasing costs on the present limited Interstate System, but we also well realize that in the 1957 session of Congress there was additional allocation of mileage made to various States and that Wisconsin did not secure any consideration at that time for additional mileage.

Our association earnestly solicits your cooperation in carrying out the intent of the attached resolution to the end that if any legislation is enacted in this session of Congress increasing mileage on the Interstate System, that our State is given primary consideration due to the factors outlined in the attached resolution.

We will appreciate being kept informed by your office on the possibility of any moves being made in this session of Congress to increase mileage on the Interstate System so that we may also solicit the support of other organizations in our State to help you secure adequate allocations for Wisconsin.

Very truly yours,

A. J. THELEN,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO ADDING MILEAGE IN WISCONSIN TO THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Whereas an important and vital segment of Wisconsin's economy is not now served by the existing routes of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways including the industrial, agricultural, forest product, mining and resort areas lying along the eastern portion of the State north of Milwaukee and in general the entire northern area of the State; and

Whereas the great potential developments arising from the completion of the Mackinac Bridge and the St. Lawrence Waterway will create an urgent need for modern highway facilities in the area; and

Whereas, the existing system in our State includes a termini from Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn., at Superior, Wis., but provides no connection between such termini and the Mackinac Bridge; and

Whereas such a connection would provide a modern link from the Northwest, including the great ore areas and the industrial areas of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas present facilities serving the area carry substantial volumes of Canadian traffic; and

Whereas such a route would well serve the defense needs of the Nation and our neighbor to the north: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Wisconsin County Boards Association in its 1957 convention duly assembled at Superior, Wis., on October 9, 1957:

1. That the United States Congress be petitioned to include in the mileage comprising the National System of Interstate Defense Highways a north-south route connecting the control points of Milwaukee, Wis., and Iron Mountain, Mich., and an east-west route connecting the control points of Iron Mountain, Mich., and Superior, Wis.

2. That the cooperation of the Director of Highways of the State of Michigan be enlisted to the end that an east-west route from the Mackinac Bridge to Superior, Wis., be included in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

3. That duly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the Wisconsin Members of the United States Congress, to the Governors of Michigan and Wisconsin, to the Michigan State Highway Department and the Wisconsin State Highway Commission.

WISCONSIN COUNTY
BOARD ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., January 20, 1958.

The Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Congressman, Seventh District, Wisconsin, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: Enclosed herewith find a resolution relating to the above subject that has been duly endorsed by our County Highway Department Associations and by the Wisconsin County Boards Association during the past year.

We feel definitely that a relaxing of the present stringent requirements as far as our State is concerned would definitely be in the public interest because we are already fully equipped to do such work because of the unique method in Wisconsin whereby county government also maintains all of the State trunk highways as well as the county roads, and in many instances other local roads and streets.

It is our understanding that in this session of Congress a codification bill will be introduced following a study by certain committees of Congress. The purpose of this proposed codification bill would be to clear up any loose ends and conflicting interpretations and opinions as to the intent of Congress in its various enactments of highway legislation during the past sessions of Congress.

Will it be possible to have included in this codification bill the essence of the resolution attached relating to force account work with Federal funds?

Our association will greatly appreciate hearing from you on a possibility of such an enactment during this session of Congress.

Very truly yours,

A. J. THELEN,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO REMOVAL OF LIMITATIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF FORCE ACCOUNT WORK UNDER F. A. S. FUND REGULATIONS

(Adopted jointly at the annual 1957 convention of the Wisconsin County Boards Association and the Wisconsin County Highway Commissioners and Committee Members Associations.)

Whereas Federal aid secondary funds under the 1956 act increased approximately 20 percent over the funds available under the 1954 Federal-Aid Law, and

Whereas in Wisconsin the entire F. A. S. allotment is made available to counties through action of the State highway commission with the requirement however, of county matching of Federal funds, and

Whereas in Wisconsin counties own and operate highway equipment probably to a greater extent than do counties in most other States because of the joint county-State arrangement whereby counties maintain the entire State trunk system as well as their own county trunk system, with the State not owning or operating any equipment; and

Whereas presently through Federal regulations on the amount of force-account work provides that "force-account work in any 1 fiscal year shall not show a substantial increase over the total force-account work done in the previous fiscal year"; and

Whereas the continuance of the regulation particularly in view of the 20-percent increase in available funds is not in the public interest in our State because counties are already adequately organized and equipped to perform a greater amount of work with their own forces and equipment than is permitted under the restrictive regulations now in effect; and

Whereas a broadening of the authority for counties in Wisconsin to do more work by force account will enable counties to more adequately plan for the year around use of their manpower and equipment normally required for the regular maintenance and traffic service work including snow and ice removal: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin County Boards Association take whatever steps are necessary at Washington, D. C., in an effort to secure a greater latitude for the counties of Wisconsin to do a greater percentage of work with their own forces and equipment.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1958.

Members of the 85th Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The State Highway Officials, meeting in Chicago, Ill., November 18–22, 1957, in annual convention discussed the progress of the enlarged highway program as well as proposed, anticipated, and existing Federal legislation, and took formal action as per the attached resolutions and policy statement.

The Congress, in its wisdom in authorizing the expanded and accelerated road program, continued the historic Federal-State relationship for building the Nation's Federal-aid highways, wherein the State highway departments are the basic operating units to initiate, plan, design, construct, and maintain the roads, and the Bureau of Public Roads administers the program to protect the Federal interest.

The enclosed actions represent the opinions of the men who are in responsible charge of the State highway departments and who are doing the job that you assigned to them.

We will appreciate your consideration and support of the views and actions as outlined in these resolutions and policy statement in acting on any proposed Federal road legislation that may come before you.

We appreciate your confidence in the State highway officials of this Nation and we assure you we will complete the job you have given us on schedule and in a most commendable manner.

Yours very truly,

CLAUDE R. MCMILLAN,
President.

RESOLUTION NO. 4 OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

Whereas at all times from the date of the original Congressional enactment requiring the placing of internal revenue stamps upon conveyances of real property until May 1, 1950, conveyances to the various States for highway purposes were completely exempt from said tax and the United States Bureau of Internal Revenue by formal ruling had so declared; and

Whereas by Internal Revenue Bulletin No. 9, dated May 1, 1950, this long-standing ruling was reversed by the United States Bureau of Internal Revenue, on the theory that while such tax could not be imposed upon a State, it could nevertheless be imposed upon the other party to the transaction, and that, therefore, all such conveyances must bear the internal revenue stamps; and

Whereas this association has previously adopted resolutions urging that legislation be enacted to clearly exempt highway right-of-way transactions from the internal revenue stamp tax; and

Whereas bills to accomplish this purpose were introduced in the Congress in 1957 and are still pending; and

Whereas, in view of the greatly expanded program which is now under way pursuant to the Federal Highway Act of 1956, the necessity of taking all possible steps to facilitate right-of-way acquisition makes enactment of such legislation of even greater importance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Association of State Highway Officials, in annual convention assembled at Chicago, Ill., November 18–22, 1957, instruct its president and executive committee to actively seek enactment of legislation to provide that right-of-way transactions for highway purposes shall be exempt from the internal revenue stamp tax; and be it further

Resolved, That such legislation exempt from such tax all transactions between May 1, 1950, and the enactment of such legislation.

A. E. JOHNSON,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION NO. 5 OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

Whereas this association in the past has called to the attention of the Congress and of the various executive departments of the Federal Government the need for legislation to permit the acquisition of adequate rights-of-way for highway purposes over and across Federal lands, and

Whereas the difficulties of obtaining such rights-of-way still exist and in some instances may prevent the development of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956; and

Whereas this association has previously endorsed in principle proposed Federal legislation which was prepared by a special committee of the Western Association of State Highway Officials, copies of which legislation were sent to the President of the United States and various Federal departments and agencies, and

Whereas by reason of the increased highway programs pursuant to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, such legislation is even more necessary than before; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Association of State Highway Officials, in Annual Convention assembled in Chicago, Ill., November 18–22, 1957, reaffirms its endorsement in principle of the draft of such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the president and executive committee of this association take all proper steps to insure the introduction in and consideration by the forthcoming session of the Congress of such legislation.

A. E. JOHNSON,
Executive Secretary.

WISCONSIN ROAD BUILDERS ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., March 12, 1958.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: We are attaching a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by this association which represents 184 highway contractor companies employing over 8,000 men.

We respectfully request that this resolution be given your careful consideration.

Very truly yours,

E. E. HOEBEL,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN ROAD BUILDERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas the economic development of the Nation and the high standard of living enjoyed by its citizens may be largely attributed to the process of private enterprise; and

Whereas it has been conclusively demonstrated that the open competitive bidding system guarantees the construction of highways at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer, with the highest quality of construction, and in the least possible time; and

Whereas the contract system provides for maximum employment, directly and indirectly, since over 90 percent of every dollar expended on construction work goes to labor as payrolls, assuring widespread benefits to labor, business, and industry; and

Whereas open competitive bidding as the basis for constructing highways and other public works is in the public interest; and

Whereas the open competitive bidding system not only encourages private business initiative, but also that of workers; and

Whereas the contractors will be operating at less than 50 percent of capacity in Wisconsin during 1958 with a consequent reduction in its labor forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Road Builders Association at its meeting on March 11, 1958, does hereby go on record reaffirming its previously stated position in full support of the open competitive bidding method for highway construction and does call upon all other interested parties and agencies to take full advantage of this method in the interest of economy, efficiency, and support of American traditions and principles; and be it further

Resolved, That all members of the Wisconsin Congressional delegation and the chairman of the appropriate Congressional committee be petitioned to provide for the continuation of the full utilization of the open competitive bidding method on all highway legislation to be acted upon by this session of the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States Bureau of Public Roads and the State Highway Commission of Wisconsin be petitioned to continue their original policy in regard to the open competitive bidding system of the urban, secondary, and regular Federal-aid system.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McGREGOR moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8921) to the committee of conference.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 109, nays 222, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—109

Abernethy	Brown, Ohio	Gary
Albert	Brownson	Glenn
Alexander	Budge	Gross
Alger	Burleson	Gwinn
Allen, Ill.	Byrne, Ill.	Haley
Andrews	Byrnes, Wis.	Harrison, Nebr.
Arends	Chiperfield	Harvey
Ayres	Cooley	Hébert
Bass, Tenn.	Curtis, Mass.	Henderson
Beamer	Curtis, Mo.	Hiestand
Beckworth	Derounian	Ikard
Belcher	Dixon	Jackson
Berry	Dowdy	Jarman
Bonner	Elliott	Jenkins
Brooks, La.	Fisher	Jennings
Brooks, Tex.	Flynt	Jensen
Brown, Mo.	Fountain	Johansen

Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kilday
Kilgore
King
Kitchin
Krueger
Laird
Lane
McCulloch
McGregor
Macdonald
Mack, Ill.
Mahon
Michel
Morris
Morrison
Murray
Neal
Nicholson
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
Philbin
Poage
Poff
Ray
Reed
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers
Rogers, Tex.
Rutherford
Scott, N. C.
Selden
Sheehan
Sheppard
Shuford
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Stauffer
Steed
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tuck
Van Pelt
Vorys
Vursell
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Young

NAYS—222

Addonizio
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Mont.
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Bates
Baumhart
Bennett, Fla.
Bentley
Betts
Blatnik
Blitch
Bosch
Boyle
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Ga.
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Cannon
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Christopher
Church
Clark
Coad
Coffin
Collier
Corbett
Cramer
Cretella
Cunningham, Iowa
Cunningham, Nebr.
Curtin
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dellay
Dennison
Denton
Devereux
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Doyle
Dwyer
Eberharter
Edmondson
Engle
Everett
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gathings
Gavin
George
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Grffin
Griffiths
Hagen
Hale
Harris
Haskell
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hemphill
Herlong
Heselton
Hill
Hoffman
Holland
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Keogh
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Lafore
Lankford
Latham
Lesinski
Libonati
Lipscomb
Loser
McCarthy
McFall
McGovern
McIntosh
McMillan
McVey
Machrowicz
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mailliard
Marshall
Matthews
May
Meader
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mitchell
Montoya
Moore
Morano
Morgan
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Natcher
Nimtz
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Pillion
Polk
Porter
Price
Prouty
Quie
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Roberts
Robison, N. Y.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Roosevelt
Sadlak
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schenck
Schwengel
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sieminski
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Talle
Teague, Calif.
Tewes
Thompson, N. J.
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Wainwright
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Whitten
Widnall
Wier
Withrow
Wolverton
Yates
Younger
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—98

Abbitt
Adair
Allen, Calif.
Anfuso
Barden
Baring
Bass, N. H.
Becker
Bennett, Mich.
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Boykin
Breeding
Broyhill
Buckley
Burdick
Carnahan
Celler
Clevenger
Colmer
Coudert
Davis, Ga.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Dent
Dies
Diggs
Dollinger
Dooley
Durham
Evins
Farbstein
Fino
Forrester
Gordon
Grant
Gubser
Halleck
Harden
Hardy
Harrison, Va.
Healey
Hess
Hillings
Hoeven
Holifield
Horan
James
Kean
Kearney
Kelly, N. Y.
Kilburn
Kirwan
Landrum
LeCompte
Lennon
McCormack
McDonough
McIntire
Martin
Mason
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Mumma
Norblad
O'Brien, N. Y.
Passman
Patman
Pilcher
Powell
Preston
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Riley
Robeson, Va.
Rooney
St. George
Scherer
Scott, Pa.
Scudder
Staggers
Sullivan
Taber
Taylor
Teller
Tollefson
Utt
Vinson
Wharton
Whitener
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Calif.
Zelenko

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Whitener with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Fino.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Dawson of Utah.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Breeding with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Gordon with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Dent with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Williams of New York.
Mr. Teller with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Bolling of Missouri with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Harrison of Virginia.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

On this vote:

Mr. McCormack for, Mr. Hoeven against.
Mr. Forrester for, Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Colmer for, Mr. Scherer against.
Mr. Abbitt for, Mr. Hess against.
Mr. Lennon for, Mr. Kean against.
Mr. Adair for, Mr. Taylor against.
Mrs. Harden for, Mr. Landrum against.
Mr. Halleck for, Mr. Vinson against.
Mr. Mumma for, Mr. Celler against.
Mr. James for, Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Becker for, Mr. Rooney against.
Mr. Wilson of California for, Mr. Dooley against.
Mr. Pilcher for, Mrs. Bolton against.
Mr. Barden for, Mr. Bow against.
Mr. Boland for, Mr. Riley against.
Mr. Passman for, Mr. Horan against.
Mr. Patman for, Mr. Dollinger against.
Mr. Rains for, Mrs. Sullivan against.
Mr. Dies for, Mr. Preston against.
Mr. Robeson of Virginia for, Mr. Holifield against.
Mr. Burdick for, Mr. Healey against.

Mr. MORRIS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. KEARNS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COLLIER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BENTLEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LIPSCOMB changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WITHROW changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were yeas 300, nays 28, not voting 101, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—300

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Mont.
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Blitch
Bonner
Bosch
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Mo.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Budge
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Cannon
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Christopher
Church
Clark
Coad
Coffin
Collier
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cretella
Cunningham, Iowa
Cunningham, Nebr.
Curtin
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dellay
Dennison
Denton
Derounian
Devereux
Dingell
Dixon
Donohue
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Dwyer
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle
Everett
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gathings
Gavin
George
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Hagen
Hale
Haley
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harvey
Haskell
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Heselton
Hiestand
Hill
Hoffman
Holland
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
Jackson
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Keogh
Kilday
King
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Krueger
Lafore
Lane
Lankford
Latham
Lesinski
Libonati
Lipscomb
Loser
McCarthy
McCulloch
McFall
McGovern
McIntosh
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mailliard
Marshall
Matthews
May
Meader
Merrow
Metcalf
Michel
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mitchell
Montoya
Moore
Morano
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Natcher
Nicholson
Nimtz
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pillion
Polk
Porter
Price
Prouty
Quie
Reece, Tenn.
Reed
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Roberts

Robison, N. Y.	Siler	Vorys
Robsion, Ky.	Simpson, Ill.	Vursell
Rodino	Sisk	Wainwright
Rogers, Colo.	Smith, Calif.	Walter
Rogers, Fla.	Smith, Kans.	Watts
Rogers, Mass.	Smith, Miss.	Weaver
Roosevelt	Spence	Westland
Sadlak	Springer	Whitten
Santangelo	Stauffer	Widnall
Saund	Steed	Wier
Saylor	Talle	Williams, Miss.
Schenck	Teague, Calif.	Willis
Schwengel	Tewes	Wilson, Ind.
Scott, N. C.	Thompson, La.	Winstead
Scrivner	Thompson, N. J	Withrow
Seely-Brown	Thomson, Wyo.	Wolverton
Selden	Thornberry	Wright
Sheehan	Trimble	Yates
Shelley	Udall	Young
Sheppard	Ullman	Younger
Shuford	Vanik	Zablocki
Sieminski	Van Pelt	
Sikes	Van Zandt	

NAYS—28

Alger	Kilgore	Rogers, Tex.
Ayres	Laird	Rutherford
Burleson	McGregor	Simpson, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Mahon	Smith, Va.
Curtis, Mass.	Neal	Teague, Tex.
Curtis, Mo.	Poage	Thomas
Fisher	Poff	Thompson, Tex.
Gary	Ray	Tuck
Glenn	Rhodes, Ariz.	
Gwinn	Rivers	

NOT VOTING—101

Abbitt	Farbstein	Murray
Adair	Fino	Norblad
Allen, Calif.	Forrester	O'Brien, N. Y.
Anfuso	Gordon	O'Neill
Barden	Grant	Passman
Baring	Gregory	Patman
Becker	Gubser	Pilcher
Bennett, Mich.	Halleck	Powell
Boggs	Harden	Preston
Boland	Hardy	Rabaut
Bolling	Harrison, Va.	Radwan
Bolton	Healey	Rains
Bow	Hess	Riley
Boykin	Hillings	Robeson, Va.
Breeding	Hoeven	Rooney
Broyhill	Holifield	St. George
Buckley	Horan	Scherer
Burdick	James	Scott, Pa.
Carnahan	Kean	Scudder
Celler	Kearney	Staggers
Clevenger	Kelly, N. Y.	Sullivan
Colmer	Kilburn	Taber
Coudert	Kirwan	Taylor
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Teller
Dawson, Ill.	LeCompte	Tollefson
Dawson, Utah	Lennon	Utt
Dent	McCormack	Vinson
Dies	McDonough	Wharton
Diggs	McIntire	Whitener
Dollinger	Martin	Wigglesworth
Dooley	Mason	Williams, N. Y.
Durham	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Calif.
Edmondson	Miller, Md.	Zelenko
Evins	Mumma	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Teller with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Whitener with Mr. Coudert.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Breeding with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Riley with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Broyhill.
Mr. Gregory with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Patman with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Dawson of Utah.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. James.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Williams of New York.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Robeson of Virginia with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Bolling with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Scudder.

Mr. HIESTAND and Mr. NORRELL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. NEAL. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I opposed this legislation.

The Federal Highway System, designed to meet a recognized need, was well conceived and planned for completion over a definite period of years with funds anticipated from taxes to be imposed on the users.

Any project of such proportions admittedly will require most careful studies and planning, in order that waste, inefficiency, and engineering errors may be avoided.

In my opinion, the Congress should avoid legislating hasty provisions that will invite unwise and uncoordinated approaches to one of the most expensive programs ever before undertaken by our Government in peacetime.

While it is highly desirable to institute much needed Federal works projects for the purpose of absorbing the acute unemployment problem facing our Nation today, this program, because of necessary delays in getting the program under way, will fall short of anticipated results in this respect.

This Federal highway program is too important to the future of transportation needs to be approached in haste. This bill foreshadows just such attempts whereby the future stability of this great project will fall short of full returns for money involved.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 39 I was unable to reach the floor in time to vote because of official business. If I had been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

GOVERNOR WILLIAMS, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] took the floor of this House to comment on the testimony of Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, before the Ways and Means Committee this last Monday, March 31. In his comments the gentleman from Michigan stated that the Governor at that time indicated he had no knowledge of the amount of debt of the State of Michigan.

I have much respect for the thoroughness of the gentleman from Michigan, but it seems that at least in this one instance he slipped slightly. If he had been as thorough as he usually is, he would have noted that, although the Governor did state that he did not have the exact figures immediately at hand, he did return to the hearing room within an hour and placed them into the RECORD.

For the gentleman's enlightenment, I cite here that portion of the transcript of March 31 relative to this matter:

Mr. MACHROWICZ. When Governor Williams was on the stand earlier today, he was asked a question about what the Michigan debt was. At that time he did not have the available figures.

Governor Williams is now in the hearing room and has asked that these figures be placed in the record. He is available to explain them if necessary.

The figures for 1956 are as follows:

The total State and local debt, $1,536,000,000. The total State debt alone was $519 million, of which $199 million is faith and credit debt. Three hundred and twenty million dollars is self-liquidating; this is debt such as the Mackinac Bridge debt which tolls pay for, and other similar debts. I ask unanimous consent that these figures be placed in the record at the appropriate place where the question was asked.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be done.

When these figures were put into the record, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who originally asked for the figures, was in the hearing room, but did not choose to question the Governor further about the matter, though the Governor was available in the room for questioning.

I sincerely hope that the next time the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] decides to comment on matters of this kind, he checks the record a little more thoroughly than he did in this instance.

TAX ON ADMISSIONS TO CERTAIN MUSICAL PERFORMANCES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8794) to provide an exemption from the tax imposed on admissions to certain musical performances, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "be" and insert "is."

Page 1, line 5, after "musical" insert "or dramatic."

Page 1, line 8, after "musical" insert "or dramatic."

Page 1, after line 8, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 4233 (a) (1) (C) of such code is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the last sentence thereof 'or to the benefit of hospitals for crippled children, or both.'"

Page 1, after line 8, insert:

"SEC. 3. Section 4233 (a) of such code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) Athletic games for benefit of retarded children: Any admissions to an athletic game between teams composed of students from elementary or secondary schools, or colleges, if the proceeds from such game inure exclusively to the benefit of an organization described in section 501 (c) (3) which is exempt from tax under section 501 (a) and which is operated exclusively for the purpose of aiding and advancing retarded children."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "2" and insert "4."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "the first section of."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide exemptions from the tax imposed on admissions for admissions to certain musical and dramatic performances and athletic events."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House will recall, H. R. 8794 as it passed the House provided an exemption from the Federal excise tax on admissions for certain musical performances so as to make an exemption available to nonprofit civic or community membership associations not only in the case of performances by symphony orchestras, bands, and vocal groups and in the case of ballets, operas, and operettas, but also in the case of musical comedies and reviews.

The Senate amended the bill in the following respects: First, such amendments would exempt from admissions tax athletic events between teams composed of students where the proceeds are divided between the educational institutions involved and hospitals for crippled children, and would exempt from admissions tax such athletic events where the proceeds are devoted to organizations operated exclusively for the purpose of aiding and advancing retarded children. There were certain technical amendments in addition. Also, there was a floor amendment to change the title of the bill and an amendment to exempt from the admissions tax dramatic performances where there is involved an organization which has civic or community membership.

Mr. REED. 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. REED. Mr. Speaker, the House-passed version of this legislation had as its purpose amending the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend the existing exemption from the excise tax on admissions presently available with respect to certain concerts so that the exemption would be available with respect to musical performances conducted by nonprofit civic or community membership associations. The Senate in acting on H. R. 8794 has extended the exemption from the admissions tax to athletic games between teams composed of students from elementary or secondary schools or colleges where the gross proceeds are divided between the schools involved and hospitals for crippled children. The exemption has also been extended to such athletic games where the proceeds inure to an exempt educational, charitable, or religious organization operated exclusively for the benefit of retarded children.

I would like to commend my able colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] for the effective work he has done on this meritorious legislation.

INVINCIBLE SPIRIT OF PATRICK

Mr. PHILBIN. 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. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the St. Patrick's observances throughout the world, particularly here in our own Nation, took on special significance this year, not only because of the increased size and fervor of the celebrations, but because of the world backdrop against which they were held.

Confusion, even chaos, stalk through much of the world; economic warning signs are hoisted; the fear of nuclear destruction from space poises ominously over the human race.

But the example and precepts of the glorious Patrick stand unchanged, immutable, symbol of the living faith, a spiritual armor that will guard us and the world from harm.

St. Patrick exemplifies the invincible spirit of the Emerald Isle and the dauntless will of its noble people.

Selfless, God-like and universal, St. Patrick is as the indestructible rock upon which the century tides of human turmoil may beat ceaselessly only to be brushed away as if by one light touch of the Divine Maker.

The Nation and the world must ponder well upon the example of the lofty spirit of St. Patrick and the history of the Irish people because here is the triumph of eternal faith, good works, and unflinching determination.

Let Americans and freedom lovers everywhere recall and again be inspired by the infinite power of prayer and the inconquerable spirit of a people fired by love of God and allegiance to personal liberty.

The Irish saga is but part of the great age-old struggle for liberty. But it is a part that teaches us eloquently that men of faith and men of courage can never be defeated.

There is another lesson to be learned from the great human experience of Patrick and the Irish and that is the lesson of undimmed hope when dark despair casts its somber reflection upon the world.

Let the enemies of freedom beware of further arousing the conscience of free men. Let those who plot our destruction and our conquest recognize above all that we will ever affirm and defend our faith in our great destiny of freedom and that we will resist, if need be, with all our great strength and power the evil forces that so cynically assail our most precious values and would, if they had their way, bring us by the mailed fist under the slavish mastery of the godless superstate.

What the Nation and the world needs today is the resolution to live by the solid values upon which our civilization rests, the values that Patrick stressed, that the Irish heritage represents and that are so intimately bound up with our own history and national life.

Devotion to the Creator and the cause of human liberty, if it is felt sincerely and practiced resolutely, can help greatly to lift up the hearts and the hopes of innumerable victims of tyranny. More than that, our uncompromising adherence to our political and spiritual ideals will preserve our rights and liberties as free men and women, regardless of the blatant threats and blandishments of the Marxist conspiracy.

It will be these values, not the selfish, materialistic ones, not the economic ones, that will put the enemies of freedom to rout. It will be the values of Patrick and his brave nation, the values of American patriots and freedom fighters everywhere moved by faith, valor and determination that will, under God, preserve the American constitutional system, our way of life, our families and our shrines and bring to the world the peace that "surpasseth all understanding"; the lasting peace and security resting in justice, compassion and the rights of man.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL AUTOMATION CONGRESS AND EXPOSITION

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 347) authorizing and requesting the President to invite the several States and foreign countries to take part in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to June 13, 1958.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "and requested."

Page 2, line 7, strike out all after "1958" over to and including "City" in line 3 page 3.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the several States and foreign countries to take part in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to June 13, 1958."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESSION REMEDY

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, since this session of Congress opened in January my office has received volumes of mail and visits by delegations from Indiana requesting drastic action on legislation to aid in curtailing the growing unemployment. Industrial workers, farmers, and small retail business groups have visited me, all hoping for legislative action to restore public buying power.

After 5 years of high interest rates and a tight-money policy coupled with Secretary of Agriculture Benson's agriculture program we find that billions of dollars in buying power has been gradually siphoned from the farm and consuming groups in our economy until we have finally found consumer goods and machinery products dormant in our retail markets.

Five and one-half million unemployed does not give the true picture of our economic condition. This figure does not include additional millions who are working part time—3 to 4 days per week. Millions of small farmers have left the farm and are working or seeking employment in our towns and cities.

The following antirecession programs should have already been placed in actual operation and I hope our Government will not delay further in getting action on same:

First. Increase individual personal exemptions from $600 to $700.

Second. Pass legislation to establish Federal standards for unemployment compensation as recommended by the Kennedy-McCarthy bill.

Third. Double time speedup on immediate highway construction. The $31 billion highway program was passed by the Congress almost 2 years ago and is still in blueprint stage.

Fourth. Construction of much needed schools, hospitals, post offices, and flood-control projects.

Fifth. Replace Secretary Benson and reestablish the farm policy which Benson discarded in 1953. The farmers' buying power must be restored.

If the President and his minority Congressional leaders will cooperate with the Congress on the above five antidepression measures, public buying power will gradually increase and production and employment reestablished.

It is astounding to observe the political antics of some of our dedicated so-called States rights governors passing the buck to Congress for relief of unemployment in their States. The Governor of my State of Indiana is an outstanding example of one engaging in political doubletalk. For several years Governor Handley in speeches, television, and newspapers has denounced the policy of Indiana receiving Federal money from Washington. He now has reversed his campaign propaganda and has made two trips to Federal agencies for help to relieve unemployment.

Thousands of Hoosiers would now be employed on much-needed school, hospital, and highway construction had he and other members of his party supported a Federal cooperation program during the last few years.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 11451.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 1, we passed our appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the coming fiscal year. In connection with the bill, I submitted for the committee our report which shows that in the last 5 years, under Secretary Benson, farm income has gone down greatly. Farm costs have gone up. The take of the middleman has constantly increased, as have the payments from the Treasury. With all of this, consumer prices have gone up. Commodity Credit Corporation holdings, despite grants, donations, sales for foreign currencies, and cash sales, have increased from $2½ billion in January 1953, to $7.2 billion in January 1958. Employees in the Department have increased by 17,000; and the cost of operating the regular programs of the Department has increased from $796 million in fiscal year 1952 to a total of $1,729,000,000 for the present fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, these facts come from the Department's own record of operations under the administration of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. In view of that record, it is hard to believe that the Secretary of Agriculture, as stubborn as he may be, would not read from such facts at least some proof that his programs for American agriculture are not working.

May I say, there was no opposition from the Republican side of the aisle either to the Agriculture Appropriations Committee report or to the bill as it passed Congress, clearly indicating the realization by the entire Congress of the true situation.

The question follows, Mr. Speaker, as to why the President turned down the pleas of Republican Members of Congress for a change in the secretaryship from Secretary Benson to someone else. In trying to determine the President's reasons, my attention was called to a copy of the Deseret News and Telegram, Salt Lake City, Tuesday, December 2, 1952, where the following news story appears:

APPOINTMENT VIEWED AS HONOR TO CHURCH

PROVO, UTAH.—Elder Ezra Taft Benson said Monday his appointment as Secretary of Agriculture was not an honor to an individual but to the entire Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.

Elder Benson, a member of the Council of the Twelve, spoke to Brigham Young University students in the fieldhouse.

"This appointment means that the world has come to recognize the church for what it is * * * it is the fulfillment of a prophecy of Joseph Smith, who said the church would one day assume leadership in Washington."

Mr. Speaker, since that time Elder Benson has reached a position of great influence at the White House. He has exercised great powers which we believe have resulted in a declining farm income. This, in the opinion of our Committee on Appropriations, is a major factor in bringing on the great unemployment which exists in our Nation, with more than 5 million unemployed.

I do not know why the President continues to retain Elder Benson as Secretary of Agriculture. We Democrats have not called on the President to make a change in designation of Secretary of Agriculture because we felt that such action by the opposite party would not have the desired result. I would say, however, Mr. Speaker, that whatever purpose the President may have in continuing the tenure and policies of the present Secretary of Agriculture, I believe he should make a change, if only on a temporary basis.

In support of the need for a change, I am reminded of the early 1930's, a time of farm depression, when I was growing up in a north Mississippi agricultural community. Money was hard to come by and times were tough; and we were unable to afford a full-time preacher. In view of the ability of some of our visiting preachers to eat, frequently during revivals different families in the community would keep the visiting preachers for a day and night, after which some other family would take on this responsibility. By that policy of passing our preachers around, taking care of them did not cost anyone too much.

Mr. Speaker, may I say again that while we Democrats haven't joined in a call on the President to remove our Secretary of Agriculture, I do feel that, whatever reasons President Eisenhower has for keeping Elder Benson in his Cabinet, he should do as we once did in our community—the President should pass him around. If the President must keep him, if he would only transfer him to the position of Secretary of Labor, or Secretary of Commerce, or any other department even for a short period of time, it would be only fair. Mr. Speaker, if the President would get one of those departments to take Elder Benson for a year it might give our farmers a little chance to catch their breath; for truly, Elder Benson is just about to eat the farmers out of house and home.

CIVILIAN SPACE AGENCY

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Congress was informed of the space proposals of President Eisenhower. This plan, as presented by the President, calls for a civilian space agency and is similar in great detail to the plan which I have presented the Congress in my bill H. R. 9966, which I introduced on January 14 of this year.

It is, I believe, a cause for serious concern that the President has recently ordered the military to launch rockets and to orbit satellites around the moon. Coincident with the President's order for the military to enter into this phase of the space program came the announcement that Nikita Khrushchev has become the absolute dictator of Soviet Russia.

A man of Khrushchev's caliber in command of Russia will obviously feel challenged by our military in attempting to take over space. We must have adequate defense but if the military sets up an operation on the moon, then the moon will become a potential threat to the Russians, for its very existence, however innocent, will present a challenge to the Russians because it will have been our Army and Air Force which will control the project.

Surely this Congress must act quickly yet thoroughly on matters relating to space. We must place moon and other space projects in the hands of civilians in line with the present Geophysical Year program. The maintenance of peace is based upon the correct moves during these days of expansion of a space program. Too much, too soon, by the wrong persons could be worse than none at all.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight Saturday to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—DEFENSE REORGANIZATION (H. DOC NO. 366)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Last January I advised the Congress of two overriding tasks in present world conditions—the insuring of our safety through strength, and the building of a genuine peace. To these ends, I outlined eight major items requiring urgent action.

One was defense reorganization.

In this message I discuss the administrative and legislative changes that I consider essential to the effective direction of our entire Defense Establishment. They are not numerous. They are, however, very important. They flow from these principles:

First, separate ground, sea, and air warfare is gone forever. If ever again we should be involved in war, we will fight it in all elements, with all services, as one single concentrated effort. Peacetime preparatory and organizational activity must conform to this fact. Strategic and tactical planning must be completely unified, combat forces organized into unified commands, each equipped with the most efficient weapons systems that science can develop, singly led and prepared to fight as one, regardless of service. The accomplishment of this result is the basic function of the Secretary of Defense, advised and assisted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and operating under the supervision of the Commander in Chief.

Additionally, Secretary of Defense authority, especially in respect to the development of new weapons, must be clear and direct, and flexible in the management of funds. Prompt decisions and elimination of wasteful activity must be primary goals.

These principles I commend to the Congress. In conformity to them I have formulated and urgently recommend certain changes in our Defense Establishment. Clearly we should preserve the traditional form and pattern of the services but should regroup and redefine certain service responsibilities. From this will flow the following significant results:

Strategic planning will be unified.

Our fighting forces will be formed into unified commands effectively organized for the attainment of national objectives.

Military command channels will be streamlined.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff will be provided professional military assistance required for efficient strategic planning and operational control.

The control and supervision of the Secretary of Defense over military research and development will be strengthened.

The Secretary of Defense will be granted needed flexibility in the management of defense funds.

The Secretary of Defense and Joint Chiefs of Staff will be given a direct voice in the appointment, assignment, and removal of officers in the top two military ranks.

The authority of the Secretary of Defense will be clarified to enable him to function as a fully effective agent of the President as Commander in Chief.

The overall efficiency of the Defense Department will be increased.

The tendency toward service rivalry and controversy, which has so deeply troubled the American people, will be sharply reduced.

In the following remarks I set forth the background and details of these legislative and administrative proposals.

In recent years a revolution has been taking place in the techniques of war. Entirely new weapons have emerged. They transcend all we have before known in destructive power, in range, in swiftness of delivery. Thermonuclear weapons, missiles, new aircraft of great speed and range, atomic ground weapons, nuclear submarines have changed the whole scale and tempo of military destructiveness. Warning times are vanishing. There can be little confidence that we would surely know of an attack before it is launched. Speeds of flight are already such as to make timely reaction difficult and interception uncertain.

The need to maintain an effective deterrent to war becomes ever more critical. In this situation, we must find more efficient and economical means of developing new devices and fitting them into our Defense Establishment. We must so revise this establishment as not only to improve our own use of such devices; additionally we must be able to counter their use against us.

The products of modern technology are not, in many cases, readily adaptable to traditional service patterns or existing provisions of law. Thus there has tended to be confusion and controversy over the introduction of new weapons into our Armed Forces and over the current applicability of long-established service roles and missions.

Moreover, the new weapons and other defense undertakings are so costly as to heavily burden our entire economy. We must achieve the utmost military efficiency in order to generate maximum power from the resources we have available.

Confronted by such urgent needs, we cannot allow differing service viewpoints to determine the character of our defenses—either as to operational planning and control, or as to the development, production and use of newer weapons. To sanction administrative confusion and interservice debate is, in these times, to court disaster. I cannot overemphasize my conviction that our country's security requirements must not be subordinated to outmoded or single-service concepts of war.

I

An understanding of the course over which we have come to the present will help determine the path we should follow now and in the future.

When our Republic was founded, we had a simple solution to the problem of

military organization—at first, only a War Department, then soon thereafter, a Department of the Navy. The Navy's mission was war at sea. The War Department's mission was war on land.

For a century and a half this two-department organization was well suited to our needs. Recently, however, the airplane has added a third dimension to the arts of war. At first the airplane was integrated into the traditional two-department organization, and there it remained until World War II.

Right after Pearl Harbor we adjusted our organization to accord a fuller role to rapidly growing airpower. Within the War Department, the Army Air Forces were placed on equal footing with Ground and Service Forces. In the Navy, task forces built around naval aviation became the heart of the fleet. The Commanding General of the Army Air Forces became a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with the Army Chief of Staff and the Chief of Naval Operations.

Immediately after the war, efforts began to build a defense organization based upon the lessons of World War II. A basic theme was to provide an adequate organizational framework for airpower armed with the awesome destructive force of atomic weapons. There emerged three coequal executive departments—Army, Navy, and Air Force. But World War II experience had proved that no longer could warfare be effectively waged under separate Army, Navy, and Air Force doctrines. So, over all our forces the Congress established a Secretary of Defense.

This reorganization in 1947 was marked by lengthy debate and eventual compromise. In that battle the lessons were lost, tradition won. The three service departments were but loosely joined. The entire structure, called the National Military Establishment, was little more than a weak confederation of sovereign military units. Few powers were vested in the new Secretary of Defense. All others were reserved to three separated executive departments.

Events soon showed that this loose aggregation was unmanageable. In 1949, the National Military Establishment was replaced by an executive Department of Defense. The authority of the Secretary of Defense over his Department was made specific. He was vested with the power of decision in the operation of several interservice boards in his Office. A Chairman was provided to preside over the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force were converted from independent executive departments to subordinate military departments. They became represented in the President's Cabinet and the National Security Council by the Secretary of Defense alone. Other changes with similar effect were made.

The unifying process moved forward again in 1953. The Secretary of Defense was given staff facilities better adapted to his heavy responsibilities. Certain boards and agencies were abolished and their duties transferred to him. Additional Assistant Secretaries of Defense were provided. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was authorized to manage the Joint Staff for the Joint Chiefs.

These various steps toward more effective coordination of our Armed Forces under one civilian head have been necessary, sound, and in the direction pointed by the lessons of modern warfare. Each such step, however, has prompted opponents to predict dire results. There have been allegations that our free institutions would be threatened by the influence of a military leader serving as the principal military adviser to the Defense Secretary and the Commander in Chief. There have been forecasts that one or more of the services would be abolished. As a result, the Secretary of Defense has never been freed of excessive statutory restraints. As a result of well-meaning attempts to protect traditional concepts and prerogatives, we have impaired civilian authority and denied ourselves a fully effective defense. We must cling no longer to statutory barriers that weaken executive action and civilian authority. We must free ourselves of emotional attachments to service systems of an era that is no more.

I therefore propose, for America's safety, that we now modernize our Defense Establishment and make it efficient enough and flexible enough to enable it to meet the fateful challenge of continuing revolutionary change.

II

I know well, from years of military life, the constant concern of service leaders for the adequacy of their respective programs, each of which is intended to strengthen the Nation's defense. I understand quite as well the necessity for these leaders to present honestly and forcefully to their superiors their views regarding the place of their programs in the overall national effort. But service responsibilities and activities must always be only the branches, not the central trunk of the national security tree. The present organization fails to apply this truth.

While at times human failure and misdirected zeal have been responsible for duplications, inefficiencies, and publicized disputes, the truth is that most of the service rivalries that have troubled us in recent years have been made inevitable by the laws that govern our defense organization.

Parenthetically, I may observe that these rivalries, so common in the National Capital, are almost unknown in the field. Here in Washington they usually find expression in the services' Congressional and press activities which become particularly conspicuous in struggles over new weapons, funds and publicity. It is just such rivalries, I am convinced, that America wants stopped.

Coming now to specific organizational changes, I want first to emphasize the vital necessity of complete unity in our strategic planning and basic operational direction. It is therefore mandatory that the initiative for this planning and direction rest not with the separate services but directly with the Secretary of Defense and his operational advisers, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, assisted by such staff organization as they deem necessary.

No military task is of greater importance than the development of strategic plans which relate our revolutionary new weapons and force deployments to national security objectives. Genuine unity is indispensable at this starting point. No amount of subsequent coordination can eliminate duplication or doctrinal conflicts which are intruded into the first shaping of military programs.

This unified effort is essential not only for long-range planning and decision which fix the pattern of our future forces and form the foundation of our major military programs, but also for effective command over military operations. The need for greater unity today is most acute at two points—in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and in the major operational commands responsible for actual combat in the event of war.

Now as to the specifics of the revisions that I deem essential:

1. We must organize our fighting forces into operational commands that are truly unified, each assigned a mission in full accord with our overall military objectives.

This lesson, taught by World War II, I learned from firsthand experience. With rare exceptions, as I stated before, there can no longer be separate ground, sea, or air battles.

Our unified commands (by which term I also include the joint and specified commands which exist today) are the cutting edge of our military machine—the units which would do the fighting. Our entire defense organization exists to make them effective.

I intend that, subject only to exceptions personally approved by the Commander in Chief, all of our operational forces be organized into truly unified commands. Such commands will be established at my direction. They will be in the Department of Defense but separate from the military departments. Their missions and force levels will conform to national objectives.

I expect these truly unified commands to go far toward realining our operational plans, weapons systems and force levels in such fashion as to provide maximum security at minimum cost.

Because I have often seen the evils of diluted command, I emphasize that each unified commander must have unquestioned authority over all units of his command. Forces must be assigned to the command and be removed only by central direction—by the Secretary of Defense or the Commander in Chief—and not by orders of individual military departments.

Commands of this kind we do not have today. To the extent that we are unable so to organize them under present law, to that extent we cannot fully marshal our armed strength.

We must recognize that by law our military organization still reflects the traditional concepts of separate forces for land, sea, and air operations, despite a Congressional assertion in the same law favoring their integration into an

efficient team of land, naval, and air forces. This separation is clearly incompatible with unified commands whose missions and weapons systems go far beyond concepts and traditions of individual services.

Today a unified command is made up of component commands from each military department, each under a commander of that department. The commander's authority over these component commands is short of the full command required for maximum efficiency. In fact, it is prescribed that some of his command powers shall take effect only in time of emergency.

I recommend, therefore, that present law, including certain restrictions relating to combatant functions, be so amended as to remove any possible obstacles to the full unity of our commands and the full command over them by unified commanders.

This recommendation most emphatically does not contemplate repeal of laws prescribing the composition of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force. I have neither the intent nor the desire to merge or abolish the traditional services. This recommendation would have no such effect. But I cannot too strongly urge that our operational commands be made truly unified, efficient military instruments. Congressional cooperation is necessary to achieve that goal.

2. We must clear command channels so that orders will proceed directly to unified commands from the Commander in Chief and Secretary of Defense.

The number of headquarters between the Commander in Chief and the commander of each unified command must be kept at the very minimum. Every additional level courts delay, confusion of authority, and diffusion of responsibility. When military responsibility is unclear, civilian control is uncertain.

Under existing practice, the chain of command is diverted through the Secretaries and service chiefs of the military departments. The department with major responsibility for a unified command is designated by the Secretary of Defense as "executive agent" for that command. The department's Secretary functions through his chief of military service.

So today the channel of military command and direction runs from the Commander in Chief to the Secretary of Defense, then to the Secretary of an executive agent department, then to a chief of service, and then, finally, to the unified commander. In time of emergency, the Secretary of the executive agent department delegates to his service chief his authority over the strategic direction and conduct of combat operations. Thus, ultimately the chief of an individual service issues, in the name of the Secretary of Defense, orders to a unified commander.

The role of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in this process is to furnish professional advice and staff assistance to the Secretary of Defense.

I consider this chain of command cumbersome and unreliable in time of peace and not usable in time of war. Clearly, Secretaries of military departments and chiefs of individual services should not direct unified operations and therefore should be removed from the command channel. Accordingly, I have directed the Secretary of Defense to discontinue the use of military departments as executive agents for unified commands.

To facilitate this effort I ask Congressional cooperation. I request repeal of any statutory authority which vests responsibilities for military operations in any official other than the Secretary of Defense. Examples are statutory provisions which prescribe that the Air Force Chief of Staff shall command major units of the Air Force and that the Chief of Naval Operations shall command naval operating forces.

3. We must strengthen the military staff in the Office of the Secretary of Defense in order to provide the Commander in Chief and the Secretary of Defense with the professional assistance they need for strategic planning and for operational direction of the unified commands.

For these purposes, several improvements are needed in the duties and organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I consider the Joint Chiefs of Staff concept essentially sound, and I therefore believe that the Joint Chiefs of Staff should continue to be constituted as currently provided in law. However, in keeping with the shift I have directed in operational channels, the Joint Chiefs of Staff will in the future serve as staff assisting the Secretary of Defense in his exercise of direction over unified commands. Orders issued to the commands by the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be under the authority and in the name of the Secretary of Defense.

I think it important to have it clearly understood that the Joint Chiefs of Staff act only under the authority and in the name of the Secretary of Defense. I am, therefore, issuing instructions that their function is to advise and assist the Secretary of Defense in respect to their duties and not to perform any of their duties independently of the Secretary's direction.

Under present law, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are provided a Joint Staff of not to exceed 210 officers. It functions under a Director selected by the Joint Chiefs of Staff with the approval of the Secretary of Defense. The Joint Chiefs of Staff assign duties to the Joint Staff which is managed for them by their Chairman. This staff is subdivided into a number of groups, each with equal representation of officers from the three military departments. In addition, there is a committee system whereby officers, representing each of the military departments, act on documents prepared by the staff groups before they are forwarded to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

These laborious processes exist because each military department feels obliged to judge independently each work product of the Joint Staff. Had I allowed my interservice and interallied staff to be similarly organized in the theaters I commanded during World War II, the delays and resulting indecisiveness would have been unacceptable to my superiors.

With the operational channel now running from the Commander in Chief and Secretary of Defense directly to unified commanders rather than through the military departments, the Joint Staff must be further unified and strengthened in order to provide the operational and planning assistance heretofore largely furnished by staffs of the military departments.

Accordingly, I have directed the Secretary of Defense to discontinue the Joint Staff committee system and to strengthen the Joint Staff by adding an integrated operations division.

I ask the Congress to assist in this effort by raising or removing the statutory limit on the size of the Joint Staff. By authorizing the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to assign duties to the Joint Staff and, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to appoint its Director, the Congress will also be helpful in increasing the efficiency of this important staff group.

I have long been aware that the Joint Chiefs' burdens are so heavy that they find it very difficult to spend adequate time on their duties as members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This situation is produced by their having the dual responsibilities of chiefs of the military services and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The problem is not new but has not yielded to past efforts to solve it. We need to solve it now, especially in view of the new strategic planning and operational burdens I have previously mentioned.

I therefore propose that present law be changed to make it clear that each chief of a military service may delegate major portions of his service responsibilities to his vice chief. Once this change is made, the Secretary of Defense will require the chiefs to use their power of delegation to enable them to make their Joint Chiefs of Staff duties their principal duties.

I have one additional proposal respecting the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is needed to correct misunderstanding of their procedures. Present law provides that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall have no vote. The fact is, neither do the other members, because they do not act by voting. I think it is wrong so to single out the Chairman. This provision should be repealed.

4. We must continue the three military departments as agencies within the Department of Defense to administer a wide range of functions.

Under the new command procedures I have described, the Secretaries of the military departments will be relieved of direct responsibility for military operations. Thus, under the supervision of the Secretary of Defense, they will be better able to perform their primary functions of managing the vast administrative, training, and logistics functions of the Defense Department. The military departments will remain permanent agencies within the Department of Defense, and their Secretaries will continue to report to and be directly responsible to the Secretary of Defense. These Secretaries should concern themselves with such vital tasks as bringing greater economy and efficiency to activities

which support operational commands rather than with military operations themselves.

The responsibilities of these Secretaries—each heading a department much larger than any executive department except the Department of Defense itself—are heavy indeed. In my judgment each of these Secretaries will continue to need the assistance of an Under Secretary and not less than two Assistant Secretaries. It should be possible, however, to eliminate at least 1 and perhaps 2 of the 4 Assistant Secretaries now authorized for each military department. The duties of these Assistant Secretaries should be left to the determination of each service Secretary rather than fixed by law.

5. We must reorganize the research and development functions of the Department in order to make the best use of our scientific and technological resources.

Our weapons systems 5 to 10 years hence will be the outgrowth of research and development which we conduct today. Until world tensions can be reduced by trustworthy agreements, we are unavoidably engaged in a race with potential enemies for new, more powerful military devices being developed by science and technology. In so critical a contest we must carefully balance our scientific resources between military and civilian needs. I consider it particularly important, therefore, that we improve the Defense Department's organization for military research.

Later in this message I will recommend measures to strengthen the authority of the Secretary of Defense to administer other functions of his Department. Referring at this point only to research and development, I consider it essential that the Secretary's control over organization and funds be made complete and unchallengeable. Only if this is done can he assure the most effective and economical use of the research and development resources of his Department. These processes are costly in money and skilled personnel; duplications are therefore doubly damaging.

The Secretary must have full authority to prevent unwise service competition in this critical area. He needs authority to centralize, to the extent he deems necessary, selected research and development projects under his direct control in organizations that may be outside the military departments and to continue other activities within the military departments. I anticipate that most research activities already under way would continue within the military departments. Such new undertakings as require central direction can be centralized with far less difficulty than projects already assigned to military departments.

To give the Secretary of Defense the caliber of assistance he requires in the research area, I recommend that the new position of Director of Defense Research and Engineering be established in place of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering. I believe his salary should be equal to that of the Secretaries of the military departments. He should rank immediately after the service Secretaries and above the Defense Assistant Secretaries. As the principal assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, he should be known nationally as a leader in science and technology. I expect his staff, civilian and military, also to be highly qualified in science and technology.

This official will have three principal functions: first, to be the principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense on scientific and technical matters; second, to supervise all research and engineering activities in the Department of Defense, including those of the Advanced Research Projects Agency and of the Office of the Director of Guided Missiles; and, third, to direct research and engineering activities that require centralized management.

Further, it will be his responsibility to plan research and development to meet the requirements of our national military objectives instead of the more limited requirements of each of the military services. It is of transcendent importance that each of our principal military objectives has strong and clearly focussed scientific and technical support.

With the approval of the Secretary of Defense, this official will eliminate unpromising or unnecessarily duplicative programs, and release promising ones for development or production. An especially important duty will be to analyze the technical programs of the military departments to make sure that an integrated research and development program exists to cover the needs of each of the operational commands. It will be his responsibility to initiate projects to see that such gaps as may exist are filled. In addition, the Director will review assignments by the military departments to technical branches, bureaus and laboratories to assure that the research and engineering activities of the Defense Department are efficiently managed and properly coordinated.

I would charge the Director, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, with seeing that unnecessary delays in the decision-making process are eliminated, that lead times are shortened, and that a steady flow of funds to approved programs is assured. Only under this kind of expert, single direction can the entire research and engineering effort be substantially improved. In these various ways, he should help stop the service rivalries and self-serving publicity in this area.

6. We must remove all doubts as to the full authority of the Secretary of Defense.

The Secretary of Defense is accountable to the President and the Congress for efficient direction of the largest single activity in our Nation. We look to him for sound management of programs amounting to well over $40 billion a year—programs that gravely concern the survival of our country. Yet, his authority has been circumscribed and hedged about in a number of ways which not only make the burdens of his office far heavier than they need to be, but also work against the efficient and effective direction of national security activities which all Americans—and especially the Congress—rightly expect.

The following areas in the Defense Establishment are especially in need of attention.

(1) Appropriated funds;

(2) The organization and distribution of functions;

(3) Legislative liaison and public affairs activities; and

(4) Military personnel.

I regard it as fundamental that the Secretary, as civilian head of the Department, should have greater flexibility in money matters, both among and within the military departments. I have already commented on the desirability of this authority in respect to research and development. It is desirable in other areas as well. Firmly exercised, it will go far toward stopping the services from vying with each other for Congressional and public favor.

Today most of our defense funds are appropriated not to the Secretary of Defense but rather to the military departments. The Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller of the Department of Defense may place certain limitations on the use of funds by the military departments. Yet they do not have sufficient directive authority over such expenditures.

This method of providing defense funds has worked against the unity of the Department of Defense as an executive department of the Government. I strongly urge that in the future the Congress make appropriations for this Department in such fashion as to provide the Secretary of Defense adequate authority and flexibility to discharge his heavy responsibilities. This need is particularly acute in respect to his powers of strategic planning and operational direction.

I have accordingly directed, in consonance with existing statutory provisions, that the Department's budget estimates for the 1960 fiscal year and thereafter be prepared and presented in a form to accomplish these ends.

In addition to greater authority and flexibility in the administration of defense funds, the Secretary of Defense needs greater control over the distribution of functions in his Department. His authority must be freed of legal restrictions derived from premissile, prenuclear concepts of warfare. Various provisions of this kind becloud his authority. Let us no longer give legal support to efforts to weaken the authority of the Secretary.

On this point the law itself invites controversy. On the one hand, the National Security Act gives the Secretary of Defense "direction, authority, and control" over his entire Department. Yet the same law provides that the military departments are to be "separately administered" by their respective Secretaries. This is not merely inconsistent and confusing. It is a hindrance to efficient administration. I do not question the necessity for continuing the military departments. There is clear necessity for the Secretary of Defense to decentralize the administration of the huge defense organization by relying on the military departments to carry on a host of essential functions.

The contradictory concept, however, that three military departments can be at once administered separately, yet directed by one administrator who is supposed to establish "integrated policies and procedures," has encouraged endless, fruitless argument. Such provisions unavoidably abrade the unity of the Defense Department.

An example in just one area—procurement and supply—is evidence of the kind of damage caused. In this area the "separately administered" concept, as well as the needless confusion over roles and missions, impede such techniques for increased efficiency and economy as the single manager plan, which would provide many of the benefits of a separate service of supply without its possible disrupting effects.

I suggest that we be done with prescribing controversy by law. I recommend eliminating from the National Security Act such provisions as those prescribing separate administration of the military departments and the other needless and injurious restraints on the authority of the Secretary of Defense. I specifically call attention to the need for removing doubts concerning the Secretary's authority to transfer, reassign, abolish, or consolidate functions of the Department.

I anticipate that the Secretary of Defense and his Deputy will require, in addition to a Director of Defense Research and Engineering and various special assistants, seven Assistant Secretaries of Defense plus a General Counsel of equivalent rank. I conceive of these Assistant Secretaries as having full staff functions; that is, they are empowered to give instructions appropriate to carrying out policies approved by the Secretary of Defense, subject at all times to the right of service Secretaries to raise contested issues with the Secretary of Defense. This is the usual concept of the powers of principal staff assistants. It is essential to the work of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

I should add here that, with a view to reducing personnel and avoiding unnecessary interference with service activities, the Secretary of Defense will critically review the operating methods of the various staffs in the Office of Secretary of Defense. He will also review the interdepartmental committee structure within the Department in an effort to accelerate the entire decisionmaking process.

Earlier I mentioned that a principal outlet for service rivalries is the public affairs and legislative liaison activity within each of the military departments. For many years I have attached the greatest importance to providing prompt and accurate information to Members of the Congress. I have the same viewpoint in respect to furnishing information to the press and the public. But surely everyone will agree that personnel charged with such duties should not seek to advance the interest of a particular service at the expense of another, nor should they advance a service cause at the expense of overall national and defense requirements. Of this I am sure: We do not want defense dollars spent in publicity and influence campaigns in which each service claims superiority over the others and strives for increased appropriations or other Congressional favors.

I have directed the Secretary of Defense to review the numbers as well as the activities of personnel of the various military departments who engage in legislative liaison and public affairs activities in the Washington area. I have requested that he act, without impeding the flow of information to the Congress and the public, to strengthen Defense Department supervision over these activities and to move such of these personnel and activities as necessary into the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

I have, in this connection, advised the Secretary of my desire that his principal assistant for legislative liaison be a civilian official. On the recommendation of the Secretary, I shall nominate a person as Assistant Secretary of Defense to perform those duties. An Assistant Secretary of Defense already holds the responsibility for public affairs activities.

Finally, I believe we can strengthen unification by two actions involving military personnel.

First, I am instituting a new personnel procedure for top-ranking officers. It is my belief that before officers are advanced beyond the two-star level, they must have demonstrated, among other qualities, the capacity for dealing objectively—without extreme service partisanship—with matters of the broadest significance to our national security. I am, therefore, instituting this new procedure: I will consider officers for nomination to these top ranks only on recommendations of the Secretary of Defense submitted to me after he has received suggestions of the Secretaries of the military departments and the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I also will base my assignments of these officers to high command, staff and departmental positions on recommendations of the Secretary of Defense. I will, in reassigning or removing them, follow the same procedure.

I further believe that the Secretary of Defense should be authorized to establish procedures for the transfer of officers between services, with the consent of the individual in each case. This authority is needed primarily in technical fields so that an officer especially qualified to contribute to the success of an activity of a sister service may be afforded an opportunity to do so without interrupting his service career. I would not limit this authority, however, to technical fields.

At my direction the Secretary of Defense will shortly transmit to Congress draft legislation to carry out those items I have discussed which require legislative action. I urge the Congress to consider them promptly and to cooperate fully in making these essential improvements in our Defense Establishment.

Now in conclusion let us clearly understand that through these various actions we will have moved forward in many important ways.

We will have better prepared our country to meet an emergency which could come with little warning.

We will have improved our military planning.

We will have accelerated decisionmaking processes.

We will have effectively organized our defense programs in the crucial fields of science and technology.

We will have remedied organizational defects which have encouraged harmful service rivalries.

We will have improved the overall efficiency and unity of our great Defense Establishment.

In our country, under the Constitution, effective military defense requires a full partnership of the Congress and the Executive. Thus, acting in accord with our respective duties and our highest tradition, we shall achieve an efficient defense organization capable of safeguarding our freedom and serving us in our quest for an enduring peace.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 3, 1958.*

EASTER GREETINGS TO THE SPEAKER AND THE MEMBERSHIP

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, having just heard read the message from the President on the reorganization of national defense I think there can be quite a good many arguments in regard to certain plans set out.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you and every Member of the House and the Senate, and everybody connected with the Capitol who help make our work pleasant and easy, a most happy, joyous, and blessed Easter.

THE NATION'S RAILROADS ARE ENTITLED TO IMMEDIATE RELIEF BY THIS CONGRESS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1958, an article appeared in many of the Nation's newspapers under the caption, "Two Month Deficit of Eastern Rails Is $43 Million." The article said in part:

> Twenty major eastern railroads showed combined losses of $43.5 million in the first 2 months of 1958. * * * This compared with the net loss $6,011,250 in the 1957 period. * * * This January–February deficit was 6 times larger than the net loss of $7,218,417 in the same 2-month period in 1932 when one-third of the Nation's railroads were in bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, if there was ever any doubt that the once mighty railroad industry is tilted toward financial disaster,

the results for the first 2 months of 1958 supply a conclusive answer, and at the same time demand prompt remedial action from this Congress.

It is true that at this moment hearings are under way by the Smathers committee in the Senate. Based on available information about the best that can be expected in the way of legislation is relief for the Nation's railroads by repeal of the wartime excise tax on the transportation of persons and property and curbing the power of the public utilities commission of the several States in regulating certain phases of the railroad industry. If the wartime excise tax is repealed and the power of the public utilities commission is curbed such action is woefully inadequate in solving the overall problem.

In addition should the Senate enact any legislation based on the recommendations of the Smathers committee, it will be at least May or June before it could be received by the House where hearings would also be necessary. With Congress adjourning in July or August, let us face the fact that the chances of this type of legislation being approved by the House before adjournment are highly doubtful.

Mr. Speaker, lengthy hearings involving thousands of pages of testimony have already been held by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as the result of recommendations presented for the consideration of President Eisenhower by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization. This Committee also spent many months studying the transportation industry so that Congress has ample evidence of the need of an efficient transportation system which includes the railroads of the Nation.

In addition to the hearings that were held, several bills are pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but no action has been taken on them. These bills while not containing the complete answer to the railroad problem are a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 1958, on the floor of the House, I quoted Mr. David C. Bevan, vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., when he said on March 19, 1958, at Cleveland, Ohio:

> The railroad industry has working capital sufficient to meet payrolls for only 1 week. * * * We need immediate action, not studies. * * * The industry is facing a dire emergency.

In addition to Mr. Bevan's statement on March 27, 1958, Eugene V. Attreed, vice president and director of the Railroad Division, Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, said in part:

> We are hearing and reading a great deal these days about the Nation's railroads. The plight is real, and unless our National Government takes immediate and extensive remedial action the damage to our country will be grave.

Confronted with these dire warnings, I have introduced this date a House resolution providing for the creation of a select committee of 9 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 5 from the majority party and 4 from the minority party 1 of whom he will designate as chairman.

The select committee would be authorized and directed to conduct a thorough and complete study and investigation of the present financial condition of the Nation's railroads, which has resulted in widespread unemployment in the industry.

The select committee would also be authorized to formulate an emergency legislative program designed to aid the railroads in such a manner as to relieve unemployment in the industry and assure the continued maintenance of a railroad system adequate to meet the needs of the United States in time of war or other emergency.

The select committee would be required to report to the House as soon as practicable but not later than June 30, 1958, with its recommendations, including recommendations for legislation.

This resolution if approved immediately would give the select committee or its subcommittee nearly 2 months to complete its assignment. Meanwhile it would have the necessary authority to subpena witnesses and the production of such papers and documents as it deems necessary. In other words, the select committee would have all the necessary power to go to work and report back to the House by June 30, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly some may wonder why this subject should not be handled by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. My answer is that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has enough to do with its full agenda between now and the adjournment of this Congress. In addition, this is emergency legislation to meet an acute situation that affects not only the transportation industry but our national defense, as well as unemployment and the health and welfare of the American people as a whole. Therefore, time is of the essence and a select committee is the only feasible answer.

I can go one step further in warning Congress that unless drastic action is taken immediately, railroad bankruptcies will not only magnify and prolong the business recession but could lead this Nation into a complete economic upheaval.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution creating a special select committee is designed to get action by this Congress at the earliest possible moment on extending relief to the Nation's railroad industry, and I am hopeful that the resolution will receive immediate approval so that this select committee can begin to function at the earliest practicable date.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE HIGHWAY BILL CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], I ask unanimous consent that all Members who participated in debate on the highway bill conference report may have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on that conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

WHY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BURNED THE BOOKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may address the House for 10 minutes, may revise and extend his remarks, and yield back his time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what has become something of a collector's item. This is a selection of comments made by a cross-section of America's farmers in response to a recent Department of Agriculture questionnaire.

The material referred to is contained on pages 2 to 16, inclusive, of a 19-page official publication of the United States Department of Agriculture entitled "Farm Population Estimates for 1957," published in January 1958. Twenty-five hundred copies of this were printed 2 months ago. Shortly after they were printed, however, the Department of Agriculture ordered them burned. They were burned.

The Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, of which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] is the very able chairman, learned of the burning of these books. In carrying out its responsibility for studying the operations of the Department of Agriculture, the subcommittee made formal demand upon the Secretary of Agriculture more than a month ago for a copy of the censored publication. The subcommittee's demand was refused. After a series of letters had failed to budge the Department of Agriculture, Chairman FOUNTAIN called a hearing for this morning in order to inquire into the Department of Agriculture's reticence about disclosing this information.

Before setting forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the burned information, I should like to state certain background facts. In February 1958 the Department of Agriculture released an optimistic study of the economic position of the American farmer, in which it proclaimed that the per capita income of the American farmer had increased 10 percent over last year. This release was based upon the finding, contained in the burned January 1958 edition of Farm Population Estimates for 1957, as well as in the unburned February 1958 edition of Farm Population Estimates for 1957, that the population living on farms declined from 22,257,000 in April 1956 to 20,396,000 in April 1957, a decrease of close to 2 million in 1 year.

This decrease compares with an increase in farm population for the year ending in April 1955 of 268,000, and an increase for the year ending in April

1956 of 99,000. The almost 2 million decrease in the year ending in April 1957 is the greatest annual exodus from the farm in the Nation's history, with the single exception of the war year 1943.

A Department of Agriculture press release of February 13, 1958, entitled "Facts About Farm Population," was issued at the same time as the expurgated February 1958 edition of Farm Population Estimates for 1957, and attempted to summarize it. In explaining the tremendous decline of the farm population during the year ending April 1957, the Department of Agriculture gave two reasons—the technological revolution on the farm, and the increasing availability of nonfarm jobs. The exact words of the Department's release follow:

II. REASONS WHY FEWER FARMERS

A. Revolution in farming

Average productivity of United States farmworkers since 1940 alone has increased more than in the previous 120 years. In 1820 each farmworker produced enough to meet the needs of 4.1 persons, and by 1940 this figure had risen to 10.8. But by 1956 a farmworker produced enough for the needs of 20.8 persons.

During the period since 1940, when farmworker productivity nearly doubled, total output of farm products increased about 36 percent, while the United States population increased only 27 percent.

The technological revolution in agriculture obviously made it impracticable for all the 30 million farm people of 1940 or the 27 million of 1947 to remain in farming.

B. Nonfarm jobs

Expansion of industry into rural areas and the unparalleled growth of military and research installations all over the Nation have made the transition from farm to nonfarm life far easier.

The automobile and modern roads have greatly lengthened the commuting range for rural people, and have given them a chance to combine urban jobs with rural homes.

Lure of a nonfarm job has been great, because the average income of farm people is characteristically less than that of nonfarmers. The table illustrates this:

	1940	1950	1955
Per capita income of farm people from all sources	$262	$828	$898
Per capita income of nonfarm people from all sources	685	1,575	1,932

Nothing was said in the release, it will be noted, concerning a possible additional cause of the drastic decline in farm population—the decline in farm income and farm prices. The pre-Benson-farm program was in full effect through June 1955, and was increasingly replaced by Secretary Benson's flexible farm program, under which support prices to the farmer were allowed to decline during the second half of 1955 and thereafter. Nineteen hundred and fifty-six was the first full year in which Secretary Benson's policies were effective. It was in the year April 1956–April 1957 in which the nearly 2 million decrease in farm population occurred.

What have become of the almost 2 million members of the farm population who left the farm in the year April 1956–April 1957, or in the period since April 1957 when, according to the Department of Agriculture, the exodus from the farm has continued? The Department of Agriculture study does not help us on this point. But the figures supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics are illuminating. Unemployment in the United States in April 1956, was 2,564,000, or 3.9 percent of the labor force. The most recent figures, for February 1958, show 5,173,000 unemployed, or 6.7 percent of the labor force, seasonally adjusted. This is an increase of over 2½ million. The statistics, of course, do not indicate to what extent those who have left the farm since April 1956, are now included among the Nation's unemployed.

I now include those sections of the January 1958 farm population estimates for 1957—the burned version—which were censored out of the February 1958 farm population estimates for 1957. The burned version is found at pages 2–16—exclusive of charts on pages 3–5—of the January 1958 version.

WHY THE FARM POPULATION IS DECLINING—AS SEEN BY THE FARMER

As a part of its annual mail questionnaire to farmers, designed to measure the number of births and deaths among farm people and the amount of movement to and from farms, the Agricultural Marketing Service invites farmers to comment about trends in the farm population. Those who do so are in the minority, but many take the trouble to comment seriously about the factors currently affecting farm population in their communities. Comments are usually available from every major farming area in the country. They convey in a way that statistics cannot the trends that farmers perceive and the farmers' evaluations of these trends. The discussion following is based upon this material. Excerpts quoted are representative of all those received, except that they may be more expressive than the average. Emphasis was placed on selection of comments that generalize about a community rather than one man's experience, and that relate to a recent period of time (April 1956–April 1957) rather than one further in the past. The number reviewed was 2,700.

Farmers are well aware that the number of farm people has been declining.

"Farm population is decreasing rapidly in this area." (Nueces County, Tex.)

"Our farm population is still on a downward trend." (Osage County, Kans.)

"The past season and this season will show a permanent reduction in farm people here." (Polk County, Minn.)

"More and more farmers in our locality are moving away from the farm." (Spokane County, Wash.)

"The number of people moving from the farm to towns and cities in this locality has been greater than usual." (Mecklenburg County, Va.)

They notice the vacant houses around them:

"There are probably 10 percent added vacant farm homes within the past 18 months." (Gilchrist County, Fla.)

"In 3 townships you will find 15 farms where the buildings stand empty and some have very good improvements." (Bon Homme County, S. Dak.)

Or the sites where houses used to be:

"Farmhouses are being abandoned and torn down." (Edgar County, Ill.)

"I can stand in my yard and count five farms that have been bought up and from which every stick of improvements was pulled down." (Frontier County, Nebr.)

The loss of young people is especially felt:

"Most all boys and girls finishing high school are getting jobs in nearby towns. Scarcely any are staying on the farm." (Alexander County, N. C.)

"I have asked a number of our young men here whose fathers own and operate if they intend to farm when through school. The answer is almost 100 percent 'No'." (Jefferson County, Tenn.)

"Sons of established farmers want no part of farming." (Hunterdon County, N. J.)

"The young people are leaving for educations or higher paying income jobs." (Whatcom County, Wash.)

"In this area of 3 communities of better-than-average productive and prosperous farms, not 1 young person plans to farm as a career. This is the fact of greatest significance to me and to most of my neighbors." (Comanche County, Tex.)

And farmers are conscious that the average age of the farm population is getting older.

"In my duties as personal property assessor I am impressed by the limited number of young men engaged in farming and the advancing age of those who are operating our farms." (Miami County, Kans.)

"All that are left are the old, tired, and unlearned." (Fayette County, Tex.)

"Most of our neighbors run from 50 to 80 years of age. There is only one young man in our neighborhood. When we oldtimers get together we talk the matter over and wonder just what the outcome will be." (Johnston County, Okla.)

"The people that are here are past middle age and cannot fit in anywhere else." (Lawrence County, Ky.)

A number of causes are ascribed to these trends, but the one heard most frequently is the general problem of low farm income. In particular, the difficulties of small farmers are noted.

"More and more farmers in our locality are moving away from the farms because they simply can't make a living for their families. The small and medium-sized farmer is a dead duck." (Spokane County, Wash.)

"There has been a terrific movement of [small] farmers out of this territory during the last 2 years." (Seward County, Nebr.)

"You can't make it on a small farm anymore." (Beauregard Parish, La.)

"Small farms are falling by the way." (Windsor County, Vt.)

"The small farmer seems to be on the way out around here or has to find a job on the side." (Sheboygan County, Wis.)

"Low income is forcing too many to quit farming and move to California or elsewhere for salaried employment." (Boone County, Iowa.)

A high rate of farm sales and auctions was reported from several northern and western areas of the country during the spring of 1957.

"I have before me two dozen auction notices of farms selling out." (Allegheny County, N. Y.)

"Forced auction sales the last 2 weeks in March have been terrific." (Richland County, N. Dak.)

"After 2 years of drought this spring saw as many as 18 farm sales in a week in this county. That is a very high average." (Custer County, Nebr.)

"An unusual amount of farm sales have been held this spring." (Bingham County, Idaho.)

Most of the farms that change hands from death, retirement, or quitting of the operator continue to be farmed, but frequently only as additions to existing operations. The trend towards consolidation and enlargement of units inexorably lowers the number of farm residents.

"Small farms and poorer soil farms are being abandoned. The land is readily being absorbed through rent or purchase by larger farmers. Competition is real keen among the larger farmers for more land to rent or buy." (Chenango County, N. Y.)

"Farms in the 80- to 160-acre size range that were let run down are rapidly being given up by single operators to those with

larger acreages and enough financing to use sufficient fertilizer on the wornout ground." (Hancock County, Ill.)

"The tax collector tells me there are about 10 less families to pay tax this year than last. Left for the city and the land was taken over by others." (Dade County, Mo.)

"The trend in this township is for farmers who operate 1,000 acres or more to increase their holdings by a quarter section or more each year. The buildings are used for seasonal labor or sold off. The result has been a decrease from 99 sets of occupied buildings 10 years ago to 71 as of this year." (Polk County, Minn.)

"Acreages of 160 acres or less are being bought up by those who are already landowners. This is particularly noticeable where an acreage goes into an estate." (Wabaunsee County, Kans.)

"Increasing number of small farmers going out of business, with other farmers taking over their farms and tilling from 1 to 6 farms, usually as grain farms." (Talbot County, Md.)

"The trend for the smaller farmer to get bigger or get out is very evident. Pressure to expand is terrific—from necessity, not desire." (Bamberg County, S. C.)

"The tendency for the past few years has been toward larger farming and ranching units, the smaller units being unable to support a family without outside employment. There are hardly any 160-acre units operating any more." (Osage County, Okla.)

"There is a trend of the larger farmer buying out the smaller farmer, destroying the improvements to farm the complete unit. Hence the number of farms are on the decrease in this county. The overhead is too great for what pay crops the little farmer is allowed to produce." (Benewah County, Idaho.)

"Most of the smaller places are being bought up by larger holders, such as I did this spring. They just can't make it on these smaller ranches." (Klickitat County, Wash.)

In a minority of cases the land is simply abandoned, especially in areas where it is of marginal agricultural quality.

"Most of the farms are growing up in pines or red brush." (Carroll County, Va.)

"There are a number of farms in my section of the county that have been abandoned." (Dillon County, S. C.)

"Most all small farms are lying out and growing up in bushes and sage grass and weeds." (Talladega County, Ala.)

"Four small ranches worked by owners have been abandoned in last 4 years in this area because owners became too old to work them." (Siskiyou County, Calif.)

"Our town has many abandoned farms, the land fast going back in wilderness." (Warren County, N. Y.)

Two new factors contributing to the decline in farm population came into play for the first time in the reporting year, April 1956–April 1957. They are the Soil Bank and social-security programs. The Soil Bank program, as illustrated by the comments below, seems to increase the competition for more land among farmers wishing to keep their equipment fully in use, lessens the need for tenants on the part of landlords, and encourages some small farmers to place all of their cropland in the program and move away to take nonagricultural jobs.

"I sold my farmhouse, placed the fields in the Soil Bank, and am working now in the city." (Warren County, N. J.)

"Three farms left vacant from owners' choice because of Soil Bank payments." (Nance County, Nebr.)

"There is a trend, owing to the price squeeze and Soil Bank plan of the farmers leaving their farms for city and factory work." (Red Lake County, Minn.)

"I plan to put all possible in the Soil Bank; remove buildings or let them rot down, and perhaps try to get 3-percent net in pasture rent and let it go at that. The wife and I are both working this winter as teachers." (Brown County, Kans.)

"If the Soil Bank lasts 5 years, there won't be any share farmers. They are fast dwindling away in the first year of its operation." (Florence County, S. C.)

"Some in my community have rented land to the Government and gone to town and got a job." (Marshall County, Ala.)

"Lots of land has been put in Soil Bank, forcing the nonlandowner to leave the farm." (Limestone County, Ala.)

"There has been lots of moving from the farm 1956–57. The Soil Bank plan has hurt lots of farm workers who will be forced off the farm, because the farmowner doesn't need any labor, because he has his land in the Soil Bank." (Yazoo County, Miss.)

"There are four farms close to me that were rented out last year that the landlords have taken back this year and put in the Soil Bank." (Jones County, Tex.)

"The present agricultural program has greatly accelerated the movement of people from the farm. The Soil Bank program has made many small farms uneconomical in that many landlords are taking over their own land and are putting the excess acres in the Soil Bank and conservation reserve." (Sedgwick County, Colo.)

The developing effects of the new social security retirement provisions for farm operators are mentioned somewhat less frequently:

"Several farmers in this area have quit farming because they are eligible for social security." (Manitowoc County, Wis.)

"It is probable that social security will make some population changes in the near future." (Hancock County, Iowa.)

"There are a few farmers who are retiring on social security on their farms, and a few who are moving from their farms into town and their farms are being consolidated with a larger unit." (Osage County, Kans.)

"Five [neighboring] farms will not be operated next year. They are going to quit and live on social security." (Johnson County, Ga.)

"There are a lot of oldtimers going on social security beginning July 1 this year." (Wibaux County, Mont.)

During 1956, and in several years just preceding, severe drought conditions in some sections of the country forced a number of farmers to leave the farm either temporarily or permanently. These conditions were frequently reported in the West Central and Mountain States.

"The moving of [neighboring farmers] to other places is caused entirely by the severe drought which has plagued the area since 1953." (Kit Carson County, Colo.)

"We have lost a great percentage of our farm people from this locality who went to town for work due to drought, most of whom hope to return if we get a good season." (Kendall County, Tex.)

"Our farm population is decreasing rapidly in this area primarily because of the drought." (Nueces County, Tex.)

"Two families moved from farms (including us) because of drought. We plan to go back when we get enough rain and if the Soil Bank program stays in effect to keep up payments on our farm." (Polk County, Nebr.)

"Quite a few moves were made by young farmers quitting and taking more remunerative jobs in cities. Drought causing more changes and distress than farm prices." (Buena Vista County, Iowa.)

Market price, and other situations affecting particular types of farms developed during the year. The substantial cut in cotton and tobacco acreage allotments produced a further contraction in the number of southern farmers. As with the Soil Bank program, such conditions affected tenant farmers and hired workers particularly.

"There are more empty farm houses now than I have known in a long time or if ever before. The cut in cash crop tobacco has moved many, many families." (Person County, N. C.)

"The 20-percent tobacco cut and Soil Bank have been responsible for the larger percent of movement [of people from farms]." (Nash County, N. C.)

"Due to cut [in cotton] acreage tenants cannot make a living on the farm and for that reason they are going anywhere they can to find public work." (Cherokee County, S. C.)

"We have three tenant houses, but due to tobacco cuts we are renting these houses for cash to families working in towns or other jobs." (Pittsylvania County, Va.)

"There is in general a movement away from farms caused by such a tremendous cut in cotton acreage." (Lauderdale County, Ala.)

"Tobacco being our main cash crop and the allotments being cut in the last few years, some of the larger farms have fewer tenants and rent their extra houses to nonfarm workers." (Jessamine County, Ky.)

"The planters here let many hands go for cotton is the only crop you need them to work. Cutting acreage is the reason." (Holmes County, Miss.)

Dairy areas were also undergoing adjustments:

"Many dairy farmers are quitting due to inspection frills and long hours." (Berks County, Pa.)

"Thirty percent of dairy farmers have stopped dairying; farms being sold for development or milk prices too low." (Hunterdon County, N. J.)

"Small dairy farms in this vicinity are giving up the struggle." (Erie County, N. Y.)

And other situations affecting particular types of farms were occasionally noted:

"Quite a few poultrymen in this location are going out of business, due to depressed prices and age." (Cape May County, N. J.)

"The continued depressed prices of potatoes have caused a great loss of purchasing power of farmers in our area. There is a trend toward taking factory or construction work." (Steuben County, N. Y.)

"The cut in wheat acres has forced the smaller farmers to quit." (Wells County, N. Dak.)

With the rapid urban expansion of recent years, comments regarding the purchase of farms for residential use are frequent. As one might expect, they come largely, although not entirely, from metropolitan areas.

"Many farms are giving way to building lots or summer homes." (Litchfield County, Conn.)

"Farms in this district are gradually being swallowed up for home and industrial developments." (Bergen County, N. J.)

"Farming in this entire county is very rapidly reverting to subdivision (lots and houses)." (Chesterfield County, Va.)

"This area is rapidly losing citrus acreage to subdivisions and industry." (Los Angeles County, Calif.)

"Within a half mile of our farm, four dairies were abandoned during the past year and subdivided into single family housing units." (Los Angeles County, Calif.)

"This area is building up very rapidly. It will be only a few years until there are no farms left in this area." (Summit County, Ohio.)

"Who wants to farm today with low prices and city neighbors who do not like the smell of manure and work toward moving you out? You have to head for the hills if you really like farming." (Middlesex County, Mass.)

Government activities and major industrial developments also have their effects.

"[Our farm and all neighboring farms] were taken from the people by the U. S. Navy for a jet base—4,500 acres." (Iberia Parish, La.)

"Farming is now a side issue. Everyone is working on the St. Lawrence Seaway and are getting wages far beyond anything they could make on a farm." (St. Lawrence County, N. Y.)

"In the past year nine families have moved from this community to the Silver Bay taconite-iron industry for permanent residence. Reasons for movement are higher wages and fewer farms as farmers are buying more land." (Polk County, Minn.)

"Pulpwood companies have bought a great deal of the land in this community." (Gordon County, Ga.)

"Doctors and lawyers have bought land in my community and letting it grow timber. The houses have been torn down." (Attala County, Miss.)

"Bulk of farming in this community is on decline due to marginal farm land. Large tracts purchased by local papermill and cut over severely." (Ross County, Ohio.)

Certain rural disadvantages, once chronic but now greatly eradicated, are still mentioned here and there as factors in loss of farm population.

"In some districts there are a large number of empty farms, where people have moved to larger towns. I think it is caused mostly on account of poor schools." (Renville County, N. Dak.)

"The decline in farm population in our neighborhood is due mostly to poor roads." (Howard County, Mo.)

"I believe bad roads, no electricity or gas, to be the main reasons why most farms in this vicinity have been abandoned." (Gilmer County, West Virginia.)

"I would say failure to stop washing away and loss of fertility a major cause of people moving away. Second—poor roads." (Smith County, Tenn.)

Frequently mentioned by farmers is the increasing proportion of farm people who work at nonfarm industries. In some instances the work is reported as taken only from necessity because of the deterioration of farm income. In other cases such attractions as shorter hours, regular pay, and good wages, coupled with the ability to commute daily. are decisive. The implications of this trend are certainly mixed. Many farmers testify that they have been able to retain their farms and survive poor years only through the income from nonfarm work. In this sense the nonfarm work prevents additional decline in the farm population. For other farmers, however, the change to nonfarm work is obviously destined to be a permanent one and farming operations are greatly reduced, or abandoned altogether through lack of time, interest, or profits.

"I can count 50 nearby farms where little or no work is done except to cut the hay. People live on most of them but work away." (Androscoggin County, Maine.)

"Some farmers are changing the name of the farm over to the wife and obtaining a job for the winter to make ends meet. In summer they go on unemployment compensation and still do the summer work." (Allegany County, N. Y.)

"The trend to cut down on farming operations and secure work in nearby manufacturing plants, but to remain on the farm, is becoming more apparent every year through this part of the State." (Richland County, Ohio)

"The population in our district is staying about the same. But quite a few farmers have quit farming and are living on their farms and driving to work in town. Some up to 60 miles one way." (Mecosta County, Mich.)

"Trend of movement now is to find winter time or off season employment in towns or cities. Continued reduction in wheat allotments makes fewer and fewer come back." (Republic County, Kans.)

"There are no fulltime farmers in this community now. Can't make a living that way. Men have sawmill or other jobs. Some work away during the week and return home to spend the weekend." (Hampshire County, W. Va.)

"Due to drought, most all men and some wives have taken jobs off the farm, mostly at a nearby air base. Now that we have gotten some rain they are still working, for they have found that they can make more money working 8 hours than they can working on farm from 12 to 16." (Hidalgo County, Tex.)

"It is very hard for a farmer with less than 200 acres of land to have a modern home and rear a family without some outside income. Many of our farms have been allowed to grow up as a result of this outside employment. Others are used for pasture land." (Hickman County, Tenn.)

"Our farm happens to be in the new unit of the Black Canyon Irrigation District. Our family is typical of the majority. One member has to be away from the farm earning a pay check to keep the farm going." (Canyon County, Idaho)

"Most farmers in this area have taken supplemental labor jobs off the farm, because the drought is so bad that very little irrigation water is available." (Apache County, Ariz.)

Whereas the net movement of farm people is away from the farm, it would be a mistake to imply that no farmers report conditions of population stability. Many of them do, occasionally from the same counties where other reporters tell of considerable decline in the population. In such cases the apparently conflicting accounts may arise because trends differ from one section of the county to another as a result of variations in natural resources, age of operators, scale of farming, or time referred to. A sample of such comments is given below.

"The farms in this vicinity are very stable and very little movement of people. Only 1 farmer in a radius of 3 miles has taken an outside job." (Lake County, Ind.)

"Farm population and farm size have changed very little in the last 5 years in this area." (Sangamon County, Ill.)

"Our farm is in an irrigated area so there hasn't been much shifting to and from the farms to city." (Lincoln County, Nebr.)

"Am very glad to tell you we have a real good neighborhood. Nobody moved, we had no boys go to the Army, and no one died. The Lord sure blessed us." (Wayne County, N. C.)

"The exodus from the farm to city and village has greatly ceased for the past 3 years in this community. So all adjoining farms are just about like they were." (Bossier Parish, La.)

"There have been no changes made on the farms in my location. Everyone has stuck it out." (Big Horn County, Wyo.)

The factor of farm ownership is often cited as a reason for stability:

"In this immediate area the population is rather stable because we are in a ranching area of good sized places, mostly owned by the people who live there." (Mason County, Tex.)

"Population in the immediate area is fairly stable, due to owner occupancy on most of the farms. They have fairly large acreage." (Parker County, Tex.)

"The people joining my farm seem to be very well satisfied and there is very little moving as most of them own their own farms." (Fauquier County, Va.)

In the Midwest there are several reports of ethnic cohesiveness or religious agrarianism as being important in maintaining farm population numbers:

"This is a Bohemian settlement and people stick and don't move in or out unless forced to." (Rawlins County, Kans.)

"This is a German community and very few farms exchange ownership. They are handed down from one generation to the other." (Montgomery County, Mo.)

"Quite an influx of new people, mostly Mennonite or Amish people from Oklahoma and Indiana. They are buying good farms and paying good prices." (Anderson County, Kans.)

In contrast to the population-decreasing effects of the Soil Bank program noted earlier, a few operators declared that it had not affected population or had aided them in retaining their farm residence:

"Soil Bank has not done away with farm population in this community." (Wilson County, N. C.)

"I notice that [several Members of Congress] and others charge that a shift from the farm is caused by the Soil Bank. This is not true. The only reason is more money." (Jackson County, Ala.)

"The Soil Bank is a blessing to old feeble people that don't know how to work at anything else and have put all their life's work and savings in a little farm. I for one appreciate the Soil Bank." (Winston County, Ala.)

From several communities the stability of local farm population was attributed to lack of other opportunities rather than to good conditions in farming:

"There has been very little change in numbers on the farms adjacent to me. However, this has been due to inability to get jobs off the farm. Several young men on these farms are marking time until something in the way of a job opens up." (Pittsylvania County, Va.)

"Movement hasn't started to city too much in this community for there isn't enough industry to absorb the unskilled in the city of Spokane." (Lincoln County, Wash.)

Finally, scattered among the numerous accounts of declining numbers of farms and dearth of young farmers are reports of opposite conditions. All of these reports were from the Midwest:

"This community does not change fast as most of the farms are operated by the owner or owner's son. Most of the farm boys who return from service farm if there is a place for them." (Fulton County, Ill.)

"Farm abandonment has all but ceased. Boys returning from the service have gone into farming either by renting or father and son partnerships. Those not capable of working out farm agreements have gone off to cities." (McLean County, N. Dak.)

"Many new farms and ranches are being started near us. They are for Indians on the rehabilitation program. We are only a few miles from Cheyenne Agency Indian Reservation." (Dewey County, S. Dak.)

"Farm population in this locality is on an upward trend according to our school census. Abandoning of farms has ceased, even recuperated." (Red Willow County, Nebr.)

"We have 8 young couples that just started to farm since World War II north of town, not mentioning young farmers on the other three sides. These young men are boys whose dads or other relatives have rented farms to them." (Sheridan County, Kans.)

This, then, is a picture of current conditions affecting the number of people in agriculture as they are seen by the farmers themselves. The reports indicate the powerful economic forces seemingly beyond the individual farmer's control that work toward a decline in the number of farms and farm people. Furthermore, there is widespread recognition by farmers that the chances of obtaining a level of living from a smaller-than-average farm comparable to that which can be obtained from nonfarm employment are slim in most cases. Enlargement of remaining commercial farms through purchase or rental of other farms is widespread at the present time in response to this fact.

The conclusion is inescapable that the consolidation process has by no means run its course and that some further decline in the size of the farm population will occur.

A reading of the burned portion may offer some clue as to why it was burned. The Reasons Why Fewer Farmers of the Department of Agriculture's February 12 press release—the revolution in farming, and nonfarm jobs—are not those given by a considerable cross section of America's farmers. The Department of Agriculture in the burned version says:

"A number of causes are ascribed to these trends (toward declining farm population), but the one heard most frequently is the general problem of low farm income."

We then hear from the Sheboygan County, Wis., farmer, who says:

The small farmer seems to be on the way out around here.

A Richland County, N. Dak., farmer says:

Forced auction sales the last two weeks in March have been terrific.

A Hunterdon County, N. J., farmer says:

Thirty percent of the dairy farmers have stopped dairying; farms being sold for development or milk prices too low.

From Cape May County, N. J., a poultryman says:

Quite a few poultrymen in this location are going out of business, due to depressed prices and age.

From Steuben County, N. Y.:

The continued depressed price of potatoes has caused a great loss of purchasing power for farmers in our area.

The Department of Agriculture then reports:

The trend toward consolidation and enlargement of units inexorably lowers the number of farm residents.

And it cites a Polk County, Minn., farmer, who say:

The trend in this township is for farmers who operate 1,000 acres or more to increase their holdings by a quarter section or more each year. The buildings are used for seasonal labor or sold off.

From Talbot County, Md., it is reported:

An increasing number of small farmers are going out of business, with other farmers taking over their farms and tilling from 1 to 6 farms, usually as grain farms.

From Osage County, Okla.:

The tendency for the past few years has been for larger farming and ranching units, the smaller units being unable to support families without finding outside employment. There are hardly any 160-acre units operating any more.

And so on and on. The story told in these poignant reports—of declining farm prices and income, of catastrophe for the family farmer, of ever greater consolidation by the large corporate-type farmer—is a far different explanation of the decline in farm population than the official Department of Agriculture line—revolution in farming, and nonfarm jobs.

The people of America will have to judge whether the extraordinary action of the Department of Agriculture in burning the 2,500 copies of the January 1958 edition of Farm Population Estimates for 1957, and in refusing to disclose the burned material until summoned before the Congress, was caused by a genuine desire to promote the public interest and inform the people, or by a desire to manipulate information so as to conceal from the public the true effects of Department of Agriculture farm policies.

It is also significant that the Department of Agriculture witnesses at today's hearing, including Assistant Secretary Don Paarlberg, were unable to say whether the burned material set forth above was made available by the Department of Agriculture to President Eisenhower, or to anyone else in the White House, at the time President Eisenhower was preparing his veto message on Senate Joint Resolution 162, which would have extended farm-price supports for 1 year at their 1957 levels. The veto message, which was sent to the Congress earlier this week, referred to various bright spots in the farm picture as justification for the veto. One wonders whether the President's farm advisers have informed him of the dark spots as well as the bright spots.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] has performed a real public service in bringing these facts before the American public.

THE INDUSTRIAL DISPERSION PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may address the House for 10 minutes, may revise and extend his remarks and yield back his time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 months I have been trying intermittently to find out from the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Department of Commerce something about the operation of the so-called industrial dispersion program. As you know, this program seeks to scatter America's essential defense production so as to minimize the danger of nuclear attack on highly concentrated target areas.

Last December, in an appearance before the Economic Club of Detroit, ODM Director Gordon Gray admitted that dispersal policy has not been very effective. In part he laid this to restrictions on rapid tax amortization, which had been the ODM's chief device for encouraging dispersion. I include here a direct quotation from the question and answer portion of Mr. Gray's remarks:

ALLEN B. CROW. The last question arises from Defense Mobilization Order 119, that was issued by your predecessor, who has addressed our meetings twice:

"Question. It is the policy of the United States to encourage and when appropriate to require that new facilities and major expansion of existing facilities important to national security be located, insofar as practical, so as to reduce the risk of damage in the event of attack. Will the Government dispersion policies now in effect prevent or hamper Detroit from getting new industries, either defense or nondefense?"

The Honorable GORDON GRAY. Well, we have a national policy of dispersion which not only reflects itself in administration documents such as the one that was just read to you, but, of course, in the Defense Production Act. When it was amended 2 years ago, the Congress wrote into the act considerable policy about dispersion. Incidentally, we are asking, for those of you who might be interested, the extension of the Defense Production Act as written for 2 more years in the next Congress. One difficulty is that the Congress set the policy but we have, however, very little of the way of tools to accomplish it. In the heyday of the rapid amortization program, dispersion was one of the factors considered, and I think in only about 15 percent of the cases, in all the certificates we issued, was the dispersion requirement waived. That program is practically at a standstill now because of the change in the law in the last session of Congress. There are other incentives that we can use under the Defense Production Act. If the Government either loans money or guarantees the loan of money, it can insist upon dispersion.

I would like to point out to you 1 or 2 other considerations, and I apologize for these long-winded answers, Mr. Chairman. A lot of people in Congress are interested in dispersion, really, I think not so much altogether from a military point of view. There are a lot of Senators from States such as my own State of North Carolina, and I think I would be for dispersion on purely economic grounds—it means we would get more industry away from the larger centers. As the size and power of weapons increases, dispersion criteria change. When we were talking about the atomic bomb, there was a certain area. In the hydrogen era the dispersal area gets larger. I am sure that any dispersion must be on a wise and selective basis or else we could destroy large, valuable segments of our economy.

To get to the particular question, as I say we do have a dispersal policy. It is under review, but it hasn't been very effective. I think we have kidded ourselves in talking so much about dispersion. I would have to make a guess right now but I see no reason why nondefense industries would be affected by this. I would suppose, however, that we would want to try to avoid complete concentration in new defense industries. I cannot give a satisfactory answer to that question, however. The answer, if I were honest, I don't know.

Undoubtedly, as Mr. Gray suggests, tax amortization was a powerful incentive. But it was an incentive which seriously affected the Federal tax structure and could be justified only in terms of national survival. With the Korean war over and defense production on a more predictable basis, Congress had every reason to limit tax amortization severely.

Furthermore, my inquiries have led me to wonder whether dispersion is even the proper answer to the Soviet industrial challenge. To begin with, I am firmly convinced, as I wrote President Eisenhower recently, that industrial waste is a far more serious danger to our defense posture than industrial concentration. According to the ODM itself, our intelligence estimates show that Soviet production is approximately 30 percent of our own. Yet we are told that dispersion is required because 71 percent of our

essential production is concentrated in our 57 largest cities.

This may sound like a standoff—30 percent against 29 percent. But in fact this is a comparison of apples with oranges—total production in one case with defense production in the other.

Now there can be no doubt that Soviet production is apportioned quite differently from ours and leans much more heavily toward military preparation. But it is not entirely devoted to military production. Nonetheless, let us err on the side of caution. Let us assume for the sake of debate that Russia does not produce anything for consumer needs. Are we to assume in addition that none of Russia's production is in vulnerable urban concentrations? Obviously this is contrary to fact. Are we to assume then no retaliation to a Soviet offensive blow? Obviously this is contrary to reason.

Let us not be panicked by statistical hyperbole. Already we have sent the Atomic Energy Commission packing to suburban Maryland where it lost unnecessary work time during the recent snows because of inaccessibility. Earlier the Veterans' Administration gave up a hospital site in Rockville, Md., in part because of distance from urban advantages.

There is a serious question in my mind whether, by insisting on dispersion, we will gain in decreased vulnerability what we stand to lose in decreased productivity, especially when you consider that dispersion has been isolated by the ODM from other—perhaps more basic—factors involved in vulnerability. Worse, dispersion of facilities itself may be extremely dangerous to an economy under impact of atomic or hydrogen war when it will create vast problems of confusion and difficulty of transportation. As the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has so ably pointed out on several occasions, we have quite as much to fear from the Soviet submarine fleet as we do from its stock of intercontinental ballistic missiles or its manned aircraft.

If the Soviets send a fleet of submarines here to rake our coastal areas with Polaris-type missiles, what becomes of the logic of dispersion? The ODM has ruled against concentrations in Wichita, Kans., and St. Louis, Mo. Yet it invites defense industries to locate along the coasts in full sight of the potential enemy and it does this in the name of reducing our vulnerability to attack.

I will certainly grant that we have more to fear from one giant nuclear blast in the heart of Pittsburgh or Detroit than from a pinpoint shot at any single target along the coast. But the danger of submarine assault is not from one isolated explosion. Rather it is from a withering blanket of nuclear firepower which can smash small-scale targets all over a 300-mile radius. I suggest that this danger is at least equal to the other, and I can see no sense whatever in running when there is no place to hide.

I suggest further—and I would be happy to have this matter studied by the Joint Committee on Defense Production—that, in the present state of the economy, industrial dispersion is not merely futile and ineffective but positively harmful. The recession has idled our industries and has thus enabled the Russians to narrow the gap. I include here an article from the Washington Post of Saturday, March 22, in which Associated Press Foreign News Analyst Thomas P. Whitney makes this very point:

RECESSION HELPS RUSSIANS NARROW PRODUCTION GAP

(By Thomas P. Whitney)

While industrial output in the United States has been dropping rapidly during the current recession, the industrial output of the Soviet Union has been surging upward at an equally rapid pace.

The result is that the Russians are swiftly narrowing the big gap between industrial production of the Soviet Union and that of the United States.

American industrial output in January and February 1958 was approximately 10 percent lower than it was in the same 2 months of 1957, according to the Federal Reserve Index.

An official communique of the Central Statistical Administration of the Soviet Government placed Soviet industrial production in January and February 1958 at 11 percent higher than in the same period of 1957.

TYPICAL OF RUSSIAN RATE

This figure of 10 or 11 percent annual increase is typical of the rate at which Russian industrial production is being increased each year currently.

Experts on the Soviet economy have estimated that roughly the Soviet Union may at present have about half as large a total industrial production as the United States. Nikita Khrushchev estimated a few months ago that it would take the Soviet Union 15 years, more or less, to reach the American industrial output of 1957.

Soviet leaders are obviously watching with great interest the American recession. Khrushchev himself demonstrated this when he devoted a full 10 minutes of his election speech on March 14 to the report by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, delivered at the recent AFL-CIO Put America Back to Work rally.

Following this speech Soviet papers devoted much attention to the Meany report which described declining production and rising unemployment in America.

TASK WOULD BE EASIER

Otherwise the Soviet press has not been devoting any tremendous amount of attention to the American recession in the last few weeks.

In the unlikely event the American industrial decline should continue for several years, the task which the Soviet Union has set for itself of catching up with American industrial would be much easier and take fewer years than the Soviet leaders have been thinking it might.

Therefore, one can be sure that despite the seeming lack of intense interest by the Soviet press in American economic troubles, Khrushchev and his colleagues in the Kremlin are following them closely. And, no doubt, they are quite pleased by the bad business news in the United States.

In spite of these facts, ODM policy requires that dispersion be considered in awarding defense contracts. I thought this illogical in view of spreading unemployment and when Gordon Gray of the ODM was quoted as saying he planned to ask the Army why it hadn't been using defense contracts to help distressed areas, I wrote Mr. Gray urging him to take another look at the whole dispersion program.

I waited a little over a week and having heard nothing, I wrote a letter to President Eisenhower expanding on my doubts.

Shortly thereafter I received word from the ODM that dispersion is only one of a number of criteria used in awarding contracts—as I already knew. I was told that Detroit had received $77 million in defense contracts during the first 6 months of the fiscal year—in spite of the fact that Detroit is a concentrated urban area and therefore ineligible from a dispersion standpoint.

The implication I was supposed to draw, no doubt, is that the ODM is applying its criteria with either a fine hand or distorted views.

I include here the correspondence between by office, the ODM and the White House:

MARCH 10, 1958.

Mr. GORDON GRAY,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, General Accounting Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: You were quoted the other day as preparing to ask the Army why no defense contracts had been placed in areas of unemployment totaling 6 percent or more.

May I call your attention to a current directive relating to the industrial dispersion program? It reads:

"The following measures will be taken:

"3. Defense contracts will be awarded, and planning under Department of Defense allocation programs will be conducted in such a manner as to make maximum use of facilities located in dispersed sites."

Less than a year ago, the ODM, over your signature, told the Joint Committee on Defense Production:

"The Department of Defense requires that geographic dispersal be taken into account in the placement of contracts * * * (and) to a considerable extent, second-source procurement is used to reduce the risks where full dispersion is impracticable."

Plainly, under present policy, little relief can be given to Detroit or similar areas through Defense Department contracts.

Since the Defense Production Act itself recognizes "the desirability for maintaining a sound economy" as a necessary element in defense, I strongly urge revision of these policies.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 18, 1958.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The enclosed copy of a letter to Mr. Gordon Gray should explain itself. After careful study, I have become convinced that the industrial dispersion program does not do what it intends and—worse—that it has undesirable side effects.

The program's failure is admitted even by its friends. Mr. Gray himself, in a speech to the Detroit Economic Club on December 16, conceded that the "dispersal policy * * * hasn't been very effective. I think we have kidded ourselves in talking so much about dispersion."

Officials at the ODM and in the Commerce Department say privately that with the reduced scope of the tax-amortization program, dispersion has become unworkable as to its major objectives and illogical as to others.

My research causes me to doubt whether dispersion ever was effective. The overwhelming majority of tax-amortization

grants—at least 80 percent by value—never passed within shouting distance of the dispersion criteria. Even in those cases where dispersion has been accomplished (theoretically), I wonder if we have not often exchanged vulnerable concentration for vulnerable geography.

Yet, despite its eminent lack of success, the dispersion program is now permitted to lie across the road to recovery. Because of dispersion criteria, defense contracts have been channeled away from areas of greatest distress. Because of dispersion criteria, the Defense Department is unable to respond effectively to the current crisis.

What do we gain from the present program? The ODM itself notes that despite concentration of productive facilities "our relative position is still a good one." We are told that "29 percent of our essential production is outside of the 57 largest cities" and that "the Soviet Union's entire industrial production is only about 30 percent of ours. Isn't it reasonable to presume that the Soviet Union, too, has some vulnerable concentrations which we would destroy if they attempt to destroy ours?

I do not mean to suggest that a dispersion program has no place in our defense effort. Within limits, it does. But our major effort ought to be directed toward improving overall industrial strength—toward the full use of productive capacity and of human resources. Industrial waste is much worse a danger than industrial concentration.

As you know, Mr. President, unemployment in Detroit has risen sharply to more than 300,000 and in Michigan to more than 400,000. In my District, the situation is nearly as desperate as it was in 1929. But this condition is not only a local or a purely personal tragedy for the men out of work and for their families. It means also an irrecoverable waste of vital productive strength, and, as such, it is a blow to our defense security.

Considering these circumstances, I have asked Mr. Gray if he will do something now to correct the deficiencies in the dispersion program. I have received no reply as yet, and I appeal now to you, sir.

It seems to me that the dispersion program can be improved most effectively by executive action. But I would remind you that the Defense Production Act comes up for renewal this session. If there is no initiative from the White House in this matter, I shall be compelled to seek action in Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 20, 1958.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: This will acknowledge your March 18 letter to the President about the industrial-dispersion program.

Your suggestions will be examined and you will receive a further response at an early date.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. MCCABE,
Associate Special Counsel to the President.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C. March 20, 1958.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: This is in reply to your letter of March 10, 1958, wherein reference is made to a current directive which requires that consideration be given to the use of dispersed facilities in the placement of procurement contracts. You suggest that it may be necessary to revise this policy if relief is to be given to Detroit or other areas of unemployment through the placement of Department of Defense contracts.

The use of dispersed facilities is only one of a great many considerations which a procurement officer must take into account in the awarding of a contract. Some of the other considerations which must be taken into account, in addition to prices, ability to perform, availability of facilities, tooling, and financing are: (a) placement in areas of unemployment (manpower policy No. 4), (b) avoidance of tight labor market areas, (c) a fair allocation to small business, and (d) the maintenance of the industrial-mobilization base and a sound economy. I am informed that there are 15 or more such major considerations that must be taken into account. They are all worthy objectives. No one can be completely controlling under all circumstances.

The relative weight to be attributed to these many considerations has always been a difficult problem. Attempts have been made from time to time to prescribe their relative importance without success. Obviously, economic considerations and procurement requirements which change from time to time would make any hard-and-fast determination of relative importance unacceptable. In view of the fact that $77,528,853 in military supply contracts were placed in the Detroit area during the period July 1957 through December 1957 (the last reporting date), I am inclined to believe that the consideration given to the use of dispersed facilities, which is but one of many factors to be taken into account in contract placement, has not adversely affected the placement of contracts in Detroit to help alleviate the current unemployment situation in that area.

In summary, it is my judgment that it is not necessary to withdraw from consideration the utilization of dispersed facilities in the placement of contracts, in order to give appropriate or even primary consideration to the placement of contracts in areas of serious unemployment.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON GRAY,
Director.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 26, 1958.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: This is in further reference to your March 18 letter about the industrial dispersion program.

I find that on March 20, the date your letter to the President was acknowledged, the Director of Defense Mobilization also wrote to you about this subject. His letter would appear to cover the various points raised in your letter to the President. However, if there are any other aspects of this program on which you would like to have further information, we would be glad to look into the matter at your request.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. MCCABE,
Associate Special Counsel to the President.

In actuality, the ODM deliberately evades the issue. As the ODM well knows, dispersion applies only in the case of new industries and then only on certain products. That $77 million figure is statistical razzle-dazzle calculated to draw the eye while sleight-of-hand continues unobserved.

As a matter of plain fact, not one single solitary contract was awarded in the Detroit area in the first 6 months of the fiscal year on any basis other than competitive advantage. As the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], established quite clearly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, March 31, the so-called preference for labor surplus areas has been almost inoperative until recently. A mere $927,260 out of $157 million was placed in the first half of the fiscal year on the basis of labor surplus preference and not one nickel of this entered Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, again I urge that the time has come for us to take a fresh look at the logic of our position. Industrial dispersion would have made more sense in World War II—despite the relative weakness of the weapons available—than it now makes. World War III, if it cannot be avoided, will not be won on the comeback trail, as we won World War II after Pearl Harbor. It will be a sharp, quick battle of knockout blows and the nation which first lands a haymaker will win. In this situation, dispersion of stockpiles makes considerable sense; dispersion of industrial capacity makes little if any. Surviving capacity may be a key to postwar recovery but it will not bring victory when there is no time to use it. Our task, then, is to outproduce rather than outwait, and, in the matter of outproducing, dispersion is less a help than a hindrance. I have therefore introduced today a bill to remove the dispersion requirement from section 2 of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

JOHN C. PUGH

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I announce with deepest regret the death of John C. Pugh, former clerk of the Committee on Appropriations. He was for 37 years an employee of the House and was one of the finest men it has ever been my good fortune to know. Too much cannot be said of the invaluable service he rendered the Congress and the country.

An accurate estimate of his life and service appears in an article in this morning's edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald written by his lifelong friend Marcellus C. Sheild which I quote:

JOHN C. PUGH

Many persons in and out of Government mourn the passing of John Pugh on March 27th. His intimate and important association with defense budgets for over a quarter of a century brought him in close contact with the leaders in national defense in the legislative and executive branches of the Government. He started his career in the Navy Department under Secretary Josephus Daniels and Assistant Secretary Franklin D. Roosevelt as a budget staff member before the establishment of the Federal budget system. He moved to the legislative branch at the request of the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations to become my chief assistant and aid in organizing the work of the enlarged committee to handle all appropriation measures in their concentration in that body by the House of Representatives under the new Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

He was an expert in defense finances, programs, organization, and law. His indefatigable industry, unfailing memory, and prodigious capacity for detail made him a reservoir of factual data relating to defense in particular and other governmental activities in general. His genial personality and unfailing courtesy endeared him to a wide

circle of friends and acquaintances. Devotion and loyalty to our country were paramount and he was a confidant and counsellor of Members of Congress and high-ranking officials in the executive branch. John C. Pugh is an illustrious example of the self-effacing, career Federal official serving in a quiet and unostentatious manner to keep the Government functioning efficiently, effectively, and economically. After my retirement as head of the committee staff in 1945 he succeeded to that position and retired in 1947.

John Pugh's greatness is known to few people but surely it stands high on God's record of the gallantry of the soul of man. For it is of the spirit. Last July his beloved wife, Winnifred, passed away. She had suffered for 4 years from paralysis and was a wheelchair patient. During this time he was her nurse, homekeeper, and constant loving companion. His unselfish devotion and attention were tonic to her physical needs and balm and stimuli to her morale and spirit. His strength to maintain this attentiveness was the constant marvel of his friends and neighbors. Three months after her death he was stricken with partial paralysis and disabled by incurable ailments. His survival to care for her over this long period in spite of his ominous physical impediments is ample evidence that a gracious and loving God gives the strength to those who seek it to fulfill their conceptions of human devotion.

Many sorrow over the departure of this noble soul. Service and friendship were the keynotes of his life. We loved him in life and continue to in eternity. From the pen of Oliver Wendell Holmes came these consoling thoughts:

"Fast as the rolling seasons bring
The hours of fate to those we love
Each pearl that leaves the broken string
Is set in friendship's crown above.
As narrower grows the earthly chain,
The circle widens in the sky;
These are our treasures that remain
But those are stars that beam on high."

MARCELLUS C. SHEILD
CHEVY CHASE, MARYLAND.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KILDAY.

Mr. LIBONATI and include a speech made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO], to a boys' club and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. METCALF (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of Montana) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. FULTON.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRIS and include a letter.

Mr. TUCK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 497. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

S. 2120. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, Mercedes division.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 303, the House stands adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, April 14, 1958.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, April 14, 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:

1777. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the First Semiannual Report of the Department of the Army Contracts for Military Construction Awarded Without Formal Advertising for the period July 1 through December 31, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 241, 85th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1778. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to provide for research into problems of flight within and outside the earth's atmosphere, and for other purposes"; to the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration.

1779. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report in connection with the restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts, pursuant to the act of July 25, 1957 (31 U. S. C. 701–708); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1780. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 21, 1958, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Devils River and tributaries, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved September 3, 1954; to the Committee on Public Works.

1781. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Katherine Burke McKelligan, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1782. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subject, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1783. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1784. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 11519. A bill to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of newly developed weapons upon such vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 1600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 11451. A bill to authorize the construction and sale by the Federal Maritime Board of a superliner passenger vessel equivalent to the steamship *United States*, and a superliner passenger vessel for operation in the Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 11851. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide varied commodities to schools and institutions and for needy persons and families out of funds appropriated for diversion of surplus agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 11852. A bill to amend the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181), relating to practices in the marketing of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 11853. A bill to amend section 2 of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 11854. A bill to provide a Federal grant program to assist the States and localities in the construction of schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 11855. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as temporarily to increase from 130 to 195 the maximum number of days of unemployment, within a benefit year, for which unemployment benefits may be paid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 11856. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons and the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11857. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise taxes on automobiles and on parts and accessories, and to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on trucks and buses to 5 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11858. A bill to authorize the creation of record of admission for permanent residence in the case of certain Hungarian refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11859. A bill to enable the States to provide an additional 13 weeks of unemployment compensation for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11860. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, to increase the scope of the activities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (renamed in this act the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and Astronautics), to establish in the Congress a Joint Committee on Astronautics, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 11861. A bill authorizing the city of Chester, Ill., to construct new approaches to and to reconstruct, repair, or improve the existing approaches to a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 11862. A bill to make available Federal grants to States for temporary unemployment assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 11863. A bill to provide that production machinery acquired during 1958 and used in a trade or business may be depreciated over a 5-year period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11864. A bill to provide that automobiles and other motor vehicles acquired during 1958 and used in a trade or business may be depreciated over a 2-year period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 11865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to collapsible corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H. R. 11866. A bill to authorize the State of New Mexico to select certain public lands in exchange for land taken by the United States for military and other uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11867. A bill to permit conveyance by the city of Truth or Consequences to Sierra County, N. Mex., of certain lands acquired from the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST (by request):

H. R. 11868. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 632), relating to the rehabilitation and preservation of historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 11869. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to provide a criminal penalty for violations of certain provisions of that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 11870. A bill to amend section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide for payment of certain accrued insurance benefits to survivors of the insured; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 11871. A bill to amend section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 11872. A bill to extend the benefits of the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956 to the orphan children of persons who die as the result of a disability incurred or aggravated during service in the Armed Forces under extrahazardous conditions or other circumstances for which the wartime rates of disability compensation would have been payable if the parent had lived; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 11873. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to improve recruitment and training for the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 11874. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to June 28, 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Res. 522. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 128; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Res. 523. Resolution creating a select committee to formulate legislation to relieve the present critical condition of the railroad industry; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 524. Resolution authorizing the expenses of the select committee created by House Resolution 523; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States, urging the repeal of the Federal excise taxes on transportation of persons and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. R. 11875. A bill for the relief of Angela Maria Chung Yan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 11876. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sidonie Juliette Gauzargues Watson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 11877. A bill for the relief of Shlomo A. H. Murad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 11878. A bill for the relief of Anayis Adrouny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 11879. A bill for the relief of Susan M. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 11880. A bill for the relief of Rose Mary Deadwyler, Sharon Ann Deadwyler, Jack Deadwyler III, James Paul Deadwyler, and Margret Lillian Deadwyler; 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:

515. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 21 residents of Franklin, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

516. Also, petition of nine residents of Franklin, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

517. Also, petition of 50 members of the Princeton General Baptist Church, Princeton, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

518. Also, petition of 49 residents of Brazil, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

519. Also, petition of 284 residents of Clay and Owen Counties, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

520. Also, petition of 20 residents of Whiteland and Franklin, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

521. Also, petition of 19 residents of Franklin, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

522. Also, petition of 35 residents of Brazil, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

523. Also, petition of 29 residents of Clay City, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

524. Also, petition of 39 residents of Daviess County, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

525. Also, petition of 18 residents of Brazil and Carbon, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

526. Also, petition of 14 members of the Hazleton General Baptist Church, Hazleton, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

527. Also, petition of 15 residents of Hazleton and Patoka, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

528. Also, petition of 63 residents of Owensville, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

529. Also, petition of 50 members of the Bethlehem General Baptist Church, Fort Branch, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

530. Also, petition of 43 residents of Owensville, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in

interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

531. Also, petition of 33 residents of Princeton and Fort Branch, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

532. Also, petition of 41 residents of Vincennes, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

533. By Mr. CANFIELD: Letter from Francis J. Pinque, president of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association, urging that Congress enact only such tax reduction measures as are made possible by expenditure reduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

534. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Vincent J. Reilly, Wheaton, Md., relative to a redress of grievance relating to wrong at the hands of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Sound Antirecession Step—An Accelerated Highway Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement I recently submitted before the House Public Works Committee in support of H. R. 11418, which I introduced, and similar measures:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, MARCH 25, 1958, IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 11418

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity of appearing before this distinguished committee in support of my bill, H. R. 11418, which is identical to H. R. 10422, introduced by the chairman of your committee, Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, a Member of Congress from New York.

H. R. 11418 would compensate each State that has had a toll road incorporated into the Interstate System by providing equivalent mileage for said State. This equivalent mileage would be designated as part of the Interstate System and would thus become eligible for 90-percent Federal aid.

Under my bill, those States which were forward-looking enough to prepare plans, finance, and construct needed highways before the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 became law, would be properly compensated. Instead of being penalized for their progressive attitude, these States would be given this additional mileage to replace the mileage incorporated into the Interstate System. I might point out that this equivalent mileage would be given to the States only when the States initiate the request for the mileage.

I believe that this additional mileage would provide another form of public works construction which would be a stimulus and a shot in the arm to the economy of the States wherein these roads would be constructed. The local areas where the highways would be laid out would receive an opportunity not only for the increased circulation of money but, in addition, the impetus of additional employment by the creation of new jobs that this work would necessitate.

From the Clay report through the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, Congress has recognized the principle that in some form or another there should be an equitable reimbursement to those States whose State-constructed mileage was taken away when the Interstate System was created. There have been a number of proposals put forward as to reimbursement; and a report has been filed by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

I have studied this matter carefully and, in my opinion, the increased mileage which this bill provides would in the long run be the most beneficial and the best form of reimbursement that the States would receive.

I thank you for the opportunity of appearing before this committee and trust that this bill will receive favorable consideration by the committee.

Political Science Fellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to an organization and a program with which, no doubt, many Members of this House are already familiar. I refer to the American Political Science Association and its Congressional fellowship program.

Each year, for the past 5 years, the association has selected a small number of promising young political scientists and journalists to spend a year working in Congress. During the past year, nine political scientists and six journalists were selected by a distinguished panel, including William White of the New York Times, Warren Unna of the Washington Post and Times Herald, Senators Mundt and Sparkman, and Representatives Yates and Curtis.

The purpose of the fellowship is simple: to provide a familiarity with Congressional politics that cannot be acquired through books, alone. Rather than simply observe and interview Congressmen, these fellows work in the offices of Members of their own choosing. Having just completed some 3½ months working on the House side, they are now beginning their apprenticeships in Senate offices, where they will remain for the rest of the session. Upon completion of their stay in Congress, they will return to the campuses and newspapers across the country, better prepared to teach and write.

Having had a fellow, Mr. William Mitchell, of Harvard, in my office, I can personally testify as to their diligence, loyalty, and intelligence. They make signal contributions both to offices and to the Congress. I am pleased to see Mr. Mitchell and his friends have the opportunity of working in the Senate, but I am sad at the loss of a valuable worker, and pleasant companion. Apparently, some of my colleagues feel as I do about the congressional fellows, for I have noticed that they make use of them year after year. Is there a better indication of the high esteem in which they are held?

I hope that as new groups of these fine young men and women come to Washington, those of you who have not had the pleasure of working with them will choose to do so. They need our cooperation, and we need their knowledge and skills. That knowledge and skill is at our disposal and without cost either to us or the taxpayers. I can think of no better investment.

Reorganization of the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the message from the President on the reorganization of the Department of Defense, I have issued the following statement:

Of course, my subcommittee will give careful and thorough consideration to all of the proposals submitted by the President. The subcommittee will also give careful consideration to proposals not submitted by the President, including those contained in the Vinson-Arends-Kilday bills now pending in the House.

We will inquire with care into the proposed repeal of the existing provision of the National Security Act that the military departments shall be separately administered. The purpose of the repeal of this language is that in the future all funds for all military purposes will be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense instead of to the three service Secretaries as is now in the case. The appropriation of almost two-thirds of the total national budget to one official of Government will require the strongest possible justification to sustain it. It is probably greater economic power than should be possessed by one individual.

As revealed before the Senate and House committees, the principal difficulty in the Defense Department is the impossibility of securing prompt decisions. All witnesses agreed this is true because of the administrative jungle created by layers of secretaries, assistant secretaries, and deputy assistant secretaries. This plan does nothing to cure that situation.

Speech of Hon. John E. Fogarty at the Annual Dinner of the Society of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech which I delivered at the annual dinner of the Society of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Westerly, R. I., on March 16, 1958:

St. Patrick's Day is a day for remembrances. It is a day on which we recall again the great names of Ireland, the names of the countries and the towns and the villages, of the hills and the valleys, of the lakes and rivers and bays of Ireland. A day on which we recall again the names of her saints and her scholars, to recite and list again the names of her great patriots and leaders, of her singers and of her poets. Even though many of us have never seen the places, just as we have not seen or known the saints of Ireland, both the persons and the places come alive again in our minds and in our hearts. We recall the names of Donegal and Tyrone and Armagh in the north, of Kildare and Meath, Wicklow and Dublin in the east, of Waterford and Cork and Kerry in the south, of Limerick, Clare, Galway and Sligo in the west. The names of Niall, Cormack, Brian, Murray, O'Connor, Parnell, O'Connell, Plunkett, Emmett and Hyde; the names of Patrick, Bridget and Columkille, and Brendan and Malachy and all the rest of the saints, and the great leaders and the scholars, and the bards and genealogists and the poets of Ireland.

It is difficult for those who are not Irish to understand the character of the Irish. There is a strong undercurrent of sadness in any joyous Irish celebration. And, on the other hand, even in Irish mourning there is an element of the joyful. The Irish wake is not an accident. This seeming division characterizes the history of the Irish people as it does characterize the Irish personality. The line between the consideration of Ireland as a gray-haired old lady mourning in the shadows for the loss of her sons and waiting in vain for help from across the waves, and the consideration of Ireland as vigorous and fertile, producing sons and daughters and sending them forth triumphantly to the ends of the earth, the lines between the things of time and those of eternity, between the times of peace and the time of trouble have been finely drawn. It is common in the characterization of nations to picture them in an hour of triumph, and of strength and victory, rather than in a time of defeat and suffering. This is not the case with Ireland and the Irish people. The Irish character has not been formed and proved in one short test, or in one shining hour. It has been slow tested and proved in a long and bitter history, in defeat and oppression and suffering. It has been proved not only as to heroic virtues, but also as to unheroic ones; not only as to courage and fortitude and greatness of mind, but as to patience and tolerance and long suffering; the little and unheroic virtues, without which neither a nation nor a man can claim perfection.

It seems as a result of this long slow testing, the Irish have developed a sensitivity which permits them to hear the last note of the harp, or the song of freedom, after other ears have become deaf to it. It permits them to see the last spark of freedom in what was once a great fire after other eyes no longer see that light, and to feel the warmth of freedom, and of hope, in what to others may appear to be a cold lump of peat. The Irish character as a result of this testing and trial has been marked by a great longing and aspiration for freedom. That longing and aspiration have been expressed in the five great loves of the Irish people.

First is their great love for country, for the soil of Ireland, for its towns and its people. So great is this love and longing, that the greatest punishment set for Columkille, the saint, was that he could no longer set foot on Irish soil. And so we have, all of us, in a sense remained exiles whenever we have been away from Ireland. Like Columkille we can say: "There is a gray eye which ever turns to Erin. What joy to fly upon the white-crested sea, and to sight the waves breaking upon the Irish shore. To return to Ireland where the song of the birds is so sweet and the clerks sing as well, where the young are so gentle and the old are so wise, where great men are noble and the women so fair."

The second great love of the Irish is their love of religion, for the things of the spirits. At the time of the coming of christianity the Irish spirit was willing and ready. St. Patrick came and was received without martyrdem. The same cannot be said of the other lands, not of Rome, not of Gaul, nor of the East, nor even of the new continents found across the sea. Ireland gained the title of Isle of Saints and became the source of missionaries to all corners of the world.

The third great love of the Irish is their love of learning. It was this great love that kept alive the flame of knowledge and the pursuit of truth during the dark period of the 5th, 6th and 7th centuries.

The fourth great love is that of political freedom—a love which sustained the Irish in standing against the Danes and the Normans, the Tudor armies, the hosts of Cromwell, and all the soldiers of the King of England.

It is this love of freedom which inspires the Irish people and their friends all over the world to create conditions in which the immoral and absurd partitioning of their homeland can be brought to an end—not only in order to right a wrong and to secure another triumph for freedom and democracy but so that the undesirable social and economic consequences of this national dismemberment may be ended also—and may I add that those who help to speed the coming of the day of the inevitable and peaceful reunion of Ireland are securing the foundations for a splendid future for the Irish homeland.

The fifth great love is that of poetry and song. A love so strong and deep and so consequential that as late as the 15th and 16th centuries English rulers were moved to impose special penalties on bards, minstrels, rhymers, and geneologists who sustained the lords and gentlemen in their love of rebellion and other crimes and which moved the soldiers of Cromwell to break the harps still found on the walls of the cottages of the Irish at the time of the invasion. The ancient Gaelic law recognized this in forbidding the seizure by justice in any house of any Gael whatsoever, one of his books, his sword, or his harp. For his book was the symbol of his intellectual and of his spiritual freedom. The sword was the symbol of his political freedom, and the harp was the symbol of all the things that the human heart aspires to.

The world needs the revival of the five great loves of the Irish today as it has always needed them. It needs love leading to positive action. In a time when the traditions of the past are rejected and frowned upon, when learning and truth must compete in the marketplace with falsehood and error and the only test is that of which is most useful, there is a great need for the return of the love of truth and the love of learning. When love of country and love of political freedom in many areas of the world have been destroyed, there is a great need for the revival of the Irish love of country. When the faith has grown cold and has been rejected by many, the love of the faith, too, must be revivified. When love of poetry is looked upon by some as unmanly, when it has little or no place in the deliberations of man, there is a great need for a revival of this Irish love of song and poetry. This, then, is the pattern and the way.

The responsibility of the sons of St. Patrick is clear. Let us hope that all may so meet and fulfill their responsibility that each and every one say that he has been the good servant of learning and of song and poetry, but in all things God's good servant first. And then we can hope that the good St. Patrick in his right may judge us all with gentleness.

Please, God, let our souls be forever free. Let us be men of our time and have the courage to stand fast by the cause of justice and righteousness and, by our steadfastness, win all mankind to an appreciation of the merit of the cause which we plead—so that, in some distant day, it may be said of some of us that there was one sanctified spot dearer than all others—where the dew glistened on the softest green, the spirit of Ireland hovered, and shook the stillness of the Irish dawn on its journey to the stars.

The American's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today, April 3, marks the 40th anniversary of The American's Creed, written by the beloved William Tyler Page. On April 3, 1918, he was given a $1,000 award for his winning entry in a countrywide contest for the writing of a national creed.

Certainly, we would do well to consider that tenets of the creed today.

Tyler Page said of his concept of such a statement, "A creed it seemed to me, should contain those things to which its subscribers had believed all along, but which never had been brought together concretely." And this is what the American creed does.

How many could recite this creed? Do Americans have an understanding generally of the ideals and principles underlying American democracy? Americans should pause to reassess what being an American means. Those Americans going as tourists to foreign shores would do well to meditate on these principles, for as unofficial ambassadors they are expected to be knowledgeable, even articulate, about their country.

I urge Americans to take stock of what they believe in and to learn to explain it to others. I can think of no better starting point than the great statement, The American's Creed, conceived by William Tyler Page.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that The American's Creed, written by William Tyler Page, who died October 20, 1942, after serving 61 years in

the Capitol Building of the United States, whose last post was as minority clerk of the House of Representatives, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed, a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity, for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

WM. TYLER PAGE.

Recession From What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I have not given the writings of Dorothy Thompson the careful attention they deserve, since in her recent article entitled "Is a Perpetual Boom Desirable?" I find so much that makes sense, probably because it coincides with my own thinking.

For instance Miss Thompson asks, "What is full employment? That everybody who has a job must keep it and all who are seeking one must find it? And find it in exactly the place they want and at wages unrelated to their productivity?" And then she adds, "But thousands of mothers are also in the labor force, often very much to the detriment of their children and their home life, and dubiously, even, to its real financial advantage."

A little farther along in her article she makes this statement which, in my opinion, sums up all that spells economic insecurity among too many of those who make up our labor force:

The 40-hour week has been established, but an enormous number of families have not based their expenditures on such earnings but on the anticipation of an overtime and an annual raise, and have been spending in advance of income, as the per capita indebtedness reveals.

And then Miss Thompson touches on my pet peeve when, in discussing salesmanship as it applies to automobiles, she sets forth this view:

Too much salesmanship can create sales resistance. And many people—

Myself included—

detest the new-model cars and are discovering, also, that a car, if well cared for, will perform for many years longer than the dealer wants the buyer to think.

In my opinion this mature and able columnist has given forth with a veritable lung-full and to all of her comments which I have quoted I want to lend my endorsement with a fervent "amen."

A Wisconsin Speech Correction Leader Points the Way to a Fuller Life for Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, among the greatest assets in the lives of all of us are the teachers who give to us their wisdom, their sympathy, and their encouragement.

In last Sunday's Milwaukee Journal, I was pleased to read a heart-warming article which describes the forthcoming 80th birthday of a teacher who is one of the outstanding leaders in a field in which we can use far more experts than we now have. I refer to Miss Anna Carr, supervisor of the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee speech correction clinic.

Miss Carr is the founder and director of the clinic. Last week, she and her colleagues attended the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Speech Correction Association, where she was awarded an honorary life membership.

Mr. President, I cannot commend too highly both this fine woman and all the unnamed men and women who have helped open to our children doors which otherwise might have remained locked.

It was teachers of this sort who opened doors for the great Helen Keller (who is now, incidentally, 77 years young, herself). We need inspired teachers of this caliber for the hundreds of thousands of youngsters in our land who otherwise might not achieve at least part of their birthright to speak and to hear. Yes, we need more technicians, more speech and hearing therapists. We need more understanding of this human brain and its speech and hearing centers as well as understanding of the ear, mouth and throat.

Communication is one of man's most essential needs. Every child, normal or retarded, 100 percent healthy or brain-injured, must be given an opportunity to communicate. There must not be an iron curtain over speech and hearing. The little boy or girl who stutters or lisps must not be denied the help to which he or she is entitled.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the article which was published in the Milwaukee Journal. However, since I also wish to stress the point that the Congress likewise has responsibilities in this field, I also send to the desk excerpts from testimony and a report of the House Appropriations Committee. The latter House of Representatives Report No. 865, which was submitted by Representative JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, who has industriously contributed a very great deal, not only to this field, but also to many other related fields. The testimony which I have sent to the desk was taken at the hearings which Representative FOGARTY and his deeply interested colleagues conducted.

In this connection, Mr. President, I stress the fact that the University of Wisconsin, the Cove Schools in Racine, Johns Hopkins in Baltimore, as well as many other leading educational and medical institutions in the United States, are helping to conduct research which will shed more light on speech and hearing problems. I hope all this work will move full speed ahead.

Speech and hearing research is still, amazingly enough, almost in its infancy, compared to other types of research. I am sure that, as it gets increasingly underway, much of it under the capable guidance of the National Institutes of Health, it will pay for itself a thousand-fold, both from an economic standpoint and from a humanitarian standpoint.

Dr. Pearce Bailey and his able colleagues at the Institute who are conscientiously dedicated to this objective, can feel a well-deserved sense of satisfaction in the knowledge of the new frontiers they are opening up toward a better life for children and adults alike.

Dr. Bailey and his associates are, of course, confronted by a vast number of possible outlets for a limited amount of Federal research funds. The House Committee which is sympathetic with that problem of so many financial needs urges, however, intensified use of funds for this speech and hearing phase.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article and the excerpts from the hearings and report be printed in the RECORD.

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

SECOND TRY AT RETIREMENT WORKS

(By Marilyn Gardner)

Miss Anna Carr's retirement 11 years ago proved to be something of a failure. So, 5 years ago, she tried again. And, this time, it seems to be working.

"My friends don't say retired, though," she said. "They say 'retread.'"

Miss Carr's first retirement was from Milwakuee State Teachers College—now the University of Wisconsin—in Milwaukee, where she had founded and served as director of the school's speech-correction clinic.

Shortly after she had retired from the college, she went to Ann Arbor, Mich., to visit a friend teaching at the University of Michigan.

"What?" said the friend upon hearing that Miss Carr had retired. "Nonsense. We need you here." So, Miss Carr went back to work, this time as the senior clinician at the university's speech-correction clinic.

Miss Carr, a tiny, lively woman whose curly, white hair was accented by her brillian red dress, stopped off in Milwaukee recently to visit old friends and colleagues at the university.

She had come from Madison where she attended the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Speech Correction Association and where she had been awarded an honorary life membership in the group.

HOW DOES 80 FEEL?

Miss Carr herself seems a bit surprised that she will be 80 years old next month.

"I don't feel like 80," she said, "but then, I don't know how you should feel. I always remember the story about an elderly woman whose niece asked her how it felt to be 80 years old. 'Why, I don't know,' the woman answered. 'I've never asked one of them.' "

One of the best known authorities in the field, Miss Carr traces her career in speech correction back to the early 1920's when, as a tutor for veterans of World War I who were students at Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

"Some of them needed help with their speech," she remembered, "and that's when I became interested in it."

Miss Carr described herself as a second-grade pioneer in the field of speech correction for, while such work was being done when she began her studies, the field wasn't nearly as broad or comprehensive as it is now.

She is one of three coauthors whose book, Rehabilitation of Speech, has become a standard text for students of speech correction. The book was published in 1937, and subsequent editions came out in 1947 and 1957.

"I believe it is the first text published which covered the whole field," Miss Carr commented. Then she added with a smile, "I've heard that some people in speech correction call it their bible."

STUDIED LATIN FIRST

A native of Galatia, a small town in southern Illinois, Miss Carr was graduated from Cornell University, majoring in Latin. After graduation, she began teaching school "here, there, and everywhere," she said. "If I told you all of the places, it would take much too long."

When she became interested in speech correction, she went to the University of Iowa in Iowa City for graduate work, getting her master's degree there.

"One of my teachers there was from Latvia, and I think it was he who put the idea in my head to go to London to study."

She was able to manage a year's work in phonetics at University College there, but then returned to this country "while there were still some coppers left in my purse." She came to the University of Wisconsin for additional graduate work.

When she finished her work at the university, Miss Carr took a position as director of the speech-correction department of the Wausau elementary schools. "I was the director and the department, too," she continued. "And, was I busy."

BUSY IN CITY, TOO

In 1930, she came to Milwaukee to teach at the college here. "We ran a three-ring circus," she remembered. "I was teaching, directing the elementary-school clinic, and working with college students who needed speech correction to become teachers."

Today, Miss Carr said, more emphasis is being put on the problems of the deaf and hard of hearing in connection with speech defects.

"After all," she explained, "we don't learn to speak without our hearing. If a child is born deaf, he won't learn to talk. But if he has been deafened after he has learned to talk, he won't have any trouble speaking."

The "team approach" is another relatively new development, she continued. Since many speech defects involve other problems, the speech correctionist must work with other people in solving the problem or know to whom the child should be referred.

"Many defects are physical in nature," she said, "but others are psychological. And still others may have, if not their origin in, at least no help from the home situation."

IMITATES SOUNDS

Since one learns to speak by hearing speech, a child is apt to "imitate whatever he hears in the home," Miss Carr added, "whether it's the Spanish language or a Southern drawl. If there's a lisp in the family, the child may speak with a lisp, although it could be caused by other things, too."

A baby's first attempt at speech, known as "baby talk," is part of this imitation process, she said, and is a perfectly normal phase of a child's speech development. "That is, of course, provided it doesn't go on beyond the age when he knows better."

A baby, she explained, "hears all this talk going around him, so he begins to try it, too. He bubbles and babbles, making all kinds of strange sounds, just enjoying his ability to make noise."

"Then one day he accidentally makes a sound like 'mah,' " Miss Carr continued. "It's an easy sound to make, so he does it again—mah-mah. 'Oh, he's beginning to talk,' says the flattered mother. 'Say mama, honey.' So he says it again, imitating her, and he learns to talk."

"A young child, however, can't make a wide variety of sounds," she said. "First he tries those that he can see being formed by a parent's lips or tip of tongue. These are sounds like 'puh,' 'buh,' 'mmm,' 'th' and so forth."

BABY TALK BEGINS

"Gradually he begins to try sounds he can't see made," she said, "sounds like 'err' or 'sss.' " And here is where so-called baby talk often begins.

"No one knows just why a youngster has trouble with these sounds," Miss Carr said. "It's probably caused by several things.

"Take the 'sss' sound, for instance. You need teeth to make that sound," a commodity most babies don't have. So instead of the "sss" sound the baby substitutes the "th" sound, one he can make easily. That's why you hear things like "thither Thuthie."

"Probably," Miss Carr concluded, "it's that a baby imitates what he hears, but substitutes sounds he can make or sounds that he thinks are the same. Many of our sounds are much the same you know.

"You stand in the next room and I'll say 'sss' and then 'th' and see if you can tell the difference. It may sound the same to a baby."

EXCERPT FROM CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY'S REPORT URGING INTENSIFIED WORK BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

"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."

EXCERPTS FROM HEARINGS ON DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959 FISCAL YEAR—TESTIMONY OF DR. PEARCE BAILEY

HEARING AND SPEECH DEFECTS

Mr. FOGARTY. We asked you last year in our report to get started on a research program in the neglected field of hearing and speech defects. What have you done about it?

Dr. BAILEY. We have done considerable, Mr. Chairman, to stimulate research in this field. There has been a considerable increase in the number of grants. In 1958, 35 research grants totaling $514,405, and four field investigations totaling $119,013, were awarded.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is this on speech and hearing defects?

Dr. BAILEY. Yes, sir. In addition to that we have started a training program in otolaryngology.

Mr. FOGARTY. Give us a breakdown of these projects, please.

Dr. BAILEY. Yes.

(The information referred to follows:)

National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness—Hearing and speech disorders, 1958

RESEARCH GRANTS

Institution:	Amount
University of Oregon School of Medicine, Portland, Oreg	$26,504
	10,166
Central Institute for the Deaf, St. Louis, Mo	5,855
	20,757
University of Chicago School of Medicine, Chicago, Ill	20,470
	13,225
	17,999
University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, Pa	3,680
Creighton University School of Medicine, Omaha, Nebr	5,988
North Western University, Evanston, Ill	4,047
	32,200
	19,550
University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, Kans	8,872
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis	9,583
Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Mo	17,154
	16,488
Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y	4,995
Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, Mich	2,750
	1,725
Manhattan Eye, Ear, and Throat Hospital, New York, N. Y	20,763
Lempert Institute of Otology, New York, N. Y	15,000
Los Angeles Otological Foundation, Los Angeles, Calif	19,482
Children's Hospital Society of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif	17,250
	15,525
	21,275
New York University, Bellevue Medical Center, New York, N. Y	34,080
Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa	5,203
Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Boston, Mass	14,834
	5,750
	40,250
Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center, Cleveland, Ohio	5,442
Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio	8,824
Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y	33,629
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Md	2,300
Dartmouth Medical School, Hanover, N. H	16,790
Total, research grants (35)	518,405

FIELD INVESTIGATION GRANTS

Institution:	
John Tracey Clinic, Los Angeles, Calif	15,621
Vanderbilt University, School of Medicine, Nashville, Tenn	20,355
American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology, Rochester, Minn	62,200
St. Christopher's Hospital for Children, Philadelphia, Pa	20,837
Total, field investigations grants (4)	119,013

TRAINING GRANTS

Institution:	
State University of Iowa School of Medicine, Iowa City, Iowa	27,852
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill	9,936
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Md	15,000
Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, Mich	4,104
Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Boston, Mass	23,058
New York University, Bellevue Medical Center, New York, N. Y	17,388
Washington University, St. Louis, Mo	22,026
State University of New York, Brooklyn, N. Y	18,854
Bowman Gray School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, N. C	13,392
Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La	16,200
Baylor University College of Medicine, Houston, Tex	17,820
University of Maryland School of Medicine, Baltimore, Md	19,120
Total, training grants (12)	204,750

Mr. FOGARTY. We have not had much chance for progress in this field.

Dr. BAILEY. It is just beginning. It was an untouched field.

COMMENTS OF CONGRESSMAN WINFIELD DENTON AND DR. BAILEY

SPEECH DEFECTS

Mr. DENTON. Did you tell us all you were doing on speech defects?

Dr. BAILEY. I did not go into detail, Mr. DENTON. We have a large experimental and basic program at Bethesda that we have developed and there has been a considerable increase in the amount of research and training support given on the outside. The program is so young it is hard to say——

Mr. DENTON. We started it a year ago; did we not?

Dr. BAILEY. That is right.

Mr. DENTON. There is nothing reported yet in the way of new discoveries?

Dr. BAILEY. No; except basic ones. We found new methods of conducting sound in the brain and things of that sort, but nothing which might be applied to the problem directly.

Nuclear Test Ban Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in sharp contrast to the rather hysterical editorials appearing in some eastern United States newspapers regarding the Soviet's current shell game on nuclear tests, western United States newspapers are assessing it as the intellectual embezzlement it actually amounts to.

The old shell game, of course, was a city slicker's trick to part the yokel from his cash. Three shells were manipulated on a table, with a pea supposedly under one. The yokel bet which shell covered the peas. But he always lost because the slicker palmed the pea and it was under none of them.

Seems that some of the city slicker east coast editorial writers have been playing yokels for the Communist propagandists latest device to strip the Free World of its needed power to deter Soviet aggression. This does not, of course, apply to all newspapers. For instance, this morning's Wall Street Journal carried an editorial cutting this business of an alleged Russian propaganda coup down to size. It relates that by now the so-called neutralist nations have pretty well firmed up their position between the Free World and the Iron Curtain, whereas our allies have pretty well alined their destinies with us, so propaganda of the test ban nature probably has little effect anyway. The editorial is as follows:

THE BOMB AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

The Soviet Union has won a big victory, we are told. With its call for an end to nuclear tests, which we have rejected, it has won a major campaign in the propaganda war.

For example, India is hailing the Soviets and tsk-tsking the United States. In the British Parliament, meanwhile, Conservative Prime Minister Macmillan, the custodian of the tradition of the old World War II alliance with this country, is backing the United States position. The laborites are damning the United States.

It seems to us that the United States worries overly much about propaganda victories and losses. Or, as it used to be phrased, about the battle for men's minds.

After more than a decade of cold war, whatever propaganda issue is raised, the so-called neutralist nations and our allies have their minds pretty well made up. By and large the camps are rather well drawn.

Mr. Dulles and his aides apparently realize this for the fact that it is. And they are rightly acting not from what is good public relations for America, but from what is good for the American public.

Notwithstanding the logic of the foregoing, and the fact that Gromyko's announcement remained wholly silent about the fact that Russia has both A-bombs and H-bombs which it could use to destroy great segments of mankind; with sort of an obsession about the subject of propaganda, a Washington Post editorial writer earlier this week attributed a great propaganda coup to Khrushchev and company while failing, in my opinion, to cite and expose the treachery of the move as forcefully as should have been done.

By way of contrast the Los Angeles Times pointed out editorially on April 1 that the Russian announcement has no real meaning in terms of peace or hopes for peace, but that United States actions since 1946 have pointed consistently in such direction. The editorial is as follows:

LET'S STAND WHERE WE ARE

It must appear to all reasonable Americans—all of whom yearn to see the end of nuclear weapons—that the announcement that Russia is suspending nuclear tests has no real meaning for disarmament.

RUSSIA IS JUDGE

First of all, the Russian statement is ambiguous. How long are the Soviets suspending tests—for a day, a week, a month? They say they will resume firing nuclear charges if the West does not go along with them. That means that they can resume tests any time on the pretext that the West has not met their specifications for suspension. They are the sole judge.

They are seeking to embarrass the United States. They have conducted 14 detected nuclear tests since last August while we have held none. Presumably they have fired everything in that series from which they could gain data. The United States announced that it will hold a series of tests in the Pacific beginning late this spring. The opportunity for propaganda was perfect. The tragedy is that many among our allies, and even some of our own people, will be determined not to see through this sham.

The United States Government fired a message back at the Russians as soon as the Russian foreign minister stopped talking and it was loaded with logic that does not become weaker with its 12 years of aging. The United States is eager to discuss disarmament through the long-agreed agency, the U. N. Commission, which the Russians have boycotted; the United States stands ready instantly to respond to a supervised suspension of nuclear tests.

The first American nuclear shot in the spring testing is likely to be the pretext to release the Russians from their suspension. Then there will be an attempt to make it appear that the United States deliberately prolonged the nuclear frightfulness. Americans will join in the clamor.

REPEATED AT GENEVA

Adlai Stevenson is one of the Americans who would stop the tests on our side. We shudder and give thanks that the American voters did not put him in the place where he could experiment with American security in order to please his foreign friends. The present administration, we are confident, will take no chances.

The United States proposed first, in 1946, that nuclear weapons be abolished. It proposed the abolishment when America alone had the atomic bomb. That offer to Russia and the world has stood ever since: The United States will stop nuclear tests and the manufacture of nuclear weapons whenever a reliable system of international inspection is set up. President Eisenhower repeated the formula with modifications at Geneva. That is where we stand and that is where we should keep on standing.

The Washington Post again this morning dealt editorially with the A-test ban topic, but again from the standpoint of its editorial writers' preoccupation with the propaganda theme instead of the basics of the case. Two suggestions were made as to United States action, one of which seems proper, the other highly dangerous to the Nation.

The first deals with an explanation by our Government of the case for testing. It is a matter which many in the Congress feel should be dealt with by the President himself in a speech to the world at large. As the Post put it, the administration, following the Red announcement, should have made:

A really thorough, documented explanation of why this country was continuing its nuclear tests, an explanation that avoided the usual pooh-poohing of fears and instead made a sober statement of risks. The best case the administration could make for the testing of clean weapons is that they might permit conversion to the sort of deterrent that would not imperil all humanity in the event of large nuclear war.

Had the editorial writer stopped there, he would have been within the range of his technical knowledge and properly backgrounded editorial comment. However, he went on to make a second, and I believe dangerous, statement as to what should have been done by our Government following the Gromyko announcement; it was as follows:

The other, and in this newspaper's opinion far preferable, course was to announce that we were placing further tests under United Nations supervision—and that simultaneously we were making the technology of a clean weapon available to the Russians.

Now, unless this editorial writer has sufficient knowledge of the science and technology of nuclear weapons-making to be able to guarantee to the people of the United States and the people of the rest of the world that placing such information in Russian hands would not simultaneously place in their hands an ability to fabricate nuclear weapons of greater offense capability against the Free World's defenders than they now possess, then it was not, in my opinion, a responsible recommendation.

There is at least some substance to the argument that the mere fact that Soviet nuclear armament is dirty deters its use. Giving them clean weapons, and possibly improved weapons, could certainly have nothing but an adverse effect on the strength of the Free World relative to the Reds.

Further, such a suggestion coming from one of the two largest newspapers in this Nation's Capital, now gives the Soviets an additional propaganda weapon to hurl back at us, as well as a lever to try to pry loose this information so vital to our security.

A lot more could be said on this subject, and probably will as time passes. I speak of it somewhat briefly with a hope that calling attention to the need for a rather broad scientific and technological background to make valid recommendations regarding many aspects of the nuclear weapons problem, may deter some

editorialists from shooting from the hip with suggestions on this subject which may not stand up, or even be dangerous, when analyzed by our people engaged in the weapons program who have more intimate knowledge of the subject.

So that the Post's editorial comments this morning may be read in context, I include the editorial, as follows:

TEST PROPAGANDA

If the administration regards the controversy over nuclear weapon tests as merely a battle of propaganda, it is no wonder that the United States has come off so badly. President Eisenhower yesterday termed the announcement of the suspension of Soviet tests a gimmick. It may well be a gimmick, coming as it does just after completion of Soviet tests and before a new series of American tests. But the effect could not really have been offset by just a gimmick on our side.

It is true, as Secretary Dulles observed, that the Russians are formidable propagandists who go to lengths to which the United States will not go. They are capitalizing on men's fears and hopes for their own purposes. But their appeal cannot be countered just by calling it propaganda; nor can these fears and hopes be dismissed as impertinent. The Russians appear to be doing something imaginative and affirmative. We don't. It is as simple as that.

Through a combination of hesitation and poor articulation the administration has accentuated its own dilemma. There seems to have been no very clear idea of what the administration wanted to do in anticipation of the Soviet move—except do nothing. The result is a largely negative position which not even the most polished Madison Avenue gloss could have converted into something positive.

Whether or not the decision not to suspend American tests was right, once this decision was made the administration had two logical alternative courses. One was to make a really thorough, documented explanation of why this country was continuing its nuclear tests—an explanation that avoided the usual pooh-poohing of fears and instead made a sober statement of risks. The best case the administration could make for the testing of clean weapons is that they might permit conversion to the sort of deterrent that would not imperil all humanity in the event of large nuclear war. To make a convincing explanation would have been difficult, but it could have been tried.

The other, and in this newspaper's opinion far preferable, course was to announce that we were placing further tests under United Nations supervision— and that simultaneously we were making the technology of clean weapons available to the Russians. United Nations supervision would help relieve fears of radioactive contamination. And if the administration really believes in the humanitarian advantages of clean weapons, such as they may be, surely it would be in our own and our allies' interest to encourage the Russians to clean up their own stockpiles.

These courses remain open. A move along either of these lines now would seem belated, but until the administration determines to assert itself in some such way this country will inevitably remain at a disadvantage. The best propaganda still is constructive actions.

To show editorial contrast, I call attention to the message carried on this morning's Los Angeles Examiner editorial page. The Examiner's comments well exemplify the caution, reason, and good judgment which should characterize editorial comment on the vital subject of nuclear testing.

STEADY ON COURSE

Reason is beginning to supplant emotional clamor here and abroad in the reaction to the Soviet announcement that it is conditionally halting nuclear tests. The evidence:

Refusing to be jarred off course, the administration will proceed calmly with our own tests in the Pacific in the interests of national security, the security of our allies and, as inevitably will become clear, the benefit of mankind.

The propaganda fallout from the Russian announcement shows no indication of damaging the American position to the fearful extent some commentators and editorialists have predicted. Its first effect was considerable. But it was not a debacle. And any propaganda advantage gained by a shoddy and obvious fraud cannot last long.

Secretary Dulles fortified the side of reason when he revealed at his press conference Tuesday that President Eisenhower brusquely rejected last week a suggestion from his top advisers to grab the world headlines ahead of the Russians by announcing we would halt nuclear tests.

The President rejected the idea because, he said, (1) it would be phony propaganda and (2) it would be dangerous to the security of the United States and the Free World.

Precisely the same words can be used to describe the Soviet statement by Foreign Minister Gromyko and its consequences if we allowed it to sway us from working realistically and patiently toward real peace, of which one vital condition is to remain strong.

The Soviet announcement is a fraud for two reasons. The first is that the Russians have just completed an intensive series of nuclear tests, conducted in rigid secrecy, and months must elapse before it will be technically possible to begin another series. The second is that the big bugle blare about halting tests is conditioned on the United States and Britain doing the same.

In other words, the Russians are using a nontesting interval, that they could not avoid under any circumstances, to make a phony pitch for peace.

In contrast, the administration has announced our coming tests publicly—and for the first time anywhere is inviting scientists representing Free World, neutralist and Communist nations (including Russia) to observe the test of a clean nuclear device.

And that, as Mr. Dulles correctly emphasized, is a chief objective of our tests; to develop small tactical weapons, and to drastically reduce the fallout from big bombs by making them clean, a process in which the Russians never have shown the slightest interest. As far as is known, they are standing pat with their dirty ones.

Development of a clean bomb is not only a humanitarian refinement of a horrible weapon, but it opens also the prospect of peaceful uses of a force that could almost literally move mountains and give its strength to huge public works.

In view of these facts it is difficult to understand on what logical grounds the frenzied commentators and editorialists are saying that we have suffered an enormous propaganda defeat. What they are really saying, with implicit intellectual arrogance, is that while they can see through the Soviet fraud the people cannot.

We don't go for that. We believe the administration's course is the right one, and that if it is calmly and firmly followed and calmly and firmly expressed, people will understand and indorse it, and recognize the Soviet sham for what it is.

Let no one be fooled about the real intentions of the Soviet leadership. Their treacherous record speaks for itself. While their propaganda has been reaching a crescendo in demanding immediate cessation of tests by the West, the Soviet Union exploded 3 nuclear weapons in the megaton range within a period of 5 days (February 23–27) and 6 more nuclear weapons in a period of 9 days (March 14–22). These are in addition to 5 other Soviet test explosions in the August-to-December period, making a total of 14 since August 1957. I am accompanying these remarks with a table summarizing announcements regarding the current Red nuclear test series.

The real motive behind the Soviet propaganda barrage is to tie United States' hands in the development of a rounded arsenal of clean nuclear weapons. They want to deprive us of a colossal counter-weapon against their threatened intercontinental ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads.

They made their decision to mount their nuclear offensive capability against us in ICBM's several years ago. They have proceeded to develop such missiles as well as the nuclear warheads to aim against United States cities and industries if they ever decide to start allout war against us to attain their ambition of world domination. When such Soviet nuclear ICBM capability will be operational is anybody's guess.

Meanwhile, our only really effective defense against such type of attack is to develop antimissile missiles with atomic warheads large enough to intercept and destroy a Soviet attack while it is high in the atmosphere. In order to use such defensive antimissile nuclear missiles over our own heads they must be clean, and not involve radioactive fallout dangers to our own population.

The Reds know we need to test in order to perfect the variety of clean weapons needed to defend ourselves in such manner. They want to force us to stop testing to prevent us from getting them and thus neutralizing Soviet attack power against the United States.

We and the rest of the people of the Free World must recognize that the same inhuman masters in the Kremlin who directed the slaughter in Hungary are those who now propose the nuclear test ban. Therefore their move is not prompted by a concern for humanity. They simply have no such concern. What they are doing in this instance, as they have done in all others, is simply what they calculate is most effective in forwarding the designs of Communist aggression. The one thing they want most of all is to render us incapable of resisting those designs. That is what is behind the current propaganda campaign and neither America nor her allies must fall into the Red trap.

We can test with safety, and have consistently done so. It is quite apparent from our recent underground test shot in Nevada that in all probability most of our testing after the current series in the Pacific will, in fact, be done underground where the possibility of radioactive fallout is nil.

A sober look at the fallout problem indicates that even the latest series of 14 blasts by the Russians, when totaled with all previous tests since Alamogordo in

1945, have added not more than 2 percent to the radiation background naturally occurring in the earth.

In terms of statistical effect on the human race, authorities have calculated the maximum shortening effect of that radioactivity increase is one-half day in the average United States life span of over 70 years.

By comparison, wearing a radium dial wrist watch is calculated to reduce average life span by 10 days, smoking cigarettes by 9 years.

When a dispassionate and informed balancing is made between the dangers to humanity from safeguarded Free World nuclear tests, and the dangers to humanity from stripping ourselves of the means of checking the Soviets' ambition to impose thir Communist dictatorship worldwide, our course is apparent.

We must continue the fight for human freedom and accept the cost and the responsibilities involved in winning it. An important ingredient of victory is that we calmly chart our course into the nuclear age, without hysteria induced by propaganda from the Communist conspiracy overseas.

Table summary of AEC announcements regarding Soviet nuclear weapons tests (Aug. 23, 1957–Mar. 22, 1958)

Date of AEC press release	Date of Soviet tests	Range of yield
Aug. 23, 1957	Aug. 22, 1957	Detonation of substantial size.
Sept. 9, 1957	Within the past 2 days	Nuclear weapons test of moderate intensity. This appears to be the 2d test in a series which began Aug. 22.
Sept. 25, 1957	Sept. 24, 1957	Detonation in the megaton range. 3d nuclear explosion in the U. S. S. R. announced by the United States since Aug. 22.
Oct. 11, 1957	Oct. 10, 1957	Another test conducted in Soviet series. Latest test was a small explosion.
Dec. 30, 1957	Dec. 28, 1957	Soviet Union is continuing its testing of nuclear weapons. Most recent nuclear explosion occurred Dec. 28. (No announcement re yield.)
Feb. 23, 1958	Feb. 23, 1958	Soviets conducted weapons test today. The yield was in the megaton range.
Feb. 28, 1958	Feb. 27, 1958 (2 tests)	Soviets have conducted 2 more large-yield explosions in current series. Today's test explosions were both in the megaton range, and brought to 3 the number of Soviet large-yield nuclear explosions in the past 5 days.
Mar. 14, 1958	Mar. 14, 1958 (2 tests)	United States has detected 2 Soviet nuclear weapons tests today. Neither test was in the megaton range.
Mar. 15, 1958	Mar. 15, 1958	Soviets today conducted another nuclear weapons test. The yield of the detonation was below the megaton range.
Mar. 21, 1958	Mar. 20 Mar. 21	Detection of 2 further nuclear tests by the Soviet Government. First occurred Mar. 20 and the energy yield was small. The 2d occurred Mar. 21 and the energy yield was in a larger range.
Mar. 22, 1958	Mar. 22, 1958	The test of another weapon by the Soviet Government was detected today. This detonation, which appears to have been in the medium range, is the 3d in the past 3 days and the 6th in the past 9 days.

Return of Enemy Property and Payment of War Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1958, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter of the same date which I received from Mr. William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Department of State, outlining on behalf of the administration a program for limited return of enemy property and the payment of war damage claims of American nationals against Germany arising out of World War II.

On March 31, I acknowledged receipt of Mr. Macomber's letter and requested that a draft bill be prepared, which I would then introduce, designed to carry out the administration's program.

My letter to Mr. Macomber reads as follows:

MARCH 31, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ASSISTANT SECRETARY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 28, 1958, submitting the administration's proposal for a limited return of vested German assets and for the payment of war damage claims of American nationals against Germany, arising out of World War II.

I am in complete agreement with your statement that action should be taken promptly if the beneficiaries of this legislation are to derive any benefits from this program during their lifetimes.

In order to bring the administration's program before the committee in the proper form, may I request that you prepare for introduction a draft bill designed to carry out the administration's program.

I trust that the spadework on such a bill has already been completed by the several agencies which will be responsible for carrying out the administration's program, and I hope that the submission of the draft bill will not be delayed too long so that the committee will be in a position to schedule hearings on this important legislation at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS, *Chairman.*

Speed for Air National Guard Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to remind the Members that on March 21, 1958 I wrote to Hon. Donald H. Quarles, Deputy Secretary of Defense, concerning the withholding of $10.2 million of fiscal year 1958 appropriated funds from the Air National Guard for its facility construction program. The text of my letter appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25, 1958.

In my letter I pointed out that the Congress had appropriated the $10.2 million to be used by the Air National Guard for the construction of Reserve facilities and that despite requests by the Air Guard for an allocation of these funds so that contracts could be let during this fiscal year the Department of Defense was refusing to apportion the funds and intended to transfer them to the MATS working capital fund.

Inasmuch as several Members had spoken to me about the need for funds by the Air National Guard and other Reserve components for the continued construction of Reserve facilities, I am very happy to state that in a letter received from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, dated April 1, 1958, I am informed that the $10.2 million has now been released and will be available to the Air Guard during this fiscal year. The projects being proposed as additions to the Air National Guard construction program for fiscal year 1958 have been forwarded to the Armed Services Committee and we are attempting to expedite approval of these projects so that work can proceed at the earliest possible time.

The Great Need for a National Coal Research and Development Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the creation of a National Coal Research and Development Commission, and have introduced H. R. 11802 for this purpose.

The coal industry is in a desperate condition both in my District and nationally. In spite of increased output per miner per day, increased mechanization, and the increased size of mine companies generally, the coal industry has been suffering heavily from unemployment, low earnings, and lack of a synchronized, concentrated research program.

Our annual United States coal production has been at about the same level in recent years but this has been accomplished by fewer mines and less miners. Although the small companies are hit the hardest—the industry as a whole does not have enough know-how and has too limited funds for more adequate research, development, mechanization and improved marketing methods.

Such funds for research should be managed so that maximum results are achieved under proper coordination with findings available to all. The proposed commission is a step in this direction. Substantial unemployment in coal mines

exists in Alabama, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. The cost of unemployment hits heavily not only at coal miners and other employees of coal companies but also exacts a cost in unemployment insurance to the taxpayers who would like to see something done to help the industry help itself, the taxpayer and the consumer. Coordinated research can help an industry get back on its feet.

Coal is of great importance to our present and future United States economy. It exists in coal-bearing rocks in 35 States. At present rates of consumption the United States coal reserves are estimated to be adequate for more than 1,900 years. In contrast, our reserves of petroleum. natural gas and uranium are estimated to be much less limited than coal. Coal is the richest and most valuable mineral deposit in the world, and we in America and Pennsylvania are richly blessed with this resource.

Chemists and scientists know that, in addition to its fuel values, coal has great potentials for chemicals, minerals, plastics, roadbuilding materials, alcohols, gasolines, and many other byproducts.

Not nearly enough is known about the origin, composition, properties and chemical behavior of coal, or about its possible new uses or improved methods of its production and marketing.

Research on coal to date has been too small in scope and uncoordinated in planning and execution from an industry level, although the United States Bureau of Mines and many companies are to be complimented for the great progress and real advances in safety and methods that are in evidence today. Increased research and sharing of knowledge for the whole industry is needed.

The proposed Commission would stimulate research by private industries and Government organizations, and make all of its hearings and findings public, available to all companies, large and small.

The Commission would consist of a few members experienced in industrial-type research who would be appointed by the President. It could hire additional research and technical staff. Although it would be an independent Commission, it would report to and be responsible to Congress. The Commission would be for the benefit of the total industry and the Nation, cooperating with private firms, educational and research organizations and Government agencies to further the production, preparation, distribution, and utilization of coal in all aspects.

Qualifications for membership on the Commission's advisory committees assure its being representative of types of coal mined, of types of coal machinery, utilities, railroads, management and labor, consumers, distributors, and research organizations. Provisions are such as to preclude stacking the committee with special interest from one or interlocking companies.

I am particularly glad that the Commission's findings are to be open to the whole industry and to help provide opportunities for independent and small coal producers.

The proposed research program of the Commission is worthwhile. It provides for investigation and reports about: First, improvement and expansion of present uses for coal; second, new and more effective uses; third, reduction in cost and distribution; and fourth, emphasis on development of particular value to small producers.

Clearly more research and better research, the results of which will be available throughout the industry, is the great need of the coal industry today. The proposed Commission is a real start toward stimulating and greatly expanding this kind of research for the greater benefit to mankind and our depressed areas in the coal-producing areas of the United States, particularly.

Personalized Rehabilitation Services of the Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a most unusual record of unselfish service for handicapped war veterans, and their dependents, has recently come to my attention. It concerns the personalized rehabilitation service activities of the Disabled American Veterans. When it was formed in 1920, the organization was composed exclusively of America's war wounded and disabled veterans. It was granted a special charter by the Congress in 1932.

Starting out as an organization of handicapped veterans of World War I, its Congressional Charter was amended in 1942 to extend eligibility to any American citizen, who has been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. The DAV is therefore composed exclusively of America's disabled defenders.

Although all of the some 2 million war veterans who are receiving disability compensation from the United States Veterans' Administration have substantially benefited by reason of its legislative and rehabilitation activities, less than 10 percent of them are dues paying DAV members—all of whom receive the Disabled American Veterans' Monthly which keeps them informed as to all developments which may affect their future.

Detailed facts are set forth in DAV annual reports to the Congress, printed as House documents by the United States Government Printing Office.

At its national convention in Louisville, Ky., in June 1941, the DAV formally decided that its contribution to the Nation's national emergency defense effort would be to see to it that all ex-servicemen and women should have the benefit of expert advice and assistance of trained National Service Officers, in the proper preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their respective claims, with the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies, for service connection of their disabilities, disability compensation, hospitalization, medical treatment, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, and finally selective placement into self-sustaining suitable jobs, utilizing their remaining abilities.

Far too many World War I disabled veterans, who failed in time to get the benefit of such expert advice, had suffered the disillusionment of being unable technically to prove their legal entitlement to such benefits to which they considered themselves equitably entitled—because of their inability to procure detailed, specific, factgiving affidavit evidence to substantiate their claims.

That the DAV has been faithful to its self-assumed policy, of extending such much needed services to disabled veterans following World War II and the Korean conflict, is indicated by a résumé of some of the many services extended by its nationwide staff of full-time National Service Officers during the last 10 years, as follows:

Claim folders reviewed	3,453,604
Rating board appearances	1,382,863
Favorable awards obtained	537,367
Service connections obtained	99,054
Increased compensation obtained	$225,493
Monetary benefits obtained	$179,083,769.66

Infinitely more could have been accomplished if the DAV had been enabled financially to maintain an even larger number of trained National Service Officers, gradually reduced from more than 300 in 1947 to about 150 at the present time. Nevertheless, during the last 10 years, the DAV has expended the aggregate sum of about $12,197,600 in the maintenance of such special advocates. This sum does not include administrative expenses at its National Headquarters at 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio, nor the cost of its national publication.

To estimate the DAV's cost of extending needed service to individual distressed disabled veterans involves differing circumstances proving entitlement to service connection, an increased disability rating, medical treatment, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, and so forth. Advising and assisting individual claimants requires time, ranging from a few minutes up to many hours. Most claimants have no conception of the time that their attorneys-in-fact must expend in carefully studying the evidence in official claims folders, in preparing briefs, in making presentation to Claims and Rating Boards, and so forth.

Thousands of claimants have been given pertinent, helpful advice, not measurable or recorded in the monthly reports required to be submitted by each National Service Officer to the National Director of Claims, Cicero F. Hogan, located at the DAV National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during the last 10

years, one would find that the DAV has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed on behalf of a claimant, or, measured another way, about $8.80 for each appearance before a rating agency, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, or about $14.10 for direct monetary benefits obtained for claimants for each rehabilitation service dollar expended by the DAV, not counting the fact that such benefits will generally continue for many years.

These statistics fail to reveal the humanitarian dividends thereby obtained for the scores of thousands of distressed disabled veterans, and their dependents, who have been directly benefited for the rest of their lives.

Most of these serviced disabled veterans have probably assumed that the DAV has been getting some kind of financial help from the Federal Government. No money has ever been appropriated to the DAV by Congress.

It is true that, because the Veterans' Administration has realized the value of such personalized services, it has, throughout the years, been furnishing office space for all DAV National Service Officers, in its Regional, District, and Central offices.

DAV income has been procured from membership dues, but, more importantly, since 1942, from its Idento-Tag project, by which most automobile owners throughout the country receive miniature automobile license tags. Incidentally, attachment of such Idento-Tags to keyrings has enabled the DAV to return about 643,000 sets of lost keys to their owners during the last 7 years—without regard to whether they had previously submitted any donation. Fortunately, Idento-Tag recipients who do respond with donations have long enabled the DAV to maintain a larger staff of full-time National Service Officers than maintained by any veteran organization.

If, however, twice as many Idento-Tag recipients were each year to donate only $1 in response to receipt of their miniature automobile license tags, then the DAV would be enabled to expand its rehabilitation service setup into all of the some 175 hospitals of the United States Veterans' Administration, where they could then extend much needed rehabilitation service to so many additional scores of thousands of discouraged disabled veterans.

Incidentally, the Idento-Tag project is owned and operated by the DAV itself at its National Headquarters at 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio. Most employees consist of disabled veterans, their wives, their widows, and other handicapped persons—a rehabilitation project in itself—under the direction of the DAV National Adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly.

Because the income from the Idento-Tag project has not been sufficiently adequate to provide for its staff of full-time National Service Officers, resignations have reduced their number from about 300 in 1947 to about 150, notwithstanding appropriations aggregating $3,240,000 during the last 9 years from its incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

Its reserve funds therefore again need to be built up, by greatly increased volume of donations by disabled veterans—all of whom have so much benefited by reason of the DAV service program—and by other social-minded Americans. Much needed are many more bequests in wills, designations as beneficiary in insurance policies, assignments of stocks and bonds, and benefactors of Perpetual Rehabilitation Funds, in some multiple of $100—a grassroots idea spontaneously started by a group of concerned disabled veterans in Montana.

After the end of each fiscal year, an updated Memorial Honor Roll of the benefactors, who have established such Perpetual Rehabilitation Funds with the DAV Service Foundation (presently ranging from $100 to $1,000) will be included in each DAV annual report to the Congress.

Only the interest earnings will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in maintaining service officers in the respective States from which each Perpetual Rehabilitation Fund originated. This unique idea, if supported by a sufficient number of social-minded Americans—as well as individual disabled veterans and their DAV Departments and Chapters—holds hope for eventually building up sufficient reserve funds, so that the earnings therefrom can enable the DAV to maintain much needed rehabilitation service for disabled veterans in each State throughout future years.

The experience as to World War I veterans, for whom service connections were procured as much as 35 years after active service, indicates that such expert service officers will be needed for many decades into the future.

Fellow Americans who think about it will realize that security for America's war disabled, and their dependents, is inevitably linked up to future security for America. Americans who help the DAV directly, or through its incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, will thereby be helping many more of America's disabled defenders, and their dependents, and their communities, and will also thereby help to fortify America's future security.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, on March 19, 1958, spoke to the Boys' Club of New York alumni on a very important subject, Juvenile Delinquency. Congressman SANTANGELO, while a State senator in New York, was selected as a member of the Temporary Commission on Youth and Delinquency. This commission made a thorough study of the problem throughout the State of New York, and as a result, Congressman SANTANGELO has become intimately familiar with many aspects of this troublesome problem. His speech furnishes a keen analysis of the causes, prevention, and control of juvenile delinquency, and will, I know, prove interesting and stimulating reading:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Rolnitzky, Mr. Capra, members of the Boys' Club alumni of New York, I am very pleased to speak to you on a subject which demands the most serious attention of all people in our community. At the outset, I want to compliment this organization for providing the opportunities for personal development for the youth of our city and permitting children to develop themselves culturally and physically. You demonstrate the essence of a successful life, a sound mind in a sound body. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to men like Peter Capra, your director, a dedicated citizen who is giving his time, attention, and energy toward your programs. I salute your membership and alumni who are providing the scholarships to all children regardless of race or religious background in secondary education and in colleges. If we had more men like your members, our city would be a better place in which to live.

I desire to speak to you about the broad subject of juvenile delinquency. I wish to talk about the nature, the extent of the problem, its causes, prevention, and control. More claptrap, hogwash, and balderdash has been uttered about juvenile delinquency, that as a result there exists a mass of confusion and loose bricks lying all around without any construction.

NATURE OF PROBLEM

The problem of juvenile delinquency forms a daily part of our newspaper reading. It is a common source of anxiety among parents, adults, and scary females. It is a frequent subject of discussion in the pulpit, in the lecture hall, the classroom, the clinics, and in meetings where the most wonderful asset of our life, our children, are seriously considered.

Each group tends to view the problem in terms of its own particular area of concern, whether it be law, religion and morality, social organization or personality development. In talking of juvenile delinquency, I am talking about persons under the age of 21 years whose conduct includes all unlawful or persistently antisocial behavior.

Certainly the problem is a legal problem. It involves provisions of law, statutes for their punishment and for their treatment. Certainly it is a moral and religious problem also, involving values by which men order their lives and their conduct. Certainly also it is a social problem, involving a threat to a stable society by children who are maladjusted and antisocial. Finally it is a problem of personal development that affects not only the individual delinquent himself, but also the church, the home, the school, the health services, the character-development agencies, and other community groups. Adding it all together, it is a challenge.

That challenge we accept.

EXTENT OF PROBLEM

To read the newspapers, one would think the youth of our country is in revolution, that they have run riot, and that rebels without causes have taken over the Government. Newspapers for their own personal gain have glorified and dramatized the problem to such an extent that the public and even the world believes that our country is basically morally rotten and that our rottenness has permeated our children. The facts belie such impressions. Statistics show that 1 out of 161 children comes to the attention of the courts. Six and two-tenths out of 1,000 are involved

in acts of juvenile delinquency. This amounts to six-tenths of 1 percent. Other statistics increase the amount to tremendous proportions of 2 percent of our youth. At any rate, 98 percent of our children walk through the corridor of life called adolescence without running into trouble or beating their heads against the walls. We are not concerning ourselves here with the 98 percent, but with those 2 percent.

On a nationwide basis, delinquency increased from 1940 to 1954 at a rate of 102 percent. The high level of juvenile delinquency was reached during the war years and declined through 1948. The increase between 1948 and 1954 was 58 percent. While our child population increased by 13 percent from 1948 to 1954, juvenile delinquency in that same period increased by 58 percent, or approximately 4 times the growth of the rate of increase of our youth. In the State of New York, the total increase of juvenile delinquency from 1940 to 1954 was 37 percent, as compared to a national average of 102 percent. Obviously the city of New York is not the den of iniquity that certain people portray it. My experience on the Temporary Commission on Youth and Delinquency disclosed that juvenile delinquency was relatively higher in urban centers than in rural centers or communities. The nature of the acts of delinquency also differed in these communities.

While there has been a relatively small proportion of young people involved in acts of delinquency and the rate of increase has not been of mountainous proportions, the instruments of evil and destruction which the children have in their possession and which they use in the perpetration of their horrible deeds have frightened and terrorized our community. While the numbers are small, nonetheless we must give serious consideration to and examine thoroughly our legal practices and our social measures.

THE CAUSES

There is no one cause for juvenile delinquency. There are many and varied causes. My conclusion has been that the major causes are as follows:

1. A breakdown in respect for authority, both for the State and for the family.

2. There is a breakdown in the family, because of increasing divorces, the absence of parents from the home and its corollary, a lack of love and affection. Of course, we also find in certain instances, a "smother" love of the overly protective parent which brings about juvenile delinquency.

3. Thirdly, and most important, the youth of our country have a feeling of frustration, of not being wanted. This feeling gives rise to a rebellion within them, so that they are truly rebels without causes. They experience a feeling of not being wanted in the home, in the school group or in the community. They struggle for recognition and desire to be recognized in some form or another.

As a resident of this town, New York, I have looked about and seen a breakdown in respect for authority. The young boy is a mimic and just as we see God in our own image—just as the Negro sees God as a Negro and the mouse visualizes God as a bat, so do the young men adore the apparently prosperous and influential people around him. When a young boy sees a racketeer sporting around in a flashy car, with a quick buck for spending in a local bar or bistro, he is overwhelmed with admiration and perhaps seeks to emulate that character. The bookmaker on the corner or the policy runner who is always ready with a roll has his influence on the kid playing ball in the street. The young boy who sees the cop get his payoff from the bookmaker or policy runner thinks that all cops are crooked and dishonest and that if he should get into trouble he too could pay and get off unscathed. He is in for a rude awakening when he finds that cops are inherently honest and will arrest and prosecute crimes of violence, larceny and homicide. The young man who is fortunate enough to live on the same block as does a baseball or other athletic star is living in the proper climate. He seeks to emulate or imitate that athlete. If fortunately the boy lives on the same street as a Perry Como or a Jerry Lewis or a similar great entertainer, he aspires to be one of them. Our economic ghettos and our trend toward communities where only the poor live and where there is not a variety of people, tends to eliminate the opportunity for helpful idolatry and hero worship. Few children admire lawyers because on the street lawyers may be considered shysters and not great men. We as lawyers must look inward to see whether or not we are carrying out our part of our destiny, that is, to be an inspiration to the young man on the street corner and on the street.

In my own opinion, I believe that our mass mediums are instrumental, more instrumental than I care to admit, in the provocation and spread of juvenile delinquency. A young man's mind is inflamed by newspaper stories of shootings, killings, and gang wars. If he does not get the idea from the street corner, he picks it up from the newspapers and television. Recently on television was publicized the making of "zip" guns, together with the method of making them. I, for one, never knew how to make a "zip" gun and learned the technique on TV. I am sure that thousands of boys also saw the same display. Newspapers inveigh against the horror magazines, but I believe that the yellow journalists and the tabloids have created more harm than they realize; as a result of their publicity; they unwittingly glorify the young hoodlum.

Our Constitution guarantees freedom of the press, but the press has failed to regulate its own publications. The press contributes in more ways than one toward the climate of juvenile delinquency and in many instances by its publicity destroys the residue of good within a boy and by its quixotic attacks at windmills prevent public officials at times from doing what is right for fear of being pilloried and destroyed.

PREVENTION

The problem today is, what are we going to do to prevent juvenile delinquency? My solution is to restore respect for authority and to instill in the youth of our country a feeling of belonging, with a desire to do good.

We must restore the responsibility to the persons and the places where it can do the most good and where by nature and circumstances the most can be accomplished. We must restore responsibility to the parents. This is a primary responsibility. You are all aware that where the parents pay attention to their children and where they are at home sharing in common pleasures, there is less apt to be outbreaks of delinquency. Because of broken homes, children are thrown into the streets, torn between conflicting interests.

As a result of the hearings held by the New York State Temporary Commission on Youth and Delinquency, I introduced a bill which became the law of the State of New York and which unfortunately our social minded judges are not inclined to enforce. This bill provided that when a young man got into trouble, a judge of the domestic relations court could call the parents in and impose conditions upon the parents, which were reasonably calculated to prevent the recurrence of juvenile delinquency. Where the parents willfully disobeyed the conditions imposed by the court, the court could impose a fine or sentence on the parent. Forewarned is being forearmed and while a parent may have an excuse because he did not know where his children were, once he has been apprised he must assume that duty of controlling that which his own acts created.

That solution, of course, is not a cure-all. We also must restore teacher responsibility. The teaching profession has been struggling for decent wages and for better educational plants. Our public schools are overcrowded. Teachers fear the disciplining of children because they fear they will lose their jobs, which means their bread and butter. I for one would strengthen the hands of the teachers by permitting them to exercise discipline, to use the rod where the occasion permitted it and to grant immunity to the teachers for their disciplinary action. Boys who know that teachers may utilize the rod are less likely to challenge their authority. Parents are to blame because they fail to support a teacher who stands in loco parentis when the teacher and child come into conflict. I would require parents to give permission to teachers to practice discipline in accordance with their judgment. Where the parent refuses to give such consent, I would authorize the teachers to expell the children or call the parents to book because of the child's lack of respect, intransigence or belligerence. Some people may say that schools are overcrowded and that teachers cannot cope with overcrowded classes. That is a lame excuse. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the parochial schools. They too are overcrowded but in the main there is no disciplinary problem in these schools. Children in parochial schools are encouraged to participate in school plays, choral groups, games and speeches. The parents are also called upon, ad nauseam, to share the children's activities and to view the results of their children's histrionic talents. The enforced attendance by parents at these functions creates both interest and a common endeavor which promotes understanding, affection, love and respect one for the other. The public schools can well profit from this example. However, people are afraid to talk about parochial schools and their methods because of the fear that one is recommending a union of church and state.

A young man's leisure hours are a source of temptation and a climate in which he can get into trouble. They are supplementary to the home and to the school. Keep a boy busy in sports and activities and you will normally keep him out of trouble. He should be encouraged to participate in school and also out of school in baseball, basketball, chess, and other activities. I cannot pay too much tribute to organizations such as the Boys Club, who fill in the hours for young men to provide stimulation and joint activity, who give the young men a feeling of belonging and recognize an achievement regardless of its importance. The Big Brother movement is a tremendous lift in our area. The Boy Scouts of America do a yeoman job and give the boys an opportunity to participate and also to receive vacations in the country, away from the sultry heat of the city streets.

Our parks give needed recreational facilities but for the poor boy they are too far away and not accessible. The playgrounds in the housing communities afford better opportunity and better avenues of release of energies. We have very few tennis courts and our playgrounds in the county of New York are not easily accessible to the teenager. In the rural sections, I have seen with pleasure the efficacy of the 4-H Clubs which provide for a development of skills and ready outlets for the young man's energy. The Police Athletic League renders a great deal of service and affords various outlets to the young boys. Of course all these activities cater to the great bulk of our youth, the 98 percent. Our job is to take care of the other one-half of 1 to 2 percent of the boys who are juvenile delinquents. The police department can be of great assistance and can make or break a young man with its understanding. Wholesale arrests and roundups by scary police officers, who lock up groups of boys who are overly active but not criminals, do not

help the situation. Police officers, before coming into the force, should receive courses on psychology. More foot patrolmen would be of great assistance because the greatest deterrent either to crime or juvenile delinquency is the presence of a bluecoat walking up and down the street making himself part of the community life.

The courts can be of great assistance. I think everything should be done to prevent that first arrest, and judges, many of them who have understanding, will dismiss cases so that there shall be no arrest but only a scolding. Lawyers can also prevent crime by talking to these juvenile delinquents as "dutch uncles." While they think their job is to "beat the rap," I think we as lawyers have a duty to ourselves and to the children to moralize with them and to encourage them to stay out of future mischief.

Government can provide an expanded housing program for low-income people which provides decent accommodations. While a poor home is not a certain source of juvenile delinquency, decent housing accommodations do not embitter children of their surroundings and we can at least provide these with modern utilities and decent sanitary conditions.

The Federal Government, the State and the city can also assist. The Federal Government can give grants-in-aid to support programs which are designed to encourage the development and growth of children. The Division of Juvenile Delinquency in the Federal Government is understaffed and undermanned and while it performs a valuable function, it can be expanded. The State of New York, as a result of a bill which I introduced, has created a permanent State youth commission, under the chairmanship of Mark McClosky. It is the function of the State youth commission to coordinate State governmental programs, to work with the local communities in promoting and expanding recreational centers, programs, and to provide the funds for local groups which are working in this common struggle to prevent and eliminate juvenile delinquency. The city of New York, by opening the school playgrounds after school, has been doing a great job not only through its educational system but also through its police department. There are many other methods of preventing it, but each one of us has the responsibility to set an example by being models of virtue and still comport ourselves as human beings.

REHABILITATION

We talk a great deal about rehabilitating the juvenile delinquent and the youthful offender, but we do very little about it actually. The famous Gluecks made a survey and found out that within 5 years 85 percent of the children who were guilty of delinquency repeated and transgressed once again. This is a horrible indictment of our system. We little realize that when a boy gets into trouble he is actually condemned to menial employment and to second-rate citizenship. Every agency of government interposes its strength to keep this child from becoming a useful citizen and losing himself in the anonymity of everyday life. A boy, after making a mistake, receives the blessing of our youthful offender law, gets a break and, being released, resolves to walk the straight and narrow path. He applies for a job—civil service closes its doors to him. He cannot become a police officer because the police department under the leadership of its police commissioner not only refuses appointments to boys who have made one mistake but also extends the principle of refusing appointment to a boy whose father has been a convict. The boy cannot even get a job cleaning the streets because civil service will not approve or certify him as qualified. He cannot get a liquor license because the ABC and the State liquor board will refuse him a license. He cannot even become a barber because that requires a license. If his crime has been a serious one, the docks and waterfront are closed to him. The State civil service also closes its doors. He can't get a Government clerical job—the Post Office Department will not even let him carry letters. The electricians and plumbers deny him, as a license is required. If he wants to drive a truck, he needs a driver's license and perhaps he cannot even get a driver's license. Even if he wants to be a grocer, he finds himself handicapped, because he might need a beer license and can't get it. Where is he to turn? He can only hold jobs which are menial and which pay little. The road back is difficult. Not only are obstacles put in front of him by the State and Federal Governments, but now the New York City Housing Authority has adopted a program to evict the families of boys who have gotten into trouble. One hundred and seventy families have been evicted and many others are threatened with eviction.

During my senatorial career in the New York State Senate I made a recommendation and introduced a bill which redefined the term "arrest." A person who has been adjudicated a juvenile delinquent or youthful offender should not be considered as a person having been arrested. In this way, a boy would be able to say truthfully, as on a civil service questionnaire, that he has never been arrested. We public officials will not take the responsibility to give a juvenile delinquent or youthful offender a chance to gain public employment. We act this way because we know that if the boy transgresses once again a newspaper will call for the removal of this public official. It requires courage for a public official to give such a boy an opportunity in public employment and there are very few with such courage. Despite these obstacles some boys rehabilitate themselves. I salute them.

Members of the Boys Club, it has been a privilege and a pleasure for me to talk with you and if I have been too long please believe that I feel like Mark Twain who was called upon to speak, and after making a long speech, said: "Please forgive the length of my speech, I didn't have time to prepare a short one."

Religious Imperatives and the Foreign Aid Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein views of some of the key leaders of major religious faiths which appeared in a publication of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order entitled, "Religious Imperatives and the Foreign Aid Issue."

RELIGIOUS IMPERATIVES AND THE FOREIGN AID ISSUE

VIEWS OF SOME KEY LEADERS OF MAJOR RELIGIOUS FAITHS

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, national director, Society for the Propagation of the Faith:

"Our moral duty to aid the underprivileged arises from the fact that we have superfluities and the superfluities of the rich are the necessities of the poor. It was a pagan, Terence, who said: 'Charity begins at home.' It was Christ, the Son of God, who in the parable of the good Samaritan said that charity begins away from home with people who are not of our race or country.

"In aiding underprivileged countries we are not to think of ourselves as superior because we are economically wealthier; or that those who are aided are inferior because economically poorer. * * * We need to justify our wealth by sharing it; we need to thank God for making us the most prosperous Nation on the earth; we need the blessing of heaven on our hearts and the grace of God on our whole being. Therefore with humility and not with pride and superiority we extend our hands to the needy. Theirs is the burden of being underprivileged; ours is the burden of being overprivileged. It is their stomachs that are empty; it could be our hearts that are empty. In any case, they could conceivably do without our aid, but we cannot continue to be without justice and charity.

"The foreign aid of the United States must introduce some factor besides the economic, political, and military, one which is the strongest in our national traditions and one which the Soviets not only lack but repudiate. They have one fear in our dealing with the rest of the world, that we will take cognizance of that defect which makes them suspect by all the peoples of Asia and Africa, and that is our belief in God, the dignity of the human person, the freedom of conscience, and the principle that the state exists for man, not man for the state. When we go along with the Communist line that matter alone matters, we are weak and they are strong, when we give economic aid on the basis that matter alone does not matter, they are powerless and we are strong.

"This is the crux of the question of foreign aid."

Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, president, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America: "All of us, as members of the one body of mankind, are entering upon a completely new era of history—the nuclear space age. We welcome the coming of this age. It is more exciting than the age of Columbus and Magellan. We should look upon it as a part of the ongoing purpose of the eternal God, moving toward a goal that is bigger than any political, ecclesiastical, or nationalistic interest. In the presence of this completely new development in history we can no longer think in terms of 1 nation or 1 continent alone. We must think in terms of the universal and the ultimate. For we are now not only 1 Nation under God, but 1 world under God. This is true whether or not we believe it.

"One of the greatest weapons of the spirit that we could possibly use is certainly that of mutual aid and economic assistance—the kind of aid that will make substantial investments both of public and private money in underdeveloped areas, thereby helping the impoverished nations and at the same time increasing the level of trade, commerce, and industry of our own country. * * * Many people in America have the idea that we are engaged in a vast giveaway program in the field of foreign aid. Actually, it is a very tiny proportion of our mutual-security program.

"A program of mutual aid should not be considered primarily as a weapon or a tool in our fight against communism. It should be based upon an interest in people as people, human beings who are in partnership with us as children of God, and deserving of the same blessings that we enjoy. At the same time it is only fair to recognize that such a program will powerfully counteract the Communist thrust.

"We are now in an international storm of revolution, nationalism, and the unknown dangers of the nuclear space age. I dare to believe that if the major political parties will rise above party alignments and provide for the basic needs of our own people and

the world's people, they will receive the increasing support of the Nation. May God with the help of His love and grace help America to rise up in the true greatness of its people and fulfill its mission to the world."

Rabbi Theodore L. Adams, president, the Synagogue Council of America: "We have come here because what is at stake is an overriding moral issue affecting the brotherhood of man and essential spiritual values in face of an unprecedented onslaught of materialist atheism.

"It seems to me that the necessity for this conference reflects a failure on the part of the American people, a failure to act in consonance with its highest ideals.

"What are these ideals?

"They are, first the ideals of our biblical faith; and, second, the ideals which inspire America's democratic traditions. These ideals which are shared by the majority of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, have as their central affirmations that God is the Lord of history, the creator, sustainer, and redeemer of all mankind, the judge of all men and nations. To Him is due the supreme loyalty, and not to the State, political party, or ruler.

"We know full well that the changeless values of our religious faith, the democratic institutions of our Nation, and the providential abundance of this good earth, have produced all that is good in us. These ideals and material legacies impose upon us, both as a Nation and as individuals, a moral responsibility to transmit to others, and to future generations, our democratic faith as well as our material wealth.

"As religionists, we feel profoundly that the utilitarian motive of benevolence is not worthy of the United States. The moral character and destiny of America compel the higher motives of compassion, of brotherhood, or respect for human personality.

"If this program fails, it will be the failure not only of the United States Government, but of the pattern of America's moral approach in the eyes of the world. It will not fail because the American people have never left unanswered the challenge of morality."

Reverend Demetrios Kalaris and Rev. John Tavlarides, Eastern Orthodox Church, Washington, D. C., in a joint statement: "We Eastern Orthodox clergymen firmly believe that, in the interest of man's welfare and the manifestation of our Christian charity, special support should be given the policies of foreign aid of the United States. We believe that it is in the spirit of brotherhood under God that our country has provided for the needs of people throughout the world and not as some would have us believe, primarily because of selfish motivation or expediency."

Reverend James L. Vizzard S. J., vice president, National Catholic Rural Life Conference: "All people of informed Christian conscience recognize in the mutual-security program our Nation's answer to a religious and moral imperative. If we dedicate ourselves to a program for shared abundance, we may never again be called upon to dedicate our lives and our wealth to a program of shared disaster. We believe that here the United States has the opportunity and the privilege to give moral leadership to the world as it has provided political and military leadership."

Opening invocation by Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry, Chairman of FRASCO, at White House Conference on Foreign Aspects of United States National Security, February 25, 1958: "Eternal God by whose holy inspiration and almighty power our fathers won their liberties of old, we their children and Thine ask in this day of testing that we may be renewed in our love of freedom and in the will to sacrifice for it.

"We ask, O God, that the people of America may be ready to hear, above the noise of selfish clamor, the still small voice of God within, the voice which speaks to us of the things that pertain to peace, justice, and charity.

"Especially, our Father in heaven, we the members of this White House Conference on Mutual Security bow in reverence before Thy great name and implore Thy grace and blessing on our efforts to think what is true and do what is right. May a fire be kindled here which shall spread to many hearts in this land of the free, enabling Americans of every calling to see the vision without which, O God, we perish and Thy world perishes.

"For Thine own name's sake. Amen."

The Honorable BROOKS HAYS, United States Congressman from Arkansas (also president, Southern Baptist Convention): "Will the ideas and method of communism win out in this global struggle or will the ethical and religious way of life we have inherited from our fathers prove victorious? I have no doubts about the outcome, but we must be vigilant on many fronts. Mutual security and sane economic assistance to underdeveloped nations are practical ways in which our great country works from year to year to build a world that is more just and compassionate. It is one way to help lay the foundations for a better life on this earth which God has committed to our keeping."

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister, Washington Hebrew Congregation: "The heart of our western heritage of faith is the love of a righteous and merciful God and the love of man, because all men are the children of God. This love must express itself in acts of loving kindness, in aiding our fellow men so that they can solve the problems of poverty and disease, of slavery and tyranny. Foreign aid is not only good religion but enlightened self-interest, for the men we help will become allies in the building of a just world."

Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, minister, Marble Collegiate Church, New York City: "For the United States to discontinue or cripple its mutual security program would please the Communists more than any one thing I can think of. Wherever I have traveled, I have found that thoughtful nationals feel American aid constitutes a serious and sincere effort to help them undergird free institutions."

Mr. Harry W. Flannery, president, Catholic Association for International Peace: "It is my humble opinion that if the full significance of foreign aid could be brought home to the American people, they would be ashamed to realize how little of our national wealth is being devoted to its cause. We have been letting the people in underdeveloped countries believe that our interest in them is derived only from our struggle with the Soviet Union. We should give aid primarily, in accordance with our traditions, in the spirit of justice, and because we have a moral responsibility to do so."

Dr. Paul S. Rees, minister, the Covenant Church, Minneapolis, Minn.; past president, National Association of Evangelicals: "My observations abroad convince me that the discontinuance of foreign aid would be a disservice alike to our own country and to the Free World. Weakness in administration should be corrected but no countenance should be given to any proposal for doing away with this arm of helpfulness in a world of need."

Bishop Arthur J. Moore, Atlanta area, the Methodist Church: "Let us not be mistaken, if atheistic communism prevails in the world, it will more deeply wound the human family and damage human society than any merely economic or political system, however bad, could possibly do. By the mutual security program of the United States Government as well as by a powerful revival of the spiritual values underlying our civilization, we can restore hope to the millions of earth and counter unrest and the fear of war with the assurance of peace."

The Right Rev. Angus Dun, Episcopal Bishop, Washington: "I think it is true that you can hardly expect a nation in its corporate political capacity to go beyond enlightened, informed self-interest, but I believe self-interest that is never guided by anything but self-interest will fall short of self-interest. That is, unless it is illuminated by a light coming from beyond the general level of ordinary decencies, it will fall short of the highest interests.

"That is, unless we are helped to look out in sensitivity and pity and generosity toward the desperate needs of multitudes of our fellows, we shall not even achieve the level of our own interests, because it is to our interest that these people trust us, that they respect us, that they turn toward the vaguely understood system of life which has done so much, as we were reminded here, along with very favorable circumstances, certainly, to give us the good inheritance and the position we have."

Dr. A. Powell Davies, deceased, formerly minister, All Souls Church, Unitarian, Washington, D. C.: "There are some people who still trot out the trite canard that loving our neighbor means what we do in direct relationship with him and that we cannot love him through acts of Congress. This is just a tired platitude. In the modern world we cannot even do our ordinary duty to our neighbor except through acts of Congress. This is true within our own country, as we have begun to recognize, and it is also true of our duty to the world."

Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, minister, Christ Church, Methodist, New York City: "The time is at hand for the recognition of the interdependence of all nations. This is an age when the incomparable spirit and achievements of America must be applied to the task of creating the economic, social, and political conditions of a genuine world peace, resting on freedom and justice."

Fourteen chaplains and ministers of all faiths to the university students and community at Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., in a joint statement: "We are sure, since there is an eternal right concerned with human values, that to ignore the aspirations of people for political freedom, the feeding of hungry men, women, and children, and assistance programs that raise the living standards of people is perilous and will be nationally self-defeating, however many missile bases we erect around Russia or sputniks are put into outer space."

Trial by Jury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by our colleague, the Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS, of Louisiana, to the Louisiana State Bar Association meeting at Alexandria, La., in November 1957, on the subject of Trial by Jury. Representative WILLIS is a member of the Judiciary Committee and one of the most able and learned lawyers in the House of Representatives. His address deals with a subject that is fundamental, and the subject and the address should be of concern to every Member of the Congress, as well as to the people of the country generally.

I concur wholeheartedly with the views so ably expressed by Representative WILLIS. The jury trial is one of our most cherished and privileged possessions, and it is imperative that it be held sacred. I regret to have to say that there are a number of organizations in the country which have little or no regard for the principles of liberty upon which this country is based. I agree with Mr. WILLIS that in all criminal prosecutions a man has an indubitable, inalienable, and indefeasible right to be confronted with his accusers and witnesses, to call for evidence in his behalf, and to a speedy trial by an impartial jury of his vicinage, without whose unanimous consent he cannot be found guilty.

The address of Mr. WILLIS is as follows:

TRIAL BY JURY

(By EDWIN E. WILLIS)

The origin of trial by jury is disputed by historians. It is evident, however, that the principle of trial by jury emanated from the sense of justice and fair play of our ancestors. This is clear when one studies the forms of trials that existed among all nations in primitive times.

As far back as the ancient days of the Greek and Roman emperors we can discern modes for the settlement of disputes which resemble our concept of modern juries. The Roman tribunal was somewhat similar to the modern jury but they employed men possessed of legal knowledge in place of a formal judge. The Romans also had a procedure comparable to our present system for challenging jurors.

The old custom of the Roman emperor in summoning before him persons who lived in the neighborhood to declare under oath their knowledge with respect to facts of public interest was indeed the germ of the modern trial by jury.

RIGHT OF EXAMINATION

In the early Middle Ages this Roman procedure was employed on ecclesiastical questions by Frankish bishops and by Charlemaine and the other Frankish kings in connection with civil issues. Some centuries later we find virtually the same custom in the inquisition processes employed by the Norman dukes.

I digress to point out another right which not only implements the jury system, but without which jury trial would be completely ineffective. I refer to the right of an accused to confront and cross-examine his accusers. We have it on highest authority that this particular right was derived directly from the Romans. Except for it, one of the most courageous and profound of all the early Christians would have been doomed to die on the cross, as did the Master before him.

At the second trial of St. Paul before Festus, the so-called witnesses did not testify. Instead Tertullus, the orator, made this argument:

"We have found this man to be a pest, a promoter of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sedition of the Nazarene sect."

Paul said, "I am standing at the tribunal of Caesar; there I ought to be tried. To the Jews I have done no wrong, as thou thyself very well knowest. For if I have done any wrong or committed a crime deserving of death, I do not refuse to die. But if there is no ground to their charges against me, no one can give me up to them; I appeal to Caesar."

Then Festus, the Roman governor, made this ruling:

"Thou hast appealed to Caesar; to Caesar thou shalt go * * * Romans are not accustomed to give any man up before the accused has met his accusers face to face and has been given a chance to defend himself against the charges."

But, regardless of the true origin of trial by jury, there is no dispute that the system, as we know it today in America, was derived from England.

During the reign of Alfred the Great, from 871 to 901 A. D., we can find semblance of settlement of disputes by juries. But the common-law system of trial by jury developed from the 10th to the 16th centuries. William the Conqueror employed the jury system, as it existed in 1085, in compiling the Doomsday Book.

In the early days trial by jury was not a matter of right, but merely a privilege, to be granted or withheld as a favor of the King. Henry II did encourage jury trials during his reign in the latter half of the 12th century. He also employed a jury for indicting those individuals who had violated the King's peace by the commission of serious crime.

During this period of development the function of the jury was not to render a verdict but to supply evidence on oath as witnesses do today. The ancient jury was very similar to our modern concept of the grand jury, to the extent that the evidence amounted to an indictment.

Until the 13th century, however, this indictment by the jury was followed by a trial by ordeal, battle or comporgation. It was dissatisfaction with such modes of trial, and the opposition of the church, which finally led to the acceptance of the opinion of a second jury, a deciding one. Here we see a resemblance of our petit jury.

MODERN SYSTEM

The abuses of King John resulted in changing the privilege of a trial by jury to a right. This ended the practice of selling and buying writs, which had flourished under him. The Magna Carta, granted at Runnymede in 1215, provided that no free man should be impoverished, dispossessed or in any way detained, except by the fair judgment of his peers and according to the law of the land. Here was the true beginning of our system of trial by jury, as a fundamental right.

The history of trial by jury during the Middle Ages is replete with incidents of abuse of, and hostility for, this system by kings and their ministers. They converted the process of attaint, which was originally devised to provide extra protection for the accused and to be a royal weapon against the corruption of justice, into an attack on the jury itself. Thus, if they considered a verdict by a jury unjust, they preferred charges against its members and tried them before the star-chamber court, which functioned without a jury. That court over the years became an instrument for religious and political persecution. That institution, with its denial of a jury trial, was one of the main causes for the downfall of Charles I and his ultimate beheading.

In 1641, when Parliament obtained the upper hand, one of its first acts was to abolish the star-chamber court and to assert the right of every Englishman to a fair and open judgment by his peers. It also abolished the right to punish jurors for verdicts considered to be unjust, and substituted therefor the remedy of a new trial. Actions of attaint were prohibited in 1670 in the famous Bushell case when a judge attempted to imprison a whole jury for a verdict with which he disagreed.

There were other instances of intimidation of juries during these years. The actions of bloody Judge Jeffries were notorious. However, public acceptance and confidence in the verdicts of juries overcame all such attacks. Able and courageous leaders of the English bar, such as Erskine, Coke, Bacon, Burke, and Fox, led the fight to preserve the sanctity of jury verdicts.

During and after the French Revolution, fear of revolutionary elements led to repressive censorship and limitations of civil liberties in England. In 1793 habeas corpus in certain cases was suspended. Fox led the movement which resulted in repealing the suspension.

POWERS EXTENDED

In 1792, Fox had also been responsible for a new libel law which extended the power of juries to decide the whole case, both as to the law and the fact. Here, indeed, was a victory for democracy and trial by jury. And since the beginning of the 19th century, there has been very little threat to the right of trial by jury in criminal cases in England.

The old adage that distance lends enchantment did not apply among the American colonists in their relationship with the English Crown. Although the same conditions on the whole prevailed in colonial America as in 18th century England, with respect to the administration of justice and trial by jury, the attitude of the colonists was from the beginning different. Being in no position to fear feudal exactions of exploitations, the colonists looked upon the King not as their protector but rather as the potential aggressor upon their rights. In this spirit they protested every effort to curtail trial by jury as an act of tyranny.

Thus the English Parliament passed the famous Navigation Acts and in 1696 reorganized the admiralty courts so as to better cope with flagrant smuggling in and out of the Colonies. These admiralty courts, however, were not part of the traditional common law system and did not provide for a trial by jury. As a result, English or English-appointed judges frequently sentenced American seamen and merchants arbitrarily. The more effective these courts became, the more the colonists resented them, and the more they came to insist upon trial by jury as a fundamental right.

The Stamp Act of 1764, offensive enough in its imposition of taxation without representation, added insult to injury by providing that all violators were to be tried in the admiralty courts where trial by jury is not provided. The Americans did not accept the British view that Parliament was completely sovereign, and could constitutionally pass any measure it chose. In their eyes, the Stamp Act was, among other things, a clear effort to bypass and thus to deprive them of the right to trial by jury. The reaction against it was so strong that it prompted the Colonies to pass acts of nullification. The Virginia resolution, introduced by Patrick Henry, the Stamp Act Congress, and, above all, the boycott of all English merchandise, forced the repeal of the Stamp Act.

This effort on the part of the English Parliament to bypass jury trial was to be repeated by the American Congress almost 200 years later in connection with so-called civil rights legislation, except that equity instead of admiralty courts were to be the instrument.

The final British effort to tamper with the traditional trial by jury in the Colonies came with the misnamed act for the impartial administration of justice. This was one of the intolerable acts passed in 1744 as a retaliatory measure for the Boston Tea Party. This act provided that certain offenders were to be transported to England for trial there. This repudiation of the colonists' own right to judge their fellow citizens was one of the last acts which made reconciliation with England impossible, and thus provoked the war for American independence.

RIGHT PRESERVED

It was in the light of this background that the Founding Fathers were determined to preserve and perpetuate the jury system when our Constitution was adopted.

It is illuminating to note, however, that there was no real controversy in respect to trial by jury in criminal cases. In fact, jury trial in criminal cases was provided for in section 2 of article 3 of the original Constitution. The seventh provision of the Bill of Rights refers to trial by jury in civil cases. Here the colonists were erecting a barrier against extension of any power, even in civil cases, comparable to that which had been vested in and exercised by the admiralty courts during the domination of England.

Jefferson was in Paris at the time of the adoption of the original Constitution. During the time of the great debates on the proposition to ratify the original instrument in the conventions of the several States, Jefferson wrote from Paris to a friend:

"There are instruments for administering the government so clearly trustworthy that we should never leave the legislature at liberty to change them. The new Constitution has secured these in the executive and legislative departments, but not in the judiciary. It should have established trials by the people themselves, that is to say, by jury."

Accordingly, our forefathers imbedded jury trials even in civil cases as part of the Bill of Rights. And the constitutional guarantee of the right to jury trial has withstood the most severe stresses and strains in our turbulent history.

Thus, the fear of the panic created by the French Revolution hit America with such force that it prompted the passage of the alien and sedition laws dealing with treason, and curtailing the right to criticize our Government. But devotion to the principle of trial by jury was so deeply imbedded in the minds of our ancestors that no one had the temerity to suggest the elimination of trial by jury under these laws.

SYSTEM NEVER SUSPENDED

In fact, in our entire history, when the greatest of threats have been leveled at the very existence of our Government itself, trial by jury has never been suspended; not even in wartime. It was preserved during the trying days of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the War Between the States, and through two World Wars.

It is this deep-rooted belief in trial by jury that is responsible for the law and jurisprudence to the effect that citizens cannot be tried by the military courts in this country.

There is one exception, however, to this history of trial by jury in America, and that is during the reconstruction era. It was the most flagrant example in our history of a peacetime suspension of the right of trial by jury. It was accomplished by the establishment of military governments in areas where fighting had ended. But the excesses of the military governors and of the carpetbaggers and scalawags who surrounded them aroused public hostility. This deliberate repudiation of all the philosophy upon which the Constitution was conceived caused the reconstruction acts to be condemned by all men of good will.

EROSION OF RIGHTS

Despite the provisions of the Bill of Rights, however, trial by jury has been gradually eliminated in civil proceedings before so-called administrative bodies and tribunals. The Honorable David F. Maxwell, former president of the American Bar Association, had this to say on the subject:

"For some time I have been deeply concerned by the insidious process which has been gradually eroding our right to trial by jury in civil cases. The right of trial by jury is firmly imbedded in the American system of jurisprudence and is as old as the country itself. Reference to it is found in the Declaration of Independence, which deplores the abuses and usurpation by George III 'depriving us in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury.' Article VII of the Bill of Rights guarantees trial by jury 'in suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20.'

"Yet, during the past half century, bit by bit, there has been a whittling away of jury jurisdiction. Arbitration has replaced the jury trial in many areas, notably in the motion picture, building trades and textile industries, and generally in the field of labor law.

"Various administrative bodies and tribunals, both on a Federal and State level, are determining the rights of citizens in a manner affecting their everyday lives, without the benefit of juries. In Saskatchewan, Canada, such a board is vested with authority to award damages in automobile accident cases on the basis of liability without fault, and there are many authorities in this country advocating the adoption of a similar system here. The Compulsory Arbitration Act in Pennsylvania, adopted in 1952, provides that the trial court may, by appropriate rule, substitute arbitration for trial by jury when the amount in controversy is $1,000 or less, and the constitutionality of the act has been upheld by the supreme court of that State."

As one of those who firmly believes in trial by jury, I, too, was concerned about recent attempts to limit and circumscribe this constitutional right of our people.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACTION

Thus, we heard and learned a great deal about the precious right of trial by jury during the debates on so-called civil-rights legislation in the Congress last year. A discussion of civil rights is, of course, beyond the scope of this assignment, but I mention our experience because it provided a new meaning to jury trials as a fundamental right.

The question was not whether, after trial of an injunction suit on its merits, a person charged with contempt of court for violating the injunction decree is entitled to be tried by jury. And no amout of specious argument by the proponents of the bill could make it so. The proposition was whether we should substitute an initial civil remedy for a present criminal prosecution as was accomplished through the admiralty courts during colonial days.

Thus, for the last 70 years or more a person charged with depriving another of any conceivable civil right, including his right to vote, can be prosecuted and tried, but only before a jury of his peers. Forsaking principle for expediency, Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General of the United States, took the position, however, that the jury system is no longer to be trusted in so-called civil rights cases.

NEW REMEDY CREATED

Accordingly, a new remedy was created. But, mind you, the new cause of action is not granted to the persons aggrieved. It is to be exercised exclusively by the Attorney General. The class injunction suit is to be filed in the name of the United States against the people of a whole community and the action can be brought without the consent and even over the protest of the real parties at interest, a reprehensible practice for which a lawyer could be disbarred.

Stated differently, the real issue was whether Congress could, as a matter of good constitutional law, or should, as a matter of cynical Congressional policy, pervert equity courts as criminal tribunals.

We did succeed in providing a jury trial in certain criminal contempt proceedings which can result in imprisonment. From my point of view, the jury trial provision is far from satisfactory, but it was the best we could imbed in the so-called civil rights bill. In any event, if this limited provision can serve as a challenge to succeeding Congresses and to the members of the bar to continue the fight against further erosion of jury trial as a fundamental right, I think our efforts will not have been in vain.

Address of Hon. T. A. Thompson, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1958

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, Congressman T. A. THOMPSON of Louisiana and I have been working closely together for the sweetpotato growers of our State. Congressman THOMPSON was honored recently by being invited to address the annual Sweet Potato Association meeting which was held in St. Francisville, La. The speech made by Congressman THOMPSON seemed most timely and this speech, followed by his efforts in Washington for the sweetpotato farmers, is further evidence of his interest in developing a better economy for our small farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the text of his speech to the membership of the House.

The address follows:

Being here with you today is a disinct honor and pleasure. I do have the distinction, however, of being the person at this meeting who knows probably less about sweet potatoes than anyone here. I do know of the many problems facing the industry—I know of the problems of the past, too, and I know of the inspired manner in which you, the farmers, the processors and the marketers, have faced up to these problems and we have all seen the results of your efforts. Your work has done more to keep the small farmers in business in our areas than any other one thing I can think of.

Back when you first began the development of the Louisiana sweetpotato program, you had no way of knowing that a badly managed cotton program would allow the traditional cotton farmers of the South to lose thousands of acres of their plantings to Western States. You had no way of knowing that Mr. Benson would allow the traditional rice farmers of our State to be placed in jeopardy by continuing price supports and not controlling acreages, thereby allowing those who had lost cotton acres in other States to immediately go into rice. Yet, the organization you started has been a dramatic thing.

I was with State government for 18 years prior to being sent to Washington and my duties then took me into every department of our State. I took particular interest then in the department of agriculture. I well remember the great work done by the late great commissioner of agriculture, the Honorable W. E. Anderson, and at that time his State entomologist, Sid McGrory, who did such a great job and later filled the high position of commissioner. His interest in our farmers was evidenced then, as it is today by his presence here.

You were beset then by just about everything that could have caused the program to be abandoned—sweet potato weevil—government quarantines, lack of sufficient funds for research and development—lack of

industry regulations—and lack of enlightened marketing.

How well do I remember the battles we had to secure funds for the sweet potato weevil programs. I was handling State budgets then, so I know. And, finally, through understanding legislatures, we were spending more in Louisiana on the program than all of the other potato-growing States combined.

Our research program was augmented and soon, through the inspired work of Dr. Julian Miller, we were to have the finest product of any State. I have learned that only recently the cause of cork has been ascertained and will soon be a problem of the past.

The one thing that stands out in my thinking, however, is the fact that producers themselves have paid their own way toward the accomplishment of marketing, advertisement, and self-regulation. The fact that no potato from Louisiana is marketed unless it meets rigid standards of your own making is something to be proud of. Has this been impressive to the consumer? Considering that Louisiana yams represent 40 percent of the Nation's consumption, how can you conclude otherwise?

I have always had great confidence in a good public relations program. I believe that 90 percent of the failures in business is due to the lack of good public relations—considering, of course, that the operators are otherwise qualified. You have done a tremendous job of letting the public know of our yams, both by advertising and by the annual excursions where Louisianians and our beautiful yam queens have received acclaim. And I want to thank the association—and especially my good friend, Joe Arceneaux—for making it possible for me to bring our yam to the attention of the folks in Washington.

From the letters I received I know that others were impressed. You should have seen Washington's most eligible bachelor, when, as an accommodation to him, I named a "Miss Yam for a Day in Washington." I think he was more impressed with the beauty of Miss Fran Anderson than by the yam mask she wore, because he didn't kiss her at all until we removed the mask.

Vice President NIXON was no less gracious. It's amazing how few closed doors there are to a pretty girl.

In addition to the 2 tons of yams given away that day, yams were served in every restaurant on Capitol Hill as a side dish even to hamburgers. I do hope the little excursion was worth the efforts you went to, to make it possible.

When I think of our National Government and its wide scope of activities, I'm reminded of the age-old story of "cabbages and kings." Our present-day Government has its finger in everything—so, perhaps, I could speak today of "Potatoes and Things."

Certainly, we in Louisiana, we of America, have made progress over the years in many fields. This progress has meant—by and large—a higher standard of living, better schools, better medical facilities, better everything. But, if we are not careful, if we lose our sense of values as to what makes America fundamentally a Nation of strong people, the entire development might become one of progress against happiness. We should never only look at the "across the board" benefits of progress. The average may be up, but it may be that because it is up some segment of our population is suffering. When average earnings are up, average costs go up. What about the small farmer—his costs go up just as high as do the costs for industrial workers, but his income has not kept pace. The small-business man is in the same boat.

In recent years I have heard it said by high Government officials that if a farmer is too small to keep pace, let him leave the farm—and many have been forced to leave. There were more bankruptcy proceedings last year than in any year since the 30's. From too many high places in our Government today we hear—big business, big farmers, economic units, big everything. They have even been closing down, or trying to close down, small post offices. What these people don't consider is, that the bigness of this Nation, the traditional success of our Government, is entirely due to a lot of little people. Little people who have maintained the faith of our Founding Fathers of a free life in the pursuit of happiness. All they want from government is enforcement of laws, protection in times of emergency, and a helping hand in times of distress.

High costs today are directly attributable to big subsidies to big business and international politics—much of it at the expense of those little people who can share only in these high costs.

America has been made great since the days of the minute men by their having common meeting places—places where news could be disseminated—where ideas could be disseminated—where ideas could be exchanged—communities where homes could plant roots and the development of inherent loyalty can be nurtured.

Take away the small post offices, such as Mr. Summerfield has been trying to do. Then you take away the common meeting place, you take away the bulletin board—and, in many instances, you take away the identity of the community. The train no longer stops. Neighbors no longer see each other daily. You no longer live in Turkey Creek, or Chicot, or Baines—you now are one of the residents of Highway 145 and must, unless you can drive 30 miles, catch the post office when it goes by. Some savings in money—yes—but what is the cost in the fundamental strength of America which stems from the small community system?

When small farmers are forced to leave the farm, how much do we lose? First, you lose the wholesome atmosphere of a healthy, happy family who lives there, not because of wealth to be attained, but because of a way of life. You lose those hardy, courageous, independent, thinking individuals from whence nearly all of our great leaders have sprung. You lose in money, too. Send the small farmer into town. He must reside where his resources will allow him to. He must accept the most menial jobs until he is trained—that is, if he is fortunate enough to get work at all. No more 4-H Club work for the children; no more chores to keep them occupied, so they may acquire a healthy outlook on life. The streets are their playground; idle minds and bodies create delinquency. The cost to you—check your welfare costs—one-tenth of the costs for welfare payments to a family of six in the city could maintain a happy and productive family on a small farm.

Where else do you lose? If one large farmer now handles crops formerly raised by 10 families—the crossroads store sells one pair of shoes where it formerly sold 10; small service stations, feed mills, in fact, the entire small country community shrinks to nothing—and, as often as not, the farm is now operated by absentee landlords so the profits made by the so-called "economic unit goes to a depository far away from the land from which it was wrenched.

Now, I do not mean that I am against a farm being an economic unit. Far from it—I have seen families reared on 40- to 50-acre farms—I have seen such small farm families send several children through college with little or no assistance from without. Our whole system of research and development and agriculture education has been founded for the purpose of developing means of gleaning more and more production from our lands, while at the same time conserving our soil's resources.

Our county agents have done banner jobs in their work with small farmers. Our home demonstration agents were not trained to visit mammoth farming operations, but have devoted their time and efforts to assisting the smaller families in becoming more and more self-sustaining—how to raise their standard of living without the expenditure of their cash money. These wonderful workers teach everything from furniture upholstering to the making of clothes, to canning, and many other things that would otherwise dip into the small earnings from cash crops.

Certainly those of us who set up these programs did not share, with Mr. Benson, the theory that small farmers must leave the farm. Let us help the small farmer to become self-sustaining and thereby be classed as an economic unit. You, as an association, are doing your share to bring this about.

I hope that your work will inspire others to follow suit. You know—experience is a great teacher—why do some people forget so easily? Do you remember when in the early days of the ERA and the CWA, how thousands of small farmers left the farms and moved into the cities and towns in order to be eligible for $12-a-week checks or grocery orders? Then, following this, the rural-rehabilitation program had to be started to get those thousands of small farmers and their families back to a stable life—I wonder how many millions were spent on that project. The Government thought it so important then for these people to return to the farm that they purchased, for cash, a mule, seed, tools, and, in some cases, bought the farm and farmhouse. We cannot allow this to happen again.

The strength of our community system, of our small farmers and our small business will determine our strength in the event of a national emergency. Anyone desiring a quiet existence did badly to be born in this 20th century, what with nuclear fission and fusion, space satellites, intercontinental missiles, and the growing cancer of Russian idealogy, we can see no peace even though we may avert outright war.

I have no doubt that our scientists are well qualified to continue to lead in scientific discovery and development. Certainly the Russians launched the first satellite—that was because our leaders failed to realize the value of such a project in world opinion or public relations. We really slipped, and Russia stole the ball—we have regained some world prestige by the launching of the Explorer.

Now we cannot relax. We must prove to the world our leadership, not by bragging of the destructive power of the H-bomb, but by convincing the people of the world that these discoveries can be used to benefit free peoples everywhere.

If confidence is to be built up in America, over the world, it will be by the positive approach in selling democracy—by feeding the hungry (our surplusses could be used for this), by assuring friends of support in times of danger. But not by reaching for the pocketbook each time we face a problem. You can't inspire the will for freedom and democracy by payments of cash.

Remember the Republican slogan of 6 years ago—"Trade Not Aid"—I wonder what has happened to that one. Mr. Dulles seems to think now that charity begins abroad—and after all the discussion of lobbies for our natural gas bill and the subsequent veto, our President has now hired the Nation's best, Mr. Eric Johnston, of Hollywood, to lobby the Americans into pressuring their Congressmen to vote for the giveaway.

Surely we should help our neighbors, but not to the extent that we bleed ourselves

white to do it. Not to build highways in Arabia while our people drown for the lack of levees; not to train farmers of foreign lands to grow rice when our farmers starve because of acreage reductions due to the loss of foreign markets.

President Eisenhower told us one day that if we should seek only to arm and create weapons for war and not protect and develop our own natural resources, that we would enter an age of peril. We are still waiting for the administration to place this piece of philosophy into effect. Only this week I saw for the first time the rivers and harbors and flood control bill treated as a partisan measure, with all the Republicans in the House voting against it.

So, you see when I mentioned "Cabbages and Kings" and "Potatoes and Things," I couldn't be far wrong in saying they are related. Certainly, we should worry about and work toward the friendship of King Saud, but not to the exclusion of help to our farmers. We should strive to keep the Suez Canal open to world traffic, but not to the extent of cost that precludes the dredging of the Calcasieu River where our own ships go aground.

You can no more force the people of Cambodia to accept a way of life to which they are not accustomed by the expenditure of funds than the Supreme Court can force its philosophy upon us of the South by the use of troops.

Every major problem can be broken down to small problems—if you solve the small ones, there will be no large ones to defeat you. That is true of our State and Nation. It is true of your efforts in the development of our sweet potato economy. Certainly, you will continue to have problems. I can only hope our Government can approach its problems with the same commonsense and perseverance as you have faced yours.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1958

Rev. William Byrd Lee, retired Episcopal minister, Richmond, Va., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, we humbly beseech Thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for their Senate in Congress assembled, that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, may be established among us for all generations. These and all necessaries for them, for us, and for all Thy people all over the world, we humbly beg in the name and mediation of Jesus Christ, our most blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 3, 1958, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 3, 1958,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on April 4, 1958, he signed the enrolled bill (S. 1386) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of power or train brakes, which had been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 4, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1386. An act to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of power or train brakes; and

S. 1740. An act to authorize the payment from the employees' life insurance fund of expenses incurred by the Civil Service Commission in making certain beneficial association assumption agreements and to extend the time for making such agreements.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

RESEARCH INTO PROBLEMS OF FLIGHT WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE EARTH'S ATMOSPHERE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the measure concerning outer space which was sent to Congress by the President.

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

The bill (S. 3609) to provide for research into problems of flight within and outside the earth's atmosphere, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the special Committee on Space and Astronautics.

VAN CLIBURN, OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have often expressed my belief that a free exchange of ideas and artistic talent between the United States and Russia is in the best interests of this country.

There is no stamp of nationality on artistic genius. The power of the artist transcends national boundaries.

We have had a clear demonstration of this truth during the past weekend. A young man from Kilgore, Tex., has won the great international piano competition in Moscow.

Van Cliburn's playing won the hearts of his Russian listeners. All the tensions of the cold war could not stop the power of his music.

Van Cliburn was raised in east Texas. His mother was his only teacher until 6 years ago. Now, in his hour of triumph, the people of Texas and of all America rejoice with him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks two stories, from the New York Times of April 12, and April 14 concerning Mr. Cliburn's performance; and a story, from the Baltimore Sun of April 14, announcing his victory in the competition.

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

[From the New York Times of April 12, 1958]

RUSSIANS CHEER UNITED STATES PIANIST, 23, FOR BRILLIANCE IN MOSCOW CONTEST

(By Max Frankel)

Moscow, April 11.—A boyish-looking, curly-haired young man from Kilgore, Tex., took musical Moscow by storm tonight.

Van Cliburn, a 23-year-old pianist, played in the finals of the International Tchaikovsky competition. He dazzled the audience with a display of technical skill that Russians have long considered their special forte. He added to it a majestic romantic style that his 1,500 listeners could not resist.

Mr. Cliburn had emerged from the first two rounds of the competition as the rage of the town. Nothing has been so scarce here in a long time as a ticket to his performance tonight.

Militiamen were ranged in front of the Tchaikovsky Conservatory to keep order among the enthusiastic crowds. Members of the well-dressed audience greeted each other as influential persons for having managed to get to the concert. Standees filled the aisles into deep balconies. The conservatory's office was telling hundreds of callers:

"Cliburn is playing tonight. Call back for tickets tomorrow."

When the young pianist finished his final piece, Rachmaninoff's Third Piano Concerto in D minor, he received a standing ovation. Even some of the jurors applauded. Shouts of "Bravo" rang out for 8½ minutes until the judges permitted a violation of the con-