

for one moment to think that changing military dimensions are the only ones that are important to national security. The last few years have seen tremendous changes in the dimensions of the economic competition between the nations of the free world and the Communist bloc. These years have not lessened either, the changing political and psychological pressures. To these changes we must be responsive. We must, in fact, continue to develop political, psychological, and economic programs of our own—pro-

grams which are as appealing as our military might is unassailable.

America's military might is for defense not aggression. The dimensions of your Military Establishment keep changing only to make it clear to any aggressor than an attack on us would be foolhardy.

America's defense will remain geared to reality—we will keep pace with technology. We will keep America's military strength superior to that of any nation which threatens us.

We will—that is, if we—and I mean all of us—take care to insure that the dimensions of our minds keep pace with the dimensions of our problems. Our mental dimensions represent our ability to understand the problems ahead and our determination, with God's grace, to conquer those problems.

Ladies, your forum represents citizenship at its best—informed citizens are the price-less ingredients of a democracy—our democracy in particular. I salute you and join you in your efforts to keep America strong.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 17, 1959

Rev. Thomas W. Sumners, rector, St. John the Divine Episcopal Church, Houston, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who has given us this good land for our heritage; we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that, through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness; and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail.

Guide and direct him who presides over the Senate, that he may rule with fairness and diligence. Inspire with Thy love and gratitude the leader of the majority party and him of the minority, that they, through gratitude to Thee for the revelation of Thy love, may lead Thy people in accordance with Thy holy will, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am proud and delighted to be present today. It was a pleasure to receive the inspiration and spiritual warmth which came from the devout prayer delivered by a great and good man of God, a devoted Texan, and a fine American. Dr. Sumners is a man dedicated in mind, in body, and in spirit to his church, to his State, and to his Nation; and I know of no finer thing that could be said of any man.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all Members of the Senate were moved by the deeply spiritual invocation and opening prayer given by the Reverend Thomas W. Sumners, of Houston, Tex. His brother, the Reverend Charles Sumners, serves the Episcopal Church in my home city of Austin, Tex.; it is the oldest church in that city.

These two brothers have great influence on the spiritual life, and thereby, on the broader aspects of living, including the educational life, of the State of Texas, and likewise on the modes of liv-

ing and the lives of many persons who occupy commanding positions in the life of the State. It has been a great privilege to me to be in the Chamber to hear the prayer of Dr. Sumners today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 14, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

To the Congress of the United States:

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

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 15, 1959.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the Eighth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 17, 1959.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING THE MAKING OF LOANS BY RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—RESOLUTION

Through inadvertence, the following resolution (S. Res. 21) expressing the sense of the Senate concerning the making of loans by the Rural Electrification Administration, submitted by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators) was omitted from the RECORD of January 14, 1959:

Whereas the Comptroller General of the United States in decisions (B-134138) dated July 21, 1958, and October 15, 1958, in questioning the validity of a portion of a loan made by the Rural Electrification Administration to the Central Iowa Power Cooperative, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, interpreted the Rural Electrification Act, in the first decision, as not authorizing loans for service to persons who are actually without central-station service if they are located in an area generally served by a power supplier; and, in the second decision, as not authorizing loans to serve persons, in fact without service, if they are located "on", "along side of", or "within a reasonable distance" of a line of a power supplier; and

Whereas the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, in a letter dated August 7, 1958, to the Comptroller General, requested reconsideration of the first decision because it was inconsistent with the express provisions of the Rural Electrification Act, its legislative history, congressional understanding, uniform administrative practice, and legal interpretations and opinions during the 22 years following enactment of the Rural Electrification Act and, by letter dated October 29, 1958, informed the Comptroller General that these objections were equally applicable to the interpretation of the Rural Electrification Act expressed in the second decision and could therefore not be agreed to; and

Whereas the interpretation of the Rural Electrification Act proposed by the Comptroller General in either of his decisions, if it had been applied to the rural electrification program from its inception, would have prevented that program's great contributions to agriculture and the rural areas of the Nation and to the national economy generally and, if now applied, would drastically curtail the future great potential of the rural electrification program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, continue to be interpreted to authorize the making of loans for the construction of facilities to bring electric service to persons who are in fact not receiving central-station service, and to continue to serve those who are presently being served, in accordance with the Acting Secretary of Agriculture's letters of August 7, 1958, and October 29, 1958, to the Comptroller General, and that the proposed limitation on the authority of the Rural Electrification Ad-

ministration introduced in the Comptroller General's decisions of July 21, 1958, and October 15, 1958, be rejected as contrary to the clear intent of the Congress.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to convene at noon on Tuesday.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am quite grateful that there will be a session on Tuesday, which will mark the sixth anniversary of the first inauguration of the present President of the United States. I should like to indicate now that on that day we would like to take a little time to testify suitably regarding that fact.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the usual request that during the transaction of routine business statements be limited to 3 minutes.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senate to consider an amendment to Resolution 58 of the 81st Congress, with regard to the Select Committee on Small Business.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk the resolution, for which I request immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 25) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the first paragraph of Senate Resolution 58 of the 81st Congress, as amended, be further amended to read as follows:

"That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business and to consist of seventeen Senators to be appointed in the same manner and at the same time as the chairman and members of the standing committees of the Senate at the beginning of each Congress."

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, just to make the legislative record, let me say that when the Select Committee on Small Business was first established, the

rule provided for 13 members. Subsequently, the resolution was amended, in 1955, to provide that they should be appointed at the same time and in the same manner as the members of standing committees of the Senate.

This resolution conformed to the amended rule, and only increases the membership from 13 to 17.

I discussed the resolution with the majority leader; and I assure him that it is quite agreeable.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DEATH OF ARTHUR E. COOK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I should call attention to the fact that yesterday a very familiar figure in the Capitol passed away. I refer to "Gus" Cook. I think every Member of the House and every Member of the Senate for many, many years knew him.

"Gus" Cook was one of the first persons I met when I became a Member of the House in 1933. He started in a very humble way in the service of the Congress, and continued to serve here for nearly 60 years.

Mr. President, 60 years of service in itself is a great testimony; but it is even greater when one measures the fidelity of "Gus" Cook to his job and the multitudes of friends he made as he went along. He was extremely helpful to every Member, and gave most freely of his knowledge, in order to see that the necessary conveniences were provided, so that the working place where we spend so much of our time is accommodated to the responsibilities which confront us.

I know that he leaves a legion of friends who mourn his passing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to join the distinguished minority leader in his eloquent tribute to the late "Gus" Cook, who served us so faithfully for many years.

I know of no public servant who was more helpful or more dedicated than was "Gus" Cook. It seems, Mr. President, that I can see him now, walking into the Speaker's room, to line up the Members to greet the President and to escort him to the Chamber.

Ever since I came to Washington, some 25 years ago, I have been rather intimately associated with this good, great, kind, and genuine man. I join the dis-

tinguished minority leader and "Gus" Cook's legion of friends in regretting his passing.

He was always kindly, always helpful, and always dedicated to his duty. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a long time ago I became a Member of the other branch of the Congress. It was then that I first met "Gus" Cook and we have been friends ever since. No one else will ever know every nook, corner, and cranny of the Capitol as well as he did. Whenever anything became out of order in the old building, he knew how to fix it.

I greatly admired his constant good humor. He and I had between us a joke which he invented—I being the senior Member of the Congress, and he being the senior member of all the employees. Some persons would call us "deans"; and "Gus" would want to know when he and I would get together to do some "deaning." That opportunity now is past. I sincerely regret his departure.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in a few words of tribute and expressions of sorrow at the passing of our friend. He was known to all of us as "Gus" Cook.

When I first came to the House of Representatives, 25 years ago, I soon found that "Gus" Cook was my friend, as indeed he was a friend of all of us. He was a man of dedication, a man who was, if anything or any human being could be, a fixture of the Capitol Building.

As the distinguished President *pro tempore* has said, "Gus" Cook always had a smile and a pleasant word; he always wanted to stop and exchange greetings while he was constantly carrying out his assigned duties and pushing himself, I believe, in his later years, even beyond his physical capacity to do so. While there is so much more I would like to say about "Gus," so many things that have come to my mind since I learned, only last night, of his passing after a long and useful life, at this time I shall have to content myself with saying, "Gus," we shall all miss you. Your place in our hearts and in this building, the Capitol of our country, will never be completely filled by anyone else. You have been a good and faithful servant."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of December 31, 1958, there was an aggregate of 2,492 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN MULLITE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 3,664 short tons of mullite (calcined kyanite) now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, as of December 31, 1958 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, together with the reports, covering the operations during the same period of Foreign-Trade Zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Virgin Islands Corporation, fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

EDUCATION, MEDICAL ATTENTION, RELIEF OF DISTRESS, AND SOCIAL WELFARE OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1 of the act of April 16, 1934, as amended by the act of June 4, 1933 (49 Stat. 1458), entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States or Territories for the education, medical attention, relief of distress, and social welfare of Indians, and for other purposes" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENLARGEMENT OF DEVILS TOWER NATIONAL MONUMENT, WYO.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enlarge the Devils Tower National Monument in the State of Wyoming and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCREASE OF LIMITATION ON BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN CIVILIANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 432(g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation on basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from \$3,750 to \$5,100 per annum (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FIXING OF OFFICIAL STATION OF CERTAIN JUDGES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to fix the official station of retired judges assigned to active duty (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 752 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 752 of title 28, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION FOR RETIRED JUDGES TO PERFORM CERTAIN SERVICES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 373 of title 28, United States Code, so as to authorize retired judges of certain territorial courts to perform judicial service when designated and assigned (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TENURE OF OFFICE AND RETIREMENT RIGHTS OF CERTAIN JUDGES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the U.S. district judges for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico shall have the same tenure of office and retirement rights as all other U.S. district judges (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION OF ALLOWANCE OF ADDITIONAL PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended, in reference to the protection of officers and employees of the United States by including probation officers of U.S. district courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

USE OF CERTIFIED MAIL IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of certified mail for the transmission or service of matter required by certain Federal laws to be transmitted or served by registered mail, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials, at San Francisco, Calif., relating to a defense highway system in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works.

CLOSING OF NAVAL AIR STATION REPAIR FACILITY IN NUECES COUNTY, TEX.—RESOLUTION OF TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I recently had inserted in the Record a statement and a group of resolutions from Corpus Christi, Tex., pertaining to the order by Secretary of the Navy Thomas Gates, Jr., that the overhaul and repair department of the naval air station located in Nueces County, Tex., has been ordered closed.

I have also requested the Secretary of the Navy make proportional cutbacks in all overhaul and repair departments, rather than the entire closing of this facility—a move which would put almost 3,500 persons out of work.

In further support of my proposal and opposition to the arbitrary move by the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a special resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas introduced by State Representatives Bridges, Glusing, Hale, Parish, and Woolsey, and passed by that body on January 15, 1959.

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

House Special Resolution 14

Whereas by order of the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Thomas Gates, Jr., the overhaul and repair department of the naval air station located in Nueces County, Tex., has been ordered closed; and

Whereas this order, directed to this one particular area, will directly affect the jobs of some 3,400 civil service workers and probably another 10,000 persons, including the families of these workers, thereby seriously affecting the entire economy of this particular area of Texas; and

Whereas this order came as a sudden and staggering blow without any warning which might have allowed the adjustment of the economy to ease the serious financial damage to the individuals of the area affected; and

Whereas it is not the intent of this legislature to oppose the economy move on the part of our Government but rather to express our feeling that an order such as this should be made applicable to all areas on an equal basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, That the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, be respectfully requested to recommend to the Secretary of the Navy that he reconsider this order; that as a countermeasure he recommended a 10-percent cutback on all overhaul and repair units of all naval air stations of the U.S. Navy rather than concentrating on this one particular unit in Nueces County, Tex.

WAGGONER LOW,

Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that House Special Resolution 14 was adopted by the House on January 15, 1959.

DOROTHY HALLMAN,

Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Cape May, N.J., favoring the enactment of legislation to change the Labor Day holiday from the first to the second Monday in September. I ask unani-

mous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

RESOLUTION: LABOR DAY HOLIDAY

Be it resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Cape May, recognizing the importance of an extended summer season, which supplies the greater part of revenue for resort towns and cities, That it is for the best interests of the city of Cape May that the Labor Day holiday be changed from the first Monday in September to the second Monday in September in each calendar year; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Governor of the State of New Jersey, the members of the State legislature and all U.S. Congressmen and U.S. Senators, urging the passage of Federal legislation changing the date of the aforesaid national holiday; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution by itself shall not change the date of the aforesaid national holiday but that the same shall be offered by the city of Cape May to the above-named officials, urging Federal legislation which will change the date of the aforesaid national holiday as prescribed by law.

Presented by Kennedy A. Hickman.

Seconded by Wm. A. Pamboud.

Passed: December 30, 1958.

RESOLUTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS OF STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, three resolutions adopted by organizations in the State of New York. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD.

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

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTION OF MONROE COUNTY COUNCIL, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES"

"Whereas the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is composed entirely of veterans who served on foreign soil during time of war; and

"Whereas, having seen such service, we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States dread and abhor war; and

"Whereas we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States have long advocated strong defenses as a deterrent to war; and

"Whereas we have long advocated a strong stand against communism as a deterrent to war; and

"Whereas we have constantly advocated that all aggressors of the Communist combine be called to a halt in all efforts to expand communism, either by internal influences through sabotage and murder or through direct aggression; and

"Whereas a new Congress of the United States is about to be convened: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of the Monroe County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, call upon the new Congress to take the necessary steps to assure us of building the world's most powerful Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Marine Corps, properly coordinated, to provide adequate national security with superior development of atomic, hydrogen, and ballistic

weapons necessary to achieve and maintain U.S. leadership in preserving world peace; be it further

"Resolved, That we advocate a strong Reserve and National Guard program in proper balance to the Military Establishment and urging the continuance of the Selective Service Act as long as present world conditions exist; be it further

"Resolved, That we urge a strong, well-financed civil defense program; be it further

"Resolved, That we again declare ourselves as militantly opposed to communism in all its forms and to any form of world government or federation which would diminish the sovereignty of the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each of the Congressmen of this area.

"Submitted by

"W. RAYMOND NOLL,

"County Commander.

"Unanimously approved at a regular meeting of the Monroe County Council on Tuesday, January 6, 1959.

"W. RAYMOND NOLL,

"Commander.

"S. F. MAINE, Adjutant."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Whereas the International Brotherhood of Teamsters has defied not only the law but sound and long-established public policy by an arrant move to picket police headquarters and other police precincts in order to force the unionization of New York City's Police Department; and

"Whereas Mayor Robert F. Wagner and Police Commissioner Stephen P. Kennedy have courageously denounced this outrageous threat to the maintenance of the safety and security of the people and the preservation of strict discipline among those entrusted with the police powers of this community: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the New York Board of Trade, Inc., does highly commend Mayor Robert F. Wagner and Police Commissioner Stephen P. Kennedy for their forthright rejection of the brazen attempt to unionize the police department, and thus indirectly control the police power, by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its New York Local No. 237; and be it further

"Resolved, That the New York Board of Trade recommends to the mayor and the police commissioner that they bar all further endeavors, by whomsoever undertaken, to establish a grievance system for the men of the department which in any way vitiates the authority of the police commissioner and the powers granted him by law, necessary to the preservation of the highest degree of discipline in the organization upon which rests the majesty of the law and the protection of our society; and be it further

"Resolved, That the New York Board of Trade does hereby commend the great majority of the officers and men of the New York City Department of Police for their fealty to their oath and the faithful discharge of their grave responsibilities; and be it further

"Resolved, That the New York Board of Trade call upon the Legislature of the State of New York and upon the Congress of the United States to cause an examination of the sufficiency of existing law applying hereto and to enact forthwith, if necessary, any amendments or new legislation needed to bar the affiliation, with any local or any national union labor organization, of any police force or any law enforcement agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That the New York Board of Trade hereby does pledge to Mayor Robert F. Wagner and Police Commissioner Stephen P. Kennedy, complete support in their most commendable effort to isolate the police de-

partment of this city from any loyalty except to the people of this city through their individual oaths of office; and be it further

"Resolved, That the New York Board of Trade does hereby call upon all of the citizens of the great city of New York to give their complete support to their mayor and police commissioner in their continuing resistance to the unionization of the members of the police department."

"Whereas the Niagara Frontier is in the throes of a prolonged critical unemployment situation adversely affecting every man, woman, and child in the area; and

"Whereas, according to the U.S. Department of Labor, this area has deteriorated from a class E to a class F labor market, indicative of a very serious percentage of unemployed people with only a discouraging future outlook; and

"Whereas the unemployment, public assistance, and welfare rolls continue their unabated upward trend; and

"Whereas other areas, by highlighting the problem and joining diverse groups within their community into a united effort, have successfully combated similar situations; Be it

"Resolved, That the leaders of industrial, civic, labor, fraternal, and charitable organizations, elected officials on city, county, State, and Federal levels, retail merchants and business associations, members of the clergy, chambers of commerce, and the family of every employed and unemployed person in the counties of Erie and Niagara protest vigorously the deplorable unemployment crisis in this area, and the inadequate measures taken to alleviate a situation that directly or indirectly adversely affects every person in Erie and Niagara Counties and the surrounding environs; further

"Resolved—

"1. That all aforementioned persons, groups, and organizations mass their combined strength at a public rally to be held in the near future at the Memorial Auditorium in Buffalo, N.Y., for the express purpose of highlighting the economic blight which is affecting the aforementioned counties; and

"2. Request that our elected representatives on city, county, State, and Federal levels attend and address this rally relative to reporting what has been accomplished to date and suggesting other possible avenues of approach to our mutual problem; and

"3. That these elected representatives join forces in a completely bipartisan effort to effect a solution to this crisis and to request from the proper U.S. governmental agency that a survey team be sent into the Niagara Frontier to ascertain the reason or reasons for the complete lack of defense contracts and/or other types of employment in our community; and

"4. That we exhort these representatives to utilize every means at their command to seek additional defense and/or other Government contracts for our area industry.

"We the undersigned are in full accord and wholeheartedly subscribe to the sentiments expressed in the foregoing resolution:

"Jan H. Kopylrm, Mayor; F. E. Primeau, Alderman; A. P. Lamke, Alderman; Michael Lesinowski, Alderman; A. F. Pagels, President of the Council; E. P. Maziarz, Alderman; Arnold C. James, Alderman; John F. Lukasik, Alderman."

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER 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.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 419. A bill to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations; and

S. 420. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to permit employees to acquire an additional unit of insurance under such act by paying both the employee's and the Government's share of the cost of the premiums thereon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

S. 421. A bill to provide certain administrative authorities for the National Security Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 422. A bill to prohibit convicted felons from holding union office or employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 423. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 89) to provide additional funds for the construction of highways in labor surplus areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 424. A bill for the relief of Panos Michalopoulos; and

S. 425. A bill for the relief of Klarchen Huebner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 426. A bill to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation; and

S. 427. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a homestead patent to the heirs of Frank L. Wilhelm; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 428. A bill to provide flexibility in the operation of marketing agreement programs;

S. 429. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to all imported limes, grapefruit, lemons, mandarins, all types of oranges including temples, tangerines, murcotts, and tangelos, dried figs, fig paste, sliced dried figs, shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made entirely of dates; and

S. 430. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of turkeys and to assure consumers an adequate supply of turkeys and turkey products of wholesome quality; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 431. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Vermont among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for policemen and firemen in positions covered by a retirement system on the same basis as other

State and local employees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JORDAN:

S. 432. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,200 to \$1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

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

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

S. 433. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the city of New York for certain lands located in said city for park and recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 434. A bill to provide for transferring from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and abolishing such naval petroleum reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 435. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to provide that the Civil Rights Commission shall have until January 2, 1961, to submit its report, findings, and recommendations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. GORE:

S. 436. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 437. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the Eastern, Middle, and Western Districts of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 438. A bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern administration and office building at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; and

S. 439. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 in order to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to dispose of certain property for college purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

S. 440. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 441. A bill to extend the duration of the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

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

S. 442. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN (by request):

S. 443. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 444. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the punishment of any individual who travels in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution or punishment for indecent molestation of a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 445. A bill for the relief of Andrea Basile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 446. A bill to amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 to authorize the President to provide for participation by foreign governments and citizens of other countries in cultural and other activities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 447. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 448. A bill for the relief of Mercedes Garcia;

S. 449. A bill for the relief of Clarita Martinez; and

S. 450. A bill for the relief of Lo Liang Sun Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 451. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Ali Halim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 452. A bill to prohibit the issuance of public certificates of necessity and convenience to certain applicants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 453. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 454. A bill to provide for suitable works of art in Federal buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 455. A bill to provide for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of exchange of persons programs and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 456. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 457. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 458. A bill for the relief of Maria Bogatkin Manea;

S. 459. A bill for the relief of Penelope Carnavas Kafos;

S. 460. A bill for the relief of Gorjana Grdijic; and

S. 461. A bill for the relief of Androula Neofitos Stephanon (Androula Kyriacou Stephanou); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 462. A bill to reduce the maximum work-week under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to 35 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 463. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw (Stanislaus) Napora; and

S. 464. A bill for the relief of Julia Mydlak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BEALL, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 465. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. PROXMIER, and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 466. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 467. A bill to amend title 11 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans) to authorize additional financial assistance in connection with public projects made necessary by certain activities related to the national defense; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 468. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Carl Bedwell, of Yucaipa, Calif.;

S. 469. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Myrtle Golden, of Milnesand, N. Mex.;

S. 470. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Walter T. Linam, of Hobbs, N. Mex.;

S. 471. A bill to provide for conveyance of certain mineral rights to Joseph E. Shipp, of Snyder, Tex.

S. 472. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Elmer M. Gandy, of Lubbock, Tex.;

S. 473. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Richard L. Robinson, of Jal, N. Mex.;

S. 474. A bill to authorize the granting of mineral rights to certain homestead patentees who were wrongfully deprived of such rights;

S. 475. A bill to authorize the granting of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbon substances, and all rights in connection therewith and pertaining thereto, to certain homestead patentees who were wrongfully deprived of such property and rights; and

S. 476. A bill to grant to the landowners a certain percentage of the income to the Federal Government from mineral rights in lands acquired by stockraising homesteads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 477. A bill for the relief of Joanne Lea (Buffington) Lybarger;

S. 478. A bill for the relief of John A. Lynn;

S. 479. A bill for the relief of Thomas Peter Villa;

S. 480. A bill to permit the United States to be named a party defendant in certain suits to quiet title if the United States is a

necessary party thereto by reason of its right, title, or interest in or to real property acquired from the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of the State of New Mexico;

S. 481. A bill for the relief of Chin Yung Kao;

S. 482. A bill for the relief of Hiroyasu Hatakeyama;

S. 483. A bill for the relief of Sushil K. Verma, Kumud Verma, and Sheetal Verma;

S. 484. A bill for the relief of Ma Bong Ching.

S. 485. A bill for the relief of Jubencio Lucero, Sr., and his wife, Adela R. Lucero; and

S. 486. A bill for the relief of Joaquin A. Bazan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 487. A bill to provide for a Federal contribution toward the cost of the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Canadian River by the State of New Mexico; and

S. 488. A bill providing for a national advisory committee on county officials to facilitate coordination of county highways in the Federal-aid highway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 489. A bill to facilitate the distribution of surplus food products to needy families in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 490. A bill for the relief of Wilbur R. Dameron, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 491. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Science Academy, a program of scientific scholarships, and the encouragement of the study of mathematics and science by assisting the States in providing science education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 492. A bill to repeal the act requiring the filing of certain information with respect to trade between the United States and its noncontiguous territory; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 493. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$500,000 to be spent for the purpose of the Pan American games to be held in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 494. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 495. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Hines Service Center, Hines, Ill., and Lincoln Ordnance Plant, Springfield, Ill., to the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mrs. SMITH:

S. 496. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Maine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 497. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for the coordinated consideration of monetary policies thereunder, and to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases which threaten economic stability; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

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

S.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution designating the 9th day of March in each year as Amerigo Vespucci Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Dickinson Dam in the State of North Dakota as "Edward Arthur Patterson Lake"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution designating the red rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION 58 OF 81ST CONGRESS, RELATING TO COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted a resolution (S. Res. 25) amending the resolution creating the Select Committee on Small Business, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED EMERGENCY LEGISLATION FOR DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am introducing today two bills to provide needed emergency legislation for the depressed areas of this Nation. Of course, I am thinking of the depressed areas of Kentucky in introducing these bills.

One bill would increase the supply and kinds of surplus foods distributed to the people of the depressed areas of our Nation, and provide a more adequate diet for thousands of persons in these areas who are actually hungry.

The second bill would follow a precedent which was established last year, and would authorize the apportionment of \$100 million of the funds already appropriated by the Congress for highway construction in depressed areas in order to provide more employment opportunities to the people living in those areas.

We read that this country has made a substantial recovery from the recent recession, and that production and income are at or near an alltime high. In so doing we may overlook the fact that there still are depressed areas or surplus labor areas. Thousands of people are out of work, without money, in need of clothing and are living on meager supplies of food provided from the surplus food stocks of our Government.

I have personal knowledge of the truth of this statement. Last fall, on several visits to eastern Kentucky and other depressed areas of our State, I saw this situation at firsthand. Only yesterday Governor Chandler of Kentucky advised me that he had visited 17 counties in eastern Kentucky this week, and had found conditions steadily worsening, with thousands of people in dire need of food and clothing.

The first bill which I am introducing would amend Public Law 480 in respect to the priorities between the various surplus-disposal programs of the Department of Agriculture. I know Congress passed Public Law 480 at a time of full employment, and that we were thinking of selling our surplus food wherever we could. I must admit I was surprised and rather shocked when I learned yesterday, in looking over the law, that priorities are given to the sale and disposal of surplus food abroad, and that the last priority is to the people of this country. The bill which I am introducing would amend that law to provide that first priority in the disposal of our surplus food shall be to the needy and hungry people of our own country.

The first bill which I am introducing would also amend existing law in a second respect. We know that, under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, 30 percent of the customs receipts of this country go into section 32 funds to encourage and develop domestic and foreign use of our agricultural products. Today there are \$400 million to \$500 million in that fund. My bill would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to expend \$50 million between now and the end of the fiscal year, and \$100 million in the next fiscal year, to buy the additional food necessary to provide an adequate diet in the school lunch programs for school children of the country, and to augment the very limited kinds of food distributed to needy families, which at present are restricted to certain Government-owned commodities without regard to the needs of our hungry people. These foods, such as dried beans, potatoes, cooking oil, canned fruits, pork shoulder and luncheon meat, dried eggs and peanut butter, if available, would provide a better diet for the thousands who are now dependent upon surplus foods provided by the Government. I point out again that the bill would give priority to supplying the needy people of our own country over those of all other countries.

The second bill—and I hope to talk to the Public Works Committee about it—follows the precedent set last year. Last year, as an antirecession measure, we authorized an additional \$400 million apportionment of road funds to the States of the Nation. My bill would authorize the apportionment of \$100 million to the States to be used in surplus labor areas.

We know there are many long-term programs being considered. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] last year introduced what has been called the depressed areas bill, of which I was a cosponsor along with many others, and which was passed by the Congress. I hope to be able, and will, support him in such an effort again this year. In the meantime, there are people out of work and starving.

The bills which I am introducing are designed to meet an immediate need in respect to providing food and employment to needy persons.

Mr. President, I intend to let these bills lie on the desk. I know my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is very much interested in this problem. I know the Senators from Illinois and

West Virginia are interested. I hope they will study these bills and the need for them.

Mr. President, I ask that a statement I have prepared be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR COOPER

I have introduced today two bills to provide needed emergency legislation for the depressed areas of Kentucky, and similar areas throughout the Nation.

One bill would increase the supply of surplus food and provide a more adequate diet for thousands of people in these areas who are actually hungry. The second bill, authorizing \$100 million for highway construction in depressed areas, would provide immediate employment opportunities to the people living in these areas.

The Nation as a whole has made a spectacular recovery from the recession of 1958. Both national production and total personal income are at an alltime high today. Yet, it is a sad fact that in those areas of the United States which are termed depressed areas, thousands of people are out of work, without money, in need of clothes, and are living on meager supplies of food provided from the surplus food stocks of our Government. I know this is true. On several visits to eastern Kentucky last fall I saw this situation at firsthand. And only this week the Governor of Kentucky, the Honorable A. B. Chandler, advised me that he had visited 17 counties in eastern Kentucky and had found conditions steadily worsening, and thousands of people in dire need of food and clothing.

In Kentucky, as in other States, long-term plans which will help the economy of these areas are in progress. In Eastern Kentucky a dam is being built at Buckhorn. The construction of Fishtrap and Pound Reservoirs, in the Big Sandy River Valley, is being urged by all of us in the Congress as well as by the people of the area to protect the people of the Big Sandy Valley.

But every step in the development of flood protection facilities is fixed by law. These projects move slowly, they are in their nature long-term programs, and cannot give immediate help to the needy people of the depressed areas.

Last year the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], with other cosponsors, introduced depressed areas legislation for which I voted, and which I hope to cosponsor at this session of the Congress. Such legislation is needed, for it is directed at the basic long-range needs of areas of persistently high unemployment, and underemployment, such as exists in Kentucky. This program, and the existing rural development program, are needed and I shall give them my full support. But, as important as these long-range programs are, I know that unless immediate steps are taken to provide food and employment opportunities for people who are out of work, the injury to them and to the Nation will be irreparable. It is to make a beginning toward meeting immediate needs that I introduce bills today.

As I have said, the first bill would amend Public Law 480. Public Law 480 provides certain priorities in the disposal of surplus foods, including those held by the Government under its support price program. Being passed at a time when there was not the need in our own country that exists today, it gave priorities to the sale of food and to its disposal abroad. My bill is simple. It would give priority to the use of surplus food for needy people in the United States. I believe that this would make available additional supplies of food and of a wider variety of food. Among these could be listed beans, potatoes, and oil for cooking.

The bill which I have introduced would also direct the Secretary of Agriculture to use \$50 million during the remainder of this fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and \$100 million during the next fiscal year, to purchase additional food. These foods, such as dried eggs, canned fruits, peanut butter and meat, if available, would provide a better diet for the thousands who are now dependent upon surplus foods provided by the Government. It is especially designed to make available to the school children in these depressed areas, school lunches with a balanced diet and with adequate supplies of food.

The second bill I introduced would amend the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1958. It would authorize the apportionment of approximately \$100 million in those States in which are located surplus labor areas designated under the Defense Production Act of 1950. This sum would be apportioned to surplus labor areas, in the ratio which the unemployment in any of these areas bears to the total unemployment in all of the areas.

There is a precedent to this bill. Only last year the Congress authorized in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1958 an additional appropriation of \$400 million to the States as an antirecession measure. The bill which I propose would limit the expenditure of the \$100 million to the areas in the States which are in great need.

I intend to introduce other measures next week which could give, I hope, immediate aid to these areas in our country, where people are in dire need. I have no doubt that in time our economy will again bring to full employment the people of our Nation. I must say, however, that in this intervening time, we must help those who, without fault of their own, are in need, even of clothes and food, when our economy is surging ahead, and when areas of our country are prospering greatly, and when many in our country become even richer. It would be unjust, unconscionable, if we do not help the people of the depressed areas of our country.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to congratulate the Senator from Kentucky for the very statesmanlike and humanitarian measure which he has just introduced. I have been watching the Lexington, Ky., papers for some time. They give authentic reports of conditions in some of the coal mining sections of Kentucky, notably Harlan County. These reports give every evidence of being conservative. The statement was made that there is a great deal of actual starvation in the coal-mining sections of the country. I can say that there is great want and need in the coal mining counties of Illinois.

It is all too easy to sweep these needy people under the rug and forget about them. It is all too easy to say the recession is over and that we do not need to do anything but wait for prosperity to return. But we know that there were in December 4,400,000 workers completely unemployed. We also know there were several million who were partially unemployed and involuntary part-time workers; and those come to the equivalent of about 1 million full-time workers. So really there were 5 million persons out of work.

The figures for January will probably be worse. We all hope that the pickup

in the spring will sweep this condition away. But the Senator from Kentucky is performing a public service in pointing out in the meantime that there is hunger and starvation, and in proposing that surplus foods should be used to stop adults and children from starving to death in the most prosperous nation in the world.

I congratulate the Senator from Kentucky. I hope the Senator will give me the privilege of being a cosponsor of these measures. What the Senator has done today is typical of the attitude which the Senator from Kentucky takes on all public issues.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, may I have unanimous consent to continue for 1 minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I appreciate what the distinguished Senator has said.

We are happy, of course, about the spectacular recovery which is being made economically in this country, but it has to be said also that when many areas are beginning to prosper as they have never prospered before, and when many people are getting richer than they have ever been before, it would be unjust—I say it would be unconscionable—and a reflection on the economy of this country if we did not take steps at this time to at least help to provide the bare necessities of life itself for people who are actually in dire need, who are in hunger and in want.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the desk in accordance with the request of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I should like to commend my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and tell him I shall be most happy and honored to be a cosponsor of the bill which he has presented to us this morning and on which he has so forcibly spoken.

The Senator from Kentucky is well aware of the problems involved. Indeed, there are serious, real, and desperate problems in many parts of our country. I think it devolves upon the Congress of the United States to do something about the so-called depressed areas.

The bills, introduced by Mr. COOPER, were received, appropriately referred, read twice by their titles, and ordered to lie on the desk, as follows:

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 423. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 89) to provide additional funds for the construction of highways in labor-surplus areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 489. A bill to facilitate the distribution of surplus food products to needy families in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT INCREASING LIMITATION OF AMOUNT EARNED BY BENEFICIARIES

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill amending title II of the Social Security Act.

My bill goes a long way, I feel, Mr. President, toward correcting a serious injustice to those people who are receiving social security benefits. The bill would increase from \$1,200 to \$1,800 a year the amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits.

Because of the restrictions now in the law on allowable income outside social security benefits, many thousands of our senior citizens are suffering needless hardships and embarrassment. Many of them have to live virtually as paupers because of the unrealistic formulas now in the law.

I think the present limitations, Mr. President, are a serious reflection on our free-enterprise system and are not in keeping with the high level of our overall economy.

Very few people, except those, of course, who are disabled, care to become completely inactive when they reach the retirement age under the Social Security Act. Most of the individuals who do receive social security benefits have a real desire to continue working on a limited basis.

I feel this bill, Mr. President, will enable those who so desire to earn a reasonable amount of income above and beyond their social security payments without being penalized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 432) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,200 to \$1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. JORDAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER LANDS WITHIN NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 4

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the purpose of turning back to the public lands of the United States a vast area in Alaska now withdrawn and set apart as a naval petroleum reserve.

This withdrawal, known as Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, Pet 4, for short, was set aside by President Harding by Executive Order No. 3797-A on February 27, 1923, at a time when his administration was under a searching investigation by a committee of this body for its handling of the then existing naval petroleum reserves. These are the Elk Hills reserve—Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1—and the Buena Vista Hills reserve—Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 2—both in California, and Teapot Dome—Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 3—in Wyoming.

Criticism of the administration's action in leasing the California and Wyoming reserves obviously was responsible for setting aside of the Alaska reserve which embraces some 37,000 square miles in the great basin lying north of the Brooks Range and extending from the crest of the mountains on the south to the Arctic Ocean on the north and from the Colville River on the east to approximately the 162d meridian of longitude on the west. Point Barrow, the northernmost point of land in Alaska and Barrow Village, the northernmost inhabited settlement in the United States, is approximately in the center of the northern boundary of the reserve.

When set aside in 1923 virtually nothing was known of the geology of the region or of the lithology of the sediments and a great part of the lands had never been explored. The only evidence of the presence of oil or gas was a single seepage near Cape Simpson where a small amount of oil seeped from a hummock of ice and ran down to cover a small lake with a scum of oil.

I am further advised that in the opinion of informed persons in the Department of the Navy the area is not suitable under present day conditions for a naval petroleum reserve even if large quantities of oil were known to exist there, primarily because of its location, climate, lack of transportation, and the great expense of exploration and development. In view of the high costs involved it would not be practicable to drill a large number of wells in a proven field in this region and maintain them in a standby status pending potential future need as has been done in the Elk Hills reserve. In Elk Hills, I am told, the Navy by merely turning the valves on suspended wells can turn into the existing pipelines to refineries at San Francisco and Los Angeles in excess of 150,000 barrels daily of additional oil whenever the Congress by joint resolution authorizes its production. This is a real and valuable reserve for the military.

It is well known that the Navy, from 1944 to 1953, endeavored to determine the potential value of its portion of this vast sedimentary basin lying north of the Brooks range—Pet 4—and expended nearly \$50 million in exploration for oil. After drilling 36 test wells and 40 core holes the Navy suspended operations and although no large oil fields were discovered, this meager amount of drilling in an area so large did not disprove the possible existence of large oil and gas fields in the many mammoth geologic structures disclosed by both its geological and geophysical exploration. The Navy did determine the presence of both oil and gas in this geologic basin in which the sediments exceed 20,000 feet in thickness in the deeper parts. Due to budget limitations the Department of the Navy is reluctant to supply funds from naval appropriations for the further development of its naval petroleum reserves and neither the Navy nor the Congress has, at this time, any plans for further exploration or use of the lands in this petroleum reserve. A naval petroleum reserve to be of use in time of emergency must be fully developed and ready, as is

the Elk Hills reserve, in order to serve its purpose. To hold a vast tract of land, such as that covered by this bill, idle and unused constitutes a waste and serves no useful purpose to the Government.

At the present time there is a great interest by the petroleum industry in the petroleum possibilities of several large sedimentary basins known to exist in Alaska and large areas in each have been leased for oil and gas exploration. Private interests appear now to be interested in the Barrow Basin and ready to carry on the work of exploration so ably begun by the Navy.

The Alaska Petroleum & Gas Co., Inc., has recently obtained leases on the Gubik gas structure, a structure in which the Navy indicated commercial gas reserves may be developed. If further drilling proves that adequate gas reserves exist in the Gubik structure, a gas line will be built to furnish gas to Fairbanks, including the military installations in the area, with the result that great savings can be made in the present fuel costs in the area, both by civilians and the military. High cost of fuel is one of the principal reasons for high costs of living in Alaska, and particularly in the Arctic regions.

At the present time the only region in Alaska which enjoys the use of natural gas for fuel is at Point Barrow, where the Navy discovered the small South Barrow field, which supplies gas to its camp and to other Government installations in the area. Drilling in this field has not been sufficient to determine accurately the gas reserves.

On the Umiat structure, some 25 miles southwest of the Gubik structure, the Navy found a field of high gravity oil at shallow depth. While the five productive wells drilled in this field did not produce oil in quantities sufficient to warrant its development as a naval reserve, it may well be that further drilling would develop enough oil to warrant laying a pipeline to Fairbanks—particularly if it could be constructed in connection with a gas line from the Gubik field.

This bill is very important to the people of the new State of Alaska, and when passed and approved will enable the petroleum industry to take over and continue the exploration started by Navy. It will enable private interests to develop that part of the Gubik structure within Pet 4 which cannot now be leased and developed; it will permit further exploration of the South Barrow gas field to the end that it may be possible to furnish gas therefrom to the citizens of Barrow Village and adjacent thereto; it will permit the industry to utilize fully the vast amount of information developed by the Navy in a further search for oil north of the Brooks range. This bill is important to the future economy of the State of Alaska and any oil or gas discoveries made in the region it will open up will add to both the resources of the State and the United States.

In closing my remarks, I want to call the attention of the Senate to a bill, H.R. 298, recently introduced by the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the

House, which has for its purpose establishment of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 5 by setting aside for the Navy the islands of San Nicolas, San Miguel, and Prince lying off the coast of southern California. These islands, if found productive of petroleum, can be developed at a reasonable cost and will be far better suited for an oil reserve for the military than is the area which is covered by the bill. Should the bill H. R. 298 ever come before this body for its consideration it will be strongly supported by me and will have my vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 434) to provide for transferring from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and abolishing such naval petroleum reserve, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ELIMINATION OF AIR POLLUTION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the duration of the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 441) to extend the duration of the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on almost any trip around our country the signs of remarkable growth and progress, of industrial and urban development, of increasing movement of our people, are impressive.

In virtually every section of the Nation, it is impossible to overlook or be unaware of significant changes in the environment in which the American people live and work. These changes, as is evident by the volume of demands for new activities and new services reaching every agency and level of government, present a succession of problems.

From the earliest moment of comprehension, Americans hear about and believe in free air. More and more it is being demonstrated that freeness of the air we breathe every moment of our lives is relative.

The supply of pure, healthful, pleasant air is in real danger of running out because of one of the grave and major environmental problems attributable to our mechanized, industrialized civilization. It long has been apparent—and I have mentioned it to the Senate on a number of occasions—that air pollution, especially in our mushrooming cities and thickly settled metropolitan areas, is a matter of grave concern and potentially of serious danger.

Four years ago, the 84th Congress enacted the Air Pollution Research and Technical Assistance Act, which I had the honor to introduce. This law authorized the Federal Government, through the U.S. Public Health Service, to carry out a 5-year program of investigation, research, and training to assist States and local governments in checking, reducing, and ultimately controlling air pollution.

Considerable progress has been made in the several elements of that program. Yet, much still remains to be done, many questions still are unanswered.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I introduce a bill for the continuance of the program and for extension of the Air Pollution Act in order that Federal agencies may pursue their efforts and provide further assistance in attempts to remove a menace which is estimated to cause \$3 billion damage annually to our Nation.

Material contribution has been made by the Federal effort to difficult problems of sampling, identifying, and measuring airborne contaminants. For example, methods of analyzing gaseous contaminants, particularly hydrocarbons, present in the atmosphere of virtually every city, have been greatly improved. Such fundamental advances in knowledge are making possible definitive studies which could not have been undertaken a few years ago.

An extensive national air sampling network now is providing an objective measure of the levels and trends of air pollution. Studies of chemical, meteorological, and physical influences and of atmospheric reactions are making available new knowledge ultimately required for rational and economical control procedures.

Appraisal has been made of some important modern sources of urban pollution such as oil refineries, automobile exhausts, and combustion processes. These indeed are inevitable concomitants of our increasing mechanization and industrialization.

Scientists generally concur that the principal source of fumes which are ingredients of smog and pollution in most cities is the motor vehicle. On a number of fronts—including the automobile and petroleum industry level—this phase of the problem is under intense study.

The Federal Government each year has stepped up its pace in this field. In the past 4 years approximately \$1,400,000 of the funds appropriated for air pollution work has been earmarked for investigating the part motor vehicle exhaust and combustion play in the problem. I understand that the forthcoming budget will provide a material increase over the current year figure of \$700,000 in the amount for this line of research.

Significantly, the Public Health Service has progressively stepped up the proportion of its outlays for technical aspects of the automotive studies. This year and again next year 55 percent of the sums for this category of work are earmarked for what is termed engineering investigation of the motor vehicle's role in atmospheric contamination. In its own laboratories at Cincinnati, the Service is carrying on a number

of projects, sampling and determining the composition of exhausts, investigating reactions between exhaust constituents, and measuring their effects. Through research contracts and grants, it is pursuing work along five specific lines, including testing of devices and chemicals for counteracting and controlling smog-causing emissions.

Health studies have developed evidence that not only does air pollution cause much irritation to individuals but is distinctly dangerous to human health and well-being. It has been determined that low levels of air pollution may cause disease and death, certain kinds of heart disease and cancer are of higher incidence in polluted areas, ozone which is a reaction product of certain smog can cause serious lung damage, and sulfur dioxide produced by burning of many fuels obstructs breathing.

Many agencies are participating in the attack on air pollution. The Federal Government is not by any means carrying the whole load. Yet it is an indispensable partner for a number of reasons.

The Congress and the Federal Government long have been and rightly must be concerned with the health of the American people. For that reason, Mr. President, I feel the bill I am introducing is worthy of early and favorable consideration and I earnestly urge passage of this measure to continue Public Law 84-159, the Air Pollution Research and Technical Assistance Act.

I ask unanimous consent to include the text of a telegram from the Governor of California, Edmond G. Brown, asking that Public Law 84-159 be reenacted and strengthened.

I have replied to him that, in my opinion, Congress should and will do so.

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

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., January 16, 1959.
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Air pollution is an urgent national health problem which requires positive action by the Federal Government as well as by State and local authorities to press forward in combating this menace. I strongly recommend that you renew and expand the National Air Pollution Control Act, Public Law 159 of the 84th Congress. To abandon this constructive program in the face of the stifling smog over cities all across the United States would be both irresponsible and tragic.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

FOREIGN SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1959

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. This bill was submitted to the Vice President by letter on December 31, 1958.

This proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the letter from the Secretary of State to the Vice President in regard to it.

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

The bill (S. 443) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GREEN (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1959."

SEC. 2. Section 415 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 415. (a) There shall be 10 classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees. The per annum salaries of staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1: \$11,660, \$11,990, \$12,320, \$12,650, \$12,980, \$13,310, \$13,640.

"Class 2: \$9,900, \$10,175, \$10,450, \$10,725, \$11,000, \$11,275, \$11,550.

"Class 3: \$8,140, \$8,415, \$8,690, \$8,965, \$9,240, \$9,515, \$9,790.

"Class 4: \$7,000, \$7,225, \$7,450, \$7,675, \$7,900, \$8,125, \$8,350.

"Class 5: \$6,150, \$6,350, \$6,550, \$6,750, \$6,950, \$7,150, \$7,350.

"Class 6: \$5,300, \$5,500, \$5,700, \$5,900, \$6,100, \$6,300, \$6,500.

"Class 7: \$4,650, \$4,800, \$4,950, \$5,100, \$5,250, \$5,400, \$5,550.

"Class 8: \$4,200, \$4,350, \$4,500, \$4,650, \$4,800, \$4,950, \$5,100.

"Class 9: \$3,750, \$3,900, \$4,050, \$4,200, \$4,350, \$4,500, \$4,650.

"Class 10: \$3,500, \$3,600, \$3,700, \$3,800, \$3,900, \$4,000, \$4,100.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, the Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, fix the salary or compensation at lesser rates of salary than those prescribed by this section for the applicable class of officers or employees who are employed locally abroad and who are not available or are not qualified for transfer to another post or posts."

SEC. 3. Section 416 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 416. (a) A person appointed as a staff officer or employee shall receive basic salary at one of the rates of the class to which he is appointed which the Secretary shall, taking into account his qualifications and experience and the needs of the Service, determine to be appropriate for him to receive.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary determines that the needs of the Service warrant the appointment of staff officers or employees in a particular occupational group uniformly at a specific step rate above the minimum rate of the applicable class, he may adjust the basic salary of any staff officer or employee in the same class and occupational group who is receiving less than such established uniform step rate."

SEC. 4. Section 431 of such Act is amended by striking out in the first sentence of sub-

paragraph (a) the phrase "the termination of time spent on authorized leave, whichever shall be later," and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "upon termination of his service in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section,"; and by amending subparagraph (b) of this section to read as follows:

"(b) The official services of a chief of mission shall not be deemed terminated by the appointment of a successor but shall continue until he has relinquished charge of the mission and for such additional period as may be determined by the Secretary, but in no case shall such additional period exceed fifty days, including time spent in transit. During such period the Secretary may require him to render such services as he may deem necessary in the interests of the Government."

SEC. 5. Section 441 of such Act and the heading thereto is amended to read as follows:

"CLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE AND IN THE DEPARTMENT"

"SEC. 441. (a) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, and in order to facilitate effective management, the Secretary shall classify all positions in the Service at posts abroad, excluding positions to be occupied by chiefs of mission, and in the case of those occupied by Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and staff officers and employees, he shall establish such positions in relation to the classes established by sections 412, 414, and 415, respectively. Positions occupied by local employees and consular agents, respectively, shall be allocated to such classes as the Secretary may establish by regulation.

"(b) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Secretary may, notwithstanding the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1071, et seq.), classify positions in or under the Department which he designates as Foreign Service positions to be occupied by officers and employees of the Service, and establish such positions in relation to the classes established by sections 412, 414, and 415."

SEC. 6. (a) Section 444. (a) of such Act is amended by striking out "444. (a)" and inserting "444" in lieu thereof which shall read as follows:

"SEC. 444. The Secretary shall, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, establish schedules of salaries for classes of positions of local (alien) employees of the Service; provided that such schedules of salaries for local employees shall be based upon prevailing wage rates and related compensation practices for corresponding types of positions in the locality, as is consistent with the public interest."

(b) Section 444. (b) of such Act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 7. A new section 447 is hereby added to such Act, as follows:

"ADMINISTRATIVE ESTABLISHMENT OF HAZARDOUS DUTY PAY FOR CERTAIN CATEGORIES OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES"

"SEC. 447. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, establish rates of salary differential, not exceeding 15 per centum of basic salary, for officers or employees of the Service while they are assigned for duty as couriers."

SEC. 8. Section 517 of such Act is amended by striking the second and third sentences thereof.

SEC. 9. (a) Section 520 and the heading thereto is amended by striking out in the heading the phrase "Reinstatement and Recall" and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "Reappointment, Recall, or Reemployment"; and by amending paragraph (b) to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary may recall any retired Foreign Service officer temporarily to active duty in the Service whenever he shall

determine such recall is in the public interest".

(b) Section 520 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (c) which shall read as follows:

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 62 and 5 U.S.C. 715a, a Foreign Service officer heretofore or hereafter retired under the provisions of section 631 or 632 or a Foreign Service staff officer or employee hereafter retired under the provisions of section 803 shall not, by reason of his retired status, be barred from employment in Federal Government service in any appointive position for which he is qualified. An annuitant so reemployed shall serve at the will of the appointing officer".

Sec. 10. Section 522 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph (3) which shall read as follows:

"(3) extend the appointment or assignment of any Reserve officer, or continue the services of any such Reserve officer by reappointment without regard to the provisions of section 527 of this Act, for not more than five additional years if the Secretary deems it to be in the public interest to continue such officer in the Service, except that the assignment of any Reserve officer under paragraph (2) above may not be extended under the provisions of this paragraph without the consent of the head of the agency concerned."

Sec. 11. Section 531 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 531. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, appoint staff officers and employees on the basis of qualifications and experience. The Secretary may make provisions for temporary, limited, and such other type appointments as he may deem necessary. He is authorized to establish appropriate probationary periods during which newly appointed staff officers or employees, other than those appointed for temporary or limited service shall be required to serve. The Secretary may terminate at any time, without regard to the provisions of section 637, or the provisions of any other law, staff officers or employees appointed for temporary or limited service and other staff officers or employees who occupy probationary status."

Sec. 12. Section 532 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 532. Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Secretary may assign a staff officer or employee to any post or he may assign him to serve in any position in which he is eligible to serve under the terms of this or any other Act. A staff officer or employee may be transferred from one post to another by order of the Secretary as the interests of the Service may require."

Sec. 13. (a) Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of section 571 of such act are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 571. (a) Any officer or employee of the Service may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be assigned or detailed for duty in any Government agency, or in any international organization, international commission, or any international body, such an assignment or combination of assignments to be for a period of not more than 4 years, except that under special circumstances the Secretary may extend this 4-year period for not more than 4 additional years."

"(b) If a Foreign Service officer shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone to a position in any Government agency, any United States delegation or mission to any international organization, international commission, or any international body, the period of his service in such capacity shall be construed as constituting an assignment within the meaning of paragraph (a) of this section and such person shall not, by virtue of the acceptance of such an assignment, lose his status as a Foreign Service officer. Service in such a

position shall not, however, be subject to the limitations concerning the duration of an assignment contained in that paragraph.

"(c) If the basic minimum salary of the position to which an officer or employee of the Service is assigned pursuant to the terms of this section is higher than the salary such officer or employee is entitled to receive as an officer or employee of the Service, such officer or employee shall, during the period such difference in salary exists, receive the salary and allowances of the position in which he is serving in lieu of his salary and allowances as an officer or employee of the Service. Any salary paid under the provisions of this section shall be paid from appropriations made available for the payment of salaries of officers and employees of the Service and shall be the salary on the basis of which computations and payments shall be made in accordance with the provisions of title VIII. No officer or employee of the Service who, subsequent to the effective date of this act is assigned to, or who after June 30, 1960, occupies a position in the Department that is designated as a Foreign Service position shall be entitled to receive a salary differential under the provisions of this paragraph."

(b) Paragraph (e) of section 571 of such act is amended by striking the phrase "with heads of Government agencies" where it appears in the second sentence and by redesignating the paragraph as "(d)."

Sec. 14. Section 625 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 625. Any Foreign Service officer or any Reserve officer, whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the Service and who shall have been in a given class for a continuous period of 9 months or more, shall, on the first day of each fiscal year, receive an increase in salary to the next higher rate for the class in which he is serving. Without regard to any other law the Secretary is authorized to grant to any such officer additional increases in salary within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon especially meritorious service."

Sec. 15. The heading "Part D. Separation of Foreign Service Officers From the Service" under title VI of such Act is amended to read as follows: "Part D. Separation of Officers and Employees From the Service."

Sec. 16. Section 631 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 631. Any Foreign Service officer who is a career ambassador or a career minister, other than one occupying a position as chief of mission or any other position to which he has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall, upon reaching the age of sixty-five, be retired from the Service and receive retirement benefits in accordance with the provisions of section 821, but whenever the Secretary shall determine it to be in the public interest, he may extend such an officer's service for a period not to exceed five years."

Sec. 17. Section 632 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 632. Any Foreign officer, other than one occupying a position as chief of mission or any other position to which he has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who is not a career ambassador or a career minister shall, upon reaching the age of sixty, be retired from the Service and receive retirement benefits in accordance with the provisions of section 821 but whenever the Secretary shall determine it to be in the public interest, he may extend such an officer's service for a period not to exceed five years."

Sec. 18. (a) Paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 637 of such Act and the heading thereto are amended to read as follows:

"SEPARATION FOR CAUSE"

"Sec. 637. (a) The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, sepa-

rate from the Service any Foreign Service officer, Reserve officer, or staff officer or employee, on account of the unsatisfactory performance of his duties, or for such other cause as will promote the efficiency of the Service, and for reasons given in writing, but no such officer or employee shall be so separated until he shall have been granted a hearing by the Board of the Foreign Service and the unsatisfactory performance of his duties, or other cause for separation, shall have been established at such hearing, or else he shall have waived in writing his right to a hearing. The provisions of this section shall not apply to Foreign Service officers of class 8 or any other officer or employee of the Service who is in a probationary status or whose appointment is limited or temporary.

"(b) Any participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability system who is:

"(1) over forty-five years of age, separated from the Service for unsatisfactory performance of duty shall be retired upon an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 821 but not in excess of 25 per centum of his per annum salary at the time of his separation;

"(2) under forty-five years of age, separated from the Service for unsatisfactory performance of duty shall at the time of separation receive a payment equal to one year's salary or the refund, as provided in section 841(a), of the contributions made by him to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, whichever shall be greater."

"(c) Any participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability system separated under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, for reasons other than unsatisfactory performance of duty, may, in the discretion of the Secretary and on the basis of criteria established in advance by him, be granted the benefits of paragraph (b) of this section depending upon his age. Unless the Secretary determines at the time of separation of a participant under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section that he shall be granted the benefits of paragraph (b) of this section his contributions to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund shall be returned to him in accordance with the provisions of section 841(a)."

"(d) Any officer or employee of the Service who is not a participant in the Foreign Service retirement and disability system shall be entitled only to such benefits as shall accrue to him under the retirement system in which he is a participant."

(b) Section 637 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (e) which shall read as follows:

"(e) Any payments made in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) or (c) of this section shall be made out of the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund."

Sec. 19. Section 638 of such Act and the heading thereto are amended to read as follows:

"TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE RESERVE OFFICERS AND STAFF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES UNDER LIMITED APPOINTMENT"

"Sec. 638. Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, the Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, terminate the services of any Reserve officer or staff officer or employee serving under limited appointment at any time."

Sec. 20. Section 641 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 641. All promotions of staff officers and employees to a higher class shall be made at the same or at a higher salary on the basis of performance and merit in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe."

SEC. 21. Section 642 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 642. (a) Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, any staff officer or employee whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the Service shall receive an increase in salary at periodic intervals to the next higher salary rate for the class in which he is serving. Without regard to any other law the Secretary is authorized to grant any such officer or employee additional increases in salary within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon especially meritorious service.

"(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, any staff officer or employee who has achieved the maximum salary rate prescribed by section 415 for the class in which he is serving may be granted an additional in-class salary increment from time to time in recognition of longevity and proficiency in the Service. Each such salary increment shall be equal to the maximum step rate increment of the applicable class and no person shall receive more than four such salary increments while serving in the same class."

SEC. 22. Section 701 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence which shall read as follows: "The Secretary may also provide appropriate orientation and language training to dependents of officers and employees of the Government if such officers and employees are assigned to foreign relations activities."

SEC. 23. Section 704 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (e) which shall read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, in the absence of suitably qualified United States citizens, employ persons who are not citizens of the United States by appointment to the staff of the Institute either on a full- or part-time basis or by contract for services in the United States or abroad at rates not in excess of those provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1071)".

SEC. 24. (a) Section 803(b)(2) of such act is amended to read as follows: "(2) have paid into the fund a special contribution for each year of such service in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of section 852."

(b) Section 803 is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (c) which shall read as follows:

"(c) (1) In accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe, any Foreign Service staff officer or employee appointed by the Secretary of State who has completed at least 10 years of continuous service in the Department's Foreign Service, exclusive of military service, shall become a participant in the Foreign Service retirement and disability system and shall make a special contribution to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 852.

"(2) Any such officer or employee who, under the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section, becomes a participant in the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, shall be mandatorily retired for age during the first year after the effective date of this section if he attains age 64 or if he is over age 64; during the second year at age 63; during the third year at age 62; during the fourth year at age 61, and thereafter at age 60."

SEC. 25. Section 804 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 804. (a) Annuitants shall be persons who are receiving annuities from the fund on the effective date of this Act and all persons, including widows, widowers, dependent widowers, children, and beneficiaries of participants or annuitants who shall become entitled to receive annuities in accordance with the provisions of this Act, as amended, or

in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Act of May 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 125).

"(b) When used in this title the term—

"(1) 'Widow' means the surviving wife of a participant who was married to such participant for at least 2 years immediately preceding his death or is the mother of issue by such marriage.

"(2) 'Widower' means the surviving husband of a participant who was married to such participant for at least 2 years immediately preceding her death or is the father of issue by such marriage.

"(3) 'Dependent widower' means the surviving husband of a participant who was married to such participant for at least 2 years immediately preceding her death or is the father of issue by such marriage, and who is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability, and who received more than one-half of his support from such participant.

"(4) 'Child' means an unmarried child, including (a) an adopted child, and (b) a stepchild or recognized natural child who received more than one-half of his support from the participant, under the age of 18 years, or such unmarried child regardless of age who because of physical or mental disability incurred before age 18 is incapable of self-support."

SEC. 26. Section 811 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "Five" and by inserting the words "Six and one-half".

SEC. 27. (a) Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of section 821 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 821. (a) The annuity of a participant shall be equal to 2 per centum of his average basic salary for the highest five consecutive years of service, for which full contributions have been made to the Fund, multiplied by the number of years, not exceeding thirty-five, of service credit obtained in accordance with the provisions of sections 851, 852, and 853. However, the highest five years of service for which full contributions have been made to the Fund shall be used in computing the annuity of any Foreign Service officer who serves as chief of mission and whose continuity of service as such is interrupted prior to retirement by appointment or assignment to any other position determined by the Secretary to be of comparable importance. In determining the aggregate period of service upon which the annuity is to be based, the fractional part of a month, if any, shall not be counted.

"(b) At the time of retirement, any participant may, except as otherwise provided by section 834(a), elect to receive a reduced annuity and to provide for an annuity payable to his widow or her widower, commencing on the date following such participant's death and terminating upon the death of such surviving widow or widower. The annuity payable to the surviving widow or widower after such participant's death shall be fifty per centum of the amount of the participant's annuity, up to the full amount of his annuity, specified by him as the base for the survivor benefits computed as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section. The annuity of the participant making such election shall be reduced by 2½ per centum of any amount up to \$2,400 he specifies as the base for the survivor benefit plus ten per centum of any amount over \$2,400 up to the full amount of the participant's annuity so specified.

"(c) (1) If an annuitant who made the election provided for in paragraph (b) of this section dies and is survived by a widow or widower and by a child or children, there shall be paid to or on behalf of each child, in addition to the annuity payable to the surviving widow or widower under such election, an annuity equal to the smallest of: (1) 40 per centum of the annuitant's average salary divided by the number of children; (11) \$600;

or (iii) \$1,800 divided between the number of children.

"(2) If an annuitant who did not make the election provided for in paragraph (b) dies and is survived by a widow or widower and by a child or children, or if such annuitant is not survived by a widow or widower but by a child or children, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of: (i) 50 per centum of the annuitant's average salary divided by the number of children; (ii) \$720; or (iii) \$2,160 divided between the number of children."

(b) Section 821 of such Act is further amended by adding new paragraphs (d), (e), and (f) which shall read as follows:

"(d) If a surviving widow or widower who is receiving an annuity in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section dies or the annuity of a child is terminated, the annuity of any other child or children shall be recomputed and paid as though such wife, husband, or child has not survived the participant.

"(e) The annuity payable to a child under paragraphs (c) or (d) of this section shall begin on the first day of the next month after the participant dies and such annuity or any right thereto shall be determined upon death, marriage, or attainment of the age of eighteen years, except that, if a child is incapable of self-support by reasons of mental or physical disability, the annuity shall be terminated only when such child dies, marries, or recovers from such disability.

"(f) A participant who is not entitled to designate a beneficiary in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section may at the time of retirement elect to receive a reduced annuity for himself and to provide for an annuity payable after his or her death to a beneficiary whose name shall be notified in writing to the Secretary. The participant may elect that such beneficiary shall receive annuity payments either equal to 50 per centum of the participant's full annuity or to such lesser base sum as the participant shall designate. The annuity payable to a participant making such election shall be reduced by 10 per centum of an annuity computed as provided in subsection (a) of this section and by 5 per centum of an annuity so computed for each full five years the person designated is younger than the retiring participant, but such total reduction shall not exceed 40 per centum. Upon the death of the surviving beneficiary all payments shall cease and no further annuity payments shall be due or payable. No such election of a reduced annuity payable to a beneficiary shall be valid until the participant shall have satisfactorily passed a physical examination as prescribed by the Secretary."

SEC. 28. (a) Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of section 831 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 831. (a) Any participant who has five years of service credit toward retirement under the system, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 851 or 852(a)(2), and who becomes totally disabled or incapacitated for useful and efficient service by reason of disease, illness, or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on his part, shall, upon his own application or upon order of the Secretary, be retired on an annuity computed as prescribed in section 821. If the disabled or incapacitated participant has less than twenty years of service credit toward his retirement under the system at the time he is retired, his annuity shall be computed on the assumption that he had had twenty years of service, but the additional service credit that may accrue to a participant under this provision shall in no case exceed the difference between his age at the time of retirement and the mandatory retirement age applicable to his class in the Service.

"(b) In each case such disability shall be determined by the Secretary upon the basis of the advice of one or more duly qualified physicians or surgeons, designated by the Secretary to conduct examinations. Unless the disability is permanent, like examinations shall be made annually until the annuitant has reached the statutory mandatory retirement age for his class in the Service. If the Secretary determines, on the basis of the advice of one or more duly qualified physicians or surgeons conducting such examinations that an annuitant has recovered to the extent that he can return to active duty, the annuitant shall be given the opportunity to be reinstated or reappointed in the Service. The Secretary may reinstate any such recovered disability annuitant in the class in which he was serving at time of retirement. The Secretary may, taking into consideration the age, qualifications, and experience of such officer and the rank of his contemporaries in the Service, recommend that the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint him to a class higher than the one in which he was serving prior to retirement. Payment of the annuity shall continue until a date six months after the date of the examination showing recovery or until the date of reinstatement to active duty in the Service, whichever is earlier. Fees for examinations under this provision, together with reasonable traveling and other expenses incurred in order to submit to examination, shall be paid out of the Fund. If the annuitant fails to submit to examination as required under this section, payment of the annuity shall be suspended until continuance of the disability is satisfactorily established.

"(c) If a recovered disability annuitant whose annuity is discontinued is for any reason not reinstated to active duty, or reappointed to a higher class in the Service, he shall be considered to have been separated within the meaning of section 834 as of the date he was retired for disability and he shall, after the discontinuance of the disability annuity, be entitled to the benefits of that section or of section 841(a) except that he may elect voluntary retirement in accordance with the provisions of section 636 if he can qualify under its provisions."

(b) Section 831 of such Act is further amended by adding new paragraphs (d), (e), and (f) which shall read as follows:

"(d) No participant shall be entitled to receive an annuity under this Act and compensation for injury or disability to himself under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, covering the same period of time. This provision shall not bar the right of any claimant to the greater benefit conferred by either Act for any part of the same period of time. Neither this provision nor any provision of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, shall be so construed as to deny the right of any person to receive an annuity under this Act by reason of his own services and to receive concurrently any payment under such Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, by reason of the death of some other persons.

"(e) Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the right of any participant entitled to an annuity under this Act shall not be affected because such participant has received an award of compensation in a lump sum under section 14 of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, except that where such annuity is payable on account of the same disability for which compensation under such section has been paid, so much of such compensation as has been paid for any period extended beyond the date such annuity becomes effective, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, shall be refunded to the Department of Labor, to be paid into the

Federal Employees' Compensation Fund. Before such person shall receive such annuity he shall (1) refund to the Department of Labor the amount representing such computed payments for such extended period, or (2) authorize the deduction of such amount from the annuity payable to him under this Act, which amount shall be transmitted to such Department for reimbursement to such Fund. Deductions from such annuity may be made from accrued and accruing payments, or may be prorated against and paid from accruing payments in such manner as the Secretary of Labor shall determine, whenever he finds that the financial circumstances of the annuitant are such as to warrant such deferred refunding."

Sec. 29. Section 832 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 832. (a) In case a participant shall die and no valid claim for annuity is payable under the provisions of this Act, his contributions to the Fund, with interest, shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of sections 841(a) and 881.

"(b) If a participant who has at least 5 years of service credit toward retirement under the system, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of sections 851 or 852(a)(2), dies before separation or retirement from the Service and is survived by a widow or a dependent widower, who qualified for an annuity under the provisions of paragraph (b) of section 821, such widow or dependent widower shall be entitled to an annuity equal to 50 per centum of the annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (e) of this section and paragraph (a) of section 821. The annuity of such widow or dependent widower shall commence on the date following death of the participant and shall terminate upon death of the widow or dependent widower, or upon the dependent widower's becoming capable of self-support.

"(c) If a participant who has at least 5 years of service credit toward retirement under the system, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of sections 851 or 852(a)(2), dies before separation or retirement from the service and is survived by a widow or a dependent widower, who qualifies for an annuity under the provisions of paragraph (b) of section 821, and a child or children, each surviving child shall be entitled to an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of section 821. The child's annuity shall begin and be terminated in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (e) of section 821. Upon the death of the surviving widow or dependent widower or termination of the annuity of a child, the annuity of any other child or children shall be recomputed and paid as though such widow or dependent widower or child had not survived the participant.

"(d) If a participant who has at least 5 years of service credit toward retirement under the system, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of sections 851 or 852(a)(2), dies before separation or retirement from the service and is not survived by a widow or widower, but by a child or children, each surviving child shall be entitled to an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c)(2) of section 821.

"(e) If, at the time of his or her death, the deceased participant had less than 20 years of service credit toward retirement under the system, the annuities payable in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section shall be computed in accordance with the provisions of section 821 on the assumption he or she had had 20 years of service, but the additional service credit that may accrue to a deceased participant under this

provision shall in no case exceed the difference between his or her age on the date of death and the mandatory retirement age applicable to his or her class in the Service. In all cases arising under paragraphs (b), (c), (d), or (e) of this section, it shall be assumed that the deceased participant was qualified for retirement on the date of his death."

Sec. 30. A new section 834 is hereby added to such Act as follows:

"DISCONTINUED SERVICE RETIREMENT"

"Sec. 834. (a) Any participant who voluntarily separates from the Service after obtaining at least 5 years of service credit toward retirement under the system, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of sections 851 or 852(a)(2), may, upon separation from the Service or at any time prior to becoming eligible for an annuity, elect to have his contributions to the Fund returned to him in accordance with the provisions of section 841, or to leave his contributions in the Fund and receive an annuity, computed as prescribed in section 821 commencing at the age of 60 years. The provisions of paragraph (f) of section 821 shall not be applicable to such participants.

"(b) If a participant who has qualified in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, to receive a deferred annuity commencing at the age of 60 dies before reaching the age of 60 his contributions to the Fund, with interest, shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of sections 841 and 881."

Sec. 31. Section 841 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 841. (a) Whenever a participant becomes separated from the Service without becoming eligible for an annuity or a deferred annuity in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the total amount of contributions from his salary with interest thereon at 4 per centum per annum, compounded annually at the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 1958; semiannually as of December 31, 1958; annually thereafter as of December 31, and proportionately for the period served during the year of separation including all contributions made during or for such period, except as provided in section 881, shall be returned to him.

"(b) In the event that the total contributions of a retired participant, other than voluntary contributions made in accordance with the provisions of section 881, with interest at 4 per centum per annum compounded annually as is provided in paragraph (a) of this section added thereto, exceed the total amount returned to such participant or to an annuitant claiming through him, in the form of annuities, accumulated at the same rate of interest up to the date the annuity payments cease under the terms of the annuity, the excess of the accumulated contributions over the accumulated annuity payments shall be paid in the following order of precedence, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"(1) To the beneficiary or beneficiaries designated by the retired participant in writing to the Secretary;

"(2) If there be no such beneficiary, to the widow or widower of such participant;

"(3) If none of the above, to the child or children of such participant and descendants of deceased children by representation;

"(4) If none of the above, to the parents of such participant or the survivor of them;

"(5) If none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such participant;

"(6) If none of the above, to other next of kin of such participant as may be determined by the Secretary in his judgment to be legally entitled thereto.

"(c) No payment shall be made pursuant to paragraph (b) (6) of this section until after the expiration of thirty days from the death of the retired participant or his surviving annuitant."

SEC. 32. Section 851 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 851. For the purposes of this title, the period of service of a participant shall be computed from the effective date of appointment as a Foreign Service officer, or, if appointed prior to July 1, 1924, as an officer or employee of the Diplomatic or Consular Service of the United States, or who becomes a participant under the provisions of this Act, as amended, but all periods of separation from the Service and so much of any leaves of absence without pay as may exceed six months in the aggregate in any calendar year shall be excluded, except leaves of absence while receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, and leaves of absence granted participants while performing active and honorable military or naval service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States."

SEC. 33. (a) Paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of section 852 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) A participant may, subject to the provisions of this section, include in his period of service—

"(1) service performed as a civilian officer or employee of the Government, including the municipal government of the District of Columbia, prior to becoming a participant; and

"(2) active and honorable military or naval service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard of the United States.

"(b) A person may obtain prior civilian service credit in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) (1) of this section by making a special contribution to the Fund equal to 5 per centum of his basic annual salary for each year of service for which credit is sought subsequent to July 1, 1924, and prior to the effective date of this Act, and at 6½ per centum thereafter with interest compounded annually at 4 per centum per annum to the date of payment. Any such participant may, under such conditions as may be determined in each instance by the Secretary, pay such special contributions in installments.

"(c) (1) If an officer or employee under some other government retirement system, becomes a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System by direct transfer, such officer or employee's total contributions and deposits, including interest accrued thereon, except voluntary contributions, shall be transferred to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund effective as of the date such officer or employee becomes a participant in the system. Each such officer or employee shall be deemed to consent to the transfer of such funds and such transfer shall be a complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands against the other government retirement fund on account of service rendered prior to becoming a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System.

"(2) No officer or employee, whose contributions are transferred to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c) (1) of this section, shall be required to make contributions in addition to those transferred, for periods of service for which full contributions were made to the other government retirement fund, nor shall any refund be made to any such officer or employee on account of contributions made during any period to the other government

retirement fund, at a higher rate than that fixed by section 811 of this Act for contributions to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System.

"(3) No officer or employee, whose contributions are transferred to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c) (1) of this section, shall receive credit for periods of prior service for which a refund of contributions has been made, or for which no contributions were made to the other Government retirement fund. A participant may, however, obtain credit for such prior service by making a special contribution to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section."

(b) Section 852 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof new paragraphs (d) and (e) which shall read as follows:

"(d) No participant may obtain prior civilian service credit toward retirement under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability system for any period of civilian service on the basis of which he is receiving or will in the future be entitled to receive any annuity under another retirement system covering civilian personnel of the Government.

"(e) A participant may obtain prior military or naval service credit in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) (2) of this section by applying for it to the Secretary prior to retirement or separation from the Service, but in the case of a participant who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of military or naval service, the period of service upon which such retired pay is based shall not be included except that in the case of a participant who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of a service-connected disability incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or resulting from an explosion of an instrument of war and incurred in line of duty during an enlistment or employment as provided in Veterans Regulation Numbered 1(a), part I, paragraph I, or is awarded under title III of Public Law 810, 80th Congress, the period of such military or naval service shall be included. No contributions to the Fund shall be required in connection with military or naval service credited to a participant in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) (2) of this section."

SEC. 34. The heading "Part H. Officers reinstated in the Service" under title VIII of such act is amended to read as follows: "Part H. Annuitants Recalled or Reinstated in the Service or Reemployed in the Government."

SEC. 35. Section 871 of such Act is amended and a heading is added thereto as follows:

"RECALL"

"SEC. 871. Any annuitant recalled to active duty in the Service in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of section 520 or paragraph (b) of section 831 shall, while so serving, be entitled in lieu of his retirement allowance to the full pay of the class in which he is serving. During such service, he shall make contributions to the Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 811. The amount of his annuity when he reverts to the retired list shall be recomputed in accordance with the provisions of section 821."

SEC. 36. A new section 872 is hereby added to such Act as follows:

"REEMPLOYMENT"

"SEC. 872. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any officer or employee of the Service, who has retired under this Act, as amended, and is receiving an annuity pursuant thereto, and who is reemployed in the Federal Government Service in any appoint-

ment position either on a part-time or full-time basis, shall be entitled to receive the salary of the position in which he is serving plus so much of his annuity payable under this Act, as amended, which when combined with such salary does not exceed during any calendar year the highest basic salary such officer or employee was entitled to receive under sections 412 or 415 of the Act, as amended, on the date of his retirement from the Service. Any such reemployed officer or employee who receives salary during any calendar year in excess of the maximum amount which he may be entitled to receive under this subparagraph shall be entitled to such salary in lieu of benefits hereunder.

"(b) When any such retired officer or employee of the Service is reemployed, the employer shall notify the Department of State of such reemployment together with all pertinent information relating thereto and shall cause to be paid, by transfer or otherwise, to the Department of State funds necessary to cover gross salary, employer contributions, and gross lump-sum leave payment relating to the employment of the reemployed officer or employee. The Department of State shall make to and on behalf of the reemployed officer or employee payments to which he is entitled under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, and shall make those withholdings and deductions authorized and required by law.

"(c) In the event of any overpayment under this section the Secretary of State is authorized to withhold the amount of such overpayment from the salary payable to such reemployed officer or employee or from his annuity."

SEC. 37. (a) Paragraph (a) of section 881 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 881. (a) Any participant may, at his option and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the President, deposit additional sums in multiples of 1 percent of his basic salary, but not in excess of 10 percent of such salary, which amounts together with interest at 3 percent per annum, compounded annually at the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 1958; semiannually as of December 31, 1958; annually thereafter as of December 31, and proportionately for the period served during the year of his retirement including all contributions made during or for such period, shall, at the date of his retirement and at his election, be—"

(b) Paragraph (c) of section 881 of such act is amended by deleting the word "annually" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "as is provided in paragraph (a) of this section."

SEC. 38. (a) Section 1021 of such act is amended by inserting the phrase "the Department including" immediately prior to the phrase "the Service" wherever it appears in this section.

(b) Section 1021(a) is further amended by striking out the phrase "if recommended by the Director General" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "at the discretion of the Secretary."

SEC. 39. Section 11 of Public Law 885, 84th Congress (70 Stat. 890) is hereby amended by inserting after the phrase "Government-owned vehicles" the phrase "or taxicabs" and by inserting after the phrase "public transportation facilities" the phrase "other than taxicabs."

SEC. 40. Paragraph (4) of section 104(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 104(a)(4)) (relating to the exclusion from gross income of compensation for injuries and sickness) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(4) amounts received as a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country or

in the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Public Health Service, or as a disability annuity payable under the provisions of section 831 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1081; 60 Stat. 1021)."

SEC. 41. Foreign Service staff officers and employees receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this Act at one of the scheduled rates provided by section 415 of such Act, as amended,

shall be transferred to the new classes established by section 415 of such Act, as amended, and shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this Act, as follows:

Present class and step rate of sec. 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (1958)			Corresponding new class and step rate of sec. 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended by this act			Amount of adjustments	Present class and step rate of sec. 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (1958)			Corresponding new class and step rate of sec. 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended by this act			Amount of adjustments
Class	Step	Rate	Class	Step	Rate		Class	Step	Rate	Class	Step	Rate	
FSS-1-----	5	\$13,160	FSS-1-----	6	\$13,310	\$150	FSS-9-----	6	\$6,650	FSS-5-----	4	\$6,750	\$100
	4	12,830		5	12,980	150		5	6,435	FSS-6-----	7	6,500	65
	3	12,480		4	12,650	170		4	6,220		6	6,300	80
	2	12,120		3	12,320	200		3	6,005		5	6,100	95
	1	11,770		2	11,990	220		2	5,795		4	5,900	105
FSS-2-----	5	12,120	FSS-1-----	3	12,320	200		1	5,585	FSS-6-----	3	5,700	115
	4	11,770		2	11,990	220	FSS-10-----	7	6,175		6	6,300	125
	3	11,485	FSS-2-----	7	11,550	65		6	5,970		5	6,100	130
	2	11,205		6	11,275	70		5	5,755		4	5,900	145
	1	10,920		5	11,000	80		4	5,540	FSS-7-----	7	5,550	10
FSS-3-----	5	11,165	FSS-2-----	6	11,275	110		3	5,400		6	5,400	140
	4	10,885		5	11,000	115		2	5,260		5	5,250	135
	3	10,600		4	10,725	125		1	5,115	FSS-7-----	7	5,550	50
	2	10,320		3	10,450	130	FSS-11-----	7	5,500		6	5,400	45
	1	10,030	FSS-2-----	2	10,175	145		6	5,355		5	5,250	35
FSS-4-----	5	10,230		3	10,450	220		5	5,215		4	5,100	30
	4	9,945		2	10,175	230		4	5,070		3	4,950	20
	3	9,665	FSS-3-----	7	9,790	125		3	4,930		2	4,800	10
	2	9,380		6	9,515	135	FSS-12-----	7	5,025	FSS-8-----	7	5,100	75
	1	9,095	FSS-3-----	5	9,240	145		6	4,890		6	4,950	60
FSS-5-----	6	9,600		7	9,790	190		5	4,745		5	4,800	55
	5	9,315		6	9,515	200		4	4,605		4	4,650	45
	4	9,030		5	9,240	210		3	4,460		3	4,500	40
	3	8,815		4	8,965	150		2	4,320		2	4,350	30
	2	8,610		3	8,690	80		1	4,180		1	4,200	20
	1	8,395	FSS-3-----	2	8,415	20	FSS-13-----	7	4,580	FSS-9-----	7	4,650	70
FSS-6-----	6	8,755		4	8,965	210		6	4,440		6	4,500	60
	5	8,540		3	8,690	150		5	4,295		5	4,350	55
	4	8,325	FSS-4-----	7	8,350	25		4	4,155		4	4,200	45
	3	8,120		6	8,125	5		3	4,010		3	4,050	40
	2	7,905		5	8,125	220		2	3,870		2	3,900	30
	1	7,690	FSS-4-----	6	7,900	210		1	3,730	FSS-9-----	4	3,750	20
FSS-7-----	6	8,050		5	7,900	60	FSS-14-----	7	4,155		1	4,200	45
	5	7,840		4	7,675	45		6	4,010	FSS-10-----	7	4,100	90
	4	7,630		3	7,450	35		5	3,870		5	3,900	30
	3	7,415		2	7,225	25		4	3,730		4	3,800	70
	2	7,200		1	7,000	10		3	3,585		3	3,600	15
	1	6,990	FSS-5-----	7	7,350	-----		2	3,445		2	3,500	55
FSS-8-----	6	7,350		6	7,150	10	FSS-15-----	1	3,300		1	3,500	200
	5	7,140		5	6,950	25		-----		-----	-----	-----	5
	4	6,925		4	6,750	40							
	3	6,710		3	6,550	55							
	2	6,495		2	6,350	65							
	1	6,285		1									

SEC. 42. The annuity of each former participant under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability system, who retired prior to July 28, 1956, and who at the time of his retirement had creditable service in excess of thirty years, shall be recomputed on the basis of actual years of creditable service not in excess of thirty-five years. Service which was not creditable under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability system on the date of a former participant retires, shall not be included as creditable service for the purpose of this recomputation. The annuities payable to such persons shall, when recomputed, be paid at the rates so determined, but no such recomputation or any other action taken pursuant to this section shall operate to reduce the rate of the annuity any such person is entitled to receive under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability system.

SEC. 43. (a) The provisions of this Act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins one month after the passage of this Act, except as provided in paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this section.

(b) The provisions of paragraphs (c) (1) and (c) (2) of section 803 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended by section 24(b) of this Act, shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins one year after the effective date of this Act, except that any Foreign Service staff officer or employee, who at the time this Act becomes effective meets the requirements for participation in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability system may elect to become a participant in the system before the mandatory provisions become effective. Such Foreign Service staff officers and employees shall become participants effective on the first day of the second month following the date of their application for earlier participation.

(c) The amendment made by section 40 of this Act shall be effective with respect to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) The provisions of section 42 of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 44. Notwithstanding the provisions of this Act, existing rules, regulations or applicable to the Foreign Service of the United States shall remain in effect until revoked or rescinded or until modified or superseded by regulations made in accordance with the provisions of this Act, unless clearly inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 45. The following headings and sections in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 442 of such Act and the heading thereto.

(2) Section 525 of such Act and the heading thereto.

(3) Section 576 of such Act and the heading thereto.

(4) Sections 651 and 652 of such Act and the headings thereto including part F.

The letter presented by Mr. GREEN is as follows:

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: In its continuing efforts to improve and strengthen the administration of the Foreign Service, the Department is submitting a proposed bill "To amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes" (tab I) for consideration by the United States Senate.

The amendments proposed in this bill are urgently needed to improve and strengthen the administration of the Foreign Service. They would accomplish the following:

1. Provide an improved 10-class salary structure for the Foreign Service staff corps and authorize the Secretary to fix salary rates for United States citizens employed abroad.

2. Provide authority for appointment of Foreign Service staff personnel at in-class salary-step rates and authorize the fixing of appointment salary rates for short-supply categories of personnel.

3. Clarify provisions governing the termination of the services of chiefs of mission.

4. Provide greater flexibility in the classification of Foreign Service positions.

5. Provide authority to pay a hazardous duty salary differential to diplomatic couriers.

6. Clarify and improve provisions governing lateral entry into the Foreign Service.

7. Improve provisions relating to reinstatement and recall of Foreign Service officers and remove existing restrictions on the reemployment by any Government agency of retired participants in the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

8. Provide authority for the continuation on the rolls of certain Foreign Service Reserve officers notwithstanding the usual limitation on duration of assignment.

9. Clarify and simplify provisions governing appointment, assignment, transfer, and promotion of Foreign Service staff personnel. Establish a system of longevity for staff personnel.

10. Clarify and simplify provisions governing the assignment of Foreign Service personnel to Government agencies.

11. Liberalize provisions relating to extension of services of Foreign Service officers beyond mandatory retirement age.

12. Provide a uniform basis for effecting separation for cause.

13. Provide specific authority for the termination of officers and employees serving under limited appointment.

14. Improve provisions governing the establishment of, the conduct of, and the use of the facilities of the Foreign Service Institute.

15. Provide for general improvement in the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, including such specific improvements as:

(a) Liberalization of survivorship benefits and coverage of surviving children;

(b) Provision for the participation of certain Foreign Service staff personnel in the system;

(c) Clarification of provisions for reinstatement of recovered disability annuitants;

(d) Clarification of provisions relating to death in service;

(e) Clarification of provisions governing prior service credit;

(f) Provision for the automatic transfer of contributions from one retirement fund to another; and

(g) An increase in rate of employee contributions from 5 to 6½ percent.

16. Improve provisions governing the acceptance of gifts.

17. Clarify provisions relating to the use of Government-owned vehicles at posts abroad.

18. Exempt disability annuities from income tax liability.

Throughout the proposed draft bill there are perfecting and clarifying technical changes that relate to the proposals listed above.

An explanation of each of the proposed amendments is enclosed (table II), together with an estimate of the cost involved in implementing the proposed legislation (table III).

Enactment of this proposed legislation will provide important improvements in the personnel system for the conduct of foreign affairs. The Department recommends the passage of this bill to accomplish the purposes set forth above and trusts that it may receive favorable consideration by the Congress.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this draft legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Acting Secretary.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills relating to cultural affairs. One is designed to promote the international

cultural exchange, and the other fosters the development of the arts here at home.

The first measure would amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956, to provide for participation by foreign governments and citizens of other countries in cultural activities in the United States. This law, which was sponsored by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, and myself, made the President's Special International Program of Cultural Exchange a permanent policy.

Unfortunately the President's program was primarily concerned with sending American cultural programs overseas and did not provide for a true exchange. In this connection I quote from the letter President Eisenhower sent to the Congress on July 27, 1954, which called for the establishment of such a program. It is clear from the letter that a program of cultural exchange was not contemplated at the time.

He requested the sum of \$5 million to be expended at his discretion "to meet extraordinary or unusual circumstances arising in the international affairs of the Government." The President specifically stressed the need to participate in international trade fairs, where the Russians had achieved marked success in advertising their way of life through their products. Then the President said:

In the cultural and artistic fields as well we need greater resources to assist and encourage private musical, dramatic, and other cultural groups to go forth and demonstrate that America too can lay claim to high cultural and artistic accomplishments.

In the 4 years that have elapsed since then, 111 attractions have been sent to 89 countries by the United States. Miracles have been accomplished by the modest sums allocated for this program. The New York Times recently noted that the 1959 allocation for the program is a mere \$2,415,000, while a single intercontinental ballistic missile costs \$2 million. At the conclusion of my remarks I shall include a brilliant review of this program and other cultural activities of the Federal Government which was carried in the New York Times in December 1958.

Unlike the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts which have seen the exchange of some 35,000 students between the United States and other countries, the lack of a provision for reciprocity in Public Law 860, 84th Congress, has seriously hampered our relations with other countries. The amendment I am sponsoring is necessary to demonstrate that the United States is interested, and deeply so, in the cultural and artistic achievements of other countries. At the present time the box office is the final arbiter of the cultural attractions which are seen in our country.

As a result, the American public sees many artists from Europe and the Soviet Union, but very few from Asia despite the Orient's long and rich cultural heritage.

The amendment which I am offering, and which Representative FRANK THOMPSON is offering in the House, will correct this situation.

American cultural isolation goes deeper than ignorance of foreign languages. Malvina Lindsay, writing in the Washington Post of October 20, 1958, declared:

Many Americans, young and old, are reluctant to come out of their cultural shells, to use their opportunities for informing themselves about foreign peoples. Yet unless they do this, they may not be able to preserve their own way of life, now being so widely challenged.

Most observers would agree, I am sure, that a cultural exchange program which includes the arts can be of great value in developing understanding between people.

Recently, Marian Anderson visited Asia under the aegis of the Humphrey-Thompson Act. She was received everywhere with enthusiastic acclaim. She did more than any other single person in recent years to change the unfriendly image of America which is held by many people abroad. She especially enhanced our prestige in Asia.

On the other hand, one of the great artists of Asia came to this country recently under commercial sponsorship and was a boxoffice flop. He went away feeling that Americans did not understand him or the people of his country.

These are some of the things that have persuaded me that my proposed amendment to Public Law 860, 84th Congress, is necessary and important. Representative THOMPSON of New Jersey has offered a companion bill in the House.

I turn now to the development of the arts here in the United States.

In his 1955 state of the Union message, President Eisenhower proposed the creation of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. President Eisenhower declared:

In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation.

In the 84th Congress, pursuant to the President's request, a number of bills were introduced in both the House and Senate to achieve this result. Following hearing by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, S. 3419 was favorably reported—Report No. 2409—on July 3, 1956. The bill passed the Senate on July 6, 1956, but was defeated in the House Education and Labor Committee.

In an effort to meet objections raised by the House committee, consultations have been held with interested Members in both Houses. Consequently, the bill I introduce today is a slightly revised version of S. 3419 as it passed the Senate under the inspired leadership of Senator Herbert H. Lehman and with the cooperation of Senator H. Alexander Smith.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an

excerpt from the letter written by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare M. B. Folsom, under date of March 25, 1957, which accompanied one draft of the bill to Congress:

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

Throughout the great epochs of history civilization has been most importantly exemplified by masterworks of art and architecture, music and the dance, drama and literature. Indeed, the verdict of history judges a civilization most definitively by its cultivation of the arts. Encouragement of the arts is a demonstration to itself and to others, of a nation's belief in its spiritual resources and creative destiny.

The United States, despite its relative youth, is rich in artistic achievement. We have contributed new power of design in architecture, created new rhythms in music, and developed a literature which commands worldwide attention. In the theater and film, and in the ancient form of the dance we show a creative vitality. Our great museums, art galleries, and orchestras are the pride of our people. Yet, millions of Americans know painting and sculpture only in reproductions, and there are vast areas where living theater is never seen. We must search for new ways to bring the enjoyment of and participation in the arts to more of our people.

We must also find ways to stimulate our talented persons in the arts. We have at our disposal many persons of talent and genius, whose gifts need the encouragement and recognition which persons in other comparable fields enjoy. The artist, the actor, and the writer must exercise crafts which are mastered only after long technical training—a training equally as arduous as that which the doctor, the chemist, or the astronomer must undergo. To a great extent workers in the arts have had to find their own facilities which, except in rare and widely scattered instances, do not compare in availability, number, or quality with those available to other fields.

Philanthropic individuals and private and public organizations have provided strong support for the arts and properly so. On the other hand, our National Government has not lent its encouragement and prestige to the arts to the extent that is feasible and desirable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that Senators MURRAY, DOUGLAS, and JAVITS have joined me in offering this bill to the Senate as a bipartisan measure. In the House of Representatives a companion bill has been introduced by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, and Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, of New York. I want to pay special tribute to Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey for his splendid initiative in the whole field of the arts. As a result of his prodigious efforts there is a new understanding of this subject in the Congress today.

I ask unanimous consent that a brilliant article in the New York Times of December 8, 1958, by Milton Bracker, entitled "U.S. Role in the Arts Is Found To Have Increased in Decade Since World War II," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. ROLE IN THE ARTS IS FOUND TO HAVE INCREASED IN DECADE SINCE WORLD WAR II

(By Milton Bracker)

In Washington a bill authorizing a National Cultural Center has been approved by Congress and signed by the President. The 9.4-acre site is there and someday—if about \$25 million in private funds can be raised within 5 years—the building may be.

In another part of the capital a white-haired New Englander (who happened to be born in California) is paid by the Government to serve as consultant in poetry to the Library of Congress. His name is Robert Frost. He remarked with hearty irony in an interview that "I'm there chiefly to thank the Government for recognizing our existence."

In New York preparations are being completed for the departures on January 13 of the San Francisco Ballet for the Near East; on January 17 of the Westminster Choir for Africa, and on February 23 of the Little Orchestra Society for the Far East.

AIDED BY STATE DEPARTMENT

All will be backed by State Department funds, administered by the International Cultural Exchange Service of the American National Theatre and Academy. ANTA—like the American Red Cross—is a private body holding a charter from Congress.

In St. Louis—at the City Art Museum—a show of American painting of the last 25 years is being assembled for a tour to open in Italy next September. About 25 artists will be represented, in what one non-Government expert describes as potentially the "most important exhibition of American art to go abroad under Government auspices." This is a venture of the U.S. Information Agency.

In New Delhi on January 5, a new U.S. chancellery will be dedicated. It is a spectacular example of the work of a modern American architect, Edward Durrell Stone, who was commissioned by the State Department through the Office of Foreign Buildings.

ANCIENT RELATIONSHIP

These disparate activities and hundreds of others, have as a common denominator the ancient relationship between the Federal Government and the arts. As it exists in the United States the relationship is virtually impossible to delineate sharply. Yet every time an American passes a coin or puts a stamp on a letter he is touched by it.

Overall truths of the relationship are hard to extract. But a month's look into many phases of it suggests the following:

There is no nationally backed opera like La Scala; no subsidized ballet like the Bolshoi; no state orchestra like the Vienna Philharmonic. Nor is there a central department or agency through which art matters are channeled. Within a given field—music, for example—even well-informed leaders are likely to confront each other with, "Oh, you mean the other committee," when discussing the myriad Government subdivisions that back one or more musical projects.

In recent years, impelled, according to some opinion, by the example of the dictatorships, this country has placed a strong emphasis on the promotion of art for export. This is often noted wryly by artists who would like to see their own particular art subsidized, or at least assisted, for domestic consumption. There is no doubt that the whole question of Government and the arts has tended to narrow into the question of the use of art as an instrument of the foreign policy of the United States in the cold war.

No matter what the Government does or does not do in relation to the arts, it is subject to a barrage of pros and cons. These concern the fear of censorship or control; the

possible sponsorship of subversive art; the timeless disputes between conservatives and modernists in any art medium; and the individual or group equities of artists competing for commissions.

PARADOX AND CONTROVERSY

And this whole subject is fraught with paradox, misunderstanding, and controversy.

In Chicago, a Government subsidy amounting to about \$16,000 was announced by the hard-pressed Lyric Opera Co. But the Government that made the subsidy had its seat not on the Potomac but on the Tiber. The grant, in lire, was to be used largely for travel expenses incurred by Italian singers hired by the Chicago company.

The triumph of Van Cliburn at the Tchaikovsky piano competition in Moscow last May is still commonly held to have been made possible by Government backing. Actually, the funds came from private sources. The Government contribution was a passport.

As for controversy, it has ranged from the political inclination of an individual artist to the design of a 3-cent stamp honoring the American poultry industry; and from the shape of a memorial on a distant beachhead to the recurrent question of whether there should be a Department of Fine Arts.

Abraham Chasins, in "Speaking of Pianists," remarks:

"American artists and intellectuals are the natural enemies of American politicians."

INCREASED LEGISLATION

Whether this is the case, the fact is that legislation by politicians presumably for the benefit of artists and intellectuals has tended to increase during the past decade. The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are ripe with tributes to one or more of the nine muses, although the rhetoric has not been enough to forestall the death of most of the bills introduced.

In his state of the Union message in 1955, President Eisenhower asserted that the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities.

He also proposed a permanent Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, to come under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In one form or another, this idea had been—and is—backed by large numbers of individual artists and their organizations. It was—and is—opposed by a few.

The proposal was passed by the Senate but died in the House. More recently there have been renewed proposals for a Department of Fine Arts, headed by a leader of Cabinet rank; for an Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs; for a U.S. Art Foundation and a National Theater.

CULTURAL AIDE NAMED

Some of these recalled the Pepper-Coffee bill of 1938, for a Bureau of Fine Arts, or even older proposals. Some are sure to be introduced in the 86th Congress. It was announced yesterday that Robert H. Thayer, former Minister to Rumania, had been appointed Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for the coordination of international, educational and cultural relations.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey is one of the most active legislators in the field. Cynics dub him a "culture vulture." The fact remains that Mr. THOMPSON and Senatorial cosponsors have pushed some significant projects over all the usual obstacles into law.

These include the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956, which covered the Brussels Fair; the bill to establish a new national art repository in the old Patent Office Building, and the bill for the National Cultural Center.

The cosponsor of the first of these was Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY of Minnesota.

It authorized on a permanent basis funds for the cultural presentations program that had been established in 1954 following a special request by President Eisenhower to Congress.

ATTRACTIONS TO 89 LANDS

This has meant that in 4 years, 111 attractions—ranging from Dizzy Gillespie to the New York Philharmonic; and from Marian Anderson to "The Skin of Our Teeth"—have been sent to 89 countries. This is the program directed by Robert C. Schnitzer, of ANTA, who observes that every so often some Congressman phones him to urge the booking of the "Flathead County Glee Club." Such pressure on behalf of hometown talent (and voters) has also been brought to bear on the office of E. Allan Lightner, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

But the criterion remains "quality, quality, quality," according to those close to Mr. Lightner. And Mr. Schnitzer says that after he explains the rigid standards of the selection panels, the Congressman invariably recedes without even threatening to have the whole program canceled. Its 1959 allocation is \$2,415,000. A single intercontinental ballistic missile costs \$2 million.

Last March 28, the bill to save the Patent House Building for an art museum became law. It was backed by Representative THOMPSON and Senators HUMPHREY and CLINTON P. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The works to be housed in the Parthenon-like structure at Seventh and F Streets include the National Collection of Fine Arts, now in the Smithsonian Institution; a national portrait gallery; and a contemporary art program.

IN AN ARTISTIC LANDMARK

The Patent Office Building was designed by Robert Mills, who did the Washington Monument. For nearly 125 years it has been one of the Capital's artistic edifices. But this is not to say that the measures sparing it from being torn down for a parking lot has automatically satisfied all those who would like to see the National Collection of Fine Arts in a home of its own.

The measure came as the culmination of a long and involved controversy over another site—on the Mall, near the Smithsonian. This was ardently desired, and ultimately obtained by proponents of the National Air Museum. The latter is temporarily housed in the Smithsonian, too. The director of one of the country's greatest museums says that the best that can be said of the Patent Office Building is that "There are walls standing." If it is to serve as a showplace of fine art, he added, "they've got to renovate the whole thing."

On the other hand, Representative THOMPSON says he has been assured by experts that the conversion is "entirely feasible." It would be paid for by the General Services Administration. But for the moment, the plan is in abeyance.

The Civil Service Commission has occupied the Patent Office Building since 1932, when the Patent Office moved to the Department of Commerce. The Civil Service Commission is scheduled to move into a new building of its own, but the building is not yet built.

SITE FOR ENTERTAINING

Thus the transfer of the National Collection of Fine Arts remains indefinitely in the future. But a large floor plan of the Patent Office Building is already on the desk of Thomas M. Beggs, director of the National Collection. He is thinking ahead, even though he knows he will have to be patient.

The National Cultural Center authorized by law September 2, would symbolize the Nation's official interest in the arts and give the President a place to entertain foreign visitors in a setting identified with both the visual and the performing arts.

As cosponsored by Senator FULBRIGHT and Representative THOMPSON, the act sets up a board including the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and 15 general trustees. These have not yet been appointed. Eventually, there would also be an Advisory Committee on the Arts—similar to the one so often proposed—made up of specialists in the fields of art covered by the center.

The site is bounded by the Inner Loop Freeway, the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge approaches, Rock Creek Parkway, New Hampshire Avenue and F Street in the sector called Foggy Bottom. But apart from obtaining the site, the Government has so far done nothing to implement the project.

And by the act's own terms, it will come to nothing if the Smithsonian Institution does not find that sufficient funds to construct the National Cultural Center have been received within 5 years.

DOWLING TO PRESS PROJECT

Once the trustees are appointed, Robert W. Dowling, chairman of the board of ANTA, is likely to take a leading role in seeing to it that the act does not come to nothing. "I have been rooting for this [the Cultural Center] for a long time," he said. He has felt that if the Government would give the land, private citizens should give the money.

New legislation apart, the Government's continuing activities in the arts can best be outlined under four headings. These are international exchange, the design and decoration of public buildings, Government collections, and coins and stamps. The four are obviously not all inclusive. For example, the chamber music programs at the Library of Congress fit none of them. But most activities can be conveniently covered by the four.

The patronage of artists for the design and decoration of public buildings, the minting of coins and the issuance of stamps, goes back to the earliest days of the Republic. The Government role as a collector began somewhat later. The depression and the New Deal brought into being a new and still controversial concept, the use of Government funds not so much to commission specific art works as to support unemployed artists. This led to inevitable disputes over the supposed leftist propaganda painted on Government walls by artists on the Federal payroll.

As pointed out by Clarence Derwent, chairman of the National Council on the Arts and Government, the New Deal arts projects, "while productive of much fine work, fell short of the full recognition of the value of the arts to society because of the public relief aspects of the program."

Since World War II the emphasis has shifted to the utilization of the arts as an arm of diplomacy. The aim is candidly asserted: To promote competitively the free creative tendencies of a nation long accused of letting its capitalist ideology cramp artistic expression.

AMERICANS' NEW SIDE

As William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, put it in the early stages of the program, it was to show that Americans, "accused throughout the world of being a materialistic, money-mad race, without interest in art and without appreciation of artists or music, have a side in our personality as a race other than materialism."

Or, as Mr. Schnitzer put it more recently, with regard to the performing arts, "It is propaganda—in the best sense. We are saying, 'Here are some artists whose work we enjoy' and we hope you'll enjoy it, too."

Actually, the State Department's Division of Cultural Relations dates to July 28, 1938. Three years later the first cultural officers were assigned to American diplomatic mis-

sions. In 1946 a major step was taken with the passage of legislation presented by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas. Becoming operative in 1948, the Fulbright plan draws on foreign currencies owed to or owned by the United States, chiefly for war surpluses, for a cooperative program of educational exchange.

Two exhibitions jointly called "Fulbright Painters," currently crossing the country, indicate how this program may operate to the benefit of individual artists. The shows are made up of samples of the work of candidates who qualified under the Fulbright Act to pursue their studies abroad.

TOURS BEGAN IN OCTOBER

One of the exhibitions opened at the Whitney Museum of Modern Art here on September 17. Both sections began tours in October. These were organized by the traveling exhibits service of the Smithsonian Institution in cooperation with the Institute of International Education. By contract with the State Department, IIE administers the Fulbright student exchange.

Here is a case, then, where a Government program has artistic implications both abroad, where the artists studied, and at home, where their work is being shown. The Fulbright scholarships cover all fields of study and that the painters represent only a small fraction of those who win them.

On the most sensitive level of exchange, in view of current East-West relations, there is the new status for American artists visiting the Soviet Union afforded by the agreement announced in Washington last January. This was signed by the State Department's William S. B. Lacy and the Soviet Ambassador at that time, Georgi N. Zaroubin, who died on November 24.

The accord did not initiate exchanges between the United States and the U.S.S.R. but facilitated them and gave them new importance. Long negotiations by Sol Hurok to bring the Moiseyev dancers here had preceded their arrival, after the conclusion of the Lacy-Zaroubin agreement. Similarly the "Porgy and Bess" company had reached Moscow on its own; Emil Gilels and David Oistrakh had played here; and the Boston Symphony went to Moscow in 1956 under the President's program as run by ANTA for the State Department.

But whereas the ANTA artists had only a "foot in the door" before the accord, according to one spokesman, the pact "opened the door wider" and gave official recognition to the visit of the Philadelphia Orchestra last May and June. This tour also had already been arranged when the accord was reached. But its auspices were enhanced by the new diplomatic understanding.

On the other hand, some cultural exchange experts see in the Lacy-Zaroubin accord an implicit quid pro quo that they regard as restrictive. These sources—within the State Department—feel that a generally freer and broader exchange is more to the point than a 50-50 balance of trade in terms of traveling artists.

Distinct from the State Department's direct role in the exchange program, there are the manifold activities of the U.S. Information Agency. Since 1953, USIA has had a major responsibility in the presentation of varied aspects of American life abroad.

This takes in the dissemination of both live and recorded music. For example, the Symphony of the Air not only played in Tokyo; a film of its tour has been popular on Japanese television. The entire Voice of America program comes under USIA and "Music U.S.A." is broadcast 7 nights a week, 52 weeks a year.

ART SHOW IN TURKEY

Meanwhile, the fine arts section of the exhibits division of the agency has a show called "Nine Generations of American Art"

in Turkey. Another show, "Twentieth Century Highlights of American Painting," involved the distribution of 40 color reproductions virtually all over the world.

USIA has also arranged small overseas shows of American serigraphy (silk screen art) and stained glass. In prospect are an exhibition of prints being assembled by the Brooklyn Museum, due to go abroad in March or April, and the collection of modern painting being assembled by the City Art Museum of St. Louis.

The pertinent background fact in connection with the latter project is that early in 1956, USIA withdrew sponsorship of three collections of paintings that were to have been sent abroad. The trouble started with denunciation of a show called "Sport in Art" by the Dallas Patriotic Council.

This raised a flurry over subversive art and underlined the vulnerability of Government to political criticism whenever it was the sponsor of art activities.

Although there remain 9 months before the St. Louis collection starts on its way, such criticism is not expected this time. A museum man associated with the choice of some of the paintings said, "I've been assured that there will be no censorship." An interested official of USIA crosses his fingers when the question is raised.

The general implication is that the tensions of the period associated with the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, have been eased. But Government endeavor in any field of the arts remains subject to attack at almost any moment.

The design and decoration of public buildings is a timeless function of Government. On November 23, the General Services Administration announced selection of a site west of Foley Square for what will be the largest Federal office building outside the District of Columbia. Recently, there has been increasing awareness that American buildings abroad could symbolize the best of the contemporary American tradition.

Assignments to architects are made through the Office of Foreign Buildings of the State Department. The Department is completing the 5th year of a 10-year, \$200 million program involving new embassies and consulates on four continents.

There is an advisory committee of three leading architects appointed on a rotational basis. The Department also has on hand about 800 brochures from architects. It makes its selection on the basis of the advice of the committee, on what it knows of the other architects, and on the special conditions applying in the country where the building is to be erected.

Thus Mr. Stone was commissioned to do the New Delhi chancellery. He was also architect of the U.S. pavilion at the Brussels Fair. In the case of the new Embassy in London, a different technique of choice was used. The department arranged a competition among eight American architects and a seven-man jury chose Eero Saarinen, of Michigan, as the winner.

An important agency, particularly with regard to public monuments and sculpture, is the Commission of Fine Arts, dating to 1910. When Congress created the American Battle Monuments Commission in 1923, it was provided that any design or material for a memorial had to be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

MINISTRY WAS OPPOSED

Moreover, pursuant to a Presidential request of January 1951, the Commission was the agency chosen to make the first and only survey of all the Government's activities in the field of art. The report was submitted in 1953. In an introduction, preceding excerpts from testimony of all Government agencies involved, the Commission said:

"It is a source of the deepest satisfaction to members of the Commission that here in

this fortunate country we have freedom to choose what seems most worthwhile in the cultural life of our time, and that the artist, in creating works of art, is free to express his own inner convictions without compulsion on the part of the state or other outside forces.

"Here we have no centralized control of art activities on the part of the Government, such as exists in many other countries."

And the Commission went on to oppose efforts to create a Ministry of Fine Arts or to combine in a single bureau art activities now carried on effectively in a number of Government agencies.

Nevertheless, the Commission—headed since 1950 by David E. Finley, who was until 1956 also Director of the National Gallery of Art—is occasionally charged with exercising arbitrary influence. It has been asserted that the seven-man unit has a stranglehold on the design and decoration of all Federal buildings and monuments in Washington, and on the design of battle monuments anywhere.

Critics of the Commission have insisted that it hews to an academic line and has facilitated commissions for the generally conservative members of the National Sculpture Society as against nonmember sculptors.

A Commission source, aware of such charges, points out that since not only authorization, but also appropriation, for any monument stems from Congress, it is to be expected that the Commission's advice should follow conservative lines. One thing rarely said of Congressmen, the source suggests, is that they are personally inclined toward advanced tendencies in art.

Nevertheless, the supposed grip of the National Sculpture Society on Government commissions invariably comes up whenever the larger question of the Government and the arts is raised.

AGAINST CENTRALIZATION

From 1951 to 1954, the society was headed by Wheeler Williams, who since 1957 has been president of the American Artists Professional League. Both groups strongly oppose any centralization of Government art activities.

In a leaflet called "War Cry," the league declares, "We must continue our battle to see that art is not socialized under political bureaucracy."

The society and the league remain firmly aloof from groups like the Committee on Government and Art, and the National Council on the Arts and Government. These have backed legislation pointing toward a permanent advisory council for the arts.

According to Adair S. Hardin, president of the National Sculpture Society, "The minute there comes a Federal bureau with a capacity to advise, some freedom is going to be dissipated."

The Committee on Government and Art, founded in 1948 and made up of representatives of 12 national organizations, including the younger and less influential Sculptors Guild, declared in a statement of principles on May 25, 1956:

"We believe that governmental art policies should represent broad artistic viewpoints, and not the predominance of any particular school or schools.

"In order to aid in making available to the Government the best experience and knowledge of the art world, we believe that there should be advisory bodies composed chiefly of professionals in the respective fields; and that art organizations in these fields should have a voice in nominating the members of these bodies."

SEVEN FIELDS REPRESENTED

The National Council on the Arts and Government consists of individual representatives of seven major art fields. In general, it has been aligned with the position of the Committee on Government and Art,

whose chairman is Lloyd Goodrich, of the Whitney Museum.

Government art collections, which symbolize the Nation's official interest in the preservation and formal display of accrued treasures, include the National Gallery of Art, the National Collection of Fine Arts, and the Freer Gallery.

In his invaluable "Government and Art," Prof. Ralph Purcell writes that it was not until 1906 that the Government began its role as a collector. He notes that when the British burned the Capitol in 1814, the only two paintings owned by the United States—gifts of Louis XVI—were destroyed.

In 1906, a group of paintings known as the Johnston collection was given to the Government by Harriet Lane Johnston, niece of President James Buchanan and mistress of the White House during his administration.

The condition was that the small but valuable collection should be placed in a National Gallery of Art, when one was established. Professor Purcell recounts how a "friendly court action was instituted to determine if the art collection already in the Smithsonian Institution would legally constitute a National Gallery of Art."

The court ruled that it would. Thus the early Smithsonian collection, enhanced by the Johnston gift, was newly constituted as the National Gallery of Art.

Oddly enough, the art in the Smithsonian was to lose that title after all. In 1937, when the Mellon collection became the Nation's foremost, the title was transferred to it. The National Gallery of Art now comprises the original Mellon bequest, and subsequent additions.

The Smithsonian art was renamed the National Collection of Fine Arts. It is the art that is to be housed in the old Patent Office Building under the recent legislation. Pending settlement in its new home, the national collection has about 500 portraits and pieces of sculpture on loan to public buildings, including the White House and the chambers of the Chief Justice.

The Freer Gallery of Art, devoted principally to oriental fine arts and the works of Whistler, was the gift of Charles L. Freer in 1906. The gallery was not built until 1920; and the collection was opened to the public as a unit of the National Collection of Fine Arts. The Freer Gallery is administered by the National Collection, of which it is considered a unit, and does not have a separate board of trustees, like the National Gallery of Art.

MEDALS UNDER MINT

Coins and special medals come under the Bureau of the Mint. By law, no regular coin may have its design changed more than once in 25 years. The mint traditionally opposes commemorative coins, although not always successfully.

When a piece of medallion art is authorized, the mint may commission an artist directly, have a small competition (as with the Washington quarter in 1932) or a nationwide one (as with the Jefferson nickel in 1938). It may also utilize its own artists.

This it prefers, particularly in the case of coins, where distribution of the design and maintenance of rims higher than the design's highest point, are technical essentials.

The Commission of Fine Arts acts in an advisory capacity to the mint. But the director of the Bureau is ultimately responsible for the project, subject only to approval by the Secretary of the Treasury.

STAMP ART IMPROVED

The situation with stamps is somewhat different because of the vast and steadily increasing interest in United States commemorative issues. For many years, these were subject to strong criticism from philatelists, particularly as compared artistically with certain foreign stamps, such as the French.

On March 26, 1957, a seven-member Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee was established. It has three artist members. Final decision on a new stamp rests with the Postmaster General. Philatelic and art circles generally agree that the pictorial quality of the commemoratives has tended to improve; although controversies over individual stamps continue.

And, indeed, the controversies continue over virtually every phase of the complex Government-Arts relationship in a democracy whose Puritan intellectual heritage started it off with what has been called (by John A. Kouwenhoven, among others) an antiesthetic bias.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 446. A bill to amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair and Participation Act of 1956 to authorize the President to provide for participation by foreign governments and citizens of other countries in cultural and other activities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 447. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, TO REMOVE LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE INCOME

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the existing limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder.

It is my view that this limitation is unrealistic and absurd and should be removed by the Congress. In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject, by Mr. J. A. Livingston, appearing in the Washington Post of January 14, 1959, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

In this article, Mr. Livingston very pointedly outlines the absurdities of the law as it is now constituted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 453) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The article presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY PENALIZES THOSE WHO WORK
(By J. A. Livingston)

"Don't get out of humor with me for writing you again and don't be annoyed when I ask you not to use my name. When you

have time please write another article about social security," writes Mrs. E. S. M.

"As a workingwoman (a widow), I am most concerned with the limitation on my earnings. People in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare insist they don't restrict my earnings. Yet they withhold social security checks when I earn more than \$1,200 a year.

"I wrote you some time ago that when I earned \$1,718, or \$518 over the limit, seven social security checks amounting to \$630.70 were held back. I was out of pocket \$112.70. "I have been with my present firm part time for 3 years. When my boss got me a 10-cent-an-hour raise without telling me, it pushed my income over the \$1,200 mark.

"I am now in line for a raise, but I shall not take it. I'll lose more than I'll get. People like to feel their work is appreciated. A raise in salary is the way a boss shows appreciation. But that is not for those on social security.

"Women who live in the Hotel Plaza in New York, or the Barclay in Philadelphia, or the Sheraton Park in Washington collect social security benefits because they get their income from dividends or bond coupons. Some of them need their social security checks like an extra hole in the head. But I need every cent I can possibly earn, and I'm not allowed to earn what I can."

Mrs. M. can't quarrel with me. Eddie Cantor and his wife can roll up to a social security office in a Cadillac and collect a check, even though the month before Cantor appeared on a TV show and earned a reported \$2,000. A man or a woman can qualify for social security on a \$100,000 income if the income comes from dividends, bonds, rents, or royalties. The law is screwy. See if you can understand it.

The law penalizes the steady worker, the low-income earner. If you earn \$1,200, you can collect your benefits in any 1 year in full. But if you earn \$1,200.01, you lose 1 month's benefits.

You can collect a benefit in any month in which you earn no more than \$100 a month. (Formerly it was \$80 a month.) Thus, if you earn \$4,000 in 1 month and \$100 per month in the other 11 months, you can collect 11 pension checks even though your total earnings are \$5,100. But if your total earnings come to \$2,080.01, and in every month you earn more than \$100, you can't collect a single benefit check.

Why? Because for each \$80 or fraction thereof above \$1,200, you lose one benefit check. And if your yearly earnings hit \$1,280.01, you lose two checks; earnings of \$2,080.01 would snatch away all checks because in every month you earned more than \$100. (It's hard to believe the human mind could have devised anything so complex.)

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is painfully and tortuously aware of the strings Congress has attached to benefit payments. It has prepared a memorandum which tries to placate the justifiably disgruntled:

"Since the old-age and survivors insurance program is designed to insure people against loss of earnings from work, it is appropriate that the retirement test take into account only an individual's earnings. It is a test of whether the worker has retired—not whether he is in need. By paying benefits without regard to other resources an individual may have built up during his working lifetime the old-age and survivors insurance system encourages private savings."

And, similarly, it discourages work.

When the Government has to defend a policy with such perverted logic, it's time to change the law. The cost of eliminating the retirement test is estimated at \$2 to \$3 billion a year, perhaps more. It's argued we can't afford it. As I see it, we can't afford the law as it stands.

If we can't pay old-age pensions as a matter of right, then we can't afford to pay the rich while penalizing the poor.

Congress should apply a straight income test, not a retirement test. If persons who are forced to work can't collect social security, then the well-off who don't have to work should not collect it.

Thank you, Mrs. M., for prodding me—and, I hope, the 86th Congress.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will provide for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of exchange of persons programs and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs.

A similar bill, S. 3112, of the 85th Congress, was passed unanimously by the Senate last year but failed to be considered in the House of Representatives during the closing days of the last session of the 85th Congress. This bill has the endorsement of the Department of State and, in view of the Senate's unanimous action of last year, I am hopeful that it will be scheduled for early consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 455) to provide for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of exchange of persons programs and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1957

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce today for appropriate reference two measures. One is a bill, of which the principal cosponsor is my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], and which is also cosponsored by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 by extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission until January 2, 1961.

The bill would give the Attorney General authority to initiate upon sworn complaint of affected individuals action for a civil injunction to prevent interference with civil rights, including the right to attend a nonsegregated public school, to enjoy equal opportunity to attend a public beach, public golf course, park, and other public facilities like restaurants and hotels, and to ride on trains, buses, and trolleys.

The other measure is a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 by including therein part III, which was stricken when the bill was under consideration in the Senate in 1957. With respect to this

bill, I am the principal sponsor. The other sponsors are my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk until the close of next Tuesday in order to permit other Senators to cosponsor it if they so desire.

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

Mr. JAVITS. The restoration of part III is the fundamental civil rights measure which should be considered by this Congress. Its consideration will constitute the acid test of the claim of Senator JOHNSON that his resolution which passed yesterday modifying the Senate rules on debate that deal with filibusters has meaning and content. Events since 1957 have shown that the authority of the Federal Government is essential to insure the enjoyment of civil rights by individual citizens particularly in the South and to sustain the hand of moderates who wish the South to be law abiding and believe that this can be effected consistently with an effective and orderly transition from social conditions which have resulted in a segregation of the races and a denial of the equal opportunities guaranteed by the Constitution.

Along with the proposals to curb "hate bombings" and "hate mail" introduced last Friday, these bills constitute excellent examples of what were the real stakes in the effort to change significantly Senate rule XXII permitting filibusters.

Under such circumstances it seems most unlikely that we can expect real decreases in the resistance to public school desegregation which has already resulted in the closing of 13 public schools in 2 States. The resulting tension presents a climate in which flourish the activities of "hate bombers" and "hate propagandists" who operate in communities where the failure of officials to condemn one form of lawlessness tends to be taken by fanatics as encouraging other acts of violence. A repetition of 1958's inaction by Congress in the months ahead on civil rights measures may make us unwilling witnesses to a series of new crises in communities throughout the South.

Under the terms of the bill which I am introducing, the U.S. Attorney General would be empowered upon written complaint to begin civil injunctive proceedings against local officials or those conspiring with such officials to deprive a citizen of his constitutional civil rights under the 14th amendment. These include the right to attend a nonsegregated public school, to enjoy equal opportunity to attend a public beach, public golf course, park, and other public facilities like restaurants and hotels, and to ride on trains, buses, and trolleys. Other vital rights protected by the Constitution are the right to vote, to serve on a jury, the right to a fair trial, and the very right to be a litigant and to enjoy unintimidated and uncoerced access to the courts of justice.

Under present law, an individual may bring suit for civil injunction to protect his civil rights, but in many cases such a person may not be financially able to begin proceedings, and the antibarratry statutes now on the books in six Southern States make it increasingly difficult for those deprived of their rights to seek the help of others to get judicial redress. My bill would permit the Attorney General to act upon showing that the person about to be deprived is himself financially unable to prosecute a civil proceeding on his own behalf.

In addition, upon the request of a State or municipality seeking to carry out the provisions of the 14th amendment, but prevented from doing so because of a conspiracy or threats of violence, the Attorney General is granted specific authority to seek civil injunction suits on its behalf.

The Supreme Court in the Brown case in 1954 and in several subsequent decisions has decided on the law in respect to desegregation of the public schools, but the responsibility for implementing it through adequate Government organization rests primarily with Congress. The successful Senate passage of part III of the act as it originally passed the House of Representatives 2 years ago would fill a major gap in the Federal Government's ability to assure every child's constitutional right to a non-segregated education.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message spoke with great concern of the image of America abroad and the price we must pay in terms of international prestige among our free world allies following the closing down of public schools to avoid desegregation. Partially counteracting some of that damaging publicity have been the recent activities of the Civil Rights Commission and its investigation into complaints of denial of voting rights starting in Alabama. However, it has begun to work on only about 20 percent of the tasks set for it and will have completed at best half its assignments if we permit it to expire in November of this year.

The proposed extension of the Commission to January 1961, as put forward by Senator KEATING, should give it sufficient time to discharge its primary responsibility to conduct similar voting investigations in other States and study attempts to deny equal protection of the law in matters ranging from education to voting, transportation, employment, housing, public accommodations, and amusements, Government facilities and State and local administration of justice.

Although the Commission did not initially receive full cooperation from local authorities in its Alabama investigation, and once again Federal court orders had to be obtained, the number of complaints involving voting rights rose from 10 at the start of public hearings to 50 before their conclusion. Clearly, the Civil Rights Commission should be continued so that members of minority groups who fear they are being deprived of their right to vote have ample opportunity to press their complaints openly before a

Federal fact-finding body empowered to make on-the-spot investigations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills referred to by Mr. JAVITS were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 435. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to provide that the Civil Rights Commission shall have until January 2, 1961, to submit its report, findings, and recommendations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 456. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF A VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL FOR SOUTH TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the erection of a U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital in south Texas.

This is an area with a population of well over 1,500,000 people residing in 40 counties, in a land area totaling over 40,000 square miles, most of them in the 14th and 15th Congressional Districts, south of San Antonio. In all of this area, there is not a single veterans' hospital—a situation which causes some veterans to travel more than 400 miles to secure medical attention.

Some veterans have died while traveling from this area to VA hospitals. Many veterans have been denied hospitalization benefits because they were unable to make the trip to the nearest facility.

The Veterans' Affairs Commission of Texas last year passed a resolution urging construction of a hospital in this area. The South Texas Veterans' Alliance also is working for solution of this problem.

The facility authorized under this bill would be a 300-bed unit. Such a facility is badly needed to extend to veterans of this area the hospitalization benefits envisioned for them under the Veterans' Administration program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill providing for construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in south Texas be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 457) to authorize the erection of a U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital in the State of Texas, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order

to provide for the furnishing of general medical and surgical facilities to veterans entitled to hospitalization or domiciliary care, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site in south Texas, and to contract for the erection thereon of a hospital with a capacity of 300 beds, together with the necessary auxiliary structures, mechanical equipment, domiciliary and out-patient dispensary facilities, and accommodations for all personnel; and the Administrator is authorized and directed to acquire the necessary vehicles, furniture, equipment, and accessories to be used in the maintenance and operation of such hospital. The Administrator is authorized to accept gifts or donations to assist in defraying the costs of constructing and equipping such hospital.

Sec. 2. In order to carry out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum of \$26,000 per bed.

ADDITIONAL JUVENILE COURT JUDGESHIP

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BIBLE, MORSE, BEALL, and JAVITS, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court for the District of Columbia.

A similar measure passed the House and Senate in the 85th Congress. The bill was referred to a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; the Senate conferees accepted the version of the bill which passed the House, and the Senate adopted the conference report, but the report was not acted upon by the House prior to adjournment.

The need for an additional judge was urgent and demonstrable last August. It is even more so now.

The business of the juvenile court is broad in scope and important in nature. The court has jurisdiction over cases in which children under the age of 18 years are charged with crimes, truancy, conduct beyond parental control, and actions endangering their own or others' health, morals, or safety. It must deal with all cases involving the paternity of children born out of wedlock, violation of the child labor and compulsory education laws and contributing to the delinquency of minors. The court also has concurrent jurisdiction with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in criminal nonsupport cases.

The Congress has provided for 1 judge to handle the entire business of the juvenile court for the 800,000 people of the District.

The present juvenile court judge, Orman W. Ketcham, has labored well and tirelessly to perform the tasks assigned to him, and he deserves the thanks of the Congress and the Community.

But no man alone can carry the workload of the court today.

On September 1, 1958, the backlog of cases on the juvenile court hearing list numbered 890, including 329 cases of complaints against juveniles. To concentrate on the pressing juvenile matters, Judge Ketcham was forced to take

certain drastic administrative measures. All nonsupport hearings were suspended for 2 months. Administrative hearings for wards of the court who committed new offenses were discontinued. An increasing number of cases were shifted to the district court for disposition.

By these means, a decrease in the backlog of juvenile cases was achieved at the expense of nonsupport cases, but when hearings of the latter type were resumed the backlog of juvenile cases, which are instituted at the rate of 75 per week, again climbed to its present record high. In spite of the hundreds of cases which have been heard by Judge Ketcham since last September, the total case backlog today number 1,032, an increase of almost 150 since Congress adjourned. If no new cases are considered it would still take Judge Ketcham months to dispose of the existing backlog.

Passage of this bill is not just needed for the relief of a badly overburdened judge. It is needed by the numerous children and destitute persons who come before the juvenile court in times of crisis and financial extremity in their lives. Their cases cannot receive the careful and prompt consideration by the court demanded by elementary justice under present conditions.

I urge favorable committee action upon this bill for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court at an early date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 465) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BEALL, and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FINANCING POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly on a subject which is of interest to my Senate colleagues at least once every 6 years. This is the problem of financing political campaigns.

There are many ways of obtaining campaign funds. Most are honorable ways. Some, unfortunately, are not. Money, whatever the amount involved, does not taint political campaigns. Money received openly and spent openly casts no shadow of doubt. It is only when money is handled in secrecy, even in partial secrecy, that it becomes a political evil.

For that reason, Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill designed to make campaign financing and reporting the open and above board act which it should be and which American citizens have a right to expect it to be.

Mr. President, campaign financing, at this time, is regulated primarily by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act. These laws are based on

the premise that clean elections depend on a full and complete disclosure of political contributions and expenditures and on limiting the dollars which may be spent in any one election. These are most worthy ideals and my bill does not deviate from their basic philosophy. The statutes themselves, however, are hopelessly out of tune with the times. They date back a quarter of a century or more. Their antiquity is exceeded only by their inadequacy.

The limits of campaign expenditures which the existing law imposes on congressional candidates are completely unrealistic. In the course of the past decade, the rise in the cost of services has changed our ideas as to just what constitutes excessive campaign spending.

When the present act was put into effect, after being passed by the Congress, we were thinking and talking in terms of a 1925 dollar. We are today thinking and talking in terms of a 1959 dollar. There are also many new devices, such as radio and television programs, with more intensive campaigning than took place in the mid-1920's.

New mediums of communications are available, and we now present political issues by radio and television. The cost of a brief broadcast today exceeds the costliest item of campaign expenditures known to us in the 1920's.

These obsolete limitations on campaign spending are completely unrealistic and must be brought up to date. But even worse, they are unenforceable. They invite circumvention. They may force an honest office seeker to skirt close to the path of dishonesty.

Mr. President, we are well aware that large amounts of money are handled by many types of political committees which operate on a local level. Yet only committees which are branches of a national organization are subject to the requirements in the reporting law.

In recent weeks, the amount of money spent by both of our major political parties in the past elections was reported. The sums involved were huge. But I have no doubt that they were but a fraction of the total amount spent by committees and campaign organizations of all kinds operating at all levels.

In several States, primary elections are the only elections which count. Yet according to the existing law, primaries are not within Federal statutes, and no political committees are required to report contributions and expenditures in connection with primaries.

Furthermore, the existing law contains no provision for the mandatory publication of the data which is reported to the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. The reports are relatively inaccessible to the public, unless some enterprising newspaper reporter digs them out and publishes them. Thus, the law fails in its primary intent.

Mr. President, I have, in the course of years, introduced several "clean election bills" each aimed at strengthening and safeguarding our national elections.

The first bill was introduced during the 1st session of the 84th Congress (S. 636); the second in the opening days of the 1st session of the 85th Congress

(S. 426); and the third on May 23, 1957 (S. 2150).

This is the fourth bill I have introduced on this subject, Mr. President. At this time I should like to solicit cosponsorship of other Senators who are of the same views. The bill of course may in some respects be modified and amended. That may be done in committee. The bill is subject to amendment or modification by the Senate. It may even be enlarged in scope.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week, in order to give Senators the opportunity of sponsoring it.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. The Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, of which I had the honor to be chairman, held extensive hearings on S. 636, and the bill was favorably reported by that subcommittee and by the full Committee on Rules and Administration. Unfortunately, the Senate as a whole never had an opportunity to act on that bill.

In 1956 Federal elections were subjected to further investigations by the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions under the able chairmanship of the senior Senator from Arkansas and by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Tennessee.

In June and July 1957, the Committee on Rules and Administration took up Senate bill 2150 and submitted it to a section-by-section scrutiny. As a result, the bill was reported to the Senate on July 3, 1957. Despite numerous efforts, I was unable, in the next 15 months to have it removed from the calendar and taken up by the Senate.

Mr. President, I have long been disturbed by that section of public opinion which holds that political campaigns are suspect—in some way unclean. I am anxious to see the field of politics returned to the position of prestige and respect that it formerly occupied in our society. Better election laws can do much to bring about such a return.

I have been honored and thankful that my endeavors in this field have resulted in bipartisan support. S. 2150 was reported favorably by a bipartisan vote of 7 to 2 in the Rules and Administration Committee. Clean elections are not of partisan concern, and I feel sure that each of our major political parties will benefit from revision of the laws. More important, the Nation, as a whole, will benefit.

It is my hope that the 86th Congress will see fit to enact a new set of laws to enhance the dignity of the National Legislature. Now is the time to do it. This is the year—a year when no Member of Congress is faced with immediate election problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 466) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. PROXMIER, and Mr.

ENGLE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FUNDS FOR PAN AMERICAN GAMES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the appropriation of \$500,000 for the purpose of promoting and insuring the success of the Pan American games to be held at Chicago, Ill., August 27 through September 7 of this year.

The Pan American games are held every 4 years under the direction of the Pan American Sports Organization. The member countries are those countries of the Americas whose national Olympic committees are members of the International Olympic Association.

At present, countries eligible for participation in the games are Argentina, Bahamas, Bermuda, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Chile, Dominican Republic, Dutch West Indies, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, Trinidad, United States of America, Uruguay, and Venezuela. It is probable that before the games take place Ecuador, Haiti, and Nicaragua will be added to the list of eligible countries.

The games program includes some 20 sports, in 7 of which there will be competitions for both men and women, consisting of baseball, basketball, boxing, cycling, equestrian, equestrian polo, fencing, gymnastics, modern pentathlon, rowing, shooting, skeet, soccer, swimming, tennis, track and field, volleyball, water polo, weightlifting, wrestling, and yachting.

Plans for the games are thus far incomplete, and precise budget estimates of the use of Federal funds are not yet available. It is, however, anticipated that a detailed justification will be submitted for consideration by the Committee on Appropriations of both the House and Senate before any funds are actually appropriated pursuant to this authority. Funds appropriated will be expended in the discretion of the organization sponsoring the games, subject to such audit as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Sports facilities of the Chicago area will be used, including Soldier Field and the athletic facilities of Northwestern, Loyola, Chicago, and De Paul Universities. None of the funds authorized will be used to finance the building in Chicago of facilities which will be available for the recreational use of the city of Chicago after the games.

It is estimated that approximately 2,000 athletes will participate in the games.

The bringing together in friendly sports of 2,000 of tomorrow's leaders in the countries of the Western Hemisphere, under circumstances where they are going to come to know and understand one another better, is desirable from the point of view of U.S. foreign policy. The Department of State has indicated its approval of support of the

games under the sponsorship of the city of Chicago in such amount as determined to be appropriate by the Congress.

President Eisenhower, in addressing Mayor Richard J. Daley, of Chicago, in accepting the chairmanship of the honorary committee for the Chicago Pan American games, recognized the games as a "clear opportunity to enhance our good relations with our neighbors in the hemisphere."

Mr. President, the success of the Pan American games in Chicago this year will certainly make a substantial contribution to the relations between the United States and other American Republics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 493) to authorize the appropriation of \$500,000 to be spent for the purpose of the Pan American games to be held in Chicago, Ill., introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FEES PAYABLE TO PATENT OFFICE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

This measure, if enacted, would revise the fees collected by the U.S. Patent Office of the Department of Commerce involved in connection with patent applications, trademark applications and registrations, reissues, certificates of correction, copies of specification and drawings of patents, recording of assignments, agreements, and related matters. The revision would result generally in an increase of such fees.

The last major change in patent fees was back in 1932 when the application and issuance fees were raised to \$30 each. Immediately after the 1932 revision of fees, the Patent Office was collecting in fees a sum exceeding 90 percent of the cost of operating the Patent Office. Since that time the costs of operation of the Patent Office have risen sharply, although no major adjustment in fees has been made to effect the same recovery of costs.

The Patent Office recovered in fees about 48 percent of its cost of operation in 1954, 1955, and 1956. The recovery in 1957 was about 40 percent. Because of increased expenditures for the operation of the Patent Office, this percentage will probably be less for the past and the current fiscal years. It is calculated during the next few years ahead that the fees under this proposal would cover only about 50 or 55 percent of expenditures of the Patent Office, compared with the 90-percent recovery in 1932.

It should be pointed out that the fees which would be modified by this proposal are established by statute and, therefore, congressional action is necessary to effect changes.

During the 85th Congress the Secretary of Commerce urged congressional action on the proposal to enable the Government to effect greater recovery of costs from special beneficiaries of this

Government program. The Bureau of the Budget concurred in that recommendation and further indicated that it would be in accord with the program of the President.

The enactment of this legislative proposal would be in keeping with the policy of the administration of charging special beneficiaries of Government programs for the cost of operation attributable to special beneficiaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 494) to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the conveyance of the Hines Service Center at Hines, Ill., and the Lincoln Ordnance Plant at Springfield, Ill., to the State of Illinois.

The Department of the Army desires to retain 5½ acres, more or less, of the Illinois National Guard General Depot at Springfield for the purpose of having it available to construct an armory for the Armed Reserve units in Springfield, Ill., and the State of Illinois concurs in this retention by the Federal Government.

Maj. Gen. Leo M. Boyle, the adjutant general of the State of Illinois, who is also the adjutant general of the Illinois National Guard, strongly endorses the enactment of this proposal.

The Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, authorized the transfer of property that was otherwise surplus by the United States to an individual State without payment therefor upon certification that the property was required for training and maintaining a civilian component of the Armed Forces. This authority was repealed by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. Thereafter, the Department of the Army, in connection with specific bills, indicated that it would interpose no objection to legislation proposing the transfer of property to a State if, first, there was no other Department of Defense requirement for the property; second, there is a long-range requirement in support of the National Guard; third, the State would agree to use the property solely for National Guard purposes; and, fourth, the property would be available for use by the United States without charge in the event of need therefor during a war or national emergency.

Since June 30, 1949, Congress has authorized and directed the transfer of separate parcels of land to many individual States, and the transfer of these particular parcels would not involve the expenditure of any Department of Defense funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 495) to provide for the conveyance of Hines Service Center,

Hines, Ill., and Lincoln Ordnance Plant, Springfield, Ill., to the State of Illinois, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for the coordinated consideration of monetary policies thereunder, and to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases which threaten economic stability. On yesterday Representative REUSS, of Wisconsin, introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives.

The bill would do two things:

First. Require the President to include in his economic report and annual economic program and recommendations a discussion of monetary and credit policies "to the same extent as all other policies affecting employment, production, and purchasing power."

Second. Assign to the Council of Economic Advisers in the Executive Office of the President the responsibility for holding public hearings on price or wage increases which appear to seriously threaten economic stability and to issue advisory statements, where advisable, as to whether the proposed increases are justified.

Our imperative domestic task is to bring to realization the goals of the Employment Act of 1946—maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, without inflation.

The measure we have introduced would assist toward those goals by clarifying the President's responsibility for monetary and credit policies and by bringing an informed public opinion to bear upon price and wage increases which threaten economic stability.

The record for 1958 shows that we have not been achieving the goals of the Employment Act. More than 6 percent of the labor force is still unemployed, and the recession cost us some \$50 billion of potential production. At the same time, we were not able to maintain price stability even during the recession. And while the indexes have appeared stable during the past few months, the averages conceal a continued serious inflation in certain sectors of the economy, particularly in the prices of manufactured goods.

While the fault lies largely in the way the Employment Act has been administered, it is nevertheless important to strengthen the act itself.

The first change which we propose would require the President to present to the Congress and the Nation an economic report and an economic program and recommendations which are truly comprehensive. At the present time, monetary and credit policy are left largely to the Federal Reserve Board, which is independent of the President, and the policies of the Board on the one hand and the President and his executive agencies on the other, may or may not be consistent with one another.

This bill would not impair the status of the Federal Reserve Board as an independent agency. It would, however, require the President to take monetary and credit policies into account to the same extent as all other policies affecting employment, production, and purchasing power, including price stability.

His report and recommendations would therefore be complete and comprehensive instead of limited and partial.

The bill specifies, however, that if the Federal Reserve Board or other independent agency disagrees with the President's program and recommendations, "the President shall report such disagreement to the Congress, together with a statement from the disagreeing agency of its reasons."

As the act is now construed by the President, he is not required to have any monetary policy at all, much less one that is coordinated with expenditure, tax, and other governmental policies. This defeats the very purpose of the act, which was to centralize in the President responsibility for coming forward with a coherent and coordinated program.

The second change in the Employment Act which we propose would assign to the Council of Economic Advisers in the Executive Office of the President the power and duty to bring to bear an informed public opinion on price or wage increases which appear to seriously threaten economic stability. The Council would request those proposing such increases to justify them at a public hearing as not constituting a threat to stability. Moreover, the bill states that "in cases where the Council deems it advisable, it may issue an advisory statement upon such justification."

Recent experience shows that even during the 1957-58 recession, strong industries were able to push through continuing price increases frequently preceded by wage increases. These increases have had serious effects upon the stability of the entire economy, not only because of their direct effects in the industries concerned but because these industries are pace setters for the economy as a whole. And they are relatively invulnerable to general monetary and fiscal controls.

Our bill would require action by the Council of Economic Advisers only in such pace-setting industries. The mere knowledge on the part of management and labor that they may be invited to justify price or wage action before a public body should encourage more consideration for the public interest in price stability. In a sense, the public will acquire at least some representation at the wage-bargaining and price-setting table. Finally, in cases where the Council is convinced of the lack of justification of the price or wage increase proposed, it can issue a public advisory statement which should be influential in restraining harmful action.

We hope that management and labor in the strong, pace-setting industries will recognize the necessity for this measure and give us their support. In any case, the interest of the general public in the stability of the economy is paramount and must take precedence over the right

of private groups to take action injurious to the entire economy without restraint of any kind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 497) to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for the coordinated consideration of monetary policies thereunder, and to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases which threaten economic stability, introduced by Mr. CLARK, 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 by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C., sec. 1023) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In order to clarify the President's responsibilities under this section, he shall consider, in his review under subsection (a) (3) of this section, and in his program and recommendations under subsections (a) (4) and (b) of this section, monetary and credit policies, to the same extent as all other policies affecting employment, production, and purchasing power. If the Federal agency directly responsible for the execution of such monetary and credit policies disagrees with such program and recommendations, the President shall report such disagreement to the Congress, together with a statement from the disagreeing agency of its reasons."

Sec. 2. Section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C., sec. 1021 et seq.) is amended by adding an additional subsection (c) (6) as follows:

"(6) In order to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price or wage increases which appear to seriously threaten economic stability;

"(i) to request persons proposing such price or wage increases to justify them at a public hearing as not in fact constituting such a threat; and

"(ii) in cases where the Council deems it advisable, to issue an advisory statement upon such justification."

AMERIGO VESPUCCI DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I introduce a joint resolution, designating the 9th day of March in each year as Amerigo Vespucci Day. Representative SANTANGELO, of New York, is introducing a similar resolution in the House.

Amerigo Vespucci, after whom our Western Hemisphere continues to be named, has made for himself a tremendous place in history as one of the discoverers of the land in South and Central America. It is particularly important because he was the first of 5 million of his countrymen from Italy—he was born in Florence, Italy, on March 9, 1451—to set foot on the continent of America.

He served as navigator on a voyage that in 1497 brought some of the first Europeans within sight of the mainland of what was later to be called America, in honor of his name. He made three

further voyages to the shores of this continent and he participated in the fitting out of Christopher Columbus' second expedition. It is of special and timely interest to us, in this day of a new exploration which may lead us to the very stars which guided Amerigo Vespucci to our continent, that this man was the first explorer to sight Cape Canaveral. I think it is indeed fitting that the day of his birth be made a most special occasion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 15) designating the 9th day of March in each year as Amerigo Vespucci Day, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SCHOOL SUPPORT ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 9, 1959, the names of Senators CARROLL, MUSKIE, and PASTORE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2) to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating funds to the States to be used for constructing school facilities and for teachers' salaries, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), on January 9, 1959.

AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT WITH REFERENCE TO EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 9, 1959, the name of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 11) to amend the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), on January 9, 1959.

HOUSING ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on January 9, 1959, I introduced a housing bill which bears the number S. 57. There were some cosponsors of the bill. Unfortunately, however, two Senators who have been active in promoting housing legislation because of their great interest in it failed to have their names included as cosponsors of the bill. The bill has already been printed. However, I ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of the bill, should there be one, the names of the two Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON] may be entered as cosponsors.

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

TAX ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM FOR SMALL BUSINESS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 9, 1959, the names of

Senators RANDOLPH, COOPER, MOSS, MORSE, BIBLE, JAVITS, BYRD of West Virginia, DODD, GRUENING, and JACKSON were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 59) to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KEFAUVER), on January 9, 1959.

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING LAW—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], I ask unanimous consent that their names be added to the list of cosponsors of the bill (S. 193) to amend and extend the laws relating to renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes, which I introduced, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on January 12.

I understand that the bill has gone to the printer; so I request that when it is next printed, the names of the additional cosponsors be added.

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

COUNTRY LIFE COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 14, 1959, the names of Senators MORTON and MUNDT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 265) to establish a Commission on Country Life, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY on January 14, 1959.

EQUALIZATION OF PAY OF RETIRED MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 14, 1959, the names of Senators HUMPHREY, MOSS, YARBOROUGH, SCOTT, SPARKMAN, LANGER, ALLOTT, BUTLER, JAVITS, HRUSKA, KEATING, PROUTY, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 269) to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and other Senators) on January 14, 1959.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LOANS MADE BY RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 14, 1959, the names of Senators HENNINGS, CURTIS, MURRAY, LANGER, and CLARK were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 21) expressing the sense of the Senate concerning the making of loans by

the Rural Electrification Administration, submitted by Mr. Aiken (for himself and other Senators) on January 14, 1959.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON GILA RIVER, CAMELBACK RESERVOIR SITE TO SALT RIVER, ARIZ. (S. DOC. NO. 5)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am about to submit a matter to which I particularly invite the attention of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated September 30, 1958, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Gila River, Camelback Reservoir site to Salt River, Ariz., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, adopted August 7, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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

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

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

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address entitled "Public Interest Demands Clean Air," delivered by him before plenary session of national conference on air pollution, Washington, D.C., November 18, 1958.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by Senator RANDOLPH before the annual civil service banquet of American Federation of Government Employees, Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va., January 16, 1959.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION BY FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON SUNDRY NOMINATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the following nominations:

C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal;

James C. H. Bonbright, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden;

Richard B. Wigglesworth, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada;

Lampton Berry, of Mississippi, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ceylon;

John D. Jernegan, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Am-

bassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Iraq;

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Harry A. Bullis, of Minnesota, to be Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board for a term of 2 years;

John O. Bell, of Maryland, to be Special Assistant for Mutual Security Coordination in the Department of State; and Leonard J. Saccio, of Connecticut, to be Deputy Director of the International Cooperation Administration in the Department of State.

The Senate has also received the nominations of 120 persons for appointment to, or promotion in, the Foreign Service of the United States.

Notice is given that the Committee on Foreign Relations, at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule, will give consideration to these nominations.

BONDING OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have recently reviewed a report from the Treasury Department on operations in connection with the bonding of Government officers and employees, under the act of August 9, 1955.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I am chairman, during the 1st session of the 84th Congress recommended to the Congress legislation which I sponsored, and which was approved, authorizing the Treasury Department to cover Federal employees under bonds at Government expense.

Mr. President, this report shows that Federal employees have saved \$1,732,000 annually and the Government itself has saved in administrative cost \$478,000. These annual savings to the Government alone exceed the annual premium rate of Government bonds for all Federal employees by \$180,000.

Type of bond	Executive		Legislative		Judicial		Total	
	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957
Position schedule.....	35,279	37,089	118	112	38	33	35,435	37,234
Blanket.....	908,873	919,934			1,105	1,105	909,978	921,039
Individual.....	443	562	4	1	10	12	457	575
Total.....	944,595	957,585	122	113	1,153	1,150	945,870	958,848

The reduction of 12,978 in the number of employees covered at the close of 1958 as compared with 1957 resulted primarily from decreases of 11,089 in the number of employees covered in the Post Office Department, 3,180 in the Department of the Air Force and 644 in the Federal Housing Administration. Other reporting units reflected increases and decreases of lesser magnitude involving an overall increase of 1,935.

Type of bond	Executive		Legislative		Judicial		Total	
	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957
Position schedule.....	94	95	4	3	3	3	101	101
Blanket.....	23	23			1	1	24	24
Individual.....	443	562	4	1	10	12	457	575
Total.....	560	680	8	4	14	16	582	700

Mr. President, I am quite proud of the report on the operation of Public Law 323, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

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

REPORT ON OPERATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE BONDING OF GOVERNMENT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES UNDER THE ACT OF AUGUST 9, 1955, FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1958

Public Law 323, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved August 9, 1955, requires the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to Congress on or before October 1 of each year a comprehensive report of operations under the act during the preceding fiscal year.

Pursuant to regulations of the Treasury Department, each of the executive departments and 49 independent offices, agencies and establishments covered by the act, submitted reports containing the specific information required by Public Law 323 for the current year. Reports were also received from the Architect of the Capitol (first report), General Accounting Office, Government Printing Office, House of Representatives (Sergeant at Arms), and Library of Congress, in the legislative branch, and from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the Supreme Court of the United States relating to the judicial branch.

The following tables summarize the information reported:

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES COVERED

As of June 30, 1958, 944,595 employees in the executive branch were covered by bonds procured under the act as compared with 957,585 employees covered as of June 30, 1957. Reports received from the legislative and judicial branches indicate that 122 legislative employees and 1,153 judicial employees were covered by bonds procured under the provisions of the act. A blanket bond of the Post Office Department covering 852,600 persons accounted for 90 percent of the bonded employees, which is the same percentage as for the previous year.

The following statement summarizes the number of employees covered by type of bond as at the close of the fiscal year 1958 compared with those at the close of the fiscal year 1957:

NUMBER AND TYPE OF BONDS PROCURED

Agencies of the executive branch procured 560 bonds under the act. Of this number, 94 were position schedule, 23 were blanket, and 443 were individual bonds. The majority of the individual bonds were taken to cover travel advances.

The following statement summarizes the number and type of bonds in effect as of June 30, 1958, as compared with those in effect at the close of fiscal year 1957:

AMOUNTS OF PREMIUMS PAID FOR BONDS

The following summary shows the annual premium rate on bonds in force as of June 30, 1958, compared with June 30, 1957. The majority of the bonds, other than individual

bonds, run for a period of 2 years. Premiums on these bonds are shown on the basis of the proportionate cost for 1 year, together with the premiums on 1-year bonds, in order to arrive at an annual rate:

Type of bond	As of June 30, 1958				Total as of June 30, 1957
	Executive	Legislative	Judicial	Total	
Position schedule.....	\$117, 637	\$538	\$255	\$118, 430	\$137, 824
Blanket.....	169, 675		3, 459	173, 134	234, 579
Individual.....	6, 147	82	160	6, 389	6, 455
Total.....	293, 459	620	3, 874	297, 953	378, 858

The reduction in the premium rate for 1958 as compared with 1957 is due primarily to the decrease in premium costs of the Post Office Department from \$183,514 to \$130,219. This reduction was occasioned by (1) a reduction of 11,089 in the number of employees covered, (2) a reduction in the unit cost of coverage per employee from \$0.21 to \$0.19, and (3) the receipt of dividends approximating \$55,000 from the 2-year bond procured

January 1, 1956. The Post Office Department expects a similar dividend of approximately \$47,000 upon termination of the present 2-year bond procured January 1, 1958.

CLAIMS AGAINST SURETY COMPANIES

The following statement shows claims for the period from July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957, and July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958, as compared with a 12-month period prior to the effective date of the act:

	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1957	Average, fiscal years 1957-58	Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1955
Amount of claims.....	\$126, 585	\$74, 203	\$100, 394	\$123, 608
Amounts recovered.....	93, 030	63, 149	78, 090	101, 986
Amount of claims pending.....	33, 555	11, 054	22, 304	21, 618

¹ One claim paid in the amount of \$3.43 less than submitted.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Administrative costs of surety bond procurement and related operations (including expenses in connection with handling, examination, filing and correspondence) for the fiscal year 1958, amounted to \$29,506 for all agencies reporting. These expenses were greater for the fiscal year 1958 since most

2-year bonds expired December 31, 1957, and new bonds were procured. However, the average for the 2 years is less than \$481,973 than the administrative expenses prior to the approval of Public Law 323.

The following table summarizes administrative costs for the fiscal year 1958, compared with figures available for prior years:

	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1957	Average, fiscal years 1957-58	Fiscal year 1955	Increase (+) or decrease (-) 2-year average of fiscal year 1957-1958 compared to fiscal year 1955
Personal services.....	\$27, 229	\$19, 615	\$23, 422	\$502, 061	-\$479, 539
Printing and reproduction.....	806	546	721	1, 638	- 917
Other expense.....	1, 381	587	984	2, 501	-1, 517
Total.....	29, 506	20, 748	25, 127	507, 100	-481, 973

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT

A comparative statement of certain items relating to bonds in force December 31, 1955

(not procured under the act of August 9, 1955) and those in force as of June 30, 1958, procured under the act of August 9, 1955, follows:

	Bonds in force Dec. 31, 1955, not procured under act of Aug. 9, 1955 ¹	Bonds procured under act of Aug. 9, 1955, in force as of June 30, 1958	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Number of officers and employees covered.....	909, 808	945, 870	+36, 062
Aggregate penal sums.....	\$2, 056, 954, 540	\$3, 415, 712, 311	+\$1, 358, 757, 771
Annual premium rate:			
Paid by employees.....	\$1, 732, 748		-\$1, 732, 748
Paid by U.S. Government.....		\$297, 953	+\$297, 953
Administrative expenses paid by U.S. Government.....	\$507, 100	\$29, 506	-\$477, 594

¹ Includes employees of Internal Revenue Service who were formerly covered under bonds procured under 7803(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SUMMARY

The majority of the bonds procured under the act, subsequent to its passage in the fiscal year 1956, covered a 2-year term, and, therefore, there was substantial bond procurement activity during the fiscal year 1958,

which resulted in an increase of administrative expenses over the preceding year of \$8,758. However, savings in administrative costs during the fiscal year 1958, as compared to the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, the last full fiscal year prior to the act, amounted to

\$477,594. These annual savings exceed the annual premium rate of \$297,953 for bonds in force as of June 30, 1958, by \$179,641. In addition to these savings, employees were relieved of paying premiums which, during the fiscal year 1955, amounted to \$1,732,748.

There is attached a detailed statement showing for each reporting agency the number of bonds procured, number of officers and employees bonded, amount of premiums paid, and total penal sums relating to bonds in force as of June 30, 1958.

The individual reports received from agencies are available in the Treasury Department.

ALLEGED LAG IN MISSILE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, in recent days we have heard much about the alleged lag in our missile-development program. There are those who contend that our missile program is adequate. There are those who contend that we are lagging behind the Soviet Union in this field. Certainly the Soviets have startled the world by sending tons of steel into orbit about the earth and by firing rockets beyond the moon. On the surface, at least, our success in this field has not been so spectacular.

Mr. Drew Pearson and Mr. Jack Anderson have published a book which deals, in part, with this alleged missile lag. The book, "U.S.A.—Second Class Power?" makes many statements about our missile programs. I am not a missile or military expert, but the authors of this book are men who stand behind their statements. Moreover, the book's general view of our missile-development program has been backed up by the report of a House of Representatives committee which found that the United States trails the Soviet Union by more than a year and that it will take at least 5 years for us to catch up.

Despite the difference of opinions which have recently been expressed on this matter, the book is food for thought and, for this reason, I call it to the attention of all of my colleagues in the Senate and commend this work, based upon extensive research and observation, to all who are concerned with the destined role of the United States as the leader of the free world and the hope of mankind.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very happy to yield from the time remaining to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy that the Senator has mentioned this very informative piece of writing. I notice that there has been quite an exchange of argument recently in the Congress concerning some of the problems of the defense program, particularly in the area of missile production. I commend to my colleagues the reading of this particular book, which it has been my privilege to read. I received a copy from one of my good neighbors in Minnesota.

I have taken a particular interest in that book because of the dispute which has taken place of late over the so-called lag in missile production. I refer my colleagues to pages 85, 86, 87, and 88, in the early part of the book, tracing the development of the missile program, and

outlining some of the problems encountered in the Bureau of the Budget, as well as other agencies of the Government. I commend the Senator from Missouri for bringing this book to our attention, and I hope every Member of the Senate will read it.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and who has recently been in Russia. He has written a fine article which was published in *Life* magazine, concerning his experiences. This book I mentioned was recently published, and I believe, is worth reading by every Member of this body and by the American public generally.

THE CHAPLAIN IN THE SPACE AGE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, Maj. Gen. J. B. Medaris, who is Commanding General of the U.S. Army Ordnance Missile Command at Redstone Arsenal, in Huntsville, Ala., is known throughout the land—indeed, through the entire world—as one of the great figures in the expansion and development of the space age. I was greatly impressed to read in one of the Atlanta newspapers excerpts from an address which General Medaris delivered before the conference of chaplains of the Third U.S. Army, at Fort McPherson.

The excerpts which I read reveal a deep and compelling conviction on the part of this great scientist that our country cannot see its way through difficulties which confront us without maintaining a firm spiritual foundation. No matter how much we may progress in the field of technology, if our country is spiritually weak, it will not survive.

For many years I have believed that we were as much threatened in this country by the weakening of our spiritual life as we were by admitted shortcomings of our military defense.

I wrote to General Medaris and asked him to send me a copy of this outstanding statement in order that I might be privileged to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask that this great address, exemplifying the fact that this great scientist clings to the simple faith of our Fathers, may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE CHAPLAIN IN THE SPACE AGE

I welcomed the opportunity to address the chaplains of the Third U.S. Army because of my deep conviction that man's survival in the space age will depend entirely upon his active faith in God and his willingness to permit the basic concepts of Judeo-Christian religion to influence his behavior. Nothing short of that ready consent will protect the people of earth from the awesome consequences inherent in coupling the long-range missile with the released power of the atom—a possibility which is not solely within our power to forestall.

There is real danger that the intellectual excitement aroused by the imminence of space exploration, and the almost limitless energies available through nuclear reaction may intoxicate men to such a degree that they might forget the blunt alternatives—either they act in accordance with divine guidance or they invite destruction.

Time will permit only a very brief examination of the impact of science and technology upon the minds of men, but I will try to indicate what this has been in the past and what we may expect in the future. Then I will attempt to suggest what I believe to be the true function of religion in this situation, and relate that to the role of the Army chaplain as we approach decisions which can open up a future rich with promise or wipe out the human race.

Let us first consider the broad influence of science upon many aspects of society. Scientific discovery is never an isolated event. Always from any new knowledge emerge new concepts in political, economic, and ethical philosophies. These new social forces must be attuned to fundamental religious beliefs. If not so supported they invite mental or physical conflicts. Especially must we anticipate spiritual crises as man enters worlds beyond our own. Lacking a firm foundation in religious faith, he will surely grope blindly as he is besieged by strange hypotheses and radical philosophies, spawned by new discoveries and theories, which often defy easy comprehension. We can find many precedents to support this likelihood—a few will suffice.

In the era when Columbus boldly steered his tiny ships upon uncharted seas, Copernicus described the orbital movements of the Moon and challenged the popular belief that the Earth was a flat body, stationary in the heavens, around which the Sun revolved.

A century later Galileo employed telescopes of his own design and reported celestial phenomena which supported the Copernican theory. He ignored the accepted superstitions of the time insisting that the Milky Way consisted of a mass of stars so numerous as to be almost beyond belief. He challenged the ancient Aristotelian theories by reporting that the Moon was not smooth, that in fact its surface was marked by mountains and valleys and did not produce light, but reflected it.

The fearful reaction inspired by publication of these discoveries and extrapolations caused a bitter conflict between church and science, the echoes of which were heard many times in subsequent ages. Inquisitorial restraint was imposed upon Galileo's pronouncements, and the work of Copernicus was placed on the index where it remained for 200 years. Yet Copernicus argued that his discoveries and theories confirmed the magnitude of God. He spoke of the order which he found and translated into mathematical formulas as more divine than human science.

"The reason for the order in which all these things succeed one another," he wrote, "and the harmony of the whole world teaches us their truth—if only we would look at the thing with both eyes."

Thus the conflict arose not from scientific discovery itself but rather from the bigoted attacks of ignorant men who refused to accept truth, and who would not interpret new knowledge in such manner as to make religion even more meaningful.

As we consider the implications of extending human activity into space, and the rapid progress of science and technology in other areas as well, let us, as Copernicus urged, "look at the thing with both eyes."

It has been said that man's entry into space will provide new opportunity for the display of barbarism and stupidity. Cynical comment of this sort, while it may have a certain popular appeal, overlooks the existence in America today of a spiritual and intellectual climate more conducive to the endless search for truth than has prevailed at any other time in history. Leading figures of all the major faiths, including the late Pius XII, saw no defiance of Divinity in our initial ventures into areas beyond the sensible atmosphere. It is my own belief, and I

am entirely sincere in this, that the door would have closed in our faces if what we are attempting contravened God's design.

Some concern has been indicated because man will enter space in an atmosphere of international rivalry and tension. Well founded as this concern may be, it is a situation which cannot be resolved by unilateral action. The sense of urgency with which we approach these projects will not tolerate delay.

In some quarters there is hesitancy to accept the logical and necessary relationship between purely scientific space exploration and the development of long-range rocket weapons essential to national security. This latter objection is all the more puzzling because the Armed Forces have always shared in major scientific and technological programs and progress. For example, former Army engineers built the transcontinental railroads. The Panama Canal was largely a military accomplishment. The Navy promoted the development of shipping. The Army, later the Air Force, spurred the development of aircraft which, although initially adapted to defense purposes, became the prototypes of civilian carriers. Exigencies of national defense have often prompted developmental programs which led to notable contributions to the national economy. The release of nuclear energy under proper control for peaceful purposes followed the development of atomic bombs. The mushrooming electronics industry grew out of military programs. A host of similar instances could be cited.

In the field with which I am identified only the urgent defense need justified the enormous cost and effort required for the development of long-range missile systems. Out of the mainstream of this program have emerged many useful devices—the electronic computer, the magnetic tape programming of production, automatic data processing and others. Benefits of even greater magnitude can be anticipated from the exploitation of presently known space technology. Earth satellites can provide accurate knowledge of weather making factors, which will improve the forecasting service and furnish timely storm warnings, thus saving countless lives and billions of dollars worth of property and crops. Instrumented satellites can facilitate worldwide communications for the instantaneous transmission of video and signals. Orbiters can refine the navigation of ships and aircraft.

I think the Explorer satellites dramatically illustrated the way in which military capabilities can serve scientific interests. For this program the Army made available, for quite a different purpose, existing missile systems and components, and the unique experience and facilities developed for its weapon program. The results speak for themselves, whether you evaluate them in terms of the scientific data obtained or the boost provided to national prestige, and the restoration of something akin to a balance between rival technologies. If the United States alone were engaged in the exploration of space for altogether peaceful objectives, I believe we could quickly dismiss any fears about the fruits of our joint efforts—military and scientific.

However, we are confronted by the technological capabilities of a godless state whose international policies would not permit man to move forward in untrammelled freedom. There is mounting concern over the intentions of international communism as it extends its activities beyond earth. Like their earth-bound predecessors, space vehicles can be employed advantageously for aggressive ends as well as for research and exploration.

Fear of the growing menace of communism arises from the ideological conflict between the free world and the Communist states dating back to the Russian Revolution of 1917. Four decades later the Communist

goal, world conquest, remains unchanged. On numerous occasions this force for evil, in extending its dominion over hapless lands and peoples, has shown a total disregard for ethical and moral considerations. We can find no evidence to suggest a more humane attitude on the part of these dictators as they invade outer space.

It is shocking to read fainthearted suggestions that it might be better to accept the idea of military and scientific supremacy by the Soviets than to risk the prospect of nuclear devastation from outer space. Any such acceptance of domination is entirely repugnant to our national will and altogether unacceptable to the American people.

The alternative is to face up to this challenge, wherever it occurs, because it is directed at us. We have attained a position of international leadership largely because, while shaping our own destiny in freedom, we have encouraged others to do likewise, and have shared our bounty with them. When their security has been endangered we have stood by them. We have become the only hope of millions beyond our shores and their sole guarantee against oppression and eventual slavery.

It is that urgent need which impels our weapons programs and which should accelerate our efforts in space. But neither scientific enlightenment nor technological achievements, of whatever magnitude, will of themselves establish a more stable peace. Nor can man, by the exercise of his own powers, raise himself from the earth to the stars. He must turn to God to find a way by which to replace equality with superiority in the international arena and exchange tolerance for prejudice, cooperation for rivalry, trust for suspicion, love for hate, and peace for conflict.

In this grave predicament involving nations determined to remain free, and others determined to enslave them, every element of our civilization has been brought into the battle. For the church, and I speak of the universal church of all faiths who accept the principle of a Divine Being, this is a day of tremendous opportunity and challenge. Man must find a rock on which to lean which offers him solace in time of stress and assurance in time of anxiety. There is a reaching out for God apparent in many regions, a searching for the kind of message Isaiah gave his troubled nation:

"Even the youths shall faint and be weary and the young men shall utterly fall. But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; and they shall walk and not faint."

Our first steps into the vacuum of space have reemphasized the beauty and order of creation, which increased the reverence of men like Copernicus, and have verified the natural laws which govern all existence. As he ponders these things, man must come to believe anew, as once he did before false intellectualism, bigotry and superstition turned him away from truth. The Ten Commandments have guided men and brought them safely through the upheavals of the past. They should be the rock of decision today and through all our tomorrows.

And now I want to offer some personal comments and suggestions about the role which you, ministers in uniform, will play in the space age.

I consider it of paramount importance that we get back to fundamentals, that we inculcate in our children the respect for God and his omniscience which will be their everlasting reliance throughout their lives. I have observed a tendency in some churches, and I am not singling out Army chapels, to sugar-coat religion, to dress it up, make it more palatable, give it the rock-and-roll

treatment and thus try to inveigle young people into the House of God. I think this is a mistake of the same kind which has our public school system foundering in a mass of social activities far removed from true education. This is not the fault of these churches alone, nor, for that matter, of those schools. It goes much deeper—into the very fabric of our country—into the home, where all too many parents have blithely transferred their basic responsibilities to anyone willing to pick up the ball.

No one has the right to persuade young minds that faith is an easy matter, to be sloughed off or retrieved as suits individual fancy. Instead, we should be emphasizing that it takes courage and stamina and perseverance to live our lives as God wants us to, just as it takes work and determination and strength to earn those things every man wants and will provide to his family. I would like to see more talk about personal dedication and sacrifice, and more talk about the living hell men build for themselves in this life when they stray from the paths of truth and righteousness.

I believe the times call for boldness and vision, with God's words resounding like a clarion call to rally those who are troubled and fearful. Man in this enlightened atmosphere is less interested in the forms and formulas of denominationalism. He will not concern himself with abstruse theological debates. He has a right to expect that the divisive influences which have retarded the Christian church will disappear, even as cultural and social differences will vanish, as technology shrinks the world further and opens up new communications possibilities. I believe the clergy must grasp the hands of the scientists and, shoulder to shoulder, interpret new knowledge in consonance with the fundamentals of Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish faith.

We must accept the fact that the confusion which exists in people's minds, caused in no small measure by the kaleidoscopic happenings in science and technology, will continue and may increase as a result of the rapid changes in our environment. The point to remember is that these environmental changes should not, in the slightest, alter our fundamental concepts and principles. The chaplain can render great service by inculcating the need for flexibility in mental outlook—the ability to grasp and comprehend totally strange things, and to react intelligently, not hysterically or fearfully, to them. Flexibility without floundering, adaptability without weakness, are and will be the need. It is your duty and privilege to help the military community understand and accept these changes in environment without ever losing sight of the fundamentals.

Upon you, as chaplains, the space age imposes the same responsibilities which have been faithfully discharged by your predecessors since the early days of the American Revolution—to sustain the faith of the man in uniform, to minister to him and his family and provide them with moral and spiritual leadership. Your task will be more difficult and more complicated because of the impact of science and technology, but you will know and keep ever in mind that the same virtues which have always carried man higher are still applicable—the virtues of reverence, humility, justice, fortitude, and tolerance.

Since the Continental Congress gave official standing to the chaplaincy in 1775, you have served unselfishly in peace and war. You have shared the hardship and anguish of combat and the stresses and strains imposed by victory. I know that this proud tradition of service to God and country will sustain you in the years ahead.

INVITATION TO REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PARTIES TO HOLD 1960 NATIONAL CONVENTIONS IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I make this statement on behalf of my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and myself.

On Monday next the Republican National Committee will meet at Des Moines, Iowa, to decide on a site for the Republican National Convention of 1960. In view of the fact that the Republican and Democratic National Conventions are now considered to be an essential part of the Government machinery of the United States, on behalf of the city of New York we are extending to the Republican and Democratic Parties invitations to hold their 1960 national conventions there. New York City has unexcelled facilities for a national political convention. It has the finest hotel accommodations in the world. It has the most modern, and the most spacious meeting halls the country can offer. It is speedily and easily reached from all parts of the country. It has been intimately connected with the political development of our Nation from the time when it was the Nation's first capital. As one of the most populous States in the Nation, with active, informed and articulate voters, it has given many outstanding men and women to the service of our Nation. Yet New York City has never been host to a Republican National Convention, and not since 1924 have the Democrats met there.

In midtown Manhattan are the finest air conditioned hotels in the world, 20,000 restaurants to suit every taste and pocketbook, 32 broadcasting studios and the entertainment center of the hemisphere. In the same area are found Madison Square Garden, and also the newly erected \$35 million New York Coliseum, all air conditioned. In this area are the centers of the country's communications and publishing networks. New York City, as the headquarters of the United Nations, is a world capital as well.

Let me outline briefly for myself and my colleague what I believe are the salient points in New York's favor. First, as we all know, a national political convention is of necessity an exhausting time for everyone connected with it. If the parties convene in New York City in 1960, the participants will have the extremely important advantage of being able to consolidate all their activities in a relatively small area of midtown Manhattan. This will practically eliminate time-consuming travel between hotels, convention hall, headquarters suites and radio and television studios which would confront us in any other city.

Madison Square Garden, which can seat 18,000 delegates and offers an additional 85,000 square feet of space for press, radio, and television, is in the very heart of Manhattan, as is the new New York Coliseum. Within walking distance of the Garden are most of the seven hotels which are being offered as headquarters. Either one can be reached from any part of the city by subway or bus, for only 15 cents. Cabs, too, are

cheaper than in any other city; 25 cents for the first one-fifth mile and 5 cents for each one-fifth mile after that. There are no additional charges for extra passengers.

The second point of great importance, since the conventions will be held in the summer, is that New York is an air conditioned city. Thirty thousand hotel rooms available to delegates are air conditioned. Madison Square Garden is air conditioned. All public meeting space in hotels is air conditioned. Restaurants, theaters, movies, museums—in fact, just about any place one would go in New York City in the summer—are comfortably cool.

Third, New York is the undisputed center of our country's great communications industry. News is disseminated faster in New York than in any other city. A political convention is a news-making event of the first magnitude, and should the conventions be held in New York City, I am convinced that their activities would receive more comprehensive news coverage than ever before. New York is the home of the major television and radio networks and the important wire services and syndicates. It is the headquarters of book and magazine publishing in the United States. Its seven daily newspapers are read by more than 5 million people a day. Thousands more read the specialized business publications such as the Wall Street Journal, our trade papers, and the nearly 50 foreign language papers published in New York City. Here are molded national opinion and thinking on a myriad of issues.

Fourth, New York City is one of the easiest cities to reach from any part of the country. It is served by all major airlines, railroads, buslines. It is the focal point of a network of superb highways and thoroughways. By 1960, with jetplane travel a reality, New York will be just 4½ hours from the west coast.

Fifth, New York City offers the country's finest hotels, restaurants, and theaters, many of the world's greatest museums, and outstanding sightseeing attractions. Although we know that delegates to a national political convention will have relatively little time to spend on amusements, it is, nevertheless, important to point out that conventions usually have a higher attendance when they are held in New York because delegates realize that whatever free time they do have can be profitably and entertainingly spent seeing the wonders of one of the world's great cities. And, incidentally, New York, the world's financial and commercial center, offers opportunities for delegates to make personally profitable their attendance at the national conventions by taking care of any business they have in New York City.

More than 750 convention groups a year attest to the fact that a New York City convention is a successful convention.

It is my sincere hope, speaking as a New Yorker, that my city will be honored by being chosen as the site of the 1960 Republican and Democratic National Conventions. Senator KEATING and I bespeak, I feel certain, the wishes of the

some 20 million Americans who live in the city's metropolitan area, an area which includes also part of Connecticut and New Jersey. New York City is in the midst of the Nation's population heartland; it is a world capital; it is the cultural and communications center of the Nation; it is the biggest city; it will welcome the national conventions in 1960.

NOMINATION OF ROGER W. JONES AS CHAIRMAN OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this morning the President submitted to the Senate for confirmation the nomination of Roger W. Jones to be a member of the Civil Service Commission. Following the confirmation of his nomination, Mr. Jones will become Chairman of the Commission.

Mr. Jones is excellently qualified for this position, and his nomination should meet with the unanimous approval of all. He is a career public servant, having first entered the Federal service in 1933.

Not only does he know the problems of the civil service employee, but his many years of contacts with the executive and legislative branches of the Government will make for better relations between the different branches of the Government and the Government employee.

It is with genuine pleasure that I urge confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Jones. I suggest that the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service call a meeting of the committee at the earliest opportunity for the consideration of this nomination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a biographical sketch of Roger W. Jones be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ROGER W. JONES

Roger W. Jones took office as Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget on September 11, 1958. Prior to his appointment to this post by the President, he had been one of the Bureau's three statutory assistant directors for 6 months.

A career civil servant, Mr. Jones was Assistant Director for Legislative Reference from February 1949 to March 1958. He entered the Federal service in 1933, and served in a series of posts with the Central Statistical Board before joining the staff of the Bureau in 1939. When the United States entered World War II, Mr. Jones was Administrative Officer of the Bureau.

He was ordered to active duty as a captain in the Officers Reserve Corps in March 1942, assigned to duty with the Combined Chiefs of Staff, Munitions Assignments Board. He was promoted to major in May of that year, to lieutenant colonel in March 1943, and to colonel in May 1945. He was released to inactive duty in December 1945, and served in several capacities in the Bureau of the Budget until 1949.

He was born in New Hartford, Conn., on February 3, 1908. He received a bachelor of arts degree from Cornell University in 1928, and a master of arts degree from Columbia University in 1931.

He has been awarded the Legion of Merit, the Order of the British Empire, the National

Civil Service League's Career Service Award, and the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service.

He is married and has three children, a daughter, Mrs. John Hodges of Cumberland, Md.; and two sons, Roger H. Jones, a graduate student at Cornell University; and Airman Edward C. Jones, USAF.

STATEMENTS BY SECRETARY OF STATE BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has had a most discouraging experience recently in trying to obtain information from the Secretary of State on which to ground our thinking about foreign policy issues facing this country.

It is customary for the Secretary to appear before the committee at the beginning of each session of the Congress and review the problem areas for which he is responsible. These statements have sometimes been so generalized as to be of little help to the committee. Our distinguished chairman made an effort this year to sharpen the discussion a little. He wrote to the President and asked for a series of briefings on the state of U.S. relations with the rest of the world, the state of our military defenses, and the state of our economic relations. The chairman attached to his letter an outline of the subjects, some 13 of them, which he hoped would be touched upon during these briefings. The President replied that he would be glad to have Secretary Dulles coordinate such presentations in executive sessions of the committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this exchange of correspondence be inserted at this point in my remarks.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
December 16, 1958.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In past years it has been customary for the Secretary of State to appear in executive session before the Committee on Foreign Relations early in each new session of Congress to give members the benefit of his views with respect to the state of our international relations. The committee has found the Secretary's testimony of great value in the discharge of its responsibilities in the field of foreign relations.

In order for the committee to have a full picture of our relations with the rest of the world, it seems to me that the Secretary's statement should be supplemented by testimony concerning the state of our military defenses and the state of our economic relations with the rest of the world. Furthermore, it is important, I believe, that the committee acquire an intelligent evaluation of our world posture as it is related to that of the Soviet bloc. The coordinated national estimate which such testimony would provide seems to me to be essential to enable the committee intelligently to consider foreign policy issues that will come before the Senate this year.

Would it be possible this year to arrange for appropriate officers of the executive branch to brief the committee along the general lines of the enclosed outline?

I am sure members of the committee would be most grateful for the assistance of the Executive, thus making it possible to begin deliberations this session on a broad foundation of mutual understanding.

Most respectfully,

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

PROPOSED OUTLINE FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION
HEARINGS OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

GENERAL PURPOSE

To provide the Committee on Foreign Relations with a broad understanding of the total strategic situation of the United States in 1959 so that the committee may properly discharge its duties in the field of foreign policy.

HEARING I. THE STATUS OF U.S. RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

1. Relations with the Soviet bloc and estimates of the tactics and pressures which may be encountered in 1959.
2. Relations with uncommitted Asian and African nations.
3. The status of our alliances.
4. Probable areas of change in U.S. policies in 1959.

HEARING II. THE DEFENSE POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES

1. Potential defensive responsibilities of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.
2. Estimate of the state of readiness of each service to discharge its responsibilities today and in the future.

HEARING III. ECONOMICS AND FOREIGN POLICY

1. The domestic impact of U.S. aid programs.
2. Relationship between trade policy and foreign policy.
3. Soviet bloc activities in trade and aid.
4. Probable areas of U.S. initiative in 1959.

HEARING IV. INTELLIGENCE ESTIMATES

1. Estimate of Soviet bloc intentions.
2. Estimate of Soviet bloc capabilities—military, economic, political, and scientific.
3. Estimate of nature and direction of nationalist movements in Asia and Africa.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, December 22, 1958.

The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Thank you for your December 16 letter. I appreciate your committee's interest in meeting with the Secretary of State and with the other executive branch officials who can discuss with you in executive session the matters outlined in your letter to me. Accordingly, I have asked Secretary Dulles to coordinate this matter, so that the officials concerned may meet with your committee at a mutually satisfactory time.

With best wishes for the holiday season,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Senators will note that Chairman GREEN suggested that the Secretary of State deal in his briefing with the following four subjects:

1. Relations with the Soviet bloc and estimates of the tactics and pressures which may be encountered in 1959.
2. Relations with "uncommitted" Asian and African nations.
3. The status of our alliances.
4. Probable areas of change in U.S. policies in 1959.

Secretary Dulles appeared before the Committee on January 14. The meeting

was in executive session. As usual, it was understood that nothing which the Secretary might say would be published without his having an opportunity to suggest deletions for security reasons. Members of the committee awaited with more than usual interest due to the advance preparation for the meeting which I have referred to—to what the Secretary might say.

The principal remarks of the Secretary of State were contained in a lengthy prepared statement which he diligently read. I have gone through these remarks with a pencil and underlined those sentences in which there was contained some new information or some revealing insight or some provocative idea or some analytical assistance. I found six sentences. Only six sentences in the whole statement could, by any stretch of definition, be considered new or provocative. The rest was a rehash of old press releases and old speeches.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the Secretary's statement before the committee with the six sentences which I have referred to in italic.

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

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1959

I. INTRODUCTION

The world is today changing more rapidly than ever before. But the fact that much is changing does not mean that everything has changed. There are certain values, certain principles, that are enduring. Among these are the concepts of individual human dignity and the supremacy of moral law.

In a changing world our task is to strive resolutely that change shall increasingly reflect the basic principles to which our Nation has, from its origin, been dedicated.

II. OUR BASIC PURPOSES

1. At a time when war involves unacceptable risks for all humanity, we work to build a stable world order.

2. We seek for general acceptance of the concept of individual dignity which will lead to the spread of responsible freedom and personal liberty.

3. We seek that the free nations shall attain a more rapid rate of economic growth, so that their independence will be more secure and vigorous and so that there will be greater opportunities for cultural and spiritual development.

III. THE PRIMARY THREAT

The Soviet Union and Communist China are expanding their economic and industrial power at a very rapid pace. They do so by a system which combines governmental rule of all labor with imposed austerity. This makes it possible greatly to accelerate capital developments.

There is emphasis, too, on quality. A spectacular product of Soviet material accomplishment was its recent space probe. In this field, the United States is still trying to "catch up" and make up for the head start of the Soviets. Our space accomplishments during the past year justify the belief that we are making good relative progress.

The Chinese Communists seem to be going into a dark night of massed regimentation and forced labor. What they call the great leap forward is in reality a tragic fall backward into the abyss of human slavery.

Asian nations are experiencing one aspect of Communist economic development: The

Communist tactic of flooding their market places with goods at less than prevailing prices. This has widespread effects, some of which reach into our own country. As one example only, the dumping of cotton textiles in southeast Asia has reduced Japanese exports in that area and is already reducing exports of cotton from the United States to Japan. As Communist economic power grows, we must anticipate and plan for further shocks to the free world economic structure from the Communist trade offensive.

Communist economic methods involve costs in human privation and misery that, for us, are not only repugnant but completely unacceptable. We believe that over the long run such a process must inevitably be altered. Already there are indications that the Soviet leaders are beginning to realize this. There is some scaling down of their heavy industry ambitions. They are beginning to heed demands by workers and peasants for more leisure and for a greater share in the fruits of their labor. Peoples sufficiently educated to operate a modern industrial state may be expected also to acquire the desire for freedom and the capacity to get it. History gives us good reason to believe that the Soviet peoples will not indefinitely submit to dictatorial rule by the International Communist Party leadership. It would appear that the Communists will encounter difficulties increasing in the long run.

But for the short run—and this may be a period of years—the situation is full of danger.

That means that we may face a period even harder than we have become used to. To get advantage from time we shall have to stand on our course. We shall need the national will to stand firm in the face of aggressive threats and probings from the Sino-Soviet bloc. We shall need to make whatever unusual sacrifices may be necessary. People respond to this kind of demand when they understand that a temporary emergency requires it. But these burdens seem to grow heavier the longer they must be borne during a period of relative peace. Our people will need to show what freedom can mean in terms of self-sacrifice and self-discipline; and in terms of fortitude and perseverance.

IV. WORLD ORDER

Let me speak now about world order. This requires an elimination of the use or threat of force to accomplish international change. This was always a bad method. It has become an intolerable method because the force at man's disposal could now practically obliterate human life on this planet.

The United States and other free world nations have, by their conduct, done much to establish, for themselves, the principle of the renunciation of aggressive force; and they have shown their ability and will to deter such use of force by others.

At the time of the Suez affair and the Israeli-Egyptian hostilities, the United Kingdom and France, and then Israel, responding to the overwhelming opinion of the United Nations, withdrew their armed forces and accepted a United Nations solution. This may well prove to be a historical landmark.

During the past year the United States and its partners have further shown their opposition to change through force or the threat of force.

When Lebanon and Jordan seemed threatened from without and appealed to the United States and the United Kingdom for emergency aid, we responded with promptness and efficiency. When the emergency was relieved by United Nations action, we promptly withdrew our forces.

Throughout the world small nations felt a profound sense of reassurance.

In the Far East the Chinese Communists, with Soviet backing, initiated military ac-

tion designed, as they put it, to expel the United States from the western Pacific. We stood beside the Republic of China as it resisted what seemed the preliminaries of that attack. Our free world associates generally supported our position that change in that area should not be effected by force of arms.

The Government of the Republic of China itself made a notable contribution when, last October, it declared that it relied primarily upon peaceful principles and not upon force to secure the freeing of the mainland. This courageous and statesmanlike act has strengthened the free world's cause in the western Pacific.

Now in Berlin we face an effort to expel the small western contingents in West Berlin. Their presence constitutes an indispensable safeguard to the freedom of that city. The NATO powers, at their December meeting, unanimously vowed that such expulsion should be resisted.

Step by step, discernible progress continues to be made in consolidating a system of collective security which will effectively operate to exclude the use of force to effect international changes.

The mutual security arrangements which we have with free world countries no longer assume the aspect of mere military alliances. They are the framework of consultative processes that, day by day, are steadily reforming the society of free nations.

In primitive and frontier societies, security is on an individual basis. Each householder defends himself by his own means. That primitive formula is now obsolete domestically. It is becoming obsolete internationally. Many free nations combine to help each other. The resultant power is not a power which can be or would be used for any aggressive or nationalistic purpose. It is a power dedicated to the common welfare as mutually agreed.

The United States has repeatedly made clear—and I said this again at the last December NATO meeting—that we regard our own military power as being a trust for the benefit of our free world partnerships; that we are ready to make known to all the defensive purposes and circumstances under which that force might be used; and that we shall heed in this respect, the advice and counsel of our partners just as we would expect them to heed our advice and counsel with respect to the international use of their force.

Thus, out of what may originally have been conceived primarily as military alliances, there is developing an international structure which provides collective security on the basis of organized and continuous collective consultation. That is something new in history.

I might add that accomplishment is not always easy, given the variety of national development, and national viewpoints. Nevertheless, the free world practice in this regard constantly grows in efficiency.

World order is not, however, assured merely by the elimination of violence. There must be processes of peaceful change. These, too, are rapidly developing within the free world. The General Assembly of the United Nations is a forum where these needs find effective expression. The General Assembly does not have the power to legislate change. But it has a capacity to induce change, at least in the case of governments which have respect for, and are responsive to, world opinion.

The peace of the free world is not a peace of political stagnation or a peace which sanctifies the status quo. It is a peace characterized by peaceful change reflecting new human aspirations and potentialities.

There is, of course, need not only for processes which permit of peaceful change, but there is equally a need for stability in adherence to basic values, including that of respecting international agreements and treaties. This requires that, unless international

law and treaty engagements are changed by common agreement, they should be respected.

There has not been as great a development of international law and recourse to judicial processes as would be desirable. The United Nations General Assembly Committee on the codification of international law has made little progress. Some significant progress in law development, was made at the recent Law of the Sea Conference, and that Conference will be resumed in 1960. Inadequate use has been made of the International Court of Justice. As the President said last week in the state of the Union address, we envisage further steps to encourage the greater use of that Court.

In such ways as I describe progress is being made toward establishing a world order where peace rests, not on mere expediency or on a balance of power, but on a basis of sound institutions.

This evolution is not spectacular and rarely considered news. What attracts attention are the aggressive proings of the Communists and the free world reactions thereto. That gives the impression that our foreign policy consists primarily of reacting to Communist initiatives.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that day by day, month by month, and year by year, we are building, quietly but steadily, in the United Nations, in NATO, in the OAS, in SEATO, and other organs of consultation, the solid foundations of an international order based upon justice and law as substitutes for force.

The Communist rulers do not share in this effort to build a stable world order based upon justice and law. International communism avowedly seeks worldwide dictatorship. The concept of justice is alien to the Communist creed, and law, in our sense of that word, is unknown. The free world and Communist concepts are mutually antagonistic.

This, however, does not mean that there cannot be useful contacts and negotiations with the Communists. We have had many such. We are striving to make progress in the field of disarmament and in that connection deal with the Soviets, particularly in relation to the controlled discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. We also seek agreement on possible measures which might be helpful in preventing surprise attack.

At Warsaw we negotiate with the Chinese Communists.

We have made clear our willingness to negotiate about the German question.

We have now an agreement with the Soviet Union on cultural and scientific exchanges which is operating satisfactorily. Also important are the visits to and from Russia of influential citizens.

President Eisenhower urged this in his letter of February 16, 1958, to the then Soviet Premier. Following this initiative, there have been useful visits on both sides, and we are glad that the First Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, Mr. Mikoyan, is now here learning about our country. We would like to see a broader exchange of students. We believe that in such ways false premises and miscalculations can be reduced in the interest of peace.

V. THE INEVITABLE MOVEMENT TOWARD FREEDOM

I turn now to our second major purpose. One of the strongest forces working in the world today is the movement toward independence and freedom.

This force is notably manifest in Africa. Here change is rapid, new states are arising almost overnight. This great continent presents a challenge to the United States to do its best to assist the peoples now emerging into independence and new opportunity.

Another such area is our hemisphere to the south. The peoples of Latin America

are making clear their determination to control their own destinies. One by one dictatorships have made way for governments more responsive to the popular will.

This worldwide movement toward freedom is accompanied by a growing awareness of the deadly nature of Sino-Soviet imperialism. The leaders of the new freedom are coming more and more to see international communism as an immediate threat to their liberties, not, as some have thought, a mere bogeyman of so-called Western imperialism.

The Communists are paying a price for the forced growth of their material power: There is a developing fear in the less powerful nations around the world of the dangerous combination of burgeoning economic and military power with the imperialist drive of the Communists for world dominion. This menacing combination brings home with force the threat which, when the Communists were not so strong, was but a matter of vague and largely academic concern.

There has recently been a surprising clarification of understanding around the world of the real purpose of Communist leaders—to subject all the world to the dominant influence and control of international communism, with its primary power centers at Moscow and Peking.

In the Middle East the deadly designs of communism are now far more clearly realized than a year ago.

In southeast Asia liberty-loving peoples are struggling—and with success—to remain masters in their newly built national homes.

In general, I believe the leaders and peoples of Asia now understand better the sincerity of American policy favoring their independence and our willingness to support unconditionally their efforts to stay free and do so in their own way, which may indeed be a non-Western way.

In France, we are witnessing an inspiring example of national renewal.

The tide of freedom is running strong in Western Europe as Communist strength there ebbs.

Even in Communist countries there is a powerful and persistent craving for greater national freedom. Yugoslavia has been steadfast against all threats and blandishments from Moscow and has courageously maintained its independence. Hungary's great effort to throw off its shackles, even though crushed by force, has been an inspiration and a tribute to man's unquenchable thirst for liberty. And throughout the bloc, even in the U.S.S.R., revisionism is a living force and ferment. Moscow considers it a deadly enemy, and with reason.

The pull of freedom is daily manifested in the flow of refugees from the Communist bloc to the free world.

The free people of West Berlin have, during years of uncertainty and danger, been an inspiring beacon light for all those whose liberties have been lost to Communist tyranny. We are determined that this light shall not fail, and that Berlin shall not be engulfed in the Red undertow.

As we look ahead, we see freedom as a predominant force, shaping our 20th-century world. As Americans, we have faith that the aspiration, deep within the soul of man, to live freely and with dignity in a just and peaceful world is stronger than all the material forces which the Communists invoke as the pledge and promise of their power.

VI. ECONOMIC PROGRESS

I turn now to our third basic purpose. We believe that economic progress is a necessary condition of stable and free nations. There must also be acceptance of economic interdependence of nations. No nation can live completely to itself.

Unless and until the less developed areas reach the stage of self-sustaining economic growth, the world as a whole will suffer.

For the inhabitants of those areas, an increasing rate of economic development has become an essential condition of free societies. The demand for economic and social betterment is now universal, and if progress cannot be achieved in freedom, it will be sought by methods that jeopardize freedom.

The Communists are fully aware of the universal demand for progress, and they point to the Soviet and Chinese Communist accomplishments in industrialization as proof that their way is better than the way of freedom.

Our aid and investment must continue to support the efforts of the leaders of the developing free nations to sustain their peoples' confidence that economic progress can be attained in freedom.

We have not been alone in providing such support. Other highly industrialized states have made significant contributions.

These industrialized nations have also shown a growing awareness of interdependence among themselves. This is particularly gratifying to us. A common market for Europe was one of the policy objectives stated in the preamble to the European Recovery Act of 1948. Now, after 10 years, the six-nation European Common Market is a fact. The Western European currencies have become more freely exchangeable and there is a strong movement for broader economic cooperation in Western Europe.

Free world economic progress does not permit complacency or relaxation. It calls instead for renewed effort to increase the forward momentum.

In the years ahead, we must through our trade and financial policies continue to promote recognition and positive use of the benefits of interdependence. These benefits, and the inevitability of economic interdependence become more clear each year. What is being done in the European Community of Six provides an example and an inspiration for greater economic cooperation elsewhere in the world.

We must continue to apply our will, energy, treasure, and techniques to the problems of the less developed areas. The cause of freedom can be won—or could be lost—in these areas.

VII. CONCLUSION

Let me in conclusion recall the basic purposes underlying our policies:

- (1) The renunciation of aggressive force and the substitutions of collective institutions of peace, justice, and law among nations;
- (2) Promotion of the concept of human dignity, worth, and freedom;
- (3) Stimulation of economic growth and interdependence to create enlarged opportunities for realization of cultural and spiritual values.

These goals are not attainable in a few years, but will require decades and, perhaps even generations. Why is this so? We are but one nation among nearly a hundred sovereignties, and but a scant 6 percent of the world's land surface and population. Our foreign policy is not something we can enact into world law or dictate to other peoples. It means rather constant adjustment to forces which, though beyond our control to direct, we can influence through wise statesmanship and adherence to sound principles. With our immense wealth and power, and even more because of our spiritual heritage of faith and freedom, we can exert a shaping influence on the world of the future.

The price of failure would be the destruction of all our other national objectives. While mustering all our resources, both material and spiritual, we must press on with courage to build surer foundations for the interdependent world community of which we are part. This will call for austerity and sacrifice on the part of all. We must put first things first.

Our purpose, ultimately and at all times, should be to use our great power, without abusing or presuming upon it, to move steadily toward lasting peace, orderly freedom, and growing opportunity. Thus do we achieve our constitutional purpose "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Senators will find in this statement no forecast of tactics and pressures from the Soviet bloc which may be encountered in 1959, which Secretary Dulles was asked for. Senators will find only one sentence concerning relations with uncommitted African nations, another subject on which the Secretary was asked to speak. There is no discussion in any detail of current issues which may be straining U.S. alliances. There is only the vaguest discussion of any possible changes in U.S. policies in 1959.

With some executive branch witnesses it is possible to pry out information and intelligent discussion of issues with the help of strenuous cross-examination. This takes a great deal of time, and it is wasteful of the energies of both the committee and the witness. I think that the executive branch should know, however, that members of the committee are willing to do this if we must, and do so in public session.

Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations read the newspapers. We read the statements of the President and the Secretary of State. We know generally what is going on in the world. What we need are those additional facts and considerations which make the difference between the casual reader of the newspaper and the well-informed Member of Congress who is trying to discharge his responsibility to understand the actions taken and the proposals made by the executive branch. We need, above all, to hear analytical discussions of the advantages and disadvantages of taking this or that possible course of action with respect to current problems. We also need to know the speculations of the Secretary of State, and other Cabinet members having responsibilities bearing on foreign relations, about the future.

Mr. President, I have made this statement in the hope that succeeding executive branch witnesses in briefings before the Committee on Foreign Relations may pay some attention to our disappointment over past performance.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have been listening very patiently to the statements of Senators during the morning hour. I think such statements should be limited to the 3 minutes prescribed in the unanimous-consent agreement. I hope that the present occupant of the chair or any other occupant of the chair will limit the statements of Senators to 3 minutes during the morning hour. Some Senators have exceeded the limitation. A Senator could occupy the entire morning hour by using 3 minutes on each of a series of subjects. Many other Senators still desire to place matters in the

RECORD. I myself desire to speak for about 5 minutes. I shall courteously wait until the other Senators have placed their matters in the RECORD. But I think the Chair should limit Senators to the 3 minutes provided for in the unanimous-consent agreement.

REOPENING OF CONSULATE AT BRAZZAVILLE, FRENCH EQUATORIAL AFRICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to express my great pleasure in hearing that the United States on January 1 reopened its consulate at Brazzaville, French Equatorial Africa. The consulate has the four newly autonomous republics of French Equatorial Africa within its consular jurisdiction, an area of almost 1 million square miles running from the Sahara Desert to the rain forest of the Congo.

Because of budgetary limitations, as of last year, not even a single American representative was stationed in a region one-third the size of the United States. I am sorry to say that even the names of these political entities, which recently have chosen to remain linked with France, are relatively unfamiliar in this country. Yet these, and almost all other African areas, are astrid with new desires and movements for political and economic development.

The free world countries, and especially the United States, must watch trends in Africa with close and sympathetic attention. We urgently need more observers in the area. This is why I am so pleased to learn that we have opened a new post headed by a career Foreign Service officer who already has experience in the region.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the State Department press release concerning the reopening of this consulate.

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

JANUARY 8, 1959.

UNITED STATES REOPENS AMERICAN CONSULATE AT BRAZZAVILLE, FRENCH EQUATORIAL AFRICA

The United States reopened its consulate at Brazzaville, French Equatorial Africa, on January 1, 1959. The consulate has all of French Equatorial Africa, including the autonomous Republics of Gabon, Middle Congo, Ubangi-Shari, and Chad, within its consular jurisdiction.

Francis N. Magliozzi, of Massachusetts, career Foreign Service officer, is the consul in charge. Mr. Magliozzi joined the Foreign Service in 1947. He has served at the American consulate general in Frankfurt as well as American Embassies in Copenhagen, Baghdad, and Brussels in that order. His last post was the American consulate general in Leopoldville, where he actually was assigned as resident consul in Brazzaville prior to the formal reopening of the post.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BOUNDARY WATERS TREATY OF 1909 BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an important occasion that has received little notice, namely,

the 50th anniversary last Saturday of the signing of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between the United States and Canada. The International Joint Commission set up under this treaty has played a vital role in enabling our nations to undertake such a great and mutually beneficial project as the St. Lawrence seaway.

It has been most appropriate that we should have had an eminent group of Canadian parliamentarians visiting us over the last weekend, and that important economic talks between Canada and the United States have just concluded after reaffirming our myriad common interests. These are additional examples of the friendly abiding ties between our two great countries. I hope we will do everything we can to nourish our already fertile relationship by giving it the closest possible attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a public statement by Secretary of State Dulles about this occasion be printed in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 10, 1959.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE BOUNDARY WATERS TREATY OF 1909

Today, January 11, 1959, is the 50th anniversary of the signing of the treaty which established the International Joint Commission of the United States and Canada and provided that "the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free."

This treaty and the Commission which it established have made an important contribution to the maintenance of the excellent relations which we have enjoyed with Canada over the years. It has provided a means of resolving problems connected with boundary waters through mutual cooperation, and it exemplifies the spirit with which we and our Canadian neighbors have approached many other questions of joint concern.

The problems which have come before the International Joint Commission since 1909 have touched the lives and interests of countless citizens on both sides of the border. They have ranged from consideration of relatively minor matters such as the proposal of an individual to block a transboundary stream to decisions controlling vast power and navigation projects of the St. Lawrence River, but all have received fair and thorough consideration by the Commission with a view to protecting the rights of all concerned.

On this 50th anniversary of the treaty it is indeed gratifying to observe that the high purpose of the contracting parties has been carried out effectively and to the great mutual benefit of the people of the United States and Canada.

BREAKFAST MEETING REMARKS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently, our colleague, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], made a few remarks to a group of Senators assembled for a breakfast meeting. Ordinarily, there is no publication of any proceedings at such meetings. However, Senator ROBERTSON's remarks are so true, so timely, and present such a ringing challenge, as well as a contribution

to our times, that I asked him to reduce them to writing. I would give a great deal to have been the author of this statement. I think these remarkable thoughts should be preserved and given to the American people. Accordingly, I ask that they be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

TRUE GREATNESS

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at meeting of Senate breakfast group January 14, 1959)

In welcoming new Members of the Senate who are meeting with us today for the first time may I express the hope that they will derive from devoting 1 hour each week to prayer and the study of God's word with their Senate colleagues the inspiration that these meetings have through a period of years been to me and share my fond belief that the prayers of contrite and humble hearts uttered in unison will ascend to that judgment throne where justice and mercy are reconciled and the judge and the brother are one.

In the 10 minutes allotted to me as discussion leader, I desire to propose as the theme for our roundtable discussion the Christian concept of true greatness. It is far different from the materialistic concept of physical, political or mental power, or the power and prestige of accumulated wealth. And it includes far more of unselfish love and unselfish service than the patriotic idealism of the Athenian statesman, Pericles, who said of the young men of Athens who died in repulsing the Persian invaders: "So they gave their bodies to the Commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchres, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulchre of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives. * * *

The fact that this is the 86th Congress of the United States indicates, of course, that there have been 85 previous Congresses which covered a span of 170 years. During that remarkable period in the world's history, the development of our material resources, of our wealth and of the power that normally goes with wealth has been on such a phenomenal scale that it is a bit difficult for us to realize two very vital facts of history, namely, 170 years is a brief span as compared with the period in which some nations of the past have been world powers before suffering total destruction and, secondly, there has never been until recently a period when it lay within the power of just one man to start a world conflict in which a substantial part of the entire world's population could be destroyed in a matter of days, leaving the remainder cowering behind a windbreak or in the diseased soaked ruins of a slum. Hence, my hope that this is an appropriate time and place for the Members of the Senate, who by their presence here this morning indicate a desire to have their lives conform to the teachings of the Bible, to ask as Benjamin Franklin did at the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention, that the Father of Light will illumine our understanding with respect to our true objectives and our concept of the meaning of greatness.

As an appropriate theme for our consideration, I wish to remind you of what Jesus said to two of his disciples, James and John, who had expressed to him the very worldly

ambition to be the two top men in His new kingdom: "Ye know that they who are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister. And whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For the Son of Man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

It is a great honor to serve in the Senate of the United States, which still can be described properly as the greatest deliberative body in the world. No man ever reached the Senate without an ambition to be great. It is, of course, a well-known fact that after achieving the ambition of being a United States Senator, many Senators have entertained the ambition of becoming President and some have achieved it. But since, as I have indicated, we live in an age in which possession of unprecedented wealth and power is no longer a guaranty of our immediate peace, much less our ultimate security, I invite your attention to the fact that man's conception of greatness has changed through the ages, and then to ask a candid expression from you during the roundtable discussion—if you sincerely feel that the people of our Nation which claims to be a Christian Nation and which inscribes on its coins "In God We Trust" have finally subscribed to the principle of greatness based upon the Christian principle that he is greatest who best loves and best serves his fellow man.

God made the universe and so God is omnipotent. God made man in His image and God knew from the days of Adam down to the present time not only what every man was doing but what every man was thinking in his heart and so God is omniscient. But, over and above all else, God is love. Love is a gift, the expression of self, and man then is great when he can catch in his poor and futile life some rays of that glory which is the first of God's characteristics.

Those who have been members of this group for the past 12 years will recall how frequently I have discussed the great men of the Old Testament who through complete faith in God dedicated their lives to the service of their fellow man. They will recall my discussion of how God let the Devil strip Job, the richest and most powerful sheik of the desert, of both his wealth and his power and how out of those trials and tribulations Job got a new concept of God and a new vision of true greatness.

Then, some of you may recall the occasion on which I discussed David's conflict with Goliath. Goliath the Giant of the Philistines who typified the barbarian test of greatness—superlative human strength. In conquering Goliath, David relied neither upon his strength nor upon his wealth nor upon a superior intellect. He relied solely upon his implicit faith in God and a deep conviction that he had an opportunity to serve his people.

And then we studied the remarkable career of the Jewish captive named Daniel, who because of his desire to encourage other captive Jews to remain true to their faith was willing to incur the death penalty by refusing to obey the command of an oriental king to worship a false God.

We do not have to look only to the Bible or to the pages of ancient secular history for examples of those who achieved true greatness through unselfish service to others. Today, for instance, is the anniversary of the birth of one of our Nation's greatest scientists, Matthew Fontaine Maury, known as the pathfinder of the seas because he charted the tradewinds and the tides, he founded the U.S. Naval Observatory, he caused to be founded the U.S. Naval Academy,

he gathered the data required for the laying of the first transatlantic cable, he organized the first League of Nations which successfully functioned for 50 years in the dissemination of maritime information, and he was the father of the present Weather Bureau. But after the unfortunate War Between the States, Matthew Fontaine Maury turned down flattering offers to head the imperial observatories of both France and Russia to accept the chair of physics at the Virginia Military Institute, in my hometown. Maury never accumulated wealth, he never had political power and during his lifetime no adequate recognition of his intellectual achievements, the three fields of greatness to which so many men aspire. But Maury is now listed among the alltime greats because like the immortal Robert E. Lee he had the Christian concept of true greatness whereby unselfish service to the training of the youth of the South was preferred to material rewards for the use of his distinguished name.

So I conclude by asking you to what extent are our current ambitions for greatness attuned to the accumulation of wealth, the exercise of political power or the public recognition of a superior intellect and what part attuned to the one who said, "I came not to be ministered unto but to minister." As a great London preacher said many years ago: "The physical strength of the Crucified ebbed with His life blood; His last earthly possessions were cast lots for by His executioners; Herod treated Him publicly as a fool when He was on His way to die. Yet His greatness remained; for His eternal strength indeed, His uncreated wealth, His clear and awful intellect, were not as men deemed, in that hour of darkness; His supreme greatness, that which was to give the law to the best human thought upon the subject, and to revolutionize the world, remained. It remained, that consummate act of service, offered by infinite charity to the Father on high, offered on behalf of man below; and henceforth all who, by faith and love, unite themselves to it, are initiated thereby into the true secret of man's greatness, and learn practically the meaning of the precept of Christ."

The recognition by this group of the Christian principle of true greatness and their believing and united prayers may help to lift the shadows from the road ahead.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN WISCONSIN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have just received from the Wisconsin State Employment Service a report that unemployment in Wisconsin during the past month amounted to 77,400. This is up by a whopping 16,000 over the number for the same time a year earlier. It is up by a solid 7,000 since November. In spite of these bleak figures, unemployment in my State is moderately less than in the rest of the country.

Mr. President, we hear much talk about Government waste, and we should. Certainly I deplore it. But the most tragic and the most irreplacable waste in this country is the waste of men who want to work but cannot find employment. The work they were denied doing last month can never be made up. It is lost forever. It is lost at a time when America needs the work of men to build tens of thousands of schoolrooms, when we need literally hundreds of thousands of homes, and a rapid and vast stepup in our missile production and in our whole Defense Establishment.

Yes, indeed, Mr. President, waste—the waste of idle manpower in an America

that needs the work of men—is the prime issue before this Congress. And this Senator intends to do everything in his power as a Senator to propose and persuade and vote to give these idle men a chance to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEATING in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

VISIT OF SOVIET UNION'S DEPUTY PREMIER ANASTAS MIKOYAN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, after a good deal of soul searching, I simply cannot condone the activities of those who indulge in socializing with Deputy Premier Mikoyan. Were he here on some specific business I could understand formal talks with him by our officials who would be concerned with his proposals. It should be obvious to all that Mikoyan is here for a propaganda good will tour; first, to try to weaken our hitherto firm stand in regard to the Berlin situation, and, secondly, to attempt to soften us up for eventual proposals of increased trade with the Soviet Union, which can only have the effect of weakening our comparative position.

A few of our great industrialists and a few of our Wall Street bankers have given him the red-carpet treatment as a matter of obvious self-interest if his mission is successful. I, for one, certainly do not intend to aid him in the accomplishment of his mission, nor do I approve of their actions. I wonder if these same bankers and industrialists are aware of Lenin's statement that, "When we Communists are ready to hang the capitalists, they'll try to outbid each other for the sale of the hemp to us." That is pretty straight language. When will we learn that men cannot be both greedy and free? Why do we now pay tribute and social adulation for a temporary smile from a man whose every past word and deed indicates that he despises us and our way of life? Has his Communist-indoctrinated thinking of many years duration so suddenly changed?

I am distressed that some of my congressional colleagues have also accorded him recognition in social activities. It is especially disturbing that this man, one of the top plotters of our destruction, should have been given a luncheon under the very dome of the U.S. Capitol, which is the most important citadel of human freedom in the world today. Those of us in public life who have entrusted to us the safeguarding of the constitutional guarantees of human freedoms might better follow the course set by that astute and beloved leader of the Catholic Church, Cardinal Cushing of Boston, who recently said without equivocation, "I shall not receive Mikoyan nor attend any functions in his honor."

That should, indeed, be the course of our people, whose memories are not so dull that they have already forgotten an incident which occurred just a few brief months ago, and which characterizes the calculated course of that ruthless regime which Mikoyan represents. An American unarmed transport plane, on its

way from Turkey to Iran, was shot down by Soviet fighter planes over Armenia, which happens to be Comrade Mikoyan's homeland. Eventually, Mr. Mikoyan's government was kind enough to return to us the bodies of four American soldiers. Where are the other ten? We do not know.

Instead of traipsing around the country exuding affable charm, I would be much more impressed if Mikoyan would address himself to giving us some information concerning the whereabouts of those sons of American mothers.

Cardinal Cushing's course is the one I had already set for myself from the time Mikoyan arrived in this country. In that decision, and in my whole course of action, I shall continue to do my utmost to convey to the Soviet enslaved peoples of the world that the torch which they bear in their never-ending struggle for freedom still shines brightly in the eyes of the vast majority of the people of this Nation.

It will be my purpose to demonstrate to those people of the world who look to us for leadership that the adulation and freewheeling publicity accorded Mikoyan in some quarters is only an expression of the views of a small fraction of the people of this country. A vast majority echo the words of Rudyard Kipling in that great anthem entitled "The Recessional," which concludes with—

Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget.

I have full faith that the people of this country have not forgotten.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I rise to disagree with the statement made by my distinguished and able and beloved friend from New Hampshire with regard to his colleagues visiting with the distinguished official of the Soviet Government.

Mr. President, I think very much of our system. I am so proud of it that there is nothing I have to hide and nothing I have to fear.

I think it was good that Mr. Mikoyan came to this country. I think the further he went, and the more he saw, the less he must have been impressed with his own system. I only wish that more people of his stature and his ability could see how the free-enterprise system works and how freedom is preserved. I also wish that men of equal stature in our country were given the same free privilege to travel through Russia and observe all areas there, instead of certain selected areas.

It was not many months ago when Mr. Khrushchev was carried on a television program in this country. I think his appearance on that program did much to unite our own people and to instill in them a new determination to preserve the freedom that our forefathers had fought for. I think it was well to have Mr. Khrushchev appear on the television screens, because no one who saw him wanted any part of either Mr. Khrushchev or the Russian system.

I believe in the Open Curtain policy, and I believe the more people can ex-

change views and exchange ideas and reason things out, the better off we shall be. This is a troubled world, but at least the people of this country and the leaders of this country want peace more than they want anything else.

I cannot help but believe that when Mr. Mikoyan returns to his own country he will at least have had a great impression of what free government really is; and I hope that he and his people will permit our President, and our Secretary of State, and our minority leader, and the leaders of both parties of our country, to appear on television, so the Russian people can see the difference.

One of the most respected Members of this body, and a friend of mine, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], has just returned from travel in Russia. I listened to his report with great interest. I had heard the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] report on a study he had made there some years ago. What impressed me about the report of the Senator from Mississippi was that he went to the schools and saw the children, he went to the stores and saw the storekeepers, he saw people in all walks of life. He was impressed with the fact that 90 percent of the people were interested in our country and wanted to know more about it. He believed they were all determined to have peace. The trouble is that the other 10 percent happen to be those who are in charge of the Government.

I would rather have a few words dropped under the dome of the Capitol than have a few bombs dropped on it.

I certainly voice no approval of the Russians' system, of their actions, or of their ideas when I discuss matters with them, any more than I give approval to what the Senator is saying when I stand to try to reason with him. The Senator is entitled to his thoughts. I have great respect for them. A great deal of the time I agree with the Senator, but I do not agree with him that we ought to shut the curtain and try to stick our nose in the sand, to run under the tunnel and hide, to tuck our tails and say, "We are so insecure ourselves, and we have such an inferiority complex we are afraid to let anybody even come to see what we have; and, more than that, we are afraid to talk with them. Moreover, if we talk with them we are certainly not going to eat with them."

That is not, in my judgment, the way to have peace in the world, ever. I think the thing the American people and the people of the world want more than anything else is the opportunity for their children to live instead of to be destroyed by the means which we have developed, which can wipe out humanity overnight.

I thank my friend for his generous reference.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Texas, there is nobody I admire more for his Americanism and forthrightness than the distinguished Senator from Texas. I have a very deep affection for him.

I do not quarrel with people of our Government having official contact, but I do not think the Senator for one mo-

ment believes our officials are going to be invited to Russia, allowed to see everything, or are going to have banquets given in their honor, are going to have luncheons given in their honor, and are going to have the red carpet rolled out for them, and so forth and so on. Does the Senator so believe?

In addition to that, we in the U.S. Senate and we as a country in the United Nations have taken a definite position against what happened in Hungary. We are talking about the man who was the architect. He was the boss right on the job when the Hungarian massacre occurred. I think this situation is a little different.

The minority leader of the Senate, the Secretary of State, and the President of the United States have never been in the position of coming forward with such a record. I think the situation is wholly different.

I do not object to any official of the U.S. Government, including Senators of the United States, sitting down to discuss problems with a representative of a foreign power. I think that is as it should be.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. What I have objected to is the giving of luncheons and dinners in Mikoyan's honor, and particularly I object when certain big Wall Street bankers and certain big industrialists—those who would be the first victims of any Communist success in this Nation—rush in to glowingly receive Mikoyan. That is what I object to.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know anything about these Wall Street bankers. The Senator is more familiar with them, evidently, than I am.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have been reading about them lately.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I went to a luncheon yesterday, given so that a group of Senators could meet and discuss their impressions with the distinguished publisher of the Commercial Appeal in Memphis, Tenn.

I observe my delightful friend, the junior Senator from Tennessee, who was host at that luncheon, is present in the Chamber.

I broke bread at that luncheon. I broke more of it than I should have, and I have taken on more weight, but it was a delicious luncheon. I enjoyed it. We exchanged ideas back and forth.

At the conclusion of that luncheon I went to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The only reason why I had not gone to the committee earlier was that I had accepted the luncheon invitation of the Senator from Tennessee first. When I got to the committee I observed—I will say this to the Senator, since it is what he objects to—there was not even any water on the table. All had finished eating. There was no food around.

I observed the distinguished minority leader. I was glad he was present. I listened to the Deputy Premier. I heard him respond to some questions asked

by members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I did not ask any questions, but I heard some very penetrating questions asked, and some answers made. I am proud we have a country where we can sit down with the leaders of government—Republicans and Democrats, the majority leader and minority leader, and the chairman of the committee and the Republican members of the committee—and, through questions, fully and thoroughly demonstrate, I think, even to Mr. Mikoyan that our system is better than his.

I would not want this opportunity to pass without making such defense as I am capable of making of the conduct of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am glad the President of the United States talked to Mr. Mikoyan. I am glad the Secretary of State talked to Mr. Mikoyan. I understand that the distinguished Vice President is anticipating a visit to Russia.

I think the more the Russian people can see us and the more we can see them the better opportunity we shall have to avoid destroying all humanity. As I said earlier, I would rather drop words than bombs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was invited to the luncheon yesterday by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. It was my honor to sit next to the Deputy Premier. I asked a great many questions about agriculture, livestock, and feed grains before other questions dealing essentially with foreign relations were brought forth.

I have two emotions about the matter. The first can be best illustrated by what happened 50 years ago, because it was exactly 50 years ago that Theodore Roosevelt invited Booker T. Washington of Tuskegee Institute to the White House for lunch. The fulminations in the country reached to the heavens. In our own country what sharp difference of opinion there was over the fact that a man of color, a great educator and a great leader of his people, should even be invited to the White House by the President of the United States.

Yesterday we had as a guest the Deputy Premier of Russia. He came as a tourist, really; he did not come in his official status. It is often difficult to make the distinction as between the status of a man in one category and in another. That is neither here nor there. I was glad to attend officially. My greatest regret is that what was said and what was asked could not have been put on the record. Then our people would be able to make a good estimate.

Much was said by way of comment about the luncheon, so I think I am free, without violating any confidences, to make remarks on an item or two. My good friend from New Hampshire raises a question of 9 or 10 unretrieved, unexplained bodies in the difficulty which happened over Armenia. That very question was raised by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. I followed his every word. I think the

Senator will agree we did not get a very satisfactory answer to that question. The Berlin question was raised. I was glad to note the alertness of my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in pursuing the matter.

I wish our people could have observed the agitation and the sharply punctuated gestures of the Deputy Premier; the firmness which he manifested; and his forthrightness, in a sense, when he said, through his affable and very fluent young interpreter, "You mistrust us, and we mistrust you." It would have been very helpful. I wish our people could have listened. It would have given them great insight. It has made me, I think, more dedicated than ever before.

I want to say to my distinguished friend that as an official, invited guest, it was quite an eye opener for me. The one thought I brought away was: Let nobody in this country ever mistake the firm chin, the flashing eye, the absolute steadfastness without any opportunity of retreat on the part of the Premier, because he laid it right on the line. From that we can well know our duty and our responsibility will be to be firm in every situation which may arise, for if we vacillate, if we weaken, I shudder to think what the ultimate consequence may be.

So I concur with my friend that it was not a social function. I think we were merely extending official courtesies to the distinguished guest from the Soviet Union. However, the meeting was an eye-opener. I am glad I was there to hear him, to see him, and to get a few questions answered. My greatest regret is that there was not time enough for many other questions. I was primed to ask how many television stations the Russians had; how many receiving sets they had; how many radio stations, and how many radio receivers. I wanted to find out, if I could, just how effective our U.S. Information Service is. My distinguished friend from Texas has listened many times to testimony on that subject.

I wondered whether we had what was necessary to match the Russians, whether or not our programs were being jumbled, and whether or not we were getting our money's worth for our expenditure of \$100 million a year. But unfortunately time did not permit of asking all those questions. If it had been possible to remain there until 4 o'clock in the afternoon and let the questioning go around the table, and if the questions and answers could all have been reduced to writing, so that there would have been a transcript, it would have made most illuminating reading.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I believe in quid pro quo. I do not object to Mr. Mikoyan appearing on every television station in the country, or to every one of our 175 million people seeing him, because I believe that everyone who saw him or heard him would reject his philosophy, and become more dedicated to the system of which America is so proud.

What I object to is that we do not demand of Russia the same privileges we grant their people. She should extend to our people the same privileges which her people enjoy when they visit our country. If Mikoyan can go from one end of the land to the other, from one supermarket to another, from one super highway to another, I believe that those of equal stature in our Government should be permitted to go to Russia and to move about as freely as we have allowed Mikoyan to move.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I pay the same tribute to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I extend to the distinguished Senator from Texas. I know that he is a great American, and I have real affection for him. I am not leveling personal criticism at any Member of the Senate. However, I was distressed that a luncheon honoring Mr. Mikoyan was given under the Capitol dome. Perhaps the exchange of ideas was healthy, but I agree with the Senator from Texas that we should demand the same privileges for our officials and citizens who travel in Russia. Reciprocity means a fair and equal exchange; and we have not had it in the past from Russia or the other Communist countries.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand the position which the Senator is taking. With reference to the luncheon yesterday, I was present. I did not consider it a luncheon honoring the Deputy Prime Minister of the Soviet Union. It was a luncheon given by the Foreign Relations Committee for the purpose of exchanging ideas. It was for the purpose of allowing us an opportunity to ask questions and get answers. The thought never entered my mind that the luncheon was in his honor at all. I did not so regard it.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is true. However, I thought it was a luncheon to honor him, because that is the way in which it was reported.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is nothing unusual in the Foreign Relations Committee having an official from a foreign government appear before it. We do it often. I have long advocated not only having officials from foreign governments appear before the committee, but having ambassadors come and talk with us whenever they return home from foreign countries. We have done so in many instances.

I agree with what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said about the exchange of ideas yesterday. I believe a great many members of the press were surprised at the general discussions we had concerning some things which were not sensational. Of course, the subject of disarmament was sensational, as was the Berlin question. There are many similar questions. However, we discussed a number of other things. We tried to obtain from Mr. Mikoyan his impression of the country, and he gave us a great many ideas.

I was particularly interested in talking with him about housing. He told us

a great deal about housing, and indicated how far behind us the Russians are in that field. I think most of us were surprised to learn that the minimum housing standards in Russia for a new house for a family are so far below what they are in this country that the two situations cannot be compared.

Those are not headline or glamorous subjects, but I think the discussion meant a great deal. A little more than 3 years ago I had the privilege of visiting Russia with my wife. We went there in an entirely unofficial capacity. At times travel in Russia is discouraged. We went on our own. We went to see what we could see, to talk with the people, and receive our own impressions.

I returned home with the feeling that if we ever hoped to make any headway toward bringing about a change in the way of doing things in Russia, it would have to be done through the exchange of ideas, the penetration of ideas. My opinion is that it is useless to hope that the Russian people will rise up. They will not.

As has been stated here, I found that the Russian people were interested in knowing about things in our country. What a fine thing it would be if we could get across to them all the facts.

I am glad that the Deputy Prime Minister of the Soviet Union came to this country, not because of the deplorable general record which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has pointed out—I deplore that as much as he does—but because he is a high official in his own Government, and because he is one who lives there. I wish more of them would come. I wish great numbers of them would come, and I wish more of our people would go over there and try to demonstrate the difference between our two ways of life.

I am pleased to learn that the distinguished Vice President of the United States will probably visit Russia this spring or summer. I am glad he is going. I presume that his rank is about the same as that of the Soviet visitor. I hope dinners will be given in his honor. I hope he will be given opportunities for discussions such as we had yesterday in the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope the Soviets will allow the Vice President to appear on television. I understand that the Deputy Prime Minister is to meet the press tomorrow afternoon. I hope that Vice President Nixon may have the opportunity of appearing on television in Russia, that he will be quoted in the press, and that he will be able to get the story across. I hope hundreds of thousands of others will follow his course. I hope many more of the Russian people will come over here.

With regard to the question of functions honoring the Deputy Premier—and I do not rule out that possibility, in view of the high position which he holds in his government—let us try to get across to him some of the ideas which will do some good. We must find a way of dealing with those people. We cannot go along forever in a cold war. I shudder to think what would happen to all of us in case of a hot war. So I say that we must grasp at every straw we

can, in the hope that it may lead to the development of something which will allow us to live together in the same world.

Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield first to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me for a half minute, so that I may explain my reason for now leaving the floor.

I realize more than anyone else that I am a legislator, not a diplomat. However, as a man I wish always to be courteous. Hardly a day passes that an official of a foreign government does not come to call upon the leaders of both parties. At this very moment there is sitting in my office the Honorable Felix von Eckart, the State Secretary of the Republic of Germany, and Mr. Richard Balken, Secretary of the German Embassy.

They are meeting with the Speaker of the House at 2 o'clock. I have been detained because of this discussion. Unfortunately, I shall miss everything the Senators have to say. I hope, however, that Senators will realize that I am frequently called upon to extend courtesies to foreign visitors and that upon occasions I must eat with officials of other lands, but that that does not mean in any respect that I am embracing their philosophies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wish to improve the arithmetic with respect to the time devoted to discussions with foreign visitors. Yesterday 17 persons were present in a 2-hour discussion. I have not calculated each person's time on the basis of minutes. However, my distinguished friend from Minnesota had 8 hours, as I understand, for his discussion in Moscow. We should approximate the matter a little bit more and try to make certain that the next time we have a luncheon of the kind we had yesterday we devote a whole afternoon to it, and that we first prepare ourselves with questions, and then make notes, and in that way try to get the whole story. That would be informative to the people of this country.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all I want to say that the minority leader has put his finger on a very important point with respect to the discussion of yesterday, namely, that the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union is tough to deal with, that he is a competent man, and that he demonstrates to us the kind of intellectual toughness and moral strength our country needs if it is to stand up and win in the cold war, and that, therefore, we must step up our activity in this regard.

One thought occurs to me particularly with respect to the length of the luncheon yesterday, and that is that it is about time the Government of the

United States realizes it is not possible to discuss problems of the world in a brief session. Our country seems to have become addicted to what is called briefs. The problems of our country and of other countries cannot be fully discussed in brief discussions lasting about 2 hours.

For example, the other day the Secretary of State appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations to give the committee a general review of American foreign policy. He spent 2 hours with the committee. If the foreign policy of our country can be discussed in a meeting that lasts no more than 2 hours, then, indeed it is not much of a foreign policy. I am not complaining about the Secretary of State. I thought he made a good presentation. I merely say that everyone around here believes he is too busy and does not have the time for a discussion of fundamental, basic issues. The Senator from Illinois is right; yesterday the time could have been profitably spent in a discussion not of 2 hours or 4 hours, but in a discussion lasting all day, and then some. It would have been to the advantage and profit of both parties.

I believe Mr. Mikoyan's visit has been helpful to the cause of peace, and I will tell the Senators why I think so.

Mr. BRIDGES. To interrupt the Senator briefly, I merely wish to observe that I had the impression the Senator was opposed to lengthy statements, judging by his votes on the so-called filibusters and changing the rules of the Senate. I thought he had made his position very clear on these issues. I am therefore a little surprised that he should favor so much time being spent on this subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am surprised that the Senator from New Hampshire should think that I would let any theory get in the way of what he knows to be the practice of the Senator from Minnesota. [Laughter.]

The distinguished Senator from Illinois just whispered to me that there was a little filibustering at yesterday's meeting with the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union. The Deputy Premier was asked a question by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and he proceeded to talk for about 25 minutes. After he had spoken for approximately that time I decided to interrupt him by asking some other questions.

However, I wish to get back to my main point, that of courtesy. I believe that the visit to the United States by the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union has resulted in a better hope for peace. I should like to tell the Senators why I think so.

I believe the Deputy Premier found out something about America which other observers of America in other reports to the Soviet Union officials did not honestly state. He found out that this great, powerful, rich, and strong country is hard at work. He was impressed, as he said several times, by the fantastic amount of industrial construction. He also found out that our people are essentially united. He also found out that in foreign relations, whether we are

Democrats or Republicans, we are united so far as the great fundamental issues involved in our foreign policy are concerned, and that we have in that respect basic agreements. We may have some differences of opinion with respect to some of the details, but on the German issue, on the Berlin issue—and particularly on the Berlin issue—our position is clear. I am sure that the Deputy Premier, Mr. Mikoyan, will go back to Mr. Khrushchev with a clear understanding that the American people are united on that issue. It was my effort to try to make that clear to Mr. Khrushchev when I was in the Soviet Union.

I believe in politeness. I do not believe it is an indication of courage to be impolite. Only a weakling feels he needs to be impolite. It is not necessary for anyone to insult another person in order to prove his point. It is possible to ask penetrating questions responsively and politely and with intelligence and courtesy and courage. It is the insulting person who is the weakling and the ranter and the demagogue. I believe America did itself proud by showing that it had no fear whatsoever.

I should also like to call attention to the fact that the people who have been picketing and demonstrating against the Deputy Premier's visit have shown to all the world that we have freedom of speech in America. It is good for the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union to know that our people have the right to protest, and that our people are not shoved around or beaten over the head or put in jail for protesting and picketing. I believe he received a good demonstration of Americana. I am all for it.

Finally I should like to say that more of these exchanges are needed. One of the weaknesses of our country today is its timidity. I, for one, am not afraid of Communists. All too often we give the impression that somehow we should not be seen talking to them or be seen in their company. Mr. President, the propagation of the faith, whatever the faith may be, is not accomplished by talking only to the converted. If we are to save any souls, we must go to work on the sinners. If it is our intention and hope to spread democracy and freedom, we must be willing to walk into the den of those who oppose them. It is necessary for us to take our peace program into the citadel of our opponent.

One of the weaknesses of our Government today is its timidity with respect to Iron Curtain countries. In the Senate we are strong in talking against the Soviets. One word said inside the Soviet Union on the subject of democracy is worth 10 CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS full of the same talk.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, does the Senator believe that Mr. Mikoyan will go back to the Soviet Union and tell the people there what he saw here and what he learned about us?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that the Russians understand power even better than Americans. I believe the Russians are able to calculate on the basis of truth. Public opinion, so far as it relates to Russia, means about 11 ministers and about 200 members of the

central committee. Those are the people to whom Mr. Mikoyan will talk. Those are the grassroots, so-called, in the Soviet Union. Those grassroots, or public opinion, are the central committee. He is returning to Russia and he will talk to them around January 27.

It should not be forgotten that Mr. Mikoyan has been a minister in Russia for 32 years. He is one member of the entire central committee who can never threaten the leader. The reason is that he is a member of the minority which, regrettably in Russia, can never hope to have one of its members succeed to the top position of premier. He is an Armenian. We in this country admire Armenians. They are first-class citizens in America. However, in Russia they have been a persecuted minority for many years. Mr. Mikoyan, for 32 years, since 1926, has had the agility and ability to go through the many changes which have taken place in the Kremlin, primarily because he is a brain truster and because he can never be a threat to the No. 1 man.

When Mr. Mikoyan returns to Russia he will carry his report inside closed rooms. Do Senators know what he will say publicly? Publicly, he will talk the way some people talk in public in America. What is important is what he will say inside closed rooms. I say again that we gave him a demonstration of political solidarity and political unity, which is all to the good. I made myself quite clear on that issue when I was in Russia. I stood up for our President. I made it clear that, regardless of partisan politics, I stood by the Secretary of State. When the Secretary of State was condemned in my presence in the Soviet Union, I said, "I will hear no more of it." It is far more important to say that inside the Kremlin than it is to say it on Constitution Avenue. When I asked for some time on Moscow TV, I was given time. I talked about President Eisenhower and about America and about justice and human dignity and spiritual values, as well as physical well-being. That is what I talked about on the Moscow TV. How did I get on it? By asking them for the opportunity.

If we are to go around the world and act like wallflowers, the Soviets will be mighty glad to put us behind a closed cage and keep us there.

I suggest that we need a little more of good, old-fashioned American spunk, to make those fellows over there wake up to what is going on over here.

I remember when I went to the United Nations. I was advised by our Government not to make myself too available; not to have my picture taken with the Soviets, if any of them came around. I was never more humiliated in my life when, one time, a Soviet official came up and stuck out his hand like a dreaded robot. I withdrew mine. Then I remembered: I am a man. So I put out my hand. Why should I have been afraid? Why should I have acted like a wallflower?

I think it is about time that we stand up and let the Russians know that we have the finest government in the world. There is not a Senator who has come

back from a trip to Russia who can say that he was not treated courteously. There is not one who did not find out that the people with whom he talked were simply dying to find out something about America.

What did they want to know? "Where do you live? Do you have a house? Do you drive a car? Really? How many rooms do you have in your house? Where do your children go to school? Do you have electricity?"

That was what they wanted to know. They had heard about these things, but they did not believe them. I know that when I was able to take out a picture of our home, show them a picture of our car, and show the children a picture of our family, I was able to demonstrate to them that we were simply plain, ordinary people, who were earning our way through life.

Such conversations made an impression, maybe not on Khrushchev, but on the 16- and 17-year-olds. I met hundreds of them. I talked to hundreds of them through our own interpreter, Dr. Michel Shimkin, of the National Institutes of Health. He will testify that in railroad stations and bus stations, in the subway, in the shops, we had no difficulty at all, unmolested, in talking to hundreds of the Russian people.

Mr. BRIDGES. But the Senator has just said that they are not the grassroots of Russia. He said that so far as having any eventual effect is concerned, the grassroots is the organization of some 200 people at the top.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is why I think Mr. Mikoyan's visit will prove to be beneficial with all the opportunities he has had to plead his case. And, believe me, he is a keen observer. He was surely using the opportunities, as the Senator has pointed out, opportunities to convince and persuade the American people. There is no official of the Soviet Government who is better qualified and more competent in the field of economics and the field of trade in his country than Mr. Mikoyan. I am confident that he will go home, after having seen the plants in Detroit and Cleveland, and remind some of the members of the Soviet hierarchy that America is a mighty strong country—that is, if he has not done so before.

But we should not lose sight of the fact, as some of us have had the chance to observe, that when we see some of the construction which is taking place in Russia, we begin to wonder about how much power they themselves have.

Mr. BRIDGES. But the Senator from Minnesota closes his eyes to the entire background and record of Mikoyan.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not. I know that he is a part of the Communist conspiracy. I know the record of the Communist Party from the day it started its revolution to this very hour. Everything the Senator from New Hampshire has said about the Communist Party is true. But it so happens that those people are in charge of a government. It so happens that the Soviet Union is the second strongest country on the face of the earth in terms of sheer military power.

I say we are still the strongest. I hope we will continue to be the strongest.

But when we have to face up to those fellows, I think we ought to face up to them as realists: first, to let them know what we are; second, to let them know that we know what kind of people they are. We should let them know that we do not intend to run away; that simply because they can do certain things in Russia, they cannot get by with them here.

Mr. BRIDGES. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I had almost forgotten what I intended to say. The colloquy on the floor has been extremely interesting.

I do wish that the Senator from New Hampshire, as well as every other Senator, could have attended the courtesy luncheon, because that was what it was, given for the Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union yesterday. If each Senator could have been there, he would have come away with greater pride in his democratic form of government and the democratic institutions which we have in this country. He would have a greater determination to protect them against the inroads of communism.

Mr. Mikoyan was very interesting. He spoke frankly. He admitted the weaknesses of Russia. He admired our strength in many respects. But he did not yield in any respect concerning the Soviet form of government—at least, he did not do so openly, and I feel certain he did not do so to himself at any time. But I could not help thinking that he will return to Russia with a feeling of envy and admiration for what he saw in the United States. As the Senator from Minnesota has said, I assume Mr. Mikoyan will make an honest, accurate report to the comparatively small group to whom he will make his report. What the Russian people will be told, I do not know.

I think the only way in which we can get our story over to the Russian people is through an exchange of visits, which will take many years, perhaps as long as a generation. We all know that the Russian people are out on a limb, so far as their government is concerned. We all know that it will probably take longer to get the entire nation off the limb than it takes some of the Members of this body, who frequently run on limbs, to get off. Some get back very agilely; others have to be helped at times.

But it seemed to me that Mr. Mikoyan's visit—and I know he did not win one convert—has confirmed our determination, if it has done nothing else, to resist his form of government, by which he still stands.

But it is well to meet with those people and to talk with them, because it is only if we know them that we will be able to deal with them most effectively. If we do not meet with them, we will not know how to deal with them.

I think, on the whole, Mr. Mikoyan will return to Russia and probably admit or concede, as he did to us, that the United States is a great country. He freely admitted that comparing our standards of living, our housing, our

highway system, and so forth, with those of Russia, Russia had a long, long way to go to catch up with us. I wish he would admit that to all the Russian people, but he probably will not. But I feel certain that he will so inform the top level officials of the Soviet Government. To that extent, I think, probably some good may come. But I am not looking for overnight miracles.

I do not think Russia is in any danger of a revolution for a long time to come. In that respect, it may be quite different from China. We cannot overlook the fact that in the past there have been blood baths in Russia, as well as in Hungary and the other satellite countries. I suppose those blood baths are small compared with what is taking place in China. But since there are so many Chinese, perhaps the Chinese Government feels that it can spare 20 or 30 million people.

On the whole, I should think there has been some gain, some better understanding, from the Mikoyan visit. I hope we may continue to learn more about the Russians, and perhaps in the future our own grandchildren may be much closer to a complete understanding of the Russians than we are.

Mr. BRIDGES. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The composite face of our country in the face of the Mikoyan visit, exposed to the world, could be the composite face of everything that has been said in the Senate. I emphasize "everything" because there is one thing I have not heard emphasized, namely, that this country in the last 10 or 12 days has been a country covered with a glass dome, under acute observation by every nation in the world, not only the Soviet Union, but every other nation in the world.

They are trying to see, first, if we are naive. The Senator from New Hampshire has been pointing out that we are not. Second, they are waiting to see if we are willing to talk to the Russians.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], have pointed out that we are willing to talk with them.

Then, the rest of the world is waiting to see whether we will get yanked into a conference of the two superpowers, in which America will abandon her position in the world, or whether we will remain firm in our alliances and treat our allies with the greatest dignity.

I respectfully submit to my colleagues, therefore, that the world should know that we Americans are courteous and, indeed, are hospitable. In fact, we may overdo it occasionally; and in this case the Senator from New Hampshire thinks perhaps we have done so. At the same time, we understand the crimes committed by the regime represented by Mr. Mikoyan, and perhaps, as the Senator from New Hampshire has described, Mr. Mikoyan himself participated in some of them. But we are perfectly willing to talk, although we are not willing to be hoodwinked, and we are not surrendering our position and are not low-

ering our guard, but are maintaining our regard for our allies in the respect that they have to be full partners of ours. If we can do all of these things at the same time, then I submit that, on balance, the visit has been a good one. But I submit that all these things are required in order to make the point which needs to be made to the world.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I gladly yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to say, regarding the action of the committee—I am not sure whether any Senator has referred to this point—that the luncheon was first cleared with the State Department, and had its approval. It was also cleared by the chairman of the committee, and I believe with all the committee members. Certainly, the chairman asked me, and I thought it was a good idea. After having participated in the luncheon, I still think it was a good idea.

I shall not burden the RECORD by repeating many of the things which already have been stated by my colleagues. There are several observations which I should like to make. One of them, I think, has not previously been made.

One of the colleagues of Mr. Mikoyan—I believe it was the head of the American desk in the foreign office of the Russian Government, Mr. Soldatov—happened to sit next to me. He said to me that he was impressed that not many questions had been asked about Hungary, and therefore he concluded that Hungary was of no great concern to Americans. He was not referring to the conversations at the luncheon. In fact, his remark was made to me prior to the questioning at the luncheon. Instead, he was referring to his experience during his trip in our country.

I tried to make clear to this Russian official, as I try to make clear now, that such an impression on his part was a false interpretation of the situation in our country—even if we grant that it is true that few questions were asked. I think the proper interpretation is that the Hungarian situation is so bad that, in cases of courtesy luncheons, such as the one we had yesterday, those who participate hesitate, when the occasion is semibusiness and semisocial, let us say—in this case, a courtesy luncheon; I like the language the Senator from Vermont used—to precipitate the most disagreeable and inhospitable question of all. That is my interpretation of why that matter had not been dwelt upon at greater length. If this RECORD is called to the attention of that official—and in view of the fact that the Senator from New Hampshire had led the debate, I have no doubt that it will be—I wish to call the attention of that official to the fact that I think the impression he described to me is a misunderstanding of the situation. Instead, the people of America are very much concerned about Hungary.

I am certain that to all Americans it is most puzzling that a country with the

responsibility of Russia would do what was done in Hungary. That is one of the things about which we must have some understanding if there is to be any possibility of improving relations between the United States and Russia. Americans are deeply concerned about Hungary and all that it implies as to the motives and character of the Soviet Government. I wish to make that statement for the RECORD.

I also wish to say that if one follows the theory of the Senator from New Hampshire to its logical conclusion, it is rather difficult to justify the luncheons which have been held in the past with representatives of the German Government or representatives of the Japanese Government. Recently, I was in Japan. I think the Japanese are very great people. I think they did some things which were inexcusable, and I believe they are not at all proud of them. But I do not think we can hold such things against the Japanese people today, to the point that we refuse to do business with them or refuse to have courtesy luncheons or conferences with them. Of course, in the case of the Japanese, we have long since passed that point. I consider that today the Japanese are very good friends of ours—and also that the Germans are very good friends of ours.

But let us keep those relations in mind in connection with the situation confronting us today in the case of the Russians. I hope that our relations with them may be improved and in such a way that we do not sacrifice our position in regard to the rest of Europe.

Furthermore, there is something we can learn from Mr. Mikoyan—namely, that the Russians have found a way to obtain very highly trained professionals to represent their country.

In the United States and in England the tradition has been that politics and diplomacy are for gentlemen, that they are primarily for amateurs, often people who do not need to work to live. On the other hand, many of our best brains go into big business, into the professions, and so forth.

As a matter of fact, I think the nearest to professionals we have in our Government, in a sense, are the Members of Congress, because, generally speaking, more Members of Congress spend their lives in politics than do the members of the executive branch of the Government.

I believe we can learn from this man that if we are going to compete in the world with the Russians we must insist on having far more intensive training for our diplomats, those who represent us in the Foreign Service. I particularly bring this matter to the attention of the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire, because year after year the Congress has struggled over appropriations for the State Department; and the items which have been stricken out or reduced time after time have been the ones providing for the training of our diplomats, for training in languages, and for upgrading the professional quality of the service, so as to make it more attractive as a longtime undertaking, and so as to induce more of our highly qualified citizens to enter the diplomatic service.

Last of all, let me refer briefly to the exchange program. It has been very difficult to get the Congress to keep it alive. However, that has not been because of any action on the part of the Senate. I believe a successful exchange program can contribute very much in this situation. At the luncheon, Mr. Mikoyan said very willingly that he thought it would be a good thing to increase the number of those who participate in the exchange program. Today that number, insofar as Russia is concerned, is 25. It is proposed that it be increased to 30. I asked him whether he thought it would be well to increase it to 100. He said he thought so.

If the Russians are willing to expose some of their young people to association with Americans, I am perfectly willing to trust the future of our country to some of our outstanding young people, who, we hope, will visit Russia and will draw the proper conclusions regarding the validity of the two different forms of society.

So, I think that, on the whole, such a meeting is beneficial to both sides.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for yielding to me.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I did not have an opportunity to hear all of the speech made by the Senator from New Hampshire, but I am quite sure that I would agree with most of it.

I think Americans have a tendency to carry everything to extremes. I recall that prior to World War II, Americans were very much opposed to Russian communism. Then America entered the war, and our Government took the Russians to our bosom, they became great partners of ours, and we are responsible for building up Russia to the strong position it occupies now. Then, later, we refused to have anything at all to do with them; we even refused to talk to them.

I remember that 3 years ago, when I was in Russia, our Ambassador, Mr. Bohlen, thought it was terrible for American officials such as we to even talk to the Russian Government heads. Mr. Bohlen was one of those who helped build up the Russians to their present strong position, during and immediately after World War II.

While I was in Russia we had a meeting with Khrushchev, Bulganin, and others; and I think much good has come from it. Since then more Americans have gone to Russia, and more Russians have come to the United States.

Such discussions can solve many of our problems. However, it is certain that the leaders of nations cannot solve problems by refusing to talk to each other.

But I think at the present time we may be carrying this business of friendship too far by wining and dining a top ranking official of a government which still plans to conquer the entire world.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from North Dakota is very sound in his observations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SENDING OF U.S. MARINES TO HAITI

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make a comment, for about 1 minute, upon the sending of a contingent of Marines to Haiti. I noticed an editorial in the Washington Post this morning, bearing the caption "Again the Marines," the first sentence of which reads:

What useful purpose is served by sending a U.S. military mission to rebuild the armed forces of Haiti—particularly by sending, of all things, a unit of 54 marines?

Mr. President, that does not tell the whole story, by any means. The fact is that we have had an air and naval mission in Haiti for the last 10 years, although I must make clear that did not extend to the ground forces. But it was in the spring of 1958 that Haiti requested a contingent and specifically asked for the Marines. This country sent a survey party there, I think last spring. It was finally agreed we should send a detachment of Marine officers and enlisted men.

I have no doubt they have done a little training, perhaps, but those men are specialists, in the main. That is not their true main function. The Marines are going to Haiti on problems of communications, sanitation, health, public works, and a great many other such purposes. They go at the request of the President of Haiti, Mr. Duvalier, who is a doctor, incidentally.

I see, by an article in the New York Times, that on January 30, President Duvalier is going to relinquish all the extraordinary and dictatorial powers he has. There is going to be a change, and it is hoped, on the basis of their request, we can relieve some of the tensions. I believe we can help establish some stability. It would be in our mutual interest to do so.

In connection therewith, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a news article from the New York Times of January 16, 1959, under the title "Haiti Chief To End Dictatorial Rule."

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

HAITI CHIEF TO END DICTATORIAL RULE—
DUVALIER SAYS HE WILL LET DECREE POWERS
EXPIRE ON SCHEDULE JANUARY 30

(By Peter Kihss)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI, January 15.—President Francois Duvalier, of Haiti, declared today that he would allow dictatorial powers by which he has ruled by decree for 6 months to expire on schedule January 30. The country will return to democratic rule, he said.

In an interview, the 48-year-old President said a state of siege would continue technically until Congress reconvened April 13.

The state of siege, which allows trials by military as well as civilian tribunals, is no longer needed, but was put in by Congress last May 2 after discovery of a bomb plot, the President asserted. The decree powers granted him by Congress after an eight-man invasion last July 29 are no longer needed because the country is peaceful, he added.

POLITICAL PRISONERS FREED

In the interview, which lasted an hour and a half, President Duvalier amplified the decrees by which he granted full pardons last week to 10 men convicted of political

offenses. He said all political prisoners had been freed as a sign of good faith and national unity. Clement Jumelle, outlawed former president candidate, can safely return from hiding, he said.

Dr. Duvalier, a physician in private life, also said opposition leaders were free to resume printing newspapers and could again hold indoor meetings. He said an old Haitian law barred open air political rallies except during electoral campaigns.

The President freely discussed Haiti's financial mess. This was attributed to a heritage of old debt, strained relations with the United States, which he said had improved completely, and a one-crop economy hard hit by low coffee prices and 2 years of drought. He praised the United States for having started a \$2 million grant program to rehabilitate a northern area near Cap-Haitien.

President Duvalier expressed hope for early U.S. approval of \$43,800,000 in projects before the Development Loan Fund.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS

However, Louis R. Leveque, Permanent Secretary of the Grand Technical Council of National Resources and Economic Development, the country's chief planning agency, said later that only \$21,800,000 had been formally applied for. He said this included \$6,500,000 for Artibonite Valley irrigation and drainage, \$12,300,000 for southern roads, and \$3,000 for a sugar mill.

President Duvalier had also referred to an Artibonite power project, and airport, wharf, telephone and water programs for Port-au-Prince.

Separately, Marc Charles, Minister of Agriculture, called the Artibonite program economically crucial. M. Charles expressed concern that Haitian oppositionists abroad might be delaying the loan in an attempt to oust President Duvalier.

The President said Communist businessmen from East Germany and Hungary had approached Haiti recently with offers of credit and projects, but had been rebuffed.

Explaining why he had replaced two army commanders while staying in power since October 22, 1957, the President said this army had been overhauled to bring in young brains. A special U.S. Marine mission completed a month's training of the Army last month, and a new mission is due January 19, Foreign Minister Louis Mars said.

President Duvalier asserted that he had used the decree powers mainly in the field of economics, to reorganize departments. However, there were also penal edicts, including an August 6 decree providing imprisonment for spreading false news or rumors likely to breach public peace. Censorship was lifted December 6.

The President said repeatedly that he wished his opponents would join him for the national welfare.

"I am not a strong man," he insisted. "I am not a dictator. I consider myself a country doctor. I want to build up Haiti."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am glad, under the circumstances, that the Marines are going. It puts the whole matter in a different light. It is not another step in gunboat diplomacy, as the Washington Post has said.

THE NECESSITY FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, an article by David Lawrence entitled "Battle Over Stable Dollar Seen Affecting All World," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 13, 1959.

As we well know, the Soviet Union, as well as challenging us in space and advanced weapons, has declared total economic war on us. The free world watches the strength of our dollar as carefully as it watches our military ability. The President's state of the Union message emphasized the need of defense effort within the framework of a balanced budget recognizing full well how completely integrated are the matters of national security and economic stability. Mr. Lawrence's article is a most timely and thoughtful one in complete confirmation of the President's position. The cause of economic stability so well charted in the President's message and repeated in Mr. Lawrence's article, is one to which I have dedicated myself.

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

BATTLE OVER STABLE DOLLAR SEEN AFFECTING ALL WORLD

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, January 12.—The battle of the century has begun. How it turns out will affect the future of the American dollar for decades to come. On the way the die is cast in the next few months depends the purchasing power of the pay envelopes of millions of Americans. Will the dollar remain stable or will it decline still further? For today the dollar is worth 48 cents in terms of what it was worth just 20 years ago, and if the forces of confiscation have their way, it could go down to 25 cents in another decade. The whole world is watching to see what America does. It affects trade everywhere.

The battle against a stable dollar is being waged here right now under respectable auspices by men in Congress who scorn the label "radical" but who would commit the United States to expenditures far beyond the President's budget.

OPPONENTS ACTIVE

Already the American people are being told by the political partisans that a "balanced budget" means insecurity or indifference to the military safety of the country. To play upon such fears, the devotees of the doctrine of spending evidently believe, is to get sanction for big appropriations—more billions for missiles or expeditions to the moon.

The insidious argument made is that the President gives too much weight to the balanced-budget idea and that he is neglecting "national defense." Will this campaign undermine the President's influence and open the floodgates in Congress so that billions more than he recommends will be appropriated even in the face of a \$12 billion deficit this year?

Mr. Eisenhower has been absorbed for months formulating the new budget. He has held lengthy conferences with our military leaders and with our economic experts. Honest, patriotic, experienced military men, without any political bias, helped to make the new budget. It was no casual decision by one man that led the President to announce that he believed the budget for the next fiscal year could be balanced.

ECONOMIC DEFENSE

What is the biggest single fact about our military position? The intercontinental missile is not yet perfected, but the intermediate missile can be fired from bases in Europe close to Soviet Russia.

The truth is, moreover, the Soviet leaders know their country can be devastated in a matter of hours. Both sides know a mutual deterrent has come into being. There's a stalemate on the military side.

The urgent question now, therefore, is not the spending of unlimited amounts on military defense, but giving more attention than ever before to economic defense. As for those who say that military spending should be expanded, no matter what it costs, there is a simple test of sincerity. Would they support heavier taxes and—more important even than higher taxes—would they vote for governmental wage-and-price controls?

DEFENSE COSTS SOAR

Why, if the cold war is so hot, shouldn't American labor unions and business corporations be held in check so that the price of the same bomber that the Government buys today will not be twice as much 2 years hence? For that's what has happened in the last 5 years to push a large part of our defense budget upward.

President Eisenhower's well-reasoned state of the Union message was printed in full text only here and there in a few newspapers of the country. He will have to go on the television, again and again, and issue more and more written expositions of his policy to make real headway against his opponents. The critics get more space in the press and on the air than do the defenders.

CONFIDENCE IN PRESIDENT

What is needed now is confidence in the Nation's Chief Executive—the very man who commanded all the allied armies in Europe just a few years ago, and whose integrity and lifetime devotion to the military security of his country ought not to be questioned. Would Dwight Eisenhower ever fail to recommend any military proposal that was really needed? Would he neglect the defense of America?

Partisan-minded people and those Members of Congress with a vested interest in currying favor in their home States and districts through more and more spending on defense factories and local facilities, which could mean bigger payrolls for their constituents, are demanding more defense and arousing fears about the Nation's security. Only an informed public opinion can win this crucial battle against bankruptcy. For this is what the battle of the century in Washington really means.

Unless the American people can see through the maze of propaganda and alarmist talk, and put into proper perspective the selfish ambitions of some of their legislators, Macaulay's prophecy of more than 100 years ago that the American Ship of State is doomed to destroy itself because it is "all sail and no anchor" could, indeed, come true.

THE CASE OF ANNIE LEE MOSS

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the December 27, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

This editorial has to do with the Annie Lee Moss case, which came before the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations which, in 1954, was headed by the late Senator McCarthy. At that time, Mrs. Moss denied under oath that she had ever been a Communist Party member, and she succeeded in convincing committee members that she was telling the truth. This particular incident comes to mind because of a recent revelation which seems to have been all too little publicized. As a result of the decision in the Jencks case, the Communist Party demanded and received the right to look at the FBI files during a recent proceeding before the Subversive Activities Control Board. The interesting result of this effort on the part of the

Communist Party was a complete boomerang.

Mr. President, I am asking the privilege of inserting this article for two reasons.

The first is to show those who are inclined to be soft on communism just how wrong they can be and how completely they can be taken in because there is nothing sacred about oaths and agreements to anyone imbued with the Communist cause.

The second reason why I wish to see this inserted in the RECORD is because I consider the revelations in this case at once both a vindication and a tribute to the dedicated members of the FBI, and the complete accuracy and painstaking carefulness of their investigations.

Upon a perusal of the files, there was found in copies of the Communist Party's own record, the authenticity of which it does not dispute, evidence that one Annie Lee Moss was a party member beyond a doubt. It is ironic that the word of Annie Lee Moss was believed instead of that of Mrs. Markward, the dedicated undercover FBI agent who had infiltrated the Communist Party organization in Washington and had testified as to Mrs. Moss' membership.

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

HERE'S AN "INFORMER" THE REDS SHOULD NOT HAVE TANGLED WITH

Once in a blue moon the Communists pull a rock, as the expression is. In a recent proceeding before the Subversive Activities Control Board the Communist Party demanded a look at the FBI files, which the Supreme Court, in the Jencks case, had decreed they might have. How this privilege bounced back in their faces makes a fascinating tale.

In February 1954 a great stew was created over charges that a Mrs. Annie Lee Moss, who was employed in the code room of the Pentagon, was a Communist. The charges were based on testimony before Senator McCarthy's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations by Mrs. Mary Markward, an FBI undercover agent who had infiltrated the Communist Party in Washington. A few weeks later Mrs. Moss took the stand and, in a dramatic session of the committee, denied under oath that she was or ever had been a Communist Party member. She convinced committee members that she was telling the truth.

In due course Mrs. Moss became the heroine of an Edward R. Murrow program on television, a program which moved TV critic John Crosby so deeply that he wrote: "The American people fought a revolution to defend, among other things, the right of Annie Lee Moss to earn a living, and Senator McCarthy now decided she had no such right." Mrs. Markward was smeared by liberals as an "informer."

Back now, as they say on the air, to the recent hearings before the Subversive Activities Control Board, which has been trying for years to compel the U.S. Communist Party to register as the agent of a foreign power, which it undoubtedly is. Twice the Federal courts have turned back the Board's judgments on the ground that certain testimony against the party was "tainted."

One allegedly tainted witness was supposed to be Mrs. Markward, whose information in the FBI files the party wanted to see. What the party learned was that the evidence on Mrs. Moss' Communist membership did not rest on Mrs. Markward's testimony alone. The story, which was dug out of the documents by Mrs. Alice Widener's U.S.A. magazine and followed up by Edward J. Mowery

in the Newark Star-Ledger, has received too little public attention.

Says the Board: "Markward's FBI reports concerning Moss, the majority being copies of actual Communist Party records such as club and branch attendance, membership and dues rosters, were received in evidence. * * * Exhibits 499-511 corroborate Mrs. Markward's testimony in the Moss security hearing. The situation that has resulted on the Moss question is that the party's own records, copies of which are now in evidence, and the authenticity of which it does not dispute, show an Annie Lee Moss, 72 R Street SW., Washington, D.C., was a party member in the mid-1940's." That was one of the addresses given by the Mrs. Moss who was employed at the Pentagon.

Thus Mrs. Markward stands vindicated as one who performed a difficult and unrewarding mission for her country. Vindicated also is the FBI, which the Communists are sworn to destroy, and—in this instance at least—the labors of a much-abused congressional committee.

Mrs. Moss, who appears to be still in the Pentagon in a "nonsensitive" job, may be small potatoes. But the episode suggests that Congress would do well to explore the possibility that our bureaucracy contains Communists in "sensitive" areas.

USE OF LOAN FUNDS UNDER RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on August 19, 1958, I submitted in the Senate Senate Resolution 385, to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to make a full and complete study and investigation of the Comptroller General's holding in a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture dated July 21, 1958—B134138—relating to the use of loan funds under the rural electrification program.

Mr. President, many REA people from the State of North Dakota and other parts of the country were greatly concerned by the Comptroller General's letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, above mentioned, in that it would have greatly curtailed the REA program throughout the United States relating to the use of loan funds under the REA program.

I am happy to advise the Senate that I am joining my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), who on Wednesday, January 14, submitted a Senate resolution to make clear beyond any question the intent of the Senate of the United States regarding this matter. The Comptroller General, in his letter to the Secretary of Agriculture of December 8, said he would not attempt to enforce decisions of a nature similar to the Iowa REA loan case in the absence of expression of the intent of Congress.

I am pleased that the distinguished Senator from Vermont placed into the RECORD the analysis of the Comptroller General's opinion, which was the basis for the submission of my resolution, Senate Resolution 385, in the 85th Congress.

TRANSIT SYSTEM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on Wednesday, January 14, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN), introduced S. 304, which was cosponsored by Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. YAR-

BOROUGH, Mr. THURMOND, and myself, to insure effective regulation of the D.C. Transit System, Inc., and fair and equal competition between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its competitors.

I joined the sentiments expressed by the distinguished minority leader when he introduced S. 304, and had I been on the floor at the time, I would also have wished to make some extended remarks pertaining to this problem, which results in the grossly unfair use of the taxpayers' dollars for the subsidization of the D.C. Transit System, Inc., as long as that corporation utilizes its resources to lessen competition in the charter and sightseeing business, and any other free enterprise with which the transit company may wish to compete, when those competing companies do not enjoy the same privileges and exemptions.

For the information of the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two letters to the Public Utilities Commission through its Chairman, the Honorable George E. C. Hayes, dated November 18 and December 4, urging that the Public Utilities Commission assert its own authority in enjoining the D.C. Transit System, Inc., from taking advantage of its competitors by virtue of a franchise granted to it by the Congress of the United States.

It is hoped that the Public Utilities Commission will take its own initiative in this matter, so that the small business people affected by the action of the D.C. Transit Company will be protected from immediate ruin, which has been the result to several competitors of the D.C. Transit System, Inc., in the past several months. I am afraid that by the time this bill is acted upon by the Congress of the United States, several more small businesses competing with the D.C. Transit System will also have been forced to go out of business.

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

NOVEMBER 18, 1958.

HON. GEORGE E. C. HAYES,
Chairman, Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia, Municipal Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As ranking minority member of the U.S. Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I am very much concerned with the impact on small businessmen in the District of Columbia who compete with the D.C. Transit System, Inc., in charter, sightseeing and Government contract services. It appears from the record in the hearings before the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, that the D.C. Transit System, Inc., is intertwined in extraneous activities with its monopoly transit operations and going beyond the contemplation of Congress' franchise in the transit companies expansion into collateral ventures financed and operated with the assets and personnel of a company which came to Congress asking for a franchise to operate a transit enterprise.

It would be grossly unfair to use taxpayers' dollars for the subsidization of the D.C. Transit System, Inc., as long as that corporation utilizes its resources to lessen competition in the charter and sightseeing business and any other free enterprise with which the transit company may wish to compete against, when those competing companies do not enjoy the same privileges

and exemptions. During the last session of the Congress, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, introduced H.R. 13767 which bill would prohibit the District of Columbia Transit System, Inc., from using its assets and personnel employed in providing the services of miscellaneous transportation of passengers for hire from being used or employed in whole or in part in any other service in competition with the service of any other company.

I have been advised that the charter and sightseeing small business companies in the District of Columbia are facing extinction if the D.C. Transit System, Inc., is permitted to continue the practices of misusing its privileges and exemptions granted by congressional franchise.

I would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible if the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia is considering issuing any orders restraining the D.C. Transit System, Inc., from misusing its privileges and exemptions granted by the franchise to the detriment of competing charter and sightseeing companies who do not possess those privileges and exemptions granted by the Congress. I would also appreciate your views on Congressman Patman's bill, H.R. 13767.

With kind regards and every good wish. I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER.

DECEMBER 4, 1958.

HON. GEORGE E. C. HAYES,
Chairman, Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia, Municipal Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of November 20, regarding the problems of D.C. Transit System's competitors, in charter, sightseeing, limousine, and Government contract services.

After reviewing the testimony given at the House Small Business Committee hearings on May 12, 16, and 19, 1958, I am puzzled by the inaction of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia. As you know, the Honorable Robert E. McLaughlin, president, District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, and former Chairman, District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission, testified as follows (House Small Business Committee hearings, pp. 27 and 160):

"Well, sir, I think that they are not likely to have any very strong competition from new companies, and I would even go so far as to say that I think this is quite monopolistic. I think this situation that exists will eventually certainly drive competition out of the field (p. 27)."

"I don't know whether counsel would agree with me, but under paragraph 4 of the Public Utilities Commission Act, the Public Utilities Commission may and is charged with requiring public utilities to comply with the laws of the United States applicable to them."

"Now, it seems to me as though since the Public Utilities Commission Act is expressly supposed to be construed in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and sections of law pursuant to the Constitution as relating to interstate commerce, which of course the antitrust laws are, it seems to me as though the PUC has the jurisdiction to issue orders of the nature of antitrust court orders. I mean issuing orders which would have the effect of restraining D.C. Transit System from actions which are monopolistic in nature" (p. 100).

I note that none of the Public Utilities Commission officials present at the hearings disagreed with the above testimony by President McLaughlin. Hence, I shall appreciate it if you will advise me as to why the Public Utilities Commission has not issued orders which would restrain D.C. Transit System, Inc., from monopolistic actions.

Competitors of D.C. Transit System are being hurt and, unquestionably, their situ-

ation will become more acute in the months ahead. Certainly, the Public Utilities Commission need not wait until there is no competition before acting.

The D.C. Transit System, Inc., has announced future development plans that can only serve to eliminate competition and create monopoly conditions in fields other than mass transit in the District of Columbia.

It seems to me that to permit D.C. Transit System's competitive practices in charter and sightseeing makes a mockery of the anti-trust laws and other laws which the Congress has enacted to help small business and to preserve our competitive system.

The record indicates that the special privileges accorded the D.C. Transit System, Inc., by the 84th Congress are not the only advantages the corporation possesses. An important advantage is the ability of the corporation to use its personnel, equipment, facilities, financial resources, and maintenance in charter and sightseeing services. Mr. O. Roy Chalk, president, D.C. Transit System, Inc., has stated, "It is not only taxes but our maintenance is lower. We can't help it. Our ability to do lower cost maintenance—that is the basic difference between us." (House Small Business Committee hearings, p. 11.)

In the light of D.C. Transit System's \$200,000 loss last year in charter, limousine, and sightseeing services (House Small Business Committee hearings, p. 21), I am not persuaded that the only way the corporation can be healthy is to engage in charter and sightseeing services.

Indeed, it would appear that the D.C. Transit System, Inc., by far the giant in the industry in terms of financial resources, could very easily adjust itself to a withdrawal from competition with charter, sightseeing, and related services.

I am hopeful that the Public Utilities Commission will act promptly on this matter, so that D.C. Transit's competitors will not be subjected to further hardships, with irretrievable loss of opportunities and morale.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER.

BENEFITS TO TAXPAYERS FROM STATE OWNERSHIP OF INDUSTRIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, upon several occasions speeches have been made upon the Senate floor against State ownership, and I have always defended the public ownership of State industries in my own State, where they have been outstandingly successful.

The Senate will be interested in learning of the latest attempt by those who would assist the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and others in "skinning" the North Dakota farmer.

As the sole survivor of the first Industrial Commission of North Dakota, consisting of the Governor, Secretary of Agriculture and Labor, and the Attorney General, I, as the then Attorney General, and later as Governor, am more familiar than is any other person with the history of these State-owned industries and the many millions of dollars they have saved the taxpayers.

Three weeks ago, a State Senator threatened to introduce a bill to sell the State Mill and Elevator. After much publicity, he has now announced he will not introduce the bill, but in the meantime a group headed by the very able and competent Fritz Nelson, of Grand Forks, has announced they will circulate initiating petitions, affecting not only

the Mill and Elevator, but also the Bank of North Dakota, the Workmen's Compensation bureau, and the State hail Insurance Department. Today I shall speak only about the Mill and Elevator, and at later times will take up the other three industries, because I want my fellow Senators to be fully aware of the very successful progress North Dakota has made in their operation.

Some of the newspapers opposed to the sale stated that the operation of the mill has been very successful under former Governors Moses, Aandahl, and Brunsdale; that the annual profits were about \$350,000 a year. Unfortunately, these newspapers do not tell the full story about the great institution, which was organized, not to make money, but to see to it that the farmers got a fair, honest price for the grain they raised. However, the Mill and Elevator provided protection to the farmers, and at the same time proved to be a great financial success.

Now listen carefully, Senators, because under my administration as Governor of the State, the State Mill and Elevator paid for itself more than 3 times over, and saved the people between \$12 million and \$14 million, according to A. J. Scott, the former Manager of the Mill and Elevator. Had we not had this State-owned Mill and Elevator, the "grain gamblers" in Minneapolis would have robbed the farmers of at least \$12 million, and possibly \$14 million, in one of the most daring, crooked, disgraceful attempts ever made to rob an honest people. No one who will read and study what I have to say here will ever sign a petition or vote to close or sell the State-owned Mill and Elevator, and I believe that the people of the State can be trusted to take care politically of those politicians who advocate the selling of this great institution. The folks who advocate the selling of the Mill and Elevator are not friends of the people, but are their enemies, who would sell out the people of North Dakota by permitting the grain trade of Minneapolis to stick their long, slimy, filthy hands into the pockets of the people and rob them.

Now I say to my fellow Senators, here are the facts to hear. On July 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, 1937, while I was Governor, the State was apparently producing one of the finest wheat crops in all its history. During those 5 days we had real hot winds—the wheat was in the milk, and because of the heat, it shriveled, with the result that we, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, only produced 54,984,000 bushels—practically none of it weighing 60 pounds to the bushel. The grain trade in Minneapolis thought that they saw their chance to "pluck" the farmer. During the night, they reduced the price of 37-pound wheat from 89 cents per bushel to 37 cents per bushel, a drop of 52 cents per bushel overnight. This went into effect at 9 o'clock in the morning of July 22, and wheat of other grades dropped accordingly. By 11 o'clock I, as Governor, was at full steam ahead. By telephone I had arranged a meeting at the Waldorf Hotel at Fargo composed of Mr. R. M. Stangler, manager of the Bank of North

Dakota; A. J. Scott, Manager of the Mill and Elevator; 2 grainmen from Minneapolis, recommended to me by Gov. Floyd Olson, of Minnesota; 2 men from Canada, recommended to me as grain experts; the 3 members of the Railroad Commission; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Attorney General, and myself as Governor, and also 3 first-class lawyers, Francis Murphy, of Fargo; J. K. Murray, of Bismarck; and the late Harrison A. Bronson, later Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of North Dakota; also an expert radio announcer, Irving Wallace, now residing in Mason City, Iowa; and others—23 men in all. We employed scores of men to call from farm to farm to pick up 2-pound samples of heads of wheat from each farm and labeled each sample with the farmer's name. These samples were rushed to the State Mill and Elevator, where each sample was threshed separately and the flour produced from each one of the more than 1,000 samples that had been gathered was used to bake over 1,000 loaves of bread—1 loaf of bread from each sample—by the expert chemist employed by the Mill and Elevator, so that we could arrive definitely at the exact milling value of this shriveled wheat. Within a few days, we knew to the tenth of a penny the milling value of that lightweight wheat.

Acting as promptly as possible, the Industrial Commission, consisting of Pete Sathre as Attorney General, John Hagen as Commissioner of Agriculture and Labor, and myself, raised the price of 37-pound wheat 35 cents a bushel, which I announced over the radio. Shortly thereafter the Bismarck Tribune finally broke the spell of silence of the opposition on the 3d day of August 1937 printing the following on its front page:

NORTH DAKOTA MILL OFFERS TO BUY WHEAT OF LIGHTER WEIGHTS—INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION SEEKING TO RAISE PRICE BASED ON JULY 26 RANGE

Beginning today the North Dakota mill and elevator at Grand Forks offers to buy all lightweight wheat produced by the farmers of North Dakota, Gov. William Langer, speaking for the industrial commission, announced Monday night.

Declaring it is the purpose of the industrial commission "to checkmate the grain gamblers who dropped the price of 37-pound wheat 52 cents in 24 hours," Governor Langer asserted the commission has secured storage space in Duluth, Minneapolis, and Grand Forks, sufficient to handle every bushel of lightweight wheat produced in North Dakota.

"Through the Bank of North Dakota we have arranged for millions of dollars of credit. We can buy every bushel of lightweight wheat in North Dakota and pay cash for it. We want the wheat unless the grain market will pay the farmers what it is worth." Producers of other States were barred, the Governor said.

SEEKS HONEST PRICE

The Governor declared that the commission had no fight with any other elevator in North Dakota, but that it is determined to obtain "an honest price, a price that means the difference as to whether thousands of North Dakota farmers will be able to support themselves or whether they will again be forced to go on relief. That honest price will mean the difference as to whether or not the farmers will pay their debts to the businessmen."

"Beginning today," the Governor said, "the prices of lightweight wheat being paid by the State mill and elevator will be announced daily over KFJR at 2 p.m."

"Our whole object is to compel the local elevators to pay the farmers what their wheat is actually and honestly worth," the Governor asserted. "If they won't pay it, the North Dakota mill and elevator will."

ASKS FOR SAMPLES

The Governor invited all producers of lightweight wheat to send samples to the State mill and elevator to determine the amount of protein it contains. He specified that not less than a 2-pound sample be dispatched and states that the mill will wire the weight upon request.

The chief executive stated daily prices will be based on the card prices offered on the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, July 26.

He said, "We will raise the price of 37-pound wheat 35 cents a bushel; 38-pound wheat 32 cents a bushel; and so on up the scale. The increase in prices on 37-pound wheat will be 35 cents a bushel more than was offered by the grain combine July 26; 38-pound wheat 32 cents more; 39-pound wheat 29 cents more and so on."

The prices paid by the State mill, the Governor explained, are based on carload lots. He advised farmers with less than carload lots to pool with their neighbors and to wire A. J. Scott, manager of the mill, for shipping instructions.

STORAGE SPECIFIED

In the case of farmers with less than carload lots who are unable to pool with other farmers, the Governor directed that they should store the grain in local elevators and obtain a storage ticket which specifies the weight of the wheat stored.

The Governor asserted the State railroad commission has instructed all elevators to mark the weights on storage tickets, and he further declared that the commission has obtained lower freight rates to the mill and elevator.

"Get your storage ticket when you haul your grain in and mail it to the State mill and elevator. We will take out the handling charges and a draft will be sent you immediately upon receipt of the storage ticket. If the grain is mortgaged, the lien will be protected."

Mr. President, the action of the Industrial Commission produced instantaneous results. The very next day, after we made the announcement over the radio, the elevators at West Fargo raised their price of 37-pound wheat by paying 36 cents a bushel more than the day before. That year the wheat crop amounted to 54,984,000 bushels, according to U.S. Department of Agriculture, so that anyone can see that the wheat farmers' benefit, as Mr. Scott said, amounted to somewhere between 12 and 14 millions of dollars, or three times more than the Mill and Elevator had cost the taxpayers to build.

Fellow Senators, we only had to buy a little over a million bushels of wheat and one of the most pleasant incidents of this fight to get the farmer a fair price was when I received a long distance telephone call from Shreve Archer of the Midland Grain Co., of Minneapolis. He approved of the action and said, "you are dead right in what you are doing and I am offering to loan you \$3 million at 3 percent in case you are short of money."

I told Mr. Archer that we were well financed by another State industry, the Bank of North Dakota, and we could buy the entire State crop if necessary. He concluded by saying, "well, if you need

this \$3 million and even 5 or 6 million, let me know."

For 2 months the price was kept up by daily announcements over the radio furnished by the State Mill and Elevator but within 24 hours the grain trade had met the price of the Mill and Elevator and were paying 1 cent more per bushel than was the Industrial Commission.

Now, fellow Senators, the construction of the mill cost the taxpayers \$3 million, and at the same time bonds in the sum of \$1½ million were issued for operating expenses—a total of \$4½ million. These bonds have been paid.

In addition to that, we have constantly improved the Mill and Elevator by erection of new buildings and other improvements in the amount of about \$3 million. Out of the profits made by the Mill and Elevator we have paid \$500,000 for World War II soldier bonuses; \$500,000 for Korean soldier bonuses; \$500,000 to the State highway fund; \$500,000 to the State general fund; or a total of \$2 million. From the above, you will note that the State has an immensely valuable investment in the State Mill and Elevator, and anyone who has been acquainted with this operation knows that Mr. Robert Stangler, whom I as Governor, induced to take over the management, first, of the Bank of North Dakota and who was later transferred to the Mill and Elevator, did an outstanding job, helped by his assistants, P. R. Fossen and Carl Lewis, making it one of the finest elevator mills in the Northwest—well equipped with the most up-to-date modern machinery. It is constantly striving to make more and better products for the people of the State, and lately has done an outstanding job in getting the very finest kind of fertilizer at the lowest price for the farmers.

This is one of the State industries that some of the politicians want to sell or close up or get rid of for the benefit of the grain trade in the twin cities. The facts I have mentioned above are unanswerable because they are proven facts.

I repeat that in 1937, the mill paid for itself three times over what it cost the taxpayers, and everyone ought to know that if the Mill and Elevator should be closed or sold, the farmers will be at the mercy of the grain trade and speculators in case we again have conditions like we had in 1937.

By the way, may I at this time thank the Congress of the United States for its good assistance through the years in building Fort Peck and Garrison Dams. They were erected not only to control the Missouri River for navigation and irrigation and other purposes, but those dams were built also for the purpose of furnishing cheap electric power to the people of the State, including cities and towns.

Less than 10 days ago, Assistant Secretary of Interior, Mr. Aandahl, allocated sufficient power so that the city of Mandan—provided the people of Mandan voted for it—could own and operate its own municipal light plant as they already do their own water plant. This can only be done in case the people of Mandan vote at an election to be held

before March 1, voting to have this city own its own municipal light and power plant. Naturally, I fervently hope that the overwhelming majority of the people of Mandan will realize that by voting "Yes" they will save the people of Mandan thousands upon thousands of dollars and, as years go by, pay for their plant. The history of the municipal light plants at Valley City, which has operated its own municipal plant for over 30 years, and other towns, has proved that it is a step in the right direction for the people of Mandan to take, and I know that my fellow Senators will be interested in the outcome of that election too.

Again I want to thank the Senators for what they have done for the people, not only of Montana and North Dakota, by the building of the Fort Peck and Garrison Dams, but for the great effect they will have upon securing cheap electric power in the other States in the Missouri River Basin. And I conclude by saying again, "Don't be fooled, operation of State industries is very successful for taxpayers."

I wish to personally thank Sophus Trom, a member of the North Dakota Legislature, and Frank Woell, Mayor of Casselton, for taking leading parts against the sale of the Mill and Elevator. As eternal vigilance is necessary, I express the hope that someone in every voting precinct in the State will write me offering to be a member of the permanent statewide committee, which will charge no dues, but simply organize to make the voters aware and fortify to fight whenever in the years to come another attempt may be made to wreck any of the State-owned industries. Just write me—WILLIAM LANGER, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DISCONTINUANCE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief report to the Senate upon my observations and suggestions as a Senate adviser to the U.S. delegation to negotiate with delegates of the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the question of discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests.

In addition, I shall make reference to certain events that have transpired since my return from the Geneva conference and certain suggestions which I hope may prove helpful.

Upon returning from Geneva, I reported to President Eisenhower, to the majority leader, to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and to the American people a conviction on my part that the Russian delegation was seeking to pressure the United States and the United Kingdom into an agreement to stop all nuclear tests, without Russian acceptance of adequate inspection to detect violation of the agreement, and that, failing in this, they would seek to place upon the United States blame for failure of the conference. I suggested that success by the Soviets in either of these respects would be detrimental to the interests of the United States.

I directed attention to the uncertain, cumbersome, if not entirely impractical, system of inspection and detection under consideration at Geneva. The uncertainty of detecting and identifying underground nuclear explosions has now been acknowledged by the President's committee of experts.

In the Geneva Conference on nuclear tests, still under way, two major security essentials are involved: First, the military strength of the West, particularly the United States, as compared with the Communist, and second the moral position and political posture of the United States, increasingly affected by world public opinion. These are inseparable, and essential parts of our national security.

I am apprehensive that the conference will break up in failure and that blame for this failure will be assessed largely to the United States. My apprehension arises out of an awareness of the Soviet's capacity for propaganda and because of the impractical and unreliable system of detection and inspection for underground tests proposed by the conference of experts, which the Russians have shown no sign of accepting. Not only have they shown no sign of accepting the proposed system, now clearly demonstrated to be inadequate, but they have refused even to discuss and give conference consideration to the new data with which the United States Government has supplied the Geneva conferees. Moreover, there is no proposal or practical plan to place inspection stations and teams in Red China, without which no system of inspection would be adequate to detect violations of an agreement against underground testing.

I say, therefore, that blame for failure of the conference, if such failure occurs, will fairly belong and should be squarely placed upon the Russians for their intransigence and steadfast refusal to accept, or, more recently, even to consider, effective and adequate means of inspection and control to detect violations of an agreement.

The assessment of blame, however, is a game at which both sides can and will play. The Russians, we must admit, have long demonstrated a remarkable facility for propaganda. Moreover, the conference was initiated by the President of the United States. Therefore, the United States cannot be disassociated from either the success or failure of the conference.

It has been my hope that the United States could save the conference from failure and significantly improve its own moral and political position by proposing to stop all atmospheric tests. Sizable nuclear detonations in the atmosphere are subject to detection by existing means and installations. It is from the atmospheric explosions, moreover, that radioactive fallout and contamination occur.

A consideration of this proposal requires an acknowledgment that our country has been severely blamed in world opinion for contaminating the world's atmosphere. We have suffered more than is our due in this regard. Here, too, the Russians have been adept.

The health hazard involved may or may not be as hazardous as a large body of world opinion regards it. I do not know, but undeniably it is a matter of deep and worldwide concern.

I believe that we could go a long way toward squaring ourselves in world public opinion in this regard, by not only demonstrating a willingness to stop further contamination of the air all must breathe, but by actually doing so. I suggested to President Eisenhower that he take the lead in stopping such radioactive contamination by a stoppage, unilaterally, if necessary, of all atmospheric tests for a given period, say, 3 years, and that he offer to enter into binding treaty obligations with the British and the Russians to make the stoppage permanent.

It is with pleasure that I acknowledge a most cordial reception of my suggestions by President Eisenhower. Moreover, my suggestions have had full consideration. For this I am grateful.

Since my conference with the President, however, two events—findings of fact on detection methods from the Hardtack II test series and the demonstration of interplanetary propulsion and telemetering capability by Russian technicians—have strongly tended to confirm my position. Moreover, the very introduction of the new data on detection tends to increase the possibility, I believe, that the Russians would succeed in attaching major blame upon the United States for failure of the conference.

Therefore, I suggest to the President even further consideration of my suggestions, as a means of saving the conference from failure.

Failure of the conference is by no means the only danger which lurks around these negotiations. There is the danger of an improvident agreement.

Should our Government sign an unwise and improvident agreement, we would face the danger of ratification by the Senate or the danger of rejection by the Senate, with far-reaching consequences in either instance.

I think we can take encouragement from President Eisenhower's state of the Union message of only last week that no improvident treaty will be signed. I trust this is the case. At least I am sure this is the intention and will of our Government. Moreover, I think it is the will of the American people, who have been conditioned for 12 years to the requirement of adequate inspection to assure the effectiveness of nuclear weapons agreements.

The conference of experts from the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, the report of which preceded and served as a foundation for the present Geneva Conference, did not even consider means of detecting nuclear explosions in interplanetary space. The lack of knowledge of this subject matter was the reason given for lack of consideration. Knowledge in this field is still insufficient to justify an agreement. Indeed, if technical experts are unable to agree even upon a statement of scientific fact in this field, political agreement would seem now entirely inadvisable. The paucity of our own knowledge in this field, as well as its potential impor-

tance, is illustrated by Russia's so-called lunik satellite and by some of the results of our own high-altitude tests. I refer particularly to ionospheric and radar disturbance from a high-altitude nuclear explosion in one instance, and to the retina burns to the eyes of rabbits which were used for the purpose of determining such effects from high-altitude explosions in another. The specifics of these tests and experiments are classified, but the fact that such experiments and tests were conducted, with consequent results, is, as I understand it, unclassified information.

The bearing and meaning that these limited test results may have upon our dependence upon the DEW line installations for early detection and warning against missile attack, upon our anti-missile program, and upon other important phases of national security and peaceful uses of outer space, are both challenging and uncertain.

For these and many more reasons, Mr. President, I have suggested to President Eisenhower that our country seize the initiative and take "one successful major first step" which I think "might very well lead to others." This is an achievable goal, now, I believe. The United States could show that it is willing to stop—that it will stop—that, indeed, it has stopped contaminating the world's atmosphere. Thereafter, any other nation that refuses to do so must bear the full blame for her act.

After this major first step, the Geneva Conference could proceed to negotiate for the discontinuance of other types of nuclear-weapons tests and to negotiate as an integral, necessary part thereof an adequate system of inspection and control.

It is better to achieve an important first step, though limited, than to face the consequences of either failure of the conference or the signing of an improvident agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to commend the very able Senator from Tennessee for the constructive and enlightening statement he has made. For many years the Senator rendered outstanding service on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as a Member of the House of Representatives. Since becoming a Member of the Senate he has always been in the forefront of all discussions and deliberations in that field. I am delighted the Senator has seen fit to accept assignment to the most recent important conference which has been held on the subject. I know that each of his colleagues will welcome, as I do, the enlightening statement he has just made to the Senate and to the country.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to state, as a Member of the minority side of the Senate, that I appreciate very much the splendid information and report which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has presented with respect to the important conference being held at

Geneva. I think it is one of the important programs which must be worked out among the countries of the world before we can begin to have a reduction of armaments. The question of effective and adequate inspection is one which is under study at Geneva, and I sincerely hope and trust something can be worked out which will be helpful in the future. I thank the Senator.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if none of my colleagues desires to address the Senate at this time, pursuant to the order previously entered I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, January 20, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17, 1959:

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the positions indicated:

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Lewis L. Strauss, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Elwood R. Quesada, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

James Tolman Pyle, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Frederick Henry Mueller, of Michigan, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

John J. Allen, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Carl F. Oechsle, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

SUPREME COURT

Potter Stewart, of Ohio, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

J. Smith Henley, of Arkansas, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Arkansas.

Edwin A. Robson, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

George L. Hart, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.

Eugene R. Gilmartin, of Rhode Island, to be judge for the district court of Guam for a term of 8 years.

Walter A. Gordon, of California, to be judge of the district court for the Virgin Islands for a term of 8 years.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Dale M. Green, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Washington for a term of 4 years.

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

The following-named persons to be Examiners in Chief, U.S. Patent Office:

James L. Brewrink, of Maryland.
Malcolm F. Bailey, of Maryland.

James E. Keely, of Maryland.
Joseph C. Manian, of Maryland.

STATE DEPARTMENT

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

James C. H. Bonbright, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

Richard B. Wigglesworth, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

John D. Jernegan, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Iraq.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR MUTUAL SECURITY COORDINATION, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

John O. Bell, of Maryland, to be Special Assistant for Mutual Security Coordination in the Department of State.

CHAIRMAN OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Harry A. Bullis, of Minnesota, to be Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board for a term of 2 years.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Leonard J. Saccio, of Connecticut, to be Deputy Director of the International Cooperation Administration in the Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Elmer F. Bennett, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

SOLICITOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

George W. Abbott, of Nebraska, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

HAWAII

SECRETARY OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Edward Elliott Johnston, of Hawaii, to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii for a term of 4 years.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE RESEARCH ENGINEERING

Herbert Frank York, of California, to be Director of Defense Research Engineering.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

T. Graydon Upton, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Dana Latham, of California, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Donald A. Maginnis, Jr., of Louisiana, to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at New Orleans for a term of 4 years.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Clarence Ludlow Miller, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR

George C. Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Eugenie Mary Davie, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term expiring August 3, 1962.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Karl Brandt, of California, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

T. Graydon Upton, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSIONER

Maj. Gen. Keith R. Barney, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Lampton Berry, of Mississippi, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ceylon, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 1 to the class of career minister:

Howard P. Jones, of Maryland.

Rolland Welch, of Texas.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Robert S. Folsom, of Massachusetts.

Aubrey E. Lippincott, of Arizona.

George F. Wilson, of California.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Merrill M. Hammond, of Virginia.

L. Wade Latham, of Virginia.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Joe Adams Robinson, of Oklahoma.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Charles S. Whitehouse, of Rhode Island.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America:

Theodore J. C. Heavner, of Ohio.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Mrs. Roberta B. Bullock, of Texas.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Mrs. Lorraine P. Bruun, of Illinois.

Vernon D. McAninch, of Texas.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Jerry P. Baugh, of Indiana.

Felix S. Bloch, of New York.

Charles W. Bray III, of Texas.

M. Lyall Breckon, of Oregon.

David P. Chandler, of New York.

Albert N. DeMott, of New York.

Thomas O. Enders, of Connecticut.

Richard W. Faville, Jr., of Oregon.

John A. Ferch, of Ohio.

Miss Melissa E. Foelsch, of California.
 Alec L. France, of Ohio.
 Albert A. Francis, of California.
 Sidney Friedland, of Wisconsin.
 John A. Froebe, Jr., of Ohio.
 Philip H. Gray, Jr., of Vermont.
 Frank J. Haendler, of Illinois.
 Samuel F. Hart, of Mississippi.
 Louis E. Kahn, of California.
 Andrew R. Kay, Jr., of New York.
 Donald Kreisberg, of New York.
 Hugh C. Lobit, of Texas.
 Hallock R. Lucius, of Montana.
 Gifford D. Malone, of New York.
 Douglas G. Marshall, of California.
 W. Graham Metson, Jr., of California.
 Michael B. Meyer, of New York.
 Harry M. Montgomery, Jr., of New Jersey.
 Tom R. Moore, of Tennessee.
 Samuel A. Morley, of Oregon.
 Miss Mary A. Mullins, of California.
 Alvis Craig Murphy, of Ohio.
 Robert F. Pfeiffer, of New York.
 James A. Placke, of Nebraska.
 William Polik, of New York.
 James I. Powers, of Idaho.
 Lutz Alexander Prager, of Maryland.
 Donald E. Rau, of Wisconsin.
 Frank M. Ravndal, of New York.
 John D. Rendahl, of Minnesota.
 William C. Sergeant, of Minnesota.
 David G. Shaw, of New York.
 John P. Sifling, of Ohio.
 Henry Sears Sizer, of New York.
 Robert W. Smith, of Missouri.
 Richard Henry Stock, of New York.
 Miss Lorraine C. Wendell, of Colorado.
 Walter G. West, of Colorado.
 Marshall W. Wiley, of Illinois.
 John F. Wolff, of Pennsylvania.
 H. L. Dufour Woolfley, of Louisiana.
 Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:
 Darrell D. Carter, of Illinois.
 John W. Edwards, of the District of Columbia.

Donald T. Shea, of California.
 Howard A. White, of Ohio.

Foreign Service reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Frederick A. Bohne, of New York.
 Charles B. Borell, of New Hampshire.
 Thomas Edmund Burke, of Massachusetts.
 F. Willard Calder, of Florida.
 Miss Bertha Carp, of New York.
 Horace C. de Baca, of New Mexico.
 Marvin A. Derrick, of California.
 Donald F. Ewing, of New Hampshire.
 John L. Hadden, of California.
 John R. Horton, of Maryland.
 John G. Hrones, of Massachusetts.
 Frank W. Jones, Jr., of Connecticut.
 William H. J. McIntyre, of Pennsylvania.
 Roy V. Palmer, of Illinois.
 Raymond Phelan, of California.
 Girvan Teall, of New York.
 Hugh H. Teller, of Michigan.
 John R. Wood, of Georgia.
 Ben Zweig, of Arizona.

Foreign Service reserve officers to be consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Nathan R. Meadows, of Massachusetts.
 George R. Vitale, of New Jersey.

Foreign Service reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Ralph H. Cadeaux, of the District of Columbia.

William A. Campbell, of California.
 William E. Cavan, of California.
 Ross L. Collins, of Virginia.
 Mrs. Frances M. Dabell, of the District of Columbia.

John W. Dayton, of Virginia.
 Robert M. Fulton, of California.
 William H. Godson III, of Virginia.
 Paxton B. Johnson, of Louisiana.
 Serge Karpovich, of Massachusetts.
 Walter M. Oden, of Virginia.
 William C. Ostlund, of Maryland.
 Donald C. Rickard, of Colorado.

Bruce P. Williams, of the District of Columbia.

Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Collins D. Almon, of Alabama.
 Nicholas M. Anikeeff, of Virginia.
 Vincent M. Barnett, Jr., of Massachusetts.
 Gerald R. Daly, of Connecticut.
 Warren L. Dean, of Virginia.
 Lee F. Dinmore, of Maryland.
 Richard A. Fuller, of Iowa.
 Walter W. Harris, Jr., of Maryland.
 Melvin W. Jokinen, of Virginia.
 Joel E. Keys, of New Hampshire.
 Joseph F. Lynch, of Massachusetts.
 Grant W. Olson, of Virginia.
 Michael S. Thompson, of the District of Columbia.
 Homer Thrall, Jr., of Ohio.
 Alfred C. Ulmer, Jr., of Florida.
 William O. Webb, of Maryland.
 Selwyn C. Woodard, Jr., of Iowa.
 Theodore A. Xanthaky, of New York.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Roger W. Jones, of Connecticut, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for a term of 6 years from March 1, 1959.

U.S. ATTORNEY

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

James Major Bailey, Jr., of North Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of North Carolina for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 9, 1957.

N. Welch Morrisette, Jr., of South Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 31, 1958.

William B. West III, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice Heard L. Floore, resigned.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel, of California, Before National Conference on Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "Public Interest Demands Clean Air," which I delivered before the plenary session of the National Conference of Air Pollution, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., on November 18, 1958.

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

PUBLIC INTEREST DEMANDS CLEAN AIR

(Speech of U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the plenary session of the National Conference on Air Pollution, November 18, 1958, Washington, D.C.)

Several recent days of intense personal discomfort in a choking atmosphere which sometimes envelops Los Angeles make me intensely aware of the deep importance of this conference.

So, as a recently escaped smog refugee, I welcome this opportunity to engage in thinking out loud on the matter of the public interest in air pollution. I appreciate the invitation to present some personal reflections to this assembly because of the inescapable fact that the communities in which I have spent most of my entire life often are painfully plagued by contaminated air in its worst form.

This conference is unmistakably a significant event. Scientific and technical problems of great moment will be discussed and examined in the earnest hope, I am sure, of promoting the public interest and serving the public welfare.

There is no question in my mind that public interest is the overriding consideration which must be the goal of all efforts to overcome the curse of air pollution. Certainly there can be no private interest, especially from a pecuniary viewpoint, in prolonging smog and other atmospheric contamination.

All of you present are aware that this meeting is occasioned by the fact that a little more than 3 years ago the Congress enacted legislation known as Public Law 159, the Air Pollution Research Act. By that measure, the Federal Government entered the fight to identify causes of air pollution and an assortment of Federal agencies became allies of public and private, State and local bodies endeavoring to conquer this public enemy.

The enactment of this legislation was no simple accomplishment.

Unfortunately, for a number of years, smog was regarded as a unique Los Angeles phenomenon. Comedians attached to it a made-in-southern-California label.

With the passage of time, and after the laughs became strained, our Nation gradually and thankfully came to the realization that air pollution is one of the distinguishing, built-in, undesirable features of the growth and advancement which our country has been enjoying.

The progress of all agencies operating under the Air Pollution Research Act is of deep concern to me because I authored that act. The conclusions of this conference will be equally meaningful to me because my interest in removing this curse of our industrialized, motorized civilization is of long duration.

When I first came to Washington as a new Senator appointed by the then-Governor of California, Chief Justice Earl Warren, I early attempted to bring about Federal participation in the fight to eliminate smog. I did this because my experiences as a State official indicated plainly the problem has so many ramifications it must be attacked on a nationwide basis.

Personal exposure to the discomfort and the inconvenience from day-long sieges of greasy, eye-irritating murk encountered in Los Angeles undoubtedly has strengthened the determination of many of you here today—as it did me—to employ all of the resources of our great Nation in eradicating a scourge which menaces the physical health and well-being of millions of Americans, which causes vegetables and fruits to wilt

and shrivel, which brings property deterioration, which adversely affects livestock, and which triggers a host of economic consequences.

The public interest in air pollution at that time was not so widely appreciated in Washington as to bring success to the first efforts in which I participated. Happily, however, the public interest had attracted the attention of people in the executive branch of our Government. It was a matter of considerable satisfaction to me, therefore, when President Eisenhower, in response to a suggestion I made in association with my colleague Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, formed what carried the formidable label of "Ad Hoc Interdepartmental Committee on Community Air Pollution."

Even though smog still occurs, millions of people should be eternally grateful for that committee, because from its deliberations resulted the legislation which I introduced, with the cosponsorship of several Senate colleagues from divergent areas who agreed something must be done.

Underlying all of my thinking and my conversations was a conviction that actual control over air-pollution sources and causes was and must be a local and a State responsibility. This view was shared by all of those who took part in framing and pushing through the Air Pollution Research Act. Throughout, the principle has been observed that the Federal Government should not and cannot impose or enforce regulations designed to prevent air pollution, regardless of how desirable such activity might at times appear.

Yet, the Federal Government has a natural and a proper role in our national war against smog and other forms of atmospheric pollution. It has unequalled resources and unmatched experience in the field of meteorology, for instance. It has immediate access to basic statistics assembled from every corner of our country on health conditions. It is in an unmatched position to coordinate investigation and research. It can mobilize from assorted sources skilled scientific and engineering personnel.

Those are among the reasons I wanted the Federal Government to play an active part in the smog fight. Those are the reasons why I am prepared to introduce next year new legislation which will implement, extend, and carry forward Public Law 159 under which present work is carried on.

As a Californian from a semiarid region, I long have been aware of the precious character and the imperative necessity of adequate water supplies. As a human being, I likewise know that clean air is basic to existence, comfort, and happiness. As a southern Californian I also realize that my section of the country, unfortunately, has encountered serious and prolonged difficulty in assuring itself of a sufficient, reliable supply of both clean air and clean water.

Those grave needs are not peculiar to California. Today they are nationwide in scope. With constant and steady increase in our population, with characteristic continuing movement of people, with development of an economy almost wholly dependent upon industrialization and motorization, the public interest demands basic factfinding which will make possible sound measures to conserve and to prevent pollution of air and water alike.

Regretably, despite startling achievements and amazing discoveries, science has not yet found a way to purify air in quantities or with the ease with which we do water. We must reduce and, to the maximum possible, prevent contamination of our atmosphere.

When a room becomes smoke-filled, one generally can open a window or turn on a blower. But no one yet has come up with a means of lifting a veritable ceiling over an entire metropolitan area which would be the

only way of ventilating a community filled with smog of the sort which occasionally plagues many American cities. We still do not know how to sweep away what meteorologists call inversion layers of superheated air which serve as a lid over our steaming kettle of closely packed people.

The lack of a window to bring in sweet, fresh air to whole communities is the justification for control measures such as have been adopted in several regions of California. Such regulatory procedures have a palliative effect and have been evolved through costly and painfully trial-and-error approaches. In many instances, they have been remarkably successful. Yet, they have not solved the problem because the problem itself is so complex.

Unfortunately, a permanent solution apparently still is some distance off. Hence, the significance of this conference.

Congress will be guided by the conclusions of this meeting. Our committees will be indebted for your evaluation of the progress made thus far, for your criticisms and your recommendations about the future course to be followed.

We on Capitol Hill are highly conscious that our people want relief from the curse and the menace of air pollution. Daily it is made plain to us that the human stake in this fight is great, because of the tremendous price our Nation may pay for continued contamination of the air all of us breathe, every moment of our lives.

The American people have been disturbed by reports of qualified medical observers that air pollution has harmful effects on persons with respiratory troubles. Is it any wonder there also is grave concern among our populace which repeatedly undergoes irritations of eyes, nose, and throats?

From many quarters comes evidence that smog causes slums and upsets the balance of communities. Foul, polluted air influences our citizens in building homes and selecting places to dwell.

The public interest in the war on air pollution has reached the point where monetary, selfish aspects cannot be ignored. Take, for instance, the situation in Los Angeles County where constituted authority can order a shutdown of industry and a cessation of motor traffic when smog reaches a specified degree of intensity.

The cost of such countermeasures are incalculable, but they are beyond question tremendous. Businesses and industries, particularly small enterprises, cannot long afford to absorb the expense entailed by drastic action to curb pollution of our air. Yet, until we learn the secrets of what causes smog, we are merely fumbling in our attempts to prevent its occurrence.

Even though periodic shutdowns because of "smog alerts" may be infrequent or brief, a community which gains the reputation of being afflicted by serious air pollution inevitably loses its appeal to tourists and visitors. Unchecked continuance of atmospheric contamination undeniably and eventually will halt the growth and progress of any community as surely as a Chinese wall around its perimeter.

The urgency of identifying every single source of pollution and of laying bare all secrets about the mystic natural forces which cause smog is emphasized by the fact that effects of contamination can be and often are far reaching. Counties surrounding heavily populated cities are not immune since the vagaries of the winds can roll clouds of fumes across man-made boundaries. Contiguous territory from which come food supplies no longer is unconcerned following discovery that some 40-odd separate crops can be injured by polluted air.

Problems of such character cannot be solved at local levels. Nor can public agencies of Government—whether State, Federal, county, or municipal—cope with all the

factors. Active cooperation of industries and private organizations is essential.

We are fortunate indeed that some of our leading enterprises, notably the petroleum and the automobile industries recognize the serious implications in the presence of air pollution. Their efforts to help check the menace have been substantial and are most commendable. Yet, they and others with related interests continue to have a public obligation to work unceasingly in the public interest in finding means by which aerial garbage will be eliminated from our environment.

For their own welfare, the petroleum and automobile industries cannot shirk their responsibility. Already public clamor has been heard in some quarters for action on the part of constituted authority which would have heavy consequences to those industries. Though scientists may scoff, none of us should lightly regard a wave of suggestions that certain types of motor fuels be prohibited by ordinance or regulation. We cannot overlook the resolutions now reaching Washington urging Federal promulgation of standards governing the emission of hydrocarbons and other products of combustion.

The program envisioned when Public Law 159 was enacted was to be of 5 years' duration. The authorized total expenditure was to be \$25 million. Our Federal agencies now are in the fourth year of that program, for which the Congress has appropriated almost \$12 million. A host of research and investigation projects has been set in motion.

This law expires at the end of fiscal year 1960. Hence, it will be incumbent upon the Congress in its forthcoming session to decide whether activities should be halted or the law extended. For my part, I am convinced the act which I sponsored should be continued in effect, and I wonder if possibly it should not be broadened.

I regret that more funds have not been made available. However, there were forceful reasons and circumstances for limiting the appropriations. But our people, especially those who undergo from time to time the irritation and inconvenience of smog occurrences, now and then wonder whether the expenditure has been sufficient. Others question whether it has been worthwhile.

It is difficult for the man in the street to appreciate the proportions and the complexity of the air pollution problem. This conference has a rare opportunity to reassure every citizen that we are expanding our knowledge and that we are pressing forward for his relief with undiminished determination.

This is vital, because the people of America, from the earliest moment of comprehension, believe in free air.

More and more, it is being demonstrated that freeness is relative.

Just as we have seen water supplies in various regions near the point of exhaustion, so must we awaken to the fact that our supply of pure air is in real danger of running out.

Public apprehension about effects of radioactive fallout—notably about what might happen when and if—has been expressed often in dramatic fashion. Yet the insidious influence of air pollution right now is a present and a continuing threat to physical and economic health.

Air is a natural resource and like all natural resources must be husbanded and conserved with all the ingenuity and determination we possess.

Public and private agencies join hands to solve the increasingly acute water problem. Local irrigation districts participate with the Federal Government in building dams and reclamation projects. Our Department of the Interior shortly will embark on an ambitious program of erecting full-scale field-test plants for converting saline water to sweet,

potable supplies for municipal, agricultural, and industrial uses.

The problem of air pollution is of comparable importance and warrants similar earnest mutual attention. Perhaps it should receive a higher priority. For, without fresh, uncontaminated air, people will not congregate or remain in thickly settled communities. In that event, the demand for ever-larger water supplies might easily be altered.

The foundation for future growth and development of many American communities may well rest on solution of the smog problem. Suggestions already have been thrown out that air zoning be undertaken. This would attempt to make certain that industrial expansion—vital and welcome as it may be—is so directed as to take advantage of prevailing winds or features of terrain in reducing potential air pollution.

Likewise, the public stake in cleansing our atmosphere may warrant radical innovations in traffic engineering. Admittedly, our Nation as a whole, and most of its major cities, confronts real headaches in constructing and rebuilding streets, highways, freeways, and other arteries to handle the furiously mounting traffic volume. But unless other means can be found to control the way mechanical horses emit foul-smelling breaths, it is conceivable that we one day will ask engineers to channel fume-spouting automobiles, buses, and trucks away from smog-prone centers.

The obvious public interest in relieving air pollution appears to be multifaceted. In promoting that interest, I sincerely trust this conference will be dedicated to the principle of pooling resources in the traditional American fashion so that the public welfare may be benefited to the greatest degree of which we are capable.

Address by Hon. Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, Before American Federation of Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, January 17, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] last evening, Friday, January 16, 1959, addressed the annual civil service banquet of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, in Portsmouth, Va. His address was delivered on the occasion of the 76th anniversary of the signing of the Pendleton Act, the Civil Service Act.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia formerly was chairman of the House Committee on Civil Service and has a splendid record in support of the civil service and merit system.

I commend to the reading of all Senators this splendid address. The Senator from West Virginia has traced the history of the development of the Civil Service Act and has set before us a challenge in terms of improvement of the civil service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the Senator from West Virginia be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT ANNUAL CIVIL SERVICE BANQUET, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO, PORTSMOUTH, VA., FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 1959, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 76TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE PENDLETON (CIVIL SERVICE) ACT

It seems fitting to me, ladies and gentlemen, on this occasion of the 76th anniversary of the Pendleton Act, to present a brief consideration to the context out of which the act emerged—as well as the historical development of the Federal service—and thereby attempt to gain some view of the tendencies and needs of the future.

Now I do not intend merely to catalog the milestones in the advancement of the Federal service, important though such achievement may be.

I am concerned, rather, with the pattern of development and the relation of the career Federal service to the other branches within our structure of government. One might argue with considerable force that the civil service, which has grown from a few thousand people in 1883 to approximately 2½ million in 1959, has assumed the proportions of a fourth branch of the Government, equal in importance—if not in constitutional status—to the traditional branches of the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary.

It behooves us, therefore, to pause occasionally—amid our concern for the multitude of details of classification, efficiency ratings, retirement plans, health insurance, and others—and give thought to the overall condition of the civil service.

In this respect, it is worth noting—as Professor Van Riper has remarked in his "History of the U.S. Civil Service"—that the original reform movement which brought forth the Pendleton Act was animated by the desire to maintain individual liberty of opportunity in the Federal service.

Such men as Carl Shurz, John Jay, and Richard Henry Dana, among others, were strongly moved by John Stuart Mills' doctrine of liberty and by the denial of that doctrine in the spoils system of the Grant administration.

The fervor of this movement is aptly expressed in the concluding statement of the first report of the Civil Service Commission by George William Curtis in 1871, when he stated that "the improvement of the civil service is emphatically the people's case, the people's reform, and the administration which vigorously begins it will acquire a glory only less than that of the salvation of the Union."

However, this reform was not to be won by rhetoric alone. Another decade of a predatory and acquisitive spoils system and the assassination of a President were required before a merit system would be inaugurated. It is worth observing, in passing, that although the classified civil service has grown from coverage of only 10 percent of 140,000 employees in 1883 to 85 percent of approximately 2½ million employees today, the Pendleton Act has remained without any fundamental changes.

But just as the act itself was a long time in arriving, so have further improvements in the civil service been characterized by obstructionism and delay.

For example, from 1883 to the expansion of Federal activities in World War I, there existed no coherent pay-classification system in the Federal service, while the pay of Government clerks remained stationary from 1854 to 1916. And yet the New York Evening Post, at the turn of the century, editorialized that Government employees

"average to receive twice as much, on a conservative estimate, as persons similarly employed on the outside world." That sounds familiar; doesn't it?

Not until 1923—40 years after passage of the Pendleton Act—was there any further basic legislation to improve the condition of the civil service. This came in the so-called Classification Act of 1923, which covered barely 10 percent of the total employees.

One could well ask: Why, in a democracy, do we handle the needs of our Federal service in such a casual and dilatory manner? Although we might find the explanation in the times, for example, in the belief then that the business of America is business or in the lack of concern on the part of the individual Chief Executives, or in the opposition by such men as Senator Smoot, the cause, I believe, lies deeper than any of these. It is to be found in the popular American attitude which places service in government in a lower category than private endeavor. Surely this is an incongruous and anomalous condition for a democratic society, the development and even the survival of which depends so heavily upon the intelligence, the integrity, and the creativeness of its Federal service.

As a Nation we can ill afford the license of ignoring the people of our civil service, much less the practice which was so widespread a few years ago—and still lingers on in some quarters—of making them the whipping boys and girls for default in our affairs as a Nation.

But in spite of the persistence of the national attitude of devaluing the Federal service, we can look back to significant advances in recent years. A number of these gains, I am pleased to report, occurred under the administrations of Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, while I was a member—and, later, chairman—of the House Civil Service Committee.

During that period we passed the Ramo-Speck-O'Mahoney Postmaster Act of 1937, the Hatch Act of 1939 and 1940, and the Ramo-Speck Act of 1940. Under the latter we authorized the President to extend the merit system to an additional 200,000 employees; we extended the authority of the President and Civil Service Commission in the field of position classification; and we provided for the revision of the efficiency rating system.

Under the provisions of the Ramo-Speck Act, President Truman, in 1945, extended Civil Service Commission authority of position classification and merit system to the field service.

In addition, one of the major advances during this period—one in which I took a particularly keen interest in drafting—was the first Federal Employees' Health Act of 1946.

Finally, we also passed in 1946 the efficiency rating legislation which led to the Performance Rating Act of 1950.

I have not intended, in this brief survey, to do more than touch the high spots of the developments of the past 75 years. Nor have I intended to convey the idea that the status of our civil service is satisfactory. Your own views on this matter have been noted with interest in your legislative proposals for the present Congress. And I hope that this Congress will give earnest and attentive concern to your program.

However, in the light of this summation, I believe we can safely make at least two generalizations:

First, that the principle of the merit system in our Federal Service is assured; and,

Second, that—belated though the progress has been—Federal employees are beginning to share increasingly in the welfare benefits that have come in recent years to employees in private industry.

But there is an issue more fundamental than either of these which I would now consider. I mentioned earlier that the Federal

service has, in a sense, become a fourth branch of the Government. In stating this I am implying, of course, that government bureaucracy has become a permanent and integral part of American life. Therefore, rather than rail against the existence of a bureaucracy as such, it is time that we give thought to the kind of bureaucracy our society demands.

Our civil service, in recent years of relative political stalemate—when we have moved with increasingly less strength of purpose and direction—has been subjected to a degree of congressional and Executive scrutiny never before experienced in our history.

But from both sides—from Congress as well as the White House—this scrutiny has too often been of a restrictive nature, rather than a positive one. Some people believe too much attention has been given to the business of policing the actions of the Fed-

eral service and too little to finding ways of releasing the creative potential of our public servants. And herein lies one of the chief responsibilities in the years ahead—to reconstruct our ideas of administrative responsibility in keeping with the present complexion of our civil service.

My esteemed colleague, the Honorable OLIN JOHNSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is deeply interested in furthering a strong civil service.

We have at last achieved what Professor Mills calls a representative bureaucracy, having tried the closed system of the Federalists and the spoils system of the Jacksonians and early Republicans. We now have a bureaucracy which shares the same values and interests as the community at large—and it is time that we tap the tremendous creative potential which such a system implies.

But this can hardly be done when the basic legislation under which our civil service operates still bears the mark of a reaction to a spoils system that we no longer need. Present concepts of personnel management and administrative responsibility have outdistanced the centralized and hierarchical system of administration of our Federal service.

I would, therefore, in closing, offer the suggestion that your organization might profitably consider the question of some such study of our civil service as the Rockefeller studies of our military security system, our international economic policy, and our educational system—a study which would be made with a view toward releasing the creative potential implicit in the most responsive and representative civil service of our time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Leviticus 26: 12: The Lord said, "I will walk among you and will be your God, and ye shall be my people."

Eternal God, our Father, grant that daily we may have a vivid and vital sense of Thy divine spirit, walking with us and working through us.

Always and everywhere we need Thee; in our weakness to sustain us; in our strength to discipline us; in our sorrows to comfort us.

May we be men and women of vision and of valor, richly endowed with clear minds and courageous hearts to meet and master the challenge of arduous tasks and heavy responsibilities.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 15, 1959, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. ELMER J. HOFFMAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

FEDERAL BUDGET FOR 1960—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 15)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The situation we face today as a nation differs significantly from that of a

year ago. We are now entering a period of national prosperity and high employment. This is a time for the Government to conduct itself so as best to help the Nation move forward strongly and confidently in economic and social progress at home, while fulfilling our responsibilities abroad. The budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1960, transmitted herewith, will effectively and responsibly carry out the Government's role in dealing with the problems and the opportunities of the period ahead.

This budget proposes to increase our military effectiveness, to enhance domestic well-being, to help friendly nations to foster their development, to preserve fiscal soundness, and to encourage economic growth and stability, not only in the fiscal year 1960 but in the years beyond. And it clearly shows that these things can be done within our income.

We cannot, of course, undertake to satisfy all proposals for Government spending. But as we choose which ones the Government should accept, we must always remember that freedom and the long-run strength of our economy are prerequisite to attainment of our national goals. Otherwise, we cannot, for long, meet the imperatives of individual freedom, national security, and the many other necessary responsibilities of Government. In short, this budget fits the conditions of today because:

1. It is a balanced budget: My recommendations call for an approximate equality between revenues and expenditures, with a small surplus.

2. It is a responsible budget: By avoiding a deficit, it will help prevent further increases in the cost of living and the hidden and unfair tax that inflation imposes on personal savings and incomes.

3. It is a confident budget: It anticipates, in a rapidly advancing economy, increases in revenues without new general taxes, and counts upon the unity and good judgment of the American people in supporting a level of government activity which such revenues will make possible.

4. It is a positive budget: It responds to national needs, with due regard to urgencies and priorities, without being either extravagant or unduly limiting.

5. It is an attainable budget: Its proposals are realistic and can be achieved with the cooperation of the Congress.

Any budget is a financial plan. The budget for the Government is proposed by the President, but it is acted upon by the Congress which has the duty under the Constitution to authorize and appropriate for expenditures. Therefore, responsibility for the Government's finances is a shared one. Achievement of the plan set forth in this budget from here on depends upon congressional response, popular support, and developments in our economy and in the world.

FUTURE BUDGET OUTLOOK

The actions we take now on the 1960 budget will affect the fiscal outlook for many years to come. This budget was prepared in the light of the following general prospects for Government finances for the next few years.

Growth of revenues: Our Nation's population and labor force will continue to increase. The output per hour of work on our farms and in our factories can also be expected to grow as it has in the past. With sustained economic expansion, with employment of our people and resources at high levels, and with continued technological advance, the value of total national production and income will be substantially larger in the future than it is today.

Economic growth generates higher personal incomes and business profits. Under our graduated income tax system, with present tax rates, budget receipts should grow even faster than national income, although the rise in receipts certainly will not be uniform from year to year. Also, some tax reforms and downward tax adjustments will be essential in future years to help maintain and strengthen the incentives for continued economic growth. With a balance in our finances in 1960, we can look forward to tax reduction in the reasonably foreseeable future. In the long run, taxes should be so arranged that in periods of prosperity some annual provision is made for debt reduction, even though at a modest rate.

Control of expenditures: The estimated 1960 expenditures, while \$3.9 billion less than in 1959, will still be \$12.4 billion higher than in 1955, an average increase of almost \$2.5 billion a year.