

track down the perpetrators of such offenses.

Third. The President has said that the right to vote is the keystone of democratic self-government. Title III of my bill will require election officers to retain and preserve for 3 years all records and papers which come into their possession relating to elections involving candidates for Federal office. The measure will also authorize the Attorney General to demand their production for examination and copying with recourse to the courts in the event of noncompliance.

Fourth. In establishing the Commission on Civil Rights, the 85th Congress provided that the Commission shall terminate its existence not later than 2 years and 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Civil Rights Act. This would mean that in the absence of an extension the Civil Rights Commission would, at the latest, cease to exist early in November of this year. The President has recommended, and title IV of this bill will accomplish, a 2-year extension in order that the Commission may adequately perform the job for which it was created. The bill also provides for

the President and the Congress to be advised in an interim report to be submitted not later than September 1, 1959, as to Commission activities as of that date.

Fifth. Title V will give legislature stature and independent existence to a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts. The 15 member Presidential Commission would be authorized to continue and to expand the work which has been done in recent years to promote equal job opportunity in the performance of Government contracts without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

Sixth. Title VI of the bill would appropriately amend Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress, which authorize Federal payments to school districts which provide free public education to children whose parents reside or work on Federal property not subject to State or local taxation to include children of members of the Armed Forces whether they reside on Federal property or not. This title will also authorize the acquisition of certain school buildings as rental property, to be used for providing for

children of military personnel education necessitated by the closing of the public schools.

Seventh. The final substantive title, title VII, will authorize the Federal Government to provide technical assistance to States which prior to the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954—Brown against Board of Education—maintained segregated schools and which seek to comply with the decision of the Supreme Court. It would accomplish this purpose by making Federal grants available to the States. Also, at the request of the States or local agencies, the Commissioner of Education would be authorized to provide technical assistance and information in the development of desegregation programs and upon request of such officials will initiate or participate in conferences dealing with the educational aspects of problems arising from desegregation of public schools.

As indicated at the outset of this statement, I am convinced that this bill is a sensible, middle course which the Congress should look upon with favor. I sincerely hope it will receive consideration at an early date.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1959

Rev. John C. Petrauskas, headmaster, Marianapolis Preparatory School, Thompson, Conn., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, as we humbly commend ourselves to Thy omnipresence, we invoke Thy infinite blessings on this august assembly, whose deliberations and decisions reverberate to the farthestmost ends of the world which Thou hast created.

Imbue our lawmakers, O Lord, with a delicate sense of justice, a burning love of the moral good, an unrelenting opposition to iniquity, and an unswerving trust in Thy inscrutable ways.

As Thou regardest this troubled world, with its emphasis on superlatives, take heed, O Lord, of the plight of small nations. We beseech Thee to look with favor upon Lithuania and her neighboring Baltic States as they mark in mourning a once proudly proclaimed freedom and independence. Banish tyranny and bondage from the face of the earth, and grant that Lithuania and all other captive nations may once again know the blessings of freedom and security, so that they may continue to glorify Thee.

With filial devotion and confidence, we have recourse to Thee, who hast been called our tainted nature's solitary boast, and whose motherly concern embraces the suffering and the oppressed. Instill in mankind a deeper sense of human brotherhood under Thy common motherhood and present to God, the Father of all, our prayerful petition that international justice and peace with honor may endure among nations forever. Amen.

CV—144

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1959.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THOMAS J. DODD, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DODD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 12, 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.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 12, 1959, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 961) fixing the representation of the majority and minority membership of the Joint Economic Committee.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the

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

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

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the news of the weekend from Walter Reed Hospital weighs heavily upon all of us as we meet here in the Senate today.

A valued American lies ill. Our hearts and the hearts of free men everywhere go out to John Foster Dulles as he begins his fight for health. If tenacity, dedication, and resoluteness of purpose are allies of medicine, then the prognosis is certainly encouraging, for Mr. Dulles has never been lacking in these qualities. In the most difficult and demanding of public duties, he has been tenacious and tireless in pursuit of what he has held to be right. His example of exhausting and unhesitating devotion to duty is one which we both admire and envy.

Over the period of his service as Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles and I have both agreed and disagreed. Yet it has never been difficult to work with him for the best interests of the Nation. I have never had occasion to say anything personal about him in any circumstance, for I have held him in very high regard, and I still do.

Mr. President, as a measure of our feelings for the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, I now submit, and send to the desk, a resolution which expresses the sympathy of the Senate for the Secretary of State at this time of his illness, and expresses our prayers and our confidence for his early recovery. I ask unanimous consent that after the resolution is read, it be considered and

adopted, and that then the Senate stand for a moment of silent prayer for the return of our friend and countryman to the duties of his office.

I now submit the resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 79) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate stand in silent prayer to the Almighty for the early and complete recovery of the Secretary of State, the beloved John Foster Dulles.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was, by unanimous consent, considered and agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will stand in silent prayer.

(The entire Senate and the occupants of the galleries stood for a moment of silent prayer.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, every energy and virtue of an individual are meant to be used. Not the least of these is a Christian conscience. Everywhere, men will admit that John Foster Dulles has used them to high purpose.

Though there may be disagreement with some of his views and policies, none will deny his vision, his zeal for good works, and his sense of mission in advancing mankind's search for peace and a better world.

What a delicate, arduous, and momentous task he has had: to plan, explore, measure, counsel, and direct our efforts and those of other nations toward peace, friendship, good will, and continued well-being. He has given a contagious quality to the unremitting effort to find ways and means for effectively meeting the challenges of our day. Truly, his dedication to liberty and dignity, as ends in themselves, to peace, to amity, to the well-being of other peoples, as well as ourselves, has generated hope and courage everywhere. Well might we pray for the restoration of his health and vigor, that this work can go forward.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, all of us are saddened that John Foster Dulles has again been retired to a hospital. We learn with distress that since last December he has been fulfilling his exacting duties although his health was so undermined that President Eisenhower and the Secretary's doctors believed that he ought to take a complete rest until he felt fit once more. This he refused to do.

A little while ago, in the fullness of his years, Mr. Dulles underwent grave surgery for cancer, and apparently recovered. He could then have retired with grace and dignity to his chimney corner, to savor the sweetness of rest and the constant companionship of his devoted wife, after a lifetime of strenuous activity, much of it in the service of his country. Instead, he chose to shoulder again the somber responsibilities that attach to his office in our troubled times, and to discharge them at whatever cost to himself, if that cost should be total.

One is especially moved when observing Mr. Dulles in action. His responsibilities are the more awesome and

his loneliness the more poignant in that, for whatever reasons, he, more than any of his predecessors within living memory, must play the leading role, both in formulating our foreign policy and in articulating it. And his tasks are not the less exhausting because he has found it congenial to discharge them by repeated journeyings to the world's capitals, for consultations with heads of states and with his counterparts elsewhere.

No man, I suggest, with the burden of his years upon him and with pain his constant companion, would be moved to such heroic exertions unless he felt that the task was great and the day short—not only his own day, but the day of all men everywhere in this century, the most dangerous of the 60 centuries of man's recorded history.

Mr. Dulles and I have not always agreed upon certain aspects of the conduct of our foreign policy; and, as befits the public servant of a democracy, I have not hesitated to express my sometimes sharp disagreement with his point of view. I hope both of us will live to agree, and sometimes perhaps to disagree, in the future, and thereby discover and elucidate the truth for which all civilized men so desperately strive.

No man, I think, can but be moved to admiration by the spectacle of the courage of John Foster Dulles, by his austere sense of duty, by his exceeding gallantry in the shadows of personal doom, and by his unrelenting purpose in seeking peace through peaceful means, for the millions on this earth whose reluctant feet may already be planted upon the road to Calvary.

It is my prayer, then, that the well-springs of Mr. Dulles' great and abundant vitality will again come to flow, and that he will return to us renewed, restored, and reinvigorated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks the text of the letter which Secretary of State Dulles wrote to the President requesting a leave of absence to undergo a hernia operation. The letter was published in the Washington Evening Star of February 10. I know that we all share the same confident expectation expressed by Mr. Dulles that he will soon be able to resume fully the duties of his most responsible office. The tone of Secretary Dulles' letter reflects his indomitable spirit and the vigor and fortitude with which he has discharged his duties through the tense times in which we have been living.

I expect that no man could serve as Secretary of State in these times and enlist unanimous and unfailing support for all his actions and policies. However, I am sure we all agree that Secretary Dulles is one of the most courageous and conscientious public servants that our country has ever produced.

From long personal association and friendship with him, I know that Under Secretary of State Christian A. Herter merits the same measure and quality of confidence and admiration as he assumes the full burden of Mr. Dulles' duties.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at

the end of my remarks two short biographical articles about Acting Secretary Herter which appeared in the New York Times and the Washington Evening Star, respectively, on February 10.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the requests of the Senator from Massachusetts?

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

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 10, 1959]

SECRETARY REQUESTS PERMISSION FOR LEAVE

Following is the text of Secretary of State Dulles' letter to President Eisenhower yesterday asking for a leave of absence to undergo a hernia operation:

FEBRUARY 9, 1959.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I should like your permission to turn over to Under Secretary Herter, or in his absence, to Under Secretary Dillon, the duties of Secretary of State for a short period.

My doctors advise that I should have an operation for a recently developed hernia; and I have not wholly thrown off the effects of the inflammation of the colon which occurred last December. I should accordingly like to devote a few weeks to physical recuperation, and also have some time when, free from other responsibilities, I could concentrate on the complicated and grave problems raised by the Soviet threats regarding Berlin and the allied response thereto.

I would be available for consultation with you and my associates and would expect, after a few weeks, to resume fully the duties of the office.

I regret the circumstances which lead me to ask for this respite, but I have full confidence, as I know you have, in my associates in the Department of State.

Faithfully yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1959]

NO. 2 IN ONE-MAN SHOW: CHRISTIAN ARCHIBALD HERTER

WASHINGTON, February 9.—As Under Secretary of State, Christian Archibald Herter has for the last 2 years had the misfortune of being No. 2 man in a one-man State Department.

As often in these last months, when the operating power was temporarily out of action on the sidelines or in full action on the frontlines, Mr. Herter today was again handed the title of "Acting Secretary." The key word here is acting, for if Mr. Herter did not know it when he arrived at State—and there is evidence that he did not—he soon found that the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, had determined that there would never be a Sumner Welles in the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Welles, Under Secretary during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, had a closer relationship with the White House than the Secretary himself, Cordell Hull.

LITTLE CHANCE TO SHINE

Accordingly, even when Mr. Dulles has been temporarily away from the store, his stand-in has had little chance to make the impact of his own personality felt on the great issues of state.

Some of Mr. Herter's associates in the Department have felt at times that Mr. Dulles was keeping him in not-so-splendid isolation and that a considerable talent was being buried under the weight of one of Washington's most powerful personalities.

Mr. Herter arrived in Washington soon after the Eisenhower election sweep of 1956 with impressive credentials and a magnificent press. An earlier tenure here, in the House of Representatives, had established

him as an attractive Republican internationalist.

Two successful terms as Governor of Massachusetts confirmed his executive ability and, after the Eisenhower heart attack of 1955, his name was high among those discussed as possible liberal Republican presidential candidates, should the President decline to run in 1956.

The President decided to run and Mr. Herter was promptly involved in a fiasco when Harold E. Stassen, then the administration's disarmament specialist, personally nominated him as the man to replace Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON on the Republican ticket.

Mr. Herter, then leaving the governorship in Massachusetts, suffering from a painful arthritic condition and facing the end of his public career, was induced to torpedo the Stassen assault by making the nominating speech for Mr. Nixon. After the inauguration, he was appointed Under Secretary of State, and there were rumors that he was to be groomed for an early succession to Mr. Dulles.

The future matured without such exciting development. Mr. Dulles, at the desk or away, stayed in charge. Mr. Herter, once the darling of those who had hoped for fresh approaches in United States diplomacy, remained untested and unexposed.

Mr. Herter was born March 2, 1895, in Paris, where his parents were studying art. Young Chris was 10 and spoke fluent French before he returned to the United States. He had his first taste of diplomacy during World War I, serving as Acting Minister to Belgium at the age of 22, when illness in the diplomatic ranks left him the top man on the spot.

After the war he served 3 years as personal assistant and secretary to Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce. As a Representative after World War II he toured 18 nations on a project that was instrumental in the creation of the Marshall plan. In 1952, he was elected Governor of Massachusetts.

In his personal contacts, Mr. Herter at 63 is a polished and charming gentleman of the old school whose manner has often deceived the unknowledgeable into mistaking him for a Boston Brahmin. With an easy smile and a persuasive graciousness, he gives the casual visitor no sign of the physical hardship imposed by the arthritis.

He is married to the former Caroline Pratt and has three sons and a daughter.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 10, 1959]

HERTER DRAWN EARLY TO FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Unlike many American politicians, Christian Archibald Herter has been interested in foreign affairs most of his life.

The man who will be Acting Secretary of State while John Foster Dulles is out for a hernia operation had a headstart in developing this interest.

He was born in Paris, France, almost 64 years ago, to struggling young American artists, Albert and Adele Herter.

Although he was brought to the United States while still a boy, his interest in foreign affairs has never wavered.

After graduating from Harvard with honors, Mr. Herter decided he would like to be an architect and enrolled at Columbia University.

But in 1916 he returned to Harvard for his first class reunion. There he talked with a classmate, Lithgow Osborne, who had been in Berlin as an aid to Ambassador Gerard. Mr. Osborne's tales of life in wartime imperial Germany excited Mr. Herter's imagination, and a week later he was on his way to Europe as a member of the United States Foreign Service.

NEARLY SHOT

He was one of the last Americans out of Germany after this country entered the First

World War—and he almost didn't make it out at all. He was trying to reach neutral territory, but on reaching Mainz was arrested as a suspected spy. One officer favored shooting him on the spot, but Mr. Herter managed to convince him that he was entitled to safe convoy as a member of the United States Embassy.

Mr. Herter tried to get into the Army, but was turned down. Too tall, he's 6-feet-5, and too lightweight, he's still slender.

But this didn't keep him from taking on several difficult jobs, such as serving as secretary of a commission to negotiate a prisoner of war treaty with Germany and, after the war, secretary of the commission to negotiate the peace treaty.

In 1919 he went to Germany with Herbert Hoover to help direct the American Relief Council there.

LEARNS A LESSON

Later he was to serve with Mr. Hoover in the Commerce Department, and there he learned a valuable lesson. Mr. Hoover, he has said, was an extraordinary and brilliant administrator, but when he got into politics, he could not be flexible in his dealings with humans—as one must be in politics.

Mr. Herter soon had a chance to test his political theories.

In 1930 he was elected to the Massachusetts House, where he spent 12 years, the last 4 as speaker.

By 1942 he was ready for bigger game—Congress.

In the House, Mr. Herter busied himself with foreign affairs, but kept an eye open for likely looking Republicans who might take the White House away from the Democrats. He was one of the earliest to say he thought that man was Dwight D. Eisenhower.

At the same time, he took a political risk of his own.

He was persuaded to run for Governor of Massachusetts against Paul A. Dever. Most observers didn't think he had a chance, but he squeaked through, by 14,000 votes.

RETURNS TO WASHINGTON

Late in 1956 he returned to Washington, as Under Secretary of State.

An Under Secretary has an important job, but usually an unpublicized one.

As politicians go, Mr. Herter seems relatively content to operate outside the main arena.

It's probably appropriate that most voters know him for what he didn't do.

In 1956 there was a boost for (a) Mr. Herter for President, when it was thought Mr. Eisenhower's health would forbid a second term, and later (b) Mr. Herter for Vice President, in place of RICHARD M. NIXON.

This last campaign was carried on—almost exclusively it seemed—by Harold E. Stassen, but it produced most of the excitement at the 1956 Republican Convention.

In the end it got nowhere.

The tall, seemingly shy man got up at San Francisco and made a speech nominating Mr. NIXON.

Full name: Christian Archibald Herter.

Home: Millis, Mass.

Birthday: March 28, 1895.

Birthplace: Paris, France.

Education: Ecole Alsacienne; Browning School; Harvard University (graduated with honors); Columbia University.

Jobs: Attaché, American Embassy in Berlin (1916-17); executive director, European Relief Council; special assistant, Secretary of Commerce (1921); editor, *The Independent*; elected Massachusetts State Legislature (1931); elected House of Representatives (1942); elected Governor of Massachusetts (1953); appointed Under Secretary of State (1957).

Family: Married, father of 3 sons and a daughter and grandfather of 11.

Hobbies: Hunting, fishing.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I compliment the majority leader, and other

Senators who have spoken, upon their statements regarding the Secretary of State. I am glad I can be present to add my own personal expression to the record of what has been said in that regard.

My own friendship with Foster Dulles goes back to 1931, when he was legal adviser to the firm with which I was active at that time. During the years I formed the impression that Foster Dulles was one of the most brilliant, able, devoted, and conscientious friends I have ever known.

In 1949, after he was defeated by Senator Lehman when he was a candidate for election to the Senate, I talked with him. I think it was advice he gave me at that time, and the expression of his opinion about public service, and similar matters, which influenced me more than any other thing to attempt to run for the Senate, myself, in 1950. Thus, I feel a special sense of friendship for Foster Dulles which I am happy to express at this time, while he is a patient in Walter Reed Hospital.

I sincerely pray and hope for his immediate and complete recovery, in order that he may continue to give our country the great and devoted service that has characterized his life really ever since World War II.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we pray today for the early recovery and return to duty of our distinguished Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. He has dedicated his life, without thought of personal convenience or of his own health, to the cause of the peace of the world. He is a man of strong convictions. Furthermore, he is willing to stand firm on his convictions. A recent editorial in the *Topeka Daily Capital* concludes with this statement:

Whatever history records about the rightness or wrongness of Secretary Dulles' policies, it must put them down as a man who served his country first and himself last.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* at this point as a part of my remarks the complete editorial which appeared in the *Topeka Daily Capital* of February 12, 1959.

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

DULLES: DEVOTED TO DUTY

The lot of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has not been a happy one in recent years but that is not something peculiar to Dulles' career. Second-guessing Secretaries of State is a sort of national pastime and the critics in the Nation's capital are numerous. So are those abroad.

But Dulles' service to his country is once again complicated by illness and his current leave of absence, to permit him to undergo a hernia operation, poses the question of whether he should continue in one of the most strenuous jobs in the world.

The word from the White House is that the Dulles' leave of absence is just that. He's expected back on his globe-girdling job, the White House says, in a few weeks.

No one, not even those critics who have disagreed violently with Dulles' policies, can say he has not given great devotion to his job. He has traveled at a gruelling pace and, at 71, has fought back against ill health with a vigor not often found in younger men. In 1956, the cancerous part of his

lower intestine was removed. Dulles was soon back at his job. Last December he was hospitalized with an inflamed colon. In January he passed up a trip to Canada because of a virus infection. But Dulles was soon back in the news, active in spite of the ailments that were reflected in his tired and haggard face.

If Americans argued about the progress of the country in foreign affairs, they were certain of one thing—that here was a man who served them devotedly and was following the course he believed best for the country. He stood firm on Quemoy and Matsu in the face of great pressure. He doggedly kept speaking of preserving the interest in the United States and the western allies in Berlin and the threats of Khrushchev and his East German henchmen.

Secretary Dulles' latest illness, however, puts President Eisenhower in the position of a baseball manager. Although Dulles is on leave of absence, he is still the nominal Secretary of State and in there pitching. Due to ill health, Dulles may take himself out of the game in the next few weeks. Or the President may decide to put in a new pitcher in view of the urgent need to meet the situation in Germany and elsewhere as effectively as possible. Dulles is the kind of a man who would graciously step aside if the President asked him to, and the President may have no other choice.

Whatever history records about the rightness or wrongness of Secretary Dulles' policies, it must put him down as a man who served his country first and himself last.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I agree with all that has been said concerning the character of John Foster Dulles. When he was stricken I sent a message to him which has appeared in the *RECORD* heretofore. He is a great citizen and a great man, one who will go down in history as one of America's greatest Secretaries of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in the remarks they have been made about our ill Secretary of State. I am sure the Senators know my feelings, because I consider John Foster Dulles to be not only a great Secretary of State, but a warm and personal friend. I hope that he has far more than a fighting chance to return to active duty and to once again become the Secretary of State in fact as well as in name.

Salute to the courage and heroism of Mr. John Foster Dulles

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the *RECORD* a moving and poignant column by Drew Pearson hailing the personal heroism and courage of our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. This column was published in the February 16 issue of the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald* under the title of "Dulles Heroism on Duty Lauded."

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

DULLES HEROISM ON DUTY LAUDED
(By Drew Pearson)

The full story of John Foster Dulles' heroism has not yet been told. Probably it can't be told in full for some time.

This writer, when in Mexico for the inauguration of President Lopez Mateos, reported that the Secretary of State was suffering great pain, had two doctors, standing by one night, but went through the ordeal of shaking hands with several thousand Americans at an Embassy reception, plus the

formalities of the Mexican inauguration, without letting anyone know how ill he was.

He even refused to call off his trip to San Francisco to speak before the chamber of commerce, remarking to a friend that, if he was suffering from cancer, 1 or 2 days would make no difference in reaching a hospital.

Back in Washington, Dulles rested a few days, then flew to Paris for the meeting of NATO. The European statesmen who sat opposite him had no idea they were talking to a sick but courageous man. He had to pass up four diplomatic functions and curtail his work, but faithfully attended the chief NATO conferences.

He found his doctors amazed at his stamina and he was sternly warned that he would have to slow down. He did slow down for a while, went to the West Indies, then came back to throw himself into the pressing problems of Mikoyan's visit and Berlin.

MRS. DULLES AGREES

President Eisenhower argued with him, threatened to order him out of the State Department. Finally he decided Dulles would never be happy if he were not at work. Mrs. Dulles agreed. Most women want their husbands to retire after a certain age, but Mrs. Dulles, knowing her husband, knows that he lives only to pilot our pressing foreign affairs toward the goal of peace. If he retired, he would be restless, unhappy.

Shortly before he went to Europe this last time, Dulles' pains started coming back. He refused to be hospitalized. In London he did not tell Prime Minister Macmillan that he was ill and would have to undergo another operation. Nor did he tell General de Gaulle.

The only European in whom he confided was Chancellor Adenauer, 83-year-old leader of West Germany, who has become Dulles' close friend. The two have sometimes differed, sometimes have been irritated with each other, but there is great basic trust between the two, and Dulles confided that when he returned to Washington he would have to undergo another operation. The Chancellor almost broke down and wept. Dulles told the old German not to worry, that the United States would not let Germany down.

When Dulles flew back to Washington he was racked with pain and fatigue. Under Secretary of State Chris Herter was in South Carolina taking warm baths for his arthritis, which at times makes it difficult for him to walk. Dulles urged Herter to finish the treatments. He himself went to the hospital and has continued to direct major State Department policy from his bed.

The Secretary of State is suffering from lesions, an aftermath of his previous operation; a hernia, and now cancer. In addition, he is 71 years old.

WHITE HOUSE ADVISER

His doctors have told him that the odds are very much against his returning to any active day-to-day direction of the State Department. They have told him that the only cure for his complicated physical distress is long rest, not a hectic 12-hour day with the burdens of the world on his shoulders.

But the dogged and dedicated Secretary Dulles is determined to settle the Berlin crisis, after which he will probably be content to retire to the status of White House adviser, leaving the active direction of the State Department to someone else.

President Eisenhower, despite denials, has become reconciled to this. The President will consult with former Gov. Tom Dewey on the latter's return from the inauguration of President Betancourt of Venezuela regarding a successor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there must be few men and women in the civilized world today who do not

salute the fortitude with which our Secretary of State has carried on, in the teeth of adversity in health which would have overcome a person of lesser determination and grit.

Fortunately, this is in our country's best tradition. We recall the valiant Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who served longer as President than any other American even though he was permanently crippled by infantile paralysis. We know the chronicles of Grover Cleveland's radical surgery for cancer of the jaw and how he served effectively in the White House for over 3 years thereafter.

But, today, the man whom the free world heralds for courage is John Foster Dulles. I have asked unanimous consent that Mr. Drew Pearson's column be printed in the *RECORD* as a tribute to Mr. Dulles—and perhaps as a warning to the rest of us that we should take from the Secretary's illness a determination to undertake a genuine "crash" program in the field of cancer research.

Mr. President, with respect to my remarks concerning cancer research and the renewed illness of the Secretary of State, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* an article about medical research and my own illness which I wrote at the request of the editors of *United Press International*.

The article was published widely throughout the Nation in such newspapers as the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald*, the *Washington Daily News*, the *Oregon Daily Journal* and many others.

This particular clipping is from the *Journal* of February 12, 1959, under the title "Grateful NEUBERGER Urges Cancer Funds."

Mr. President, I shall read to the Senate one short sentence from the article, in view of the illness of our Secretary of State:

Does it make sense to invest in cancer research only about 1 percent of what we spend on research into armaments and weapons of war?

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

GRATEFUL NEUBERGER URGES CANCER FUNDS

(Last fall, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, 46-year-old Democratic Senator from Oregon, underwent surgery for removal of a cancerous tumor. In this dispatch, Senator NEUBERGER speaks frankly of his experience and, as he prepares to resume a normal schedule of activity—his physicians' words—offers a message of hope to other cancer sufferers.)

(By U.S. Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER)

It has become almost axiomatic to protest about our modern age. Yet if I did not live in a modern age, I would probably be dead now. Three miracles of modern medical science have given me a prospect for recovery from cancer which my doctors regard as excellent.

These miracles are (1) early detection of the tumor, (2) skillful surgery, and (3) the twin agents of cobalt radiation and chemotherapy, with their destructive impact on any of the tumor which might have spread.

Even before cancer was diagnosed in me, I stood on the floor of the U.S. Senate and advocated vastly increased Federal support of medical research. Yet I used glibly the reference that 40 million Americans were destined to have cancer. I never thought I

might be among the 40 million. I always felt that this would be somebody else. I suppose countless citizens feel this way—otherwise we would not tolerate spending more on chewing gum than on cancer research, and many times more on such things as permanent waves and cigarettes.

Along with my colleagues, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, I have been proposing an international medical year and a pooling of medical discoveries made by all nations. This has a particularly urgent meaning for me today. Cobalt radiation, a vital factor in the successful treatment I have undergone, was developed by such illustrious scientists of Canada as Dr. David A. Keyes and Dr. H. F. Batho. I am fortunate that no unwise import quota kept this marvel of their intellects from coming to the United States.

A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective. First, one becomes profoundly grateful to all those who, through the long history of medical research, have contributed to the advances thus far made in treatment of this grim disease. Secondly, old antagonisms fade away. I no longer can transform political disagreements into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being.

I am keenly aware that some of the most eminent Members of the Senate have died of cancer during recent years—among them Charles L. McNary, of my own State of Oregon; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan; Matthew Neely, of West Virginia; and Brien McMahon, of Connecticut. That is why I regard it as so crucially important if I can stand in the Senate and stress to my colleagues that my own life has been spared, because I have had a type of cancer which has responded to a discovery thus far made in the realm of medical research.

Is it not vital that we devote every effort to extending these discoveries, if possible, into other areas of cancer where successful treatment has not yet been achieved? Does it make sense to invest in cancer research only about 1 percent of what we spend on research into armaments and weapons of war? Two out of every three American families are in peril of affliction from cancer.

From the very beginning, I told my doctors to include candidly in their medical bulletins the fact that my illness has been diagnosed as cancer. I realize that has not been done in the case of some public figures. Yet we need to have full understanding of this disease if it is to be conquered.

Medical scientists inform me that some people, knowing they may have cancer, still hesitate to seek treatment because they fear it is inevitably hopeless. Thus, if a person in public life does recover from cancer, it is an event which can give hope and courage to many millions of others.

The American Cancer Society reports that, already, about 30 or 35 percent of cancer victims are being saved. As new findings are attained in the field of chemotherapy, this percentage undoubtedly will be increased—especially if people seek immediate medical care.

While much remains to be known about cancer, I think it is essential that Americans have faith in the competence of their doctors. Some believe that capable care can be received only at a few nationally known medical centers. I chose to remain for treatment in my native city of Portland, Ore., because I believe that knowledge and competence in this field are not confined to one or two famous places. I think I have been confirmed in this decision by the fact that, in my travels around our State this last fall and winter, I have met quite a few men and women who have recovered from cancer under the able auspices of their own local physicians.

The National Cancer Institute, which is part of our U.S. Public Health Service, makes grants throughout the Nation to all promising avenues in the area of cancer research. Your own life or that of a loved one might potentially be saved if you urge your Senator to vote full and adequate appropriations for this vital Government agency, which provides about 72 percent of the funds for research into the causes and possible cures of the series of diseases known as cancer.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, later in the week I expect to introduce some proposed legislation in this field. I trust that the Senate will give it additional interest because of our concern over the recent illness of Secretary Dulles.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thought permission was to be requested for the subcommittee to sit for the rest of this week. I understand the majority leader is now requesting permission for just today, but there will be executive sessions for the rest of the week. I would certainly not object to amending the unanimous-consent request so that it would include all week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would prefer to do it on a daily basis. That is the way the request has been made.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the same request with regard to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that it be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I wish to say, in cooperation with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] that I, as chairman of the Railroad Retirement Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, have agreed that the meetings of my subcommittee will be held in the afternoons, so that the Senator from Massachusetts can have his meetings in the mornings. I assure the Senator from Illinois I know this meets with the pleasure of members on both sides of my subcommittee.

Therefore, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Railroad Retirement Subcommittee, which has to complete its hearings this week, may hold its meetings in the afternoon while the full committee holds its meetings in the morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would have no objection, but I prefer to have the consent on a daily basis, and I shall be glad to have that request made for today.

Mr. MORSE. We are not meeting today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall propose that request for the Senator tomorrow.

Mr. President, have the requests for the committee meetings been acted on?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the requests of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the requests are granted.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION I

"Joint resolution of the House and Senate of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Congress of the United States; to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD; to Congressmen LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON; and to the Hawaii delegation in the U.S. Congress and the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii; requesting the President and Congress of the United States to do what may be necessary to give full statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

"Whereas the Legislature of Montana is aware of the unfairness with which the Territory of Hawaii has been treated in its appeal for statehood; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Montana is aware of the great contributions that the Territory of Hawaii has made to the welfare of the United States, and believing that such contributions could be vastly accelerated by statehood; and

"Whereas the platforms of both major political parties have and do advocate statehood for Hawaii; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has advocated statehood for Hawaii in speeches, and before his inauguration; and

"Whereas the growth and prosperity of the Territory of Hawaii, and the people of Hawaii are seriously handicapped by the Territorial status that now exists; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii, and the people of that Territory have now reached a stalemate in their development that cannot be overcome until statehood is granted; and

"Whereas it is to the future benefit of the United States of America to accelerate the development of the vast potential that is Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Montana, both House and Senate concurring, do petition the President and the Congress of the United States to jointly do that which is necessary to immediately give full statehood to the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted by the Secretary of State of the State of Montana to each of the individuals and to the chairman of the committee named in the title of this resolution, and also to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

"JOHN J. MACDONALD,
"Speaker of the House.
"PAUL CANNON,
"President of the Senate."

A resolution adopted by the New York-New Jersey Regional Council of the National Federation of Catholic College Students, relating to diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Brockton, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation granting statehood

to Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of Wayne Kanekiyo, of Kaumakani, Kauai, T.H., praying for the enactment of legislation granting statehood to Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of Eugenio C. Nicholas, of Manila, Philippine Islands, praying for a redress of grievances under the Philippine war damage law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A paper, in the nature of a petition, from the American Public Welfare Association, Chicago, Ill., entitled "Federal Legislative Objectives, 1959"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. Moss): A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the separate States

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein—

"Whereas recent decisions from the Federal courts and recent rulings from the U.S. Department of Justice have deprived States, and persons, of rights which said States and persons previously enjoyed, to regulate and control the use of the water in those respective States; and

"Whereas, said decisions and rulings are further a part of a general pattern developing gradually into Federal supremacy and usurpation over water, which, if continued, will destroy individual and States rights over water, and substitute in lieu thereof an all powerful centralized Government control thereover: Be it therefore

"Resolved by the 33d Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, That the Congress and President of the United States and the Representatives of Utah in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary action to (1) preserve the water rights of the individual and the States and to prevent Federal usurpation of those rights; (2) to see that legislation is initiated and supported to reestablish to the individuals and to the States, the rights taken from them by the Federal courts and the Justice Department; and (3) in every way possible reaffirm, renew, and defend the concepts that water rights are property rights and that these established rights, to the use of water, by a State or an individual, should not be taken away without due process of law and adequate compensation; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the above be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, Chairman of the U.S. Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, U.S. Senator FRANK E. MOSS, U.S. Representative HENRY A. DIXON, and U.S. Representative DAVID S. KING."

**HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD—
RESOLUTION**

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Garden City Junior Chamber of Commerce, Garden City, Kans., adopted and signed a resolution for immediate statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be made a part of these remarks and that the resolution be referred to the proper committee.

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

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has long been an integral part of the United States of America, having contributed to the Nation's wellbeing in both peace and war; and

Whereas said Territory has for some time past and is now again, seeking admission to the Union as the 50th State, said admission being earnestly supported and sought by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the Territory of Hawaii, with its 16 chapters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Garden City Junior Chamber of Commerce, That the Territory of Hawaii should be admitted to the Union as the 50th State and that all Kansas U.S. Congressmen and all U.S. Senators should be and are hereby urged by this organization and the undersigned members thereof, to support and vote for said statehood for the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution should be forwarded to the six Kansas Congressmen and two Senators by the secretary of this organization.

Dated this 4th day of February 1959.

Manford Kimberly, Merton R. Staley, Melvin R. Johnston, Jerry Schultz, Donald H. Moses, John Gies, John Metheny, Richard L. Henkle, John F. Riggs, Jr., D.D.S., Owen D. Burton, John Miles, Ralph D. Viehman, George M. Herron, Bobby McKain, Clayton L. Crenshaw, William F. Hedges, Vern L. Holmes, Joe Tennesen, Jim Fishback, Don Grimes, Dwight E. Denbow, Leo W. Hanneman, Roy Herring, Lewis E. Lyman, Philip D. Merringer, W. R. Grundy, Paul Parker, Rev. Marvin Tolliver, Arthur F. Wilson, Jr., Sterling Lewis, Robert Gardiner, Al Towles, Pete M. Garcia, Stewart Boone, Lloyd V. Smith, M.T., Duane W. Hays, Duane E. West, Ronald W. Jackson, Les DePew, Lowell Goodwin.

**RESOLUTION OF VEGETABLE
GROWERS' ASSOCIATION OF NEW
JERSEY, INC.**

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Vegetable Growers' Association of New Jersey, Inc., concerning land reclamation.

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

**LAND RECLAMATION—RESOLUTION ADOPTED
DECEMBER 17, 1958, VEGETABLE GROWERS'
ASSOCIATION OF NEW JERSEY, INC.**

Whereas since World War II it has been increasingly evident that there has been overproduction of vegetables; and

Whereas this has created quite a hardship for farmers in the form of low returns for their crops; and

Whereas the U.S. Government has spent a great deal of money trying to correct this situation; and

Whereas increased production per acre of vegetables as well as other farm commodities is compounding an overproduction problem; and

Whereas the U.S. Government should not justify the spending of public funds to build dams to irrigate new lands, further increasing overproduction, especially in vegetables: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Vegetable Growers' Association of New Jersey, Inc., restate its position opposing the use of public funds to bring new land into production, and that

the Secretary be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each of our Representatives and Senators in Washington, D.C., to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Vegetable Growers' Association of America.

REDUCTION IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BUDGET—LETTER

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter received from the Burlington County Executive Committee, the American Legion, urging that no cuts be made in the Veterans' Administration budget.

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

BURLINGTON COUNTY
AMERICAN LEGION
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
January 20, 1959.

Hon. CLIFFORD CASE,
U.S. Senator From New Jersey,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: At a recent meeting of the Burlington County Executive Committee of the American Legion, a motion was unanimously passed directing me to write a letter to you in regards to veterans' benefits.

At this time when Congress is concerned with the new budget, we feel that no cuts should be made in the Veterans' Administration budget. We know that any cuts in this budget will work a hardship on many a deserving veteran and also will make a heavier burden on the community in which he resides.

Representing the 3,500 Legionnaires of Burlington County we are asking you to help keep the VA budget from being cut.

Yours truly,

W. ROBERT BOHN,
Adjutant, Burlington County
Executive Committee.

**BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION
INTRODUCED**

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

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1041. A bill to eliminate shifts in wheat acreage allotment resulting from the overplanting of allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1042. A bill for the relief of Stephanos Tsoukalas; and

S. 1043. A bill to establish an additional judicial district within the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1044. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended; 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. BENNETT:

S. 1045. A bill to authorize construction of the Little Dell Dam and Reservoir project at Salt Lake City, Utah; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 1046. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enter-

prises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to \$1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1047. A bill to establish and maintain the U.S. Maritime Service as a uniformed service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

S. 1048. A bill for the relief of Salomon Harari, Yvonne Harari, Gracie Harari, Elie Harari, and Henry Harari; and

S. 1049. A bill for the relief of Rachel Borenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1050. A bill to provide educational assistance for the children of service men and women who suffer death from a service-connected disability arising out of active military service during the period beginning on February 1, 1955, and ending on June 30, 1963; 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. BRIDGES:

S. 1051. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hellen M. Sargent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1052. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 with respect to the position descriptions and salary levels of mail handlers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1053. A bill for the relief of Rosa Maria Montenegro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN):

S. 1054. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 1055. A bill for the relief of Eusebio Asla Pinuaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1056. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1057. A bill for the relief of Rachel Zilderstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 1058. A bill to provide for the erection of a Federal building in Las Vegas, Nev.; and

S. 1059. A bill to provide for the erection of a Federal building in Reno, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1060. A bill to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Arizona and Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1061. A bill to amend section 9(b) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities" (the Hatch Political Activities Act) to eliminate the requirement

that the Civil Service Commission impose no penalty less than 90 days' suspension for any violation of section 9 of the act; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 1062. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1063. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, with respect to proceedings in the Patent Office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1064. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1065. A bill for the incorporation of the Merchant Marine and Maritime Service Veterans Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1066. A bill to revise the boundaries and change the name of Fort Donelson National Military Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 1067. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1068. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou; and

S. 1069. A bill for the relief of Zee Yung Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1070. A bill to recodify, with certain amendments thereto, chapter 19 of title 5 of the United States Code, entitled "Administrative Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1071. A bill for the relief of Nettie Korn and Manfred Korn;

S. 1072. A bill for the relief of Pierre Bertagnolio; and

S. 1073. A bill for the relief of Su-Ming Tseng and her daughter, Wu-Mo Tseng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1074. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act of 1935, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. HART:

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to authorize the proclaiming annually of National Auto Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted a resolution (S. Res. 79), relating to the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, which was considered and agreed to.

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

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Building Act of 1926, as amended. This bill was submitted to the Vice President by letter on February 3, 1959.

This proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and, in my capacity as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 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. In this connection, I take the opportunity to recall that when this bill was previously considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations in 1957, I urged that there be a limitation inserted to ensure that the Department of State would not use foreign currencies in the building program at the expense of using them for international educational exchange activities. I expect to go into this matter further when this subject is considered by the committee.

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 and a statement reflecting the authorizations and appropriations under the Foreign Service Buildings Act supplied by the Department of State.

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

The bill (S. 1044) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (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 section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 295), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this Act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to amounts previously authorized, an amount not to exceed \$100,000,000, of

which \$50,000,000 shall be available exclusively for payments representing the value, in whole or in part, of property or credits in accordance with the provisions of the Act of July 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 663). Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expended."

The letter and statement presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1959.

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

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Department submits and recommends for your consideration the enclosed proposed legislation amending the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 292-300).

Authorizations of appropriations to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act from 1926 to the present total \$231,625,000 of which \$200 million is authorized to be used exclusively for payments to agencies of the U.S. Government for foreign credits and currencies. After the appropriation for the current fiscal year, there remains an unappropriated balance of authorization of \$28,095,000 of which \$27,234,000 is for the procurement of foreign currencies and \$861,000 is in dollar authorization. These amounts will be reduced further by the appropriation for the fiscal year which ends June 30, 1960.

Thus far, under its Foreign Service buildings program, the Department of State has acquired residences, office buildings, and staff housing valued in excess of \$158 million.

Even so, many of the personnel at overseas posts are working and living in accommodations far below the standards considered minimum in the United States of America. In order to assess the total needs overseas, the Department initiated a post-by-post survey of buildings requirements, and as a result of this survey prepared a program to meet the basic requirements. A copy of the program is enclosed. It contemplates expenditure of an estimated \$120 million in the period from fiscal year 1961 through fiscal year 1965.

Acquisitions under the Foreign Service Buildings Act have been financed largely through the use of foreign currencies and credits. Surplus property and lend-lease credits have provided foreign currencies for a substantial portion of the program. The use of these credits permitted the conversion of a portion of the debts to tangible assets of lasting value. The disposal of surplus agriculture commodities authorized by Public Law 480 currently is providing foreign currencies useful in financing the buildings program.

There are, however, certain limitations to the use of foreign currencies and credits. A substantial portion of them are held in countries where the need for building facilities no longer is acute. Under regulations prescribed by the U.S. Treasury Department and placed in effect on December 1, 1953, all agencies of the U.S. Government needing foreign exchange are required to purchase it from U.S. Treasury holdings, and they may not purchase from external sources unless the Treasury cannot supply

the kind of currency needed. Only a relatively small number of foreign currencies are held by the Treasury in substantial amounts, relative to overall U.S. needs, and this number is being reduced wherever possible by exchange conversion of surplus holdings into currencies in demand.

Conversely, many of the Department's most urgent and compelling buildings needs are in countries where credits or local currencies in excess of current disbursing requirements are not held by the United States. In addition, the buildings program funds the maintenance and operating costs for owned and long-term leased buildings of the Department of State overseas, and a number of these buildings are located in areas where no currency credits are available. U.S. dollars must be expended to meet obligations in these circumstances. Consequently, the dollar requirements have increased in recent years and probably will continue to increase in the future.

The proposed amendment to section 4 will authorize additional appropriations of \$100 million of which \$50 million is to be in foreign currency credit authorization. A statement reflecting the authorizations and appropriations under the Foreign Service Buildings Act is enclosed.

The Department of State has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation to the Congress of the proposed legislation.

A letter similar to this is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, OFFICE OF FOREIGN BUILDINGS

Proposed building program for period from 1961 to 1965 inclusive

[Thousands of dollars]

Program	Total	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
Acquisition and construction:						
Africa.....	\$13,115	\$1,775	\$2,120	\$2,910	\$3,880	\$2,430
American Republics.....	10,285	3,000	1,700	1,700	1,535	2,290
Europe.....	9,800	2,350	2,425	1,800	1,025	1,700
Far East.....	8,860	2,245	2,545	1,080	1,710	1,280
Near East and south Asia.....	10,340	1,980	2,000	2,910	1,700	1,750
Subtotal.....	51,900	11,350	10,850	10,400	9,850	9,450
Attache housing:						
Agriculture.....	750	150	150	150	150	150
Defense.....	1,250	250	250	250	250	250
Subtotal.....	88,900	11,750	11,250	10,800	10,250	9,850
Project development:						
Project supervision.....	2,600	600	600	500	500	400
Property leaseholds.....	2,950	550	600	600	600	600
Capital improvements.....	3,750	750	750	750	750	750
Furniture and furnishings.....	4,500	800	800	900	1,000	1,000
Operation of buildings.....	5,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Maintenance and repairs.....	20,100	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,500
Conduct of program.....	20,000	3,600	3,800	4,000	4,200	4,400
Subtotal.....	7,200	1,350	1,400	1,450	1,500	1,500
Subtotal.....	66,100	12,250	12,750	13,200	13,750	14,150
Total.....	120,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000

Acquisition and construction program 1961-65

BY AREA

[Thousands of dollars]

Geographic area	Total estimated cost	Office buildings		Embassy residences		Deputy chief and consulate residences		Residences for senior officers		Staff housing ¹	
		Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Africa.....	\$13,115	18	\$7,645	2	\$400	13	\$1,050	40	\$1,900	106	\$2,120
American Republics.....	10,285	10	8,450	3	850	9	585	20	1,500	20	400
Europe.....	9,800	11	6,550	3	1,475	17	1,125	3	150	138	2,700
Far East.....	8,860	11	5,100	1	250	1	50	14	700	70	1,400
Near East and south Asia.....	10,340	18	6,440	4	1,000	18	1,200	6	300	334	6,660
Total.....	51,900	68	34,185	13	3,975	58	4,010	63	3,050	334	6,660

¹ Number of living units.

² Includes 2 warehouses, 1 garage, and 1 communications building.

Acquisition and construction program 1961-65—Continued

AFRICAN AREA, BY COUNTRY

[Thousands of dollars]

Geographic area	Total estimated cost	Office buildings		Embassy residences		Deputy chief and consulate residences		Residences for senior officers		Staff housing	
		Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Angola.....	\$375	1	\$300			1	\$75				
Cameron.....	655	1	400			1	75	2	\$100	4	\$80
French Equatorial Africa.....	655	1	400			1	75	2	100	4	80
French West Africa.....	735	1	400			1	75	2	100	8	160
Ivory Coast.....	605	1	400			1	75	1	50	4	80
Kenya.....	400	1	400								
Libya.....	1,780	1	965	1	\$250	1	75	5	250	12	240
Madagascar.....	655	1	400			1	75	2	100	4	80
Morocco.....	625	1	550			1	75				
Mozambique.....	580	1	400					2	100	4	80
Nigeria.....	865	1	250			2	175	4	200	12	240
Rhodesia and Nyasaland.....	725	1	500			1	125	2	100		
Sierra Leone.....	705	1	400			1	75	3	150	4	80
Somalia.....	1,280							10	400	44	880
Tanganyika.....	400	1	400								
Tunisia.....	520	1	150	1	150			2	100	6	120
Uganda.....	475	1	400			1	75				
Union of South Africa.....	1,080	2	930					3	150		
Total.....	13,115	18	7,645	2	400	13	1,050	40	1,900	106	2,120

AMERICAN REPUBLIC, BY COUNTRY

Argentina.....	\$600	1	\$600								
Bolivia.....	535	1	400			1	\$75			3	\$60
Brazil.....	100					2	100				
Chile.....	700	1	700								
Colombia.....	125					2	125				
Costa Rica.....	250			1	\$250						
Dominican Republic.....	300	1	300								
Ecuador.....	335	1	200			2	135				
El Salvador.....	550	1	350	1	200						
Guatemala.....	600	1	600								
Haiti.....	200									10	200
Honduras.....	80									4	80
Mexico.....	3,500	1	3,000	1	400	1	100				
Panama.....	50					1	50				
Paraguay.....	60									3	60
Venezuela.....	1,300	1	1,300								
Uruguay.....	1,000	1	1,000								
Total.....	10,285	10	8,450	3	850	9	585			20	400

EUROPEAN AREAS, BY COUNTRY

Algeria.....	\$750	1	\$700					1	\$50		
Austria.....	50					1	\$50	1	50		
Bahamas.....	150	1	150								
Bermuda.....	50					1	50				
Canada.....	650	2	500			3	150				
Denmark.....	100							2	100		
Finland.....	1,050	1	1,000			1	50				
France.....	575	2	500			1	75				
Germany.....	225					3	225				
Ireland.....	575	1	500			1	75				
Italy.....	625	1	400			3	225				
Poland.....	2,625	1	2,200	1	\$425						
Portugal.....	350			1	350						
Spain.....	700			1	700						
Switzerland.....	675	1	600			1	75				
United Kingdom.....	75					1	75				
Yugoslavia.....	75					1	75				
Total.....	9,300	11	6,550	3	1,475	17	1,125	3	150		

FAR EASTERN AREA, BY COUNTRY

Australia.....	\$660	1	\$200					2	\$100	18	\$360
Burma.....	290	1	150							12	240
Cambodia.....	950	1	300	1	\$250			2	100	15	300
Japan.....	450	1	300			1	\$50	2	100		
Korea.....	480							4	200	14	280
Laos.....	905	1	275					3	150	24	480
Malaya.....	800	1	500							15	300
New Zealand.....	50							1	50		
Philippines.....	975	2	475							25	500
Taiwan.....	870	1	870								
Thailand.....	1,230	1	930							15	300
Vietnam.....	1,200	1	1,200								
Total.....	8,860	11	5,100	1	250	1	50	14	700	138	2,760

* Warehouse and garage.

† Warehouse, communications building.

The district engineer's report of November 3, 1955, recommends the construction of an earth-fill dam, 175 feet in height, which would create reservoir storage for about 8,000 acre-feet of water. Actual construction costs are estimated to be \$6,052,000, of which the Federal Government will pay \$3,843,000, and the city of Salt Lake will pay \$2,209,000. In

addition to paying 36.5 percent of construction costs, the city will pay \$341,000 for all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, including the relocation of highways and other utilities. The city has also agreed to maintain and operate the completed project at a cost currently estimated to be \$24,000 annually, in accordance with rules and regulations provided by the Secretary of the Army. The project represents a constructive Federal-local partnership effort.

The dam and reservoir will have many salutary benefits. It will greatly alleviate flood problems from Parleys Canyon to the Jordan River in the vicinity of 13th South Street resulting from floods on Parleys, Emigration, and Red Butte Creeks. About 30 percent of the reservoir capacity will be reserved for flood control. Moreover, by capturing the water in the mountains, the flow to the Jordan River and Surplus Canal will be diminished during floods, thus lessening the flood threat along the valley streams. The existing Mountain Dell Dam is solely operated for water storage. Because of its construction, it cannot control floods since there is no overflow spillway and the water pours over the top of the dam.

The Little Dell project will also add greatly to water storage for municipal purposes. At the present time, the Mountain Dell Reservoir with its 3,000 acre-feet capacity is grossly inadequate to meet storage needs. It is estimated that an average of 13,000 acre-feet of water is lost each year. However, the 8,000 acre-feet capacity Little Dell Reservoir will cut these water losses sharply.

A public hearing on the proposed project was held in Salt Lake City in the summer of 1956. Agreement has now been reached, and I ask unanimous consent that a resolution from the Salt Lake City Commission together with the transmitting letter approving the project be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

Some formal administrative processing will still be required, but I am anxious to have this important project before Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and letter will be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

The bill (S. 1045) to authorize construction of the Little Dell Dam and Reservoir project at Salt Lake City, Utah, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter and resolution presented by Mr. BENNETT are as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY CORP.,
Salt Lake City, Utah, August 29, 1958.
Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are enclosing a letter from Roy W. McLeese, Salt Lake City engineer, together with a resolution setting forth the city's proposal for the construction of the earth dam in the Little Dell Fork, Parley's Canyon, Utah.

Both the letter and the resolution were duly approved by the board of commissioners in regular session held August 26, 1958.

The city commissioners are most appreciative of your interest and effective work to assist in the construction of this valuable dam, and are highly pleased that you have offered to continue your efforts in this direction.

Sincerely,

HERMAN J. HOGENSEN,
City Recorder.

RESOLUTION

Whereas a public hearing was held in Salt Lake City on August 14, 1956, by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, relative to a proposed Federal dam and reservoir on Parleys Creek for the control of floods and for domestic water supply; and

Whereas at said time certain estimated costs and distribution of benefits and expenses were arrived at; and

Whereas on the 10th day of October 1956 the Salt Lake City Commission by resolution agreed to participate in the construction of said dam and reservoir and agreed to bear their portion of the cost of said project; and

Whereas additional studies and further consideration have been made as to said project and that a meeting was held with the city officials and the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, on the 23d day of July 1958, at which time new and final figures were arrived at as to the cost and expense of said project; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, has requested that the Board of Commissioners of Salt Lake City agree to participate in the construction of said dam and reservoir on the following basis, to wit:

(a) Furnish without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, including in this provision the undertaking of all necessary alterations and constructions of highway facilities and other utilities, all at a cost currently estimated at \$341,000;

(b) Reimburse the United States for 36.5 percent of the Federal first cost of the project, said percentage currently estimated at \$2,209,000, such reimbursement, if possible, to be in uniform annual payments over a 50-year period covering both principal and interest at Federal rates on the unpaid balance; and

(c) Maintain and operate the completed project at their own expense, at a cost currently estimated at \$24,000 per year; such operation to be in accordance with rules and regulations to be provided by the Secretary of the Army; and

Whereas Salt Lake City is in urgent need of flood control and additional water supply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Commissioners of Salt Lake City strongly support authorization and early construction of the Little Dell Dam and Reservoir for flood control and water supply, as proposed by the Corps of Engineers; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of commissioners hereby furnish the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, the requested assurances to the effect it will enter into a contract with the Federal Government for its fair and equitable share of the project as above outlined and for the maintenance and operation of the project by Salt Lake City, such contract to provide, preferably, for uniform annual payments by Salt Lake City to the Government, over a 50-year period, covering both the principal and interest at Federal rates on the unpaid balance.

This resolution to supersede and take the place of the resolution heretofore passed by the Salt Lake City Board of Commissioners on the 10th day of October 1956.

Dated this 26th day of August 1958.

AMENDMENTS OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MORSE, CLARK, McNAMARA, MURRAY, RANDOLPH, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to bring about long-delayed and much-needed improvements in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, popularly known as the wage-hour law. Our bill proposes two basic improvements in the present wage-hour law:

First. It raises the Federal minimum wage from the present figure of \$1 an hour to \$1.25 an hour.

Second. It extends the coverage of the law to approximately 7½ million additional workers.

In 1938, when the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed, Congress pledged itself "to correct and as rapidly as possible to eliminate all of the conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers." Mr. President, it is time to redeem that pledge, to eliminate the conditions deplored by the 75th Congress, and to assure our workers of the minimum standard of living to which they are entitled.

In 1938, when the 25-cent minimum was established, the average earnings in American industry were less than 63 cents per hour. The difference between the minimum and the average was therefore 38 cents. Today the minimum is \$1 and the average is \$2.19, or a gap of \$1.19 per hour.

To put it another way, in 1949 the minimum wage was raised to 75 cents. Since then average industry earnings—including the lowest paid group—have risen 77 cents an hour. The higher paid, better organized workers have averaged increases of more than 85 cents an hour in wages alone. They have, in addition, received numerous fringe benefits which would increase this figure to over \$1 an hour. Yet during these same 9 years the minimum wage has advanced only 25 cents.

Accompanying the advance of the general level of wages, there has been a considerable increase in the cost of living. Thus, since July 1955, when the \$1 minimum wage was adopted by Congress, there has been a 9-point increase in the Consumer Price Index. This has yielded an automatic 18-cent-per-hour wage increase to workers covered by escalator clauses. In addition, during this same span there have been four annual improvement factor or productivity increases averaging about 26 cents an hour in all. This is a total of 44 cents an hour entirely apart from any basic change in rates negotiated at the termination of contracts. Certainly the lowest paid, largely unorganized workers are entitled to some relief.

Otherwise, we face the creation of a depressed class within our own society—a class of workers who, though they are employed, are condemned to a way of life that falls further and further behind the standards enjoyed by American workers as a whole and behind the price

of the food they must buy and the clothing they must wear.

Many studies have been made of the minimum subsistence requirements of families and of individual workers. If the Department of Labor study made in 1951, 8 years ago, is adjusted for subsequent increases in the cost of living, it reveals that a family of four requires an income of \$2.25 an hour to maintain a decent minimum standard of living today. The increase to \$1.25 per hour contemplated by the proposed legislation is a modest recognition of this fact.

Turning now to the second objective—the extension of coverage—we find that the amendments to the law which were adopted in 1949 have actually reduced the proportion of workers now covered to less than the proportion that were covered in 1938, when the law was passed. These are the workers in large retail stores, in wholesale establishments, in the construction industry, in service industries, and a score of other smaller categories.

Although the present bill does not include farm labor, I believe we all recognize that there is a pressing need for the extension of wage-hour protection to those who are employed in huge agricultural enterprises. There are many such enterprises which may accurately be termed "factories in the field." However, the farm labor problem presents so many special complexities that it is not included in this bill but is the subject of separate legislative proposals. I believe, however, that the hearings upon this bill should include a consideration of the treatment of our farm workers and the extent to which fair labor standards should be applied to them.

I have shown the need for this bill in facts and figures. But that is not its only justification. When we permit the growth of a depressed class, numbering millions, whose members cannot afford the bare necessities of life, we pay a heavy price. We undermine the general prosperity of the Nation which rests upon consumer purchasing power. We promote the spread of slums, of crime, of disease, of all the ills that grow from hopeless poverty. We weaken our moral position as the proud symbol of the blessings of democracy and as the leader of the free world. It has been said that the test of our belief in human dignity is the manner in which we treat those at the bottom of the economic ladder. The 75th Congress recognized that fact in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; the 86th Congress can bring reality to the promise of nearly a generation ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the end of my remarks the section-by-section analysis of the bill which I have prepared, together with a joint statement by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], Representative ROOSEVELT, and myself, dealing with this subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section analysis of the bill and the joint statement will be printed in the Record at this point.

The bill (S. 1046) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as

amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to \$1.25 an hour, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The section-by-section analysis and joint statement presented by Mr. KENNEDY are as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1959

The proposed Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1959 is a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, and to increase the minimum wage for employees under the act to \$1.25 an hour.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This section contains the title of the bill, "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1959."

SECTION 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 2 amends section 2 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "act") by adding to this section a new subsection (b) containing an additional congressional finding setting forth the need, in retail trade and service and other industries engaged in interstate commerce, of eliminating labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers. The present subsection (b) of section 2 of the act would be relettered as subsection (c).

SECTION 3. DEFINITIONS

Section 3 amends two of the definitions presently included in section 3 of the act and adds to this section of the act definitions of a number of new terms used in the bill.

Subsection (a) amends paragraph (j) of section 3, defining the term "produced." Under the present language of this paragraph, which was adopted in the 1949 amendments to the act, employees are deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if, among other things, they are employed in "any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production" of goods. Under the proposed amendment employees would be deemed to be engaged in the production of goods if they are employed in "any process or occupation necessary to the production" of goods.

Subsection (b) amends paragraph (m) of section 3 of the act, defining the term "wage," by adding to this definition standards to enable the Secretary of Labor to determine the fair value of board, lodging, or other facilities customarily furnished by an employer to his employees. Such determinations could be for defined classes of employees and in defined areas and could be based on the average value to the employer or groups of employers similarly situated of furnishing to employees the facilities in question or the average value of such facilities to groups of employees, or on other appropriate measures of fair value. It is specified that such evaluations, where applicable and pertinent, shall be used in lieu of actual measure of cost in determining the wage paid to any employee for purposes of the act.

Subsection (c) adds eight new definitions to section 3 of the act:

A new paragraph (p) would define "American vessel," as used in the act, as including any vessel which is defined as a "vessel of the United States" in title 18, United States Code, section 9, or which is documented or numbered under the laws of the United States;

Paragraph (q) specifies that "Secretary," as used in the act, means the Secretary of Labor of the U.S. Department of Labor;

Paragraph (r) defines the term "enterprise." This term is used in connection with extension of the minimum wage, overtime, and child labor provisions to seven types of large enterprises on an employer basis, as set forth in the discussion of the proposed new paragraph (w) below. The term is defined as meaning related activities performed either directly or through unified operation or common control or otherwise, for a common business purpose of providing goods or services, or the products thereof, or a combination of them, to others, and includes all such activities, whether performed in one or more establishments or by one or more corporate or other organizational units. Under this definition, the activities of the seven specified types of enterprises as employers of employees under the act are to be viewed as a whole in determining whether any such enterprise is engaged in activities which bring its employees within the scope of the act;

Paragraphs (s) and (t) define the terms "activity affecting commerce" and "employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce." Under these definitions, an employee who is not technically engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce will nevertheless be covered if (1) he is employed by any one of seven types of enterprises defined in paragraph (t) and (2) such enterprise is engaged in an activity affecting interstate commerce, as defined in paragraph (s). Paragraph (s) defines the term "activity affecting commerce" as including any activity in commerce, necessary to commerce, or competing with any activity in commerce, or where the payment of wages at rates below those prescribed by the act, or the employment of oppressive child labor prohibited by the act, burdens or obstructs or tends to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce. This definition is substantially the same as and is intended to provide coverage substantially similar to that provided under "affecting commerce" definitions used in the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended. Paragraph (t), which defines the term "employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce" specifies seven types of establishments to whose employees coverage under the act would be extended by the bill. Under this paragraph coverage is extended on an enterprise basis if the employer is engaged in an activity affecting commerce. This contrasts with the present tests of coverage which are on an employee basis and provide coverage only if the individual employee is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

The term "employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce" includes seven types of large enterprises whose sales exceed certain specified amounts based for the most part on current jurisdictional standards being applied by the National Labor Relations Board in determining whether assertion of Board jurisdiction in specific cases would serve the purpose of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. The employees of such enterprises will be covered if the employer is engaged in an activity affecting commerce. These seven types of large enterprises are as follows:

(1) Any enterprise where the employer has one or more retail establishments if the annual gross sales of such enterprise as a whole

are not less than \$500,000 or if the sales of such enterprise for resale or to customers engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business amount to at least \$50,000 annually;

(2) Any enterprise where the employer has one or more service establishments if the annual gross sales of such enterprise as a whole are not less than \$500,000 or if the sales of such enterprise to customers engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business amount to at least \$50,000 annually;

(3) Any enterprise where the employer has one or more establishments engaged in laundering, cleaning or repairing clothes or fabrics, if the annual gross sales of such enterprise as a whole are not less than \$250,000, or if the sales of such enterprise to customers engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business amount to at least 15 percent of the gross sales of the enterprise;

(4) Any enterprise where the employer is engaged in the business of operating a street, suburban, or interurban transit system;

(5) Any enterprise where the employer is engaged in the business of operating taxis if the annual gross business of such enterprise as a whole is not less than \$500,000.

(6) Any enterprise where the employer is engaged in the building and construction industry if the annual gross business of such enterprise as a whole is not less than \$50,000;

(7) Any enterprise where the employer has one or more employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce if the annual gross business of such enterprise as a whole is not less than \$50,000.

A proviso at the end of paragraph (w) specifies that so-called "mom and pop" shops are not to be covered. The term "employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce" specifically excludes any retail or service enterprise in which the only employees are the owner of such enterprise and a parent, spouse or child of such owner.

SECTION 4. SPECIAL INDUSTRY COMMITTEES FOR PUERTO RICO AND VIRGIN ISLANDS

This section makes changes in section 5 of the act, relating to the appointment of industry committees to recommend the minimum rates of wages to be paid under section 6 to employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, so as to give such committees jurisdiction over employees employed by any employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce, as well as over employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. Under the terms of subsection (c) of section 6 of the act, the same procedures which are applicable to the appointment of industry committees and the issuance of minimum wage orders for employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are applicable to employees in American Samoa.

SECTION 5. MINIMUM WAGES

Subsection (a) amends subsection (a) of section 6 of the act to make the minimum wage provisions apply not only to every employee engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce but also to every employee of every employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce, as defined in paragraph (w) of section 3 of the act, as amended. Certain exemptions continue to be provided for in section 13 of the act, as amended, but heretofore exempt employees will be entitled to be paid in accordance with section 6 of the act, as amended, if they are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce unless such employees are specifically exempt from the application of such section under the provisions of subsections (a), (d), or (f) of section 13 of such act, as amended.

Subsection (b) amends paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 of the act by rais-

ing the minimum wage under the act from \$1.00 to \$1.25 an hour.

Subsection (c) amends subsection (c) of section 6 of the act, applicable to the issuance of wage orders for employees in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and American Samoa, so that wage orders may be issued not only with respect to any such employees who are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce but also with respect to any such employees who are employed by an employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce. A proviso is included in this section which specifies that the minimum wage rates applicable to any employee covered by a wage order heretofore in effect for employees in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands or American Samoa shall be increased by the same number of cents per hour as the minimum wage prescribed in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 is increased by the bill. Such minimum wage rate or rates, if less than the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) as amended, are to be in effect only for so long as and insofar as such minimum wage rate or rates are not superseded by a subsequent wage order issued in accordance with sections 5 and 8, as amended, fixing a higher minimum wage rate or rates, not in excess of the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of subsection (a).

SECTION 6. MAXIMUM HOURS

Subsection (a) amends subsection (a) of section 7 to make the maximum hours provisions of the act apply not only to non-exempt employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce but also to nonexempt employees employed by any employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce. Certain exemptions continue to be provided for in section 13 of the act, as amended, but heretofore exempt employees will be entitled to be paid in accordance with section 7 of the act if they are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce unless such employees are specifically exempt from the application of such section under the provision of subsections (a), (b), (d) or (f) of section 13 of the act, as amended.

Subsection (b) amends subsection (b) of section 7 of the act by striking from this subsection the so-called "seasonal industry" exemption contained in clause 3 of this subsection.

Subsection (c) amends section 7 by striking out the maximum hours exemptions applicable to employees engaged in certain specified agricultural handling and processing occupations contained in subsection (c) of such section.

SECTION 7. WAGE ORDERS IN PUERTO RICO AND VIRGIN ISLANDS

This section amends section 8 of the act so that wage orders issued under the act with respect to employees in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa shall apply not only to employees in such islands who are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce but also to any such employees who are employed by an employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce.

SECTION 8. CHILD LABOR PROVISIONS

This section amends subsection (c) of section 12 of the act by providing that the child labor provisions shall not only apply to employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce but also to employers engaged in activity affecting commerce. Certain exemptions continue to be provided for in section 13 of the act, as amended, but child labor which has heretofore been permitted will be prohibited under section 12, if the employer is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce unless such child labor is specifically exempt from such section under the

provisions of subsection (c), (d), or (f), of section 13 of such act, as amended.

SECTION 9. EXEMPTIONS

Subsections (a) and (b) of this section rewrite and make the following changes in subsections (a) and (b) of section 13 of the act:

(a) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions for employees employed in a local retailing capacity presently contained in clause (1) of subsection (a) have been eliminated. The present exemptions for executive, administrative, and professional employees and for outside salesmen, however, are retained;

(b) Clauses (2) and (3) containing minimum wage and overtime exemptions applicable to employees of retail, service, and laundry, cleaning and repairing enterprises have been eliminated. The new coverage provisions specify the types of retail service and laundry, cleaning, and repairing enterprises that would be covered by the bill;

(c) Clause 5 has been amended to eliminate the present minimum wage and overtime exemptions for employees engaged in packing or other processing of fish or seafood products. Fishing and other occupations which precede packing and processing of such products would, however, continue to be exempt;

(d) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions for employees of weekly, semi-weekly and daily newspapers contained in clause 8 have been eliminated;

(e) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions for employees of street, suburban and interurban transit systems contained in clause 9 have been eliminated. The new coverage provisions specify the types of enterprises engaged in the business of operating any such system that would be covered by the bill;

(f) Although overtime exemptions for employees engaged in certain agricultural processing occupations have been eliminated, as explained in the discussion of section 6 of the bill, supra, existing exemptions from the minimum wage and overtime provisions applicable to specified agricultural processing operations in the area of production contained in clause 10 have been retained;

(g) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions applicable to certain telephone switchboard operators under clause 11 have been amended to apply only where the operator is providing telephone service through a telephone switchboard located in the operator's home;

(h) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions for employees of employers engaged in the business of operating taxicabs contained in clause 12 have been eliminated. The new coverage provisions specify the types of enterprises engaged in the business of operating taxis that would be covered by the bill;

(i) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions applicable under clause 14 to employees employed as seamen have been amended to apply only to seamen employed on vessels other than American vessels. A new subsection (g) is added to section 13 of the act, specifying the manner in which the minimum wage and overtime provisions are to be applicable to employees employed as seamen on American vessels;

(j) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions applicable under clause 15 to employees of sawmills employing 12 or fewer employees have been eliminated;

(k) The overtime exemptions applicable to pipeline and trucking employees under clause 1 of subsection (b) of section 13 have been eliminated;

(l) The overtime exemptions applicable to canning of fish or seafood products under clause (4) of subsection (b) of section 13 have been eliminated;

(m) Employees in American Samoa subject to the provisions of subsection (e) of

section 13 would be exempt from the overtime provisions under a new clause 3 of subsection (b) of section 13, as amended.

The bill continues the present minimum wage and overtime exemptions applicable to retail establishments that make or process the goods which they sell and to contract telegraph agencies maintained in exempt retail of service establishments where the telegraph message revenue of the agency does not exceed \$500 a month. It also retains the minimum wage and overtime exemption for employees employed in agriculture or in connection with nonprofit ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways used for supplying or storing water for agricultural purposes. Similarly, the minimum wage and overtime exemptions for employees covered by subminimum wage rates fixed by the Secretary under section 14 of the act for learners, apprentices, and handicapped workers is retained. Presumably the Secretary would proceed promptly to review these subminimum rates upon enactment of the higher minimum wage rate provided for in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 of the act, as amended.

The various clauses of subsections (a), and (b) have been renumbered to take account of clauses which would be repealed.

Subsection (c) of section 9 amends subsection (c) of section 13 of the act to make clear that the exemption from the child labor provisions applicable to children employed in agriculture is restricted to children employed in agricultural work which is exempt under clause 4 of subsection (a) of section 13, as amended. This exemption would apply only to children employed outside of school hours for the school district where such children are living while so employed.

Subsection (d) adds to subsection (d) of section 13 of the act a new proviso specifying that the child labor provisions shall not apply to any newspaper delivery employee, other than newsboys engaged in residential delivery of newspapers, if such employee is employed outside of school hours for the school district where the employee is living while he is so employed and the employee is 16 years of age or over.

Subsection (e) adds to section 13 of the act a new subsection (g) which provides that for purposes of the application of the minimum wage and overtime provisions to seamen employed on American vessels, such employees are to be paid not less than the rate which will provide to the employee, for the period covered by the wage payment, wages equal to compensation at the prescribed minimum wage rate or overtime rate, or both, as may be appropriate, for all hours during such period when the employee was actually on duty. This period, however, is not to include off-duty hours within such period which are provided pursuant to the employment agreement applicable to such employee or to periods aboard ship when the employee was not, at the direction of a superior officer, either performing other work or standing by.

SECTION 10. PROHIBITED ACTS: PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE

This section adds to section 15 of the act a new subsection (c) providing that the provisions of subsection (a) of this section declaring certain violations of the act and other actions of an employer to be unlawful when engaged in by such employer with respect to any employee engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce shall be applicable to every employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce with respect to any employee of an enterprise where the employer is so engaged.

SECTION 11. EFFECTIVE DATE

This section specifies that the act shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment.

JOINT STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY, SENATOR MORSE, AND REPRESENTATIVE ROOSEVELT, UPON INTRODUCTION OF MINIMUM WAGE BILL, FEBRUARY 16, 1959

These amendments will correct in part one of the most shocking but least publicized economic and moral crises facing America today—the fact that millions of hard-working citizens cannot earn enough, no matter how many hours they toil, to maintain themselves and their families at a higher level than bare subsistence.

The present \$1 minimum wage is even less adequate in 1959 than the original 25 cents minimum was in 1938. Contrary to the expressed intention of Congress 21 years ago, the lowest paid workers have fallen farther and farther behind the average wage earner. Moreover, a smaller proportion of our Nation's work force has wage-hour protection today than had such protection in 1938.

The failure of our national economy to rally as quickly as predicted from last year's slump can be traced directly to a lack of consumer buying power among the lowest paid workers. If a third of the employed wage earners are hard put to meet the cost of food and shelter, they cannot buy enough automobiles, appliances, or houses to put America back on its feet.

It is bad enough that we have fallen behind the Soviet Union in the science of rocketry and ballistic missiles. If we also fall in our economy—if millions of Americans cannot achieve freedom from fear or freedom from want—the impact on world opinion will be greater than a Soviet Union expedition to the moon.

Experience after 1949, when the minimum wage was nearly doubled, and after 1955, when it rose by one-third, proved beyond a doubt that higher earnings for the lowest paid are not reflected in higher prices. We need only cite the studies made in each case by the Department of Labor.

In order to eliminate any misunderstanding about the application of the bill to the so-called ma and pa enterprises, it explicitly exempts all businesses in which the owner and members of his immediate family do the work. The exemption is clear and categorical. We hope it will put an end, once and for all, to this baseless argument against a fair law.

EXTENSION OF WAR ORPHANS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act to cover those presently serving in the Armed Forces and the orphans they may unfortunately leave.

We have heard much in recent days of a tragic flight by a U.S. Air Force plane over a small corner of the Soviet Union, the coldblooded destruction of this unarmed plane, and the probable death of all its occupants. We have heard much of the implications of this incident on our foreign policy, on what Khrushchev thinks, on what Mikoyan thinks, on how and what we heard on radio monitors, on all the pros and cons of our intelligence efforts, airplane flight routes, false radio signals, and other details.

One fact remains; perhaps 17 airmen doing their duty for their country were killed by what we may consider, in this situation at least, a hostile aggressor, using the weapons of warfare. Our airmen have paid the price of thousands of our heroes, and we have paid them all due honor and respect. But that honor

and respect does not discharge the Nation's full obligation to these heroes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the names of the crew list of the plane which was gunned down. Two members of the crew were from my own State.

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

Capt. Paul E. Duncan, Bedford, England.
First Lt. John E. Simpson, Austin, Tex.
Capt. Rudy J. Swiestra, Compton, Calif.
First Lt. Ricardo M. Vallarreal, Laredo, Tex.

Capt. Edward J. Jeruss, Rhein-Main Airbase, Germany.

T. Sgt. Laroy Price, Hodgenville, Ky.
A2c. Archie T. Bourg, Morfelden, Germany.
A2c. James E. Ferguson, Hamlet, Ind.
A2c. Joe H. Fields, Cynthiana, Ky.
A2c. Harold T. Kamps, Coleman, Wis.
A2c. Gerald C. Magglocoma, Everett, Mass.
A2c. Gerald E. Medeiros, New Bedford, Mass.

T. Sgt. Arthur L. Mello, Erie, Pa.
A1c. Robert J. Oshinski, Shamokin, Pa.
A2c. Clement O. Mankis, Point Marion, Pa.
A2c. Robert H. Moore, West Monroe, La.
M. Sgt. George P. Petrochilos, Levittown, Pa.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, let us now look apart from the ceremonials and the words of praise. Let us look at the concrete steps a grateful Government can take to in some small way recompense those beloved by our fallen servants. You may look, but you will not find the recompense. You will not find any compensation to the families of these casualties of the cold war other than a meager social-security annuity and a burial allowance. I submit that this is not even an acceptable measure for legal liability, much less recognition by a humane Government of the supreme sacrifice made in its behalf.

Two of the fliers shot down by the Communists were natives of my home State. But it is not only for the sake of their survivors that I introduce this bill; it is for all the children who may find themselves fatherless because their parents were under our peacetime compulsion to serve in our Armed Forces.

Up to January 1955, if a soldier died in service or from a service-incurred disability, his children, the war orphans, were entitled to assistance for educational purposes, to help complete their education.

This bill I introduce would provide educational assistance for the children of those dying in active military service or by reason of a disability incurred from active military service. We did this before January 31, 1955—surely we are not too niggardly to do it now, since the circumstances are the same.

The bill provides that each eligible child would be entitled to educational assistance for a period not to exceed 36 months, or to the equivalent thereof in part-time training. This assistance would be in the form of a monthly allowance to be paid on the basis of \$110 per month on full-time schooling, \$80 per month on three-quarters time, or \$50 per month on half-time schooling.

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

as a part of my remarks, together with an explanation of the bill showing the amounts to be paid for the education of these children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The bill will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD, together with the explanatory statement.

The bill (S. 1050) to provide educational assistance for the children of service men and women who suffer death from a service-connected disability arising out of active military service during the period beginning on February 1, 1955, and ending on June 30, 1963, 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 section 1701 (a) (1) of title 38 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the Korean conflict, or the period beginning on February 1, 1955, and ending on June 30, 1963,".

(b) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the Korean conflict, or the period beginning on February 1, 1955, and ending on June 30, 1963,".

(c) Section 1712 of such title is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and inserting a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) In the case of any person (1) who becomes eligible for educational assistance under this chapter by virtue of the amendments to such chapter made by the Act which enacted this subsection, and (2) who is above the age of seventeen years and below the age of twenty-three years on the date of enactment of such Act, the period of eligibility prescribed by this section shall not end with respect to such person until five years after the date of enactment of such Act."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This bill provides educational assistance to the children of service men and women who suffer death from a service-connected disability arising out of active military service during the period beginning on February 1, 1955, and ending on June 30, 1963.

Each eligible child would be entitled to educational assistance for a period not in excess of 36 months, or to the equivalent thereof in part-time training. The assistance would be in the form of a monthly allowance to be paid in accordance with the following:

(a) For a person pursuing a program of education consisting of institutional courses, the allowance shall be computed at the rate of (1) \$110 per month if pursued on a full-time basis, (2) \$80 per month if pursued on a three-quarters time basis, and (3) \$50 per month if pursued on a half-time basis.

(b) The allowance to be paid an eligible person who is pursuing a full-time program of education which consists of institutional courses and alternate phases of training in a business or industrial establishment, with the training in the business or industrial establishment being strictly supplemental to the institutional portion, shall be computed at the rate of \$90 per month.

(c) No allowance shall be paid to an eligible person for a period during which he

is enrolled in and pursuing an institutional course on a less than half-time basis, or any course described in (b) above, on less than a full-time basis.

The bill contains a savings clause for children who become eligible for educational assistance by virtue of the enactment of the bill, but who are already of school age at the time of such enactment. The effect of the savings clause is to give these persons a period of 1 year from the date of enactment of the bill within which to commence a program of education or training under the bill. After commencement of education or training, these persons would have an additional 4 years within which to complete their educational training.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to lie on the table for 1 week, so that other Senators who desire may join as cosponsors.

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

AMENDMENT OF APPROPRIATION BILL FOR SERVICE OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1913

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, for nearly half a century it has been a recognized principle of our Federal law that there should be annual disclosures by individuals or corporations with a substantial interest in any newspaper or other publication using the mails. The reason and design for such legislation is quite apparent. It is to enable the public to be apprised of whose voice is speaking in the particular publication. To implement this policy the law has required that a sworn annual return indicating the names of the individuals or corporations holding 1 percent or more of the total stock, bonds, mortgages, or other securities of the periodical using the mails be filed.

It was brought to the attention of the special committee investigating political activities, lobbying, and campaign contributions, working under Senate Resolution 128 of the 85th Congress, that there has been an avoidance of the spirit, if not the letter, of the law under the existing disclosure requirements.

The bill which I am introducing on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is very short and uncomplicated. It makes two changes in the existing law: First, it requires that any holders of a financial interest substantially sufficient to establish control, whether it is a secured interest or not, must file a disclosure. Secondly, it requires the address of the person or corporation filing the return, for surely the name would be of little value without the address.

I think it is evident from the great number of publications and the enormous increase in their respective costs that they are particularly vulnerable to exploitation by those who seek to control through loans or otherwise. I believe the bill which I am about to introduce will be a step in the right direction to remedy the situation through disclosure as I have outlined.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Arkansas, I in-

troduce this bill, for appropriate reference.

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

The bill (S. 1054) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," introduced by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE ACT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the 1959 version of what was known in the forties as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill providing a national health insurance program. I believe that most of my colleagues are aware that this is a measure designed to provide a practical method through which the people of the United States will find it easily possible to meet the currently overwhelming burden of trying to pay for medical care. It is a measure, Mr. President, which is substantially identical in its content to the health insurance title of the bill which I had the pleasure of cosponsoring in the Senate some 14 years ago with our late and greatly esteemed colleague, Senator Bob Wagner, of New York, and the companion bill which was then introduced in the House by the late and respected Congressman Dingell, the father of the brilliant young Member of the House of Representatives who is today introducing a bill identical to mine in the House of Representatives.

I would like to point out to my colleagues, and particularly to the representatives of the press who are present here today, that when we introduced our bill some 14 years ago it was invariably denounced, particularly by the American Medical Association, as—and I quote—"socialized medicine." It is amusing to me—wryly amusing—to notice how even the AMA today encourages the Congress to appropriate funds for some seven going programs, each of which was a part of the early Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. These programs, which they once denounced as socialized medicine and therefore presumably repugnant to our American way of life, now that they have been in actual operation, most of them for over a decade, have not only proved tremendously valuable to the American people and worthy of the continuing support of the Congress but have even won the support of the American Medical Association.

So well accepted are these aid programs, Mr. President, that I suspect that almost no Member of the Congress, and very few representatives of the press, are the least bit conscious of the fact that they were part of the early Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills. I refer, Mr. President, to programs under which we now provide Federal support, first, for the education of health personnel; second, for the support of medical research; third, for the tremendously valuable and

popular hospital survey and construction grant program; fourth, grants for public health aids in rural and other shortage areas; fifth, grants to the States for local health work; sixth, grants for research in child life; and, seventh, grants for maternal and child health and crippled children's services. Each of these programs, now recognized as of tremendous value to the country, was once a part of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell so-called socialized medicine bill.

It is my hope, Mr. President, in introducing that one most important part of the original Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, its health insurance provisions, that my fellow legislators and the American people—and perhaps even the American Medical Association—will realize the absurdity of trying to prevent enactment of this measure by use of the old, worn-out cliché of socialized medicine which was once attached not only to the proposal set forth in the bill I am today introducing but to all of the other programs now in operation which I have mentioned above. Let the record state very clearly that this bill would not socialize medicine. If enacted, the practice of medicine as we know it need not change at all. The only thing that would change would be the ability of those of our people who need medical care to get it without worrying about its cost.

Socialized medicine means just one thing. It means a system of medicine wherein physicians and dentists and other health personnel are all employees of the Government. That is a system which I, myself, do not advocate.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be set forth in the RECORD, following my remarks, a most informative and interesting article written by Dr. Bruce Cardew, general secretary of the Medical Practitioners' Union, in which he sets forth and proves conclusively the fact that, having now lived with Britain's national health system for 10 years, every segment of British society, including its doctors of medicine, wholeheartedly approves of their system, finds that it is working well, and agrees that it is giving the people of Britain access to far more and to far better care than was theirs before the program went into effect. This article, Mr. President, appeared in the January 31 issue of *United Paper*, which is published by the United Paper Makers and Paper Workers, AFL-CIO.

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. 1056) to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The article presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

IN BRITAIN THEY SAY THEIR HEALTH PLAN IS HERE TO STAY

(By Dr. Bruce Cardew)

Last year marked the 10th anniversary of the national health service in our coun-

try. Ten years seems a likely period for fair appraisal.

I should think it would be of particular interest to Americans in view of the volume of adverse reporting about the British health service in the United States press.

While it is far from my province to suggest that a British plan serve as a model for an American one, an exchange of views on the economics of health may prove of value all around. Hence, I appreciate the invitation of *United Paper* to write this article and offer these observations for consideration by trade unionists in the United States.

No one act of the British Labor Government of 1945-50 has been more popular or more widely accepted than the national health service.

Despite the fact its introduction was heralded by the American press in highly critical terms, there is now an overwhelming support for the service among the British people regardless of their political views. No government (conservative, liberal, or labor) would even consider abolishing the service, or indeed, in modifying it seriously in any way.

The various professions, including the doctors and dentists who showed great reluctance to come into the service, are now in it to stay. I would estimate that very few doctors, probably not more than 5 percent, would like to return to the conditions that existed before the service came into being.

Many foreigners, and certainly including many Americans, seem to think that the British national health service is an expensive luxury. These views are refuted by the facts.

In Britain we spend less than 4 percent of our national income on the health service. Comparisons have been made with what other countries spend on health, and certainly the United States of America spends a higher proportion of its national income on providing health for its citizens than does Britain.

Our health service is paid for largely out of general taxation. This means, in effect, that the richer section of the community pays relatively more than does the poorer. Indeed, those who pay no income tax obtain their health service at a very low cost to themselves.

If the cost of the service is averaged out, it comes to about 14 pounds (\$40) per head of the population. This includes all hospital care, all family doctor care, drugs, dressings, surgical appliances, dental care, false teeth and even wigs if they are necessary.

If a woman has a baby, she not only has the complete cost met by the service, but also receives a grant toward the cost of the baby's clothes, and so forth.

If an elderly man or woman lives alone and cannot afford to have anyone look after them or cook their meals, the service provides what we call home helps free of charge to go in and care for the old person.

From this you can see that the British national health service is very comprehensive. It not only covers the citizen against every form of medical disability, but it covers all of us, rich and poor alike. The millionaire is as entitled to benefits as is the rank and file trade unionist. Even visitors to our land obtain the full benefits of the health service providing that their need arose at the time of their visit.

The comprehensive character of the national health service has had certain important consequences, particularly for the trade union movement. In many other countries, notably in the United States of America, one of the most important functions which individual trade unions have had to assume is the provision of medical care for their members. In Great Britain, however, the trade union movement has al-

ways taken the view that this provision is the proper function of the Government and that the burden of providing it should not fall on the trade union movement.

The Trades Union Congress (equivalent to your AFL-CIO) has also maintained that medical benefits should be financed principally out of taxation and not out of direct insurance contributions by the workers.

In 1946 the Labor government then in office, placed the main financial burdens on the taxpayer, thus insuring that those best able to pay would carry the main burden. Recently the Conservative government increased the modest insurance funds contribution to the service from 40 million to 100 million pounds. Even thus, six-sevenths of the total cost falls on taxation.

Now let us look at the British health service in more detail, particularly with regard to various charges in the American press claiming the service has led to regimentation of patients and practitioners.

First, we should deal with the general practitioner service. Every British citizen, whatever his age, has the right to be registered on the list of a family doctor who will be responsible for visiting him when sick and providing him with all the drugs and dressings he needs. Some 98 percent of the population are registered.

The patient can choose any doctor he wishes and, in the event of a disagreement, can change his doctor by giving a fortnight's notice. The doctor, too, can ask for a patient to be removed from his list.

The family doctor is paid a sum each year for looking after the patient, plus his expenses. This system has certain advantages but it does little to insure that the standards of surgery accommodation are uniform throughout the county, with the result that they vary from good to very poor.

One of the tasks ahead is to raise the general standards of domiciliary medical care. This is not purely an administrative matter. The doctors themselves are keen to better their own standards. A few years ago a College of General Practitioners was formed which is doing a great deal of work to this end.

The general practitioner does his best for his patients within the limits of his own knowledge and equipment. When he is in difficulties he refers his patient to the outpatient department of the local hospital where fuller diagnostic procedures are available. Following outpatient hospital diagnosis, the patient may be admitted to the hospital or referred back to his doctor with advice for further treatment.

The family doctor may also use the health and welfare services of the local authorities. These are quite extensive and include, among others, a complete domiciliary nursing service, a midwifery service and a health visiting service. Domestic home helps are also available to enter the home of the patient and care for him during illness.

Special services are also available for the care of old people. Local authorities are empowered to provide all sorts of special services for the aged. Among these are a meals-on-wheels service which takes hot meals around to patients who are sick; a home laundering service; and the organization of old people's clubs.

In Great Britain the care of the old presents a considerable challenge as their number is increasing year by year as a proportion of the population. Whereas in the beginning of the century we had 8 old people for every 100 of the population, we now have 15, and within the next 20 years we should have 20 per 100.

It is important, therefore, that we should develop our old people's medical and social services not only for humane reasons but so as to keep them healthy and usefully at work as long as they want to stay. This requires a high level of good organization.

Although we are gratified with the achievements of the health service, it must not be thought we are in any way complacent. We know well that it has many deficiencies which can only be corrected slowly. The hospital field is one example. In this respect our country is singularly badly placed. As with our railways and factories, our hospitals were built during the last century. In many instances they are 50 years behind those of other countries. Today we inherit a vast number of ancient hospital buildings which need replacement. Since the war we have gone from one economic crisis to another and have never been in a financial position to invest much capital in hospital development. Britain is, therefore, faced with a tremendous problem of hospital rebuilding, and a start is now being made on this. It will, however, take many years before our hospitals are up to date and worthy of our health service.

There is also a great need to house general practitioners in more modern and better equipped premises. This also takes money and can only be done gradually.

Fortunately there is a growing realization in Great Britain that a health service is not only a wealth consuming service, but a wealth producing service as well. It produces wealth in that it keeps people at work and returns them to work more rapidly. Thus, it has a great part to play in the economy of our country.

During the last 10 years I have read many excerpts from articles on the British National Health Service which have appeared in the American press. Most have been critical and many have given a false picture leading Americans to think our service has not been a success. I would say the opposite is the case.

Nearly everyone in the country uses the service and regards it as a blessing. Very few doctors or patients today would prefer the conditions that existed before the service. It has become part of our national life and it is here to stay.

ADMINISTRATION OF LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, ARIZONA AND NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Arizona and Nevada, and for other purposes.

The recreation area surrounding Lake Mead and Lake Mojave, bodies of water formed by Hoover and Davis Dams on the Colorado River, is unsurpassed in scenic grandeur. More than 2½ million visitors are attracted to this area each year.

Since its withdrawal by Executive order in 1930 for reclamation purposes, this 2-million-acre area has been beset by administrative problems of control. It has been administered by the National Park Service under an interbureau agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation.

The underlying purpose of our bill is to provide the area with regulations that would bring about more beneficial use of the tremendous recreational facilities. This great area has a plateau section which includes nearly 100 miles of the Grand Canyon and the canyon's mouth, the 155-mile-long Lake Mead, which is the world's largest manmade body of

water, and Lake Mojave. In addition, there are many points of geological, biological, and archaeological interest.

This bill introduced by my colleague and myself redesignates the boundaries of the national recreation area, eliminating approximately 139,800 acres from the present gross area of 1,951,928 acres. It is recognized that this is a large acreage, but it includes a rugged region, the principal values of which, apart from the storage of water, are those arising from its use by the national recreation area and collateral uses such as mining and grazing.

Our bill will afford full protection to the water-control projects, at the same time facilitating speedier development of the unlimited recreational advantages. Present regulations governing hunting, grazing, and vacation cabin sites will be continued substantially the same as at present.

Recognition is given to the canyon portion of the Hualapai Indian Reservation within the national recreation area. The Arizona tribe has indicated its willingness to have certain of its lands included, allowing the tribe to participate and benefit from establishment of the area.

Our bill seeks to bring into harmonious adjustment the various activities within the recreation area. Also, it will stimulate greater development of the area's recreational potential, in keeping with the proper demands of the growing populations in Nevada, Arizona, and other Western States.

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

The bill (S. 1060) to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz. and Nev., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PREVENTION OF PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES—AMENDMENT OF HATCH ACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 9(b) of the Hatch Political Activities Act of 1939 to eliminate the requirement that the Civil Service Commission impose a minimum penalty of 90 days suspension and loss of one quarter of a year's salary for any violation of the act, regardless of whether it is of a minor or inadvertent nature.

The administration of the Hatch Act over a period of years has clearly demonstrated that this mandatory minimum penalty provision frequently results in an unjust hardship on the Federal employee and a burden on the Government agency which employs him.

The present minimum penalty is unfair to the employee because he must forfeit one-fourth of his annual salary—a large sum if one makes only \$3,600 per year—for any violation, no matter how trivial or involuntary. Reference to a

few cases decided recently or now pending, will illustrate the type of person upon whom this penalty is falling.

Case No. 1: A Federal employee was a candidate for and elected to the position of election clerk, an office which in most States is nonpartisan. Because the position involved long hours and hard work on election days, and was looked upon in the community as a civic duty, the employee had no opposition and had held the position in several elections prior to becoming a Federal employee. For this infraction the employee had to forfeit one-fourth of his yearly pay and suffer a 90-day suspension.

Case 2: A postmaster, since October 2, 1933, authorized his name to appear in a political advertisement published in a local newspaper in July of 1953, endorsing his son as a candidate for the nomination for county attorney. Prior to the primary he helped string a political campaign poster announcing his son's candidacy from a second floor porch of the building which houses the post office to a point on the opposite side of the street. Penalty: 90 days' suspension; loss of 3 months' pay.

Case 3: A Federal employee announced his candidacy for the office of justice of the peace and was elected to the post. After the election, it was brought to his attention that such activity was a violation of the Hatch Act, and he withdrew and never assumed office. Penalty: 90 days' suspension; one-fourth year's pay.

Case 4: A Federal employee of long standing was elected without opposition in 1947 to the office of township school director, and reelected twice in 1951 and 1957 by write-in votes. He was advised after the 1957 election that that activity might constitute a violation of the act and withdrew. Penalty proposed: 90 days' suspension without pay.

Case 5: A postal employee since October 1946 was a member of a reception committee in 1956 to welcome a former President of the United States as a principal speaker at a political rally held on October 29, 1956. Case pending.

The General Counsel of the Civil Service Commission recommended the removal of this mandatory minimum penalty provision in a letter to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service dated January 30, 1959, and he stressed the fact that the "harshness of the penalty may also be a burden upon the employee's agency when that agency is denied the employee's services for a 90-day period due to a minor violation."

This same amendment to the Hatch Act was recommended in a report dated December 31, 1958, of the Special Committee To Investigate and Study the Operation and Enforcement of the Hatch Political Activities Act.

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

The bill (S. 1061) to amend section 9(b) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities" (the Hatch Political Activities Act) to eliminate the requirement that the Civil Service Commission impose no penalty less than 90 days' suspension for any

violation of section 9 of the act, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT, RELATING TO MERGERS AND CONSOLIDATIONS OF BANKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill on the subject of bank mergers. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill, prepared by me, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1062) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. CAPEHART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

I have introduced a bill to authorize the national banking agencies to regulate bank mergers on the basis of uniform standards involving both banking and competitive factors. It would prevent bank mergers which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking.

This bill has been considered by the Senate before. It is the same as S. 3911, 84th Congress, which was the subject of hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in June 1956, and which the committee reported on July 16, 1956, and the Senate passed on July 25, 1956.

The bill is also the same as section 23 of title III of the financial institutions bill, which passed the Senate on March 21, 1957. This provision was included in the bill reported by the committee and it was specifically considered and approved by the Senate.

The Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation supported these proposals in the 84th and 85th Congresses, and the Treasury Department has now recommended the bill again.

Many bank mergers have taken place over the past few years, and others are now under consideration. It is unfortunate that, because final action was not taken on either S. 3911 or the financial institutions bill, the national banking agencies have not had uniform and clear authority to regulate or control, on the basis of both banking and competitive factors, all of these mergers which involved national banks, State member banks, and State nonmember banks insured by FDIC. These bills would have given the agencies such authority.

At the present time the situation with respect to bank mergers is both complicated and confused. There are gaps in the controls exercised by the national banking agencies, and even where the power of approval is given, the standards are not clearly spelled out. Uniform regulation under clear

standards would be helpful to the public, the banking authorities and the banks.

All bank mergers are subject to sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act, but I understand no proceedings have ever been instituted under these sections against a bank merger or consolidation.

Bank mergers by stock acquisition are prohibited by section 7 of the Clayton Act, but, as national banks and members of the Federal Reserve System are prohibited from acquiring stock in other banks, and as this is generally the case under State laws, section 7 means little in the case of bank mergers.

The approval of the Comptroller of the Currency is required for banks (state or National) to merge into a national bank, but no specific standards are set forth in the statute to guide him in his consideration of the application.

No bank insured by FDIC may merge with an uninsured bank without obtaining the permission of FDIC; and no insured bank may merge with another insured bank without obtaining the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, as may be appropriate, if the capital stock or surplus of the resulting merged bank will be less than the aggregate capital stock and surplus of all the merging banks. No specific standards are set forth in the statute to control the consideration of these applications.

The approval of the Federal Reserve Board is required before a State member bank may establish a new branch. The Board is engaged in litigation to determine whether this requirement applies to a case where two banks merged, and wish to continue to operate some or all of the branches formerly operated by the two merging branches, and if so whether competitive factors may be weighed.

The bill I have introduced replaces these complicated provisions by a simple rule. Every bank insured by FDIC would have to get advance approval before it could acquire the assets of another bank by merger, consolidation, or absorption through the purchase of assets and assumption of liabilities. This consent would be obtained from the appropriate banking agency, the Comptroller of the Currency for national banks, the Federal Reserve Board for State member banks and the FDIC for State nonmember banks.

In passing on these applications, the banking agency would consider the banking factors specified in section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act—the financial history and condition of the bank, the adequacy of its capital structure, its future earnings prospects, the general character of its management, the convenience and needs of the community to be served by the bank, and whether or not its corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. In addition, the responsible banking authority would be specifically required to consider whether the effect of the acquisition might be to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly. The banking authority would be required to consult with each of the other banking authorities, in the interests of uniform standards, and it would be authorized to request the opinion of the Attorney General with respect to the application.

My bill differs from the proposal which has been made by the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department. They would subject bank mergers by acquisition of assets to the provisions of the Clayton Act applicable to mergers of ordinary business corporations, where unrestricted competition is the rule. Unrestricted competition, however, has not been the rule in the banking industry, for many years. The approval of a charter for a national bank by the Comptroller, the

admission of a State bank to membership in the Federal Reserve System, and the admission of a State bank to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, are not matters of routine. The financial history and condition of the bank, if already existing, the general character of its management and the convenience and needs of the community to be served must all be considered. And once in business, the bank's activities are carefully regulated by many agencies—the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and, in the case of State banks, the appropriate State bank supervisor. The Government has a vital interest in the Nation's banks as suppliers of funds, as depositories, and as fiscal agents. Commerce, industry, and private citizens have a vital interest in banks as a source of credit needed for development and growth. Depositors have a vital interest in the safety of their deposits.

All these considerations make it impossible to require unrestricted competition in the field of banking, and make it impossible to subject banks to the rules applicable to ordinary industrial and commercial concerns not subject to regulation and not vested with a public interest.

But, while unrestricted competition in the field of banking would be disastrous, I am also convinced that a measure of control, based on uniform standards involving both banking and competitive factors, is necessary. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee, for these reasons, has twice reported, and the Senate has twice passed, legislation which would provide for control over bank mergers, to be exercised by the responsible and informed banking agencies.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over all proposed legislation relating to banking, will be asked to consider this proposal for a third time. I am hopeful that this time constructive legislation on this important issue will be enacted.

REGISTRATION AND PROTECTION OF TRADEMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, and so forth.

This is a matter which has been before the Senate Judiciary Committee. In connection with the bill, I submit, and ask to have printed in the RECORD, a short statement, which I also ask unanimous consent to have appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 1063) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, with respect to proceedings in the Patent Office, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. DIRKSEN was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

I have introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and pro-

tection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, with respect to proceedings in the Patent Office.

The proposal, which has the approval of the trademark committee of the Patent Law Association of Chicago, Ill., amends the act providing for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, etc., by providing that any person paying the prescribed fee may file with the Commissioner a declaration expressing his intent to use in commerce a particular mark.

It requires the declaration to contain a drawing of the mark and a specification of the goods in connection with which it is intended that such mark be used. It further directs the Commissioner, unless there is a registration or pending application for registration of the same mark, to publish in the official Gazette (a) the mark; (b) the specified goods or services; and (c) the name and address of the declarant.

The bill provides that during the 6 months period immediately following the date the Commissioner has published a mark pursuant to the foregoing, no application for the registration of such mark under the preceding provisions of this section on the part of any person, other than the person whose mark was published shall be acted upon by the Commissioner.

It permits more than one person to file a declaration with respect to a certain mark but prohibits the second and each succeeding publication of such mark from taking place until 6 months after the date of the last preceding publication of such mark, and sets the filing fee at \$15.

AREA ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I also introduce, for appropriate reference, the administration bill dealing with area redevelopment and assistance to distressed areas. The legislation proposed by the administration to establish a program of Federal assistance to areas of substantial and persistent unemployment has been transmitted to the Senate by the Secretary of Commerce, with his recommendation for its enactment. I believe it will provide adequate Federal participation in local efforts to achieve the diversified economy necessary for an area to overcome long-standing difficulties.

In connection with this statement, Mr. President, which will be short, I also submit a statement explaining the purpose of the bill, and dealing with the conditions under which this proposed legislation would function. I also send forward the bill itself. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that these statements be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks, and that the bill be appropriately referred, but first lie on the desk for some portion of the current week; and I put on notice Senators who may wish to join in sponsoring this proposed legislation.

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

The bill (S. 1064) to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statements presented by Mr. DIRKSEN are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Legislation proposed by the administration to establish a program of Federal assistance to areas of substantial and persistent unemployment has been transmitted to the Senate by the Secretary of Commerce with his recommendation for enactment.

I believe that this program will provide adequate Federal participation in local efforts to achieve the diversified economy necessary for an area to overcome long-standing difficulties.

As has been stated by the President in seeking such legislation, there is a recognition of a responsibility of the Federal Government to assist these areas which have not shared in periods of prosperity enjoyed by our country generally. Participation by and interest of the troubled areas and of the States in which they are located, however, provides and should continue to provide the main drive toward overcoming their difficulties by use of local resources including human resources.

Specifically, the proposal would authorize Federal loans on a second mortgage basis to help finance development of lands and facilities for industrial usage, the construction of new factory buildings, or the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing buildings for industrial use.

It would authorize grants in the amount of \$1.5 million annually for technical assistance including studies to evaluate the needs and to develop potentialities of areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. An equal amount would also be available to assist efforts to decrease the economic vulnerability of towns predominantly dependent on one industry, small towns which could serve as centers for economic diversification of rural areas of underemployment, and rural low-income areas.

Technical assistance on the use of the labor force in areas designated under the proposal would be provided by the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare would assist in the vocational training or retraining of such labor force.

Authority would be provided to allow areas of chronic labor surplus certain benefits under existing housing programs including priorities for loans for public facilities and other special considerations for industrial developments.

Fostering, promoting, and development of our Nation's industry and commerce are duties we have lodged with the Secretary of Commerce. These duties are closely related to the new program to be undertaken. The Department of Commerce presently has an Office of Area Development engaged in helping these very communities within the limits of general authority of the Department. For these reasons, the proposal would center responsibility for carrying out the proposed program in the Secretary of Commerce.

Under this proposal, with the guidance of the Secretary of Commerce, there would be focused on the problems of these communities the total coordinated capabilities of all Federal agencies which can make contributions to full use of resources of these areas.

I believe that this proposed program, including the program of Federal loans to State and local development companies which was passed by the Congress in the last session, will provide the incentive and assistance necessary to enable these areas of chronic unemployment to work out their problems and share in the general high level of prosperity of our Nation.

With respect to the adequacy of the loan fund of \$50 million to do the job, there are several points that should be made:

First, it should be remembered that this bill is confined to local unemployment areas

of long standing that need redevelopment and assistance. These areas are definitely limited in number and are generally well known. Other bills that purport to deal with vast rural areas of low income which become almost regional in nature require a much greater fund to be adequate to serve the needs of this much greater coverage.

A second point is that the administration bill limits the Federal participation to 35 percent of project costs. This is on the legitimate assumption that sound projects can secure 50 percent of their financing from private sources, banks, or insurance companies. The private loans up to 50 percent would have the security of a first mortgage, whereas the Federal loans up to 35 percent would be in a second position. Finally, the communities and States are asked under the terms of the bill to make a third contribution of 15 percent. Other bills which commit the Federal Government to a position of up to 65 percent obviously require double the funds.

A third point is that the administration bill does not provide loans for machinery and equipment. Loans are extended only for the factory building itself. Machinery and equipment loans in most instances would exceed the amounts necessary for the building. Other bills do commit the Federal Government to make loans for machinery and equipment unnecessarily, since special payment terms can be negotiated with manufacturers of such machinery in most instances.

Finally, it is believed that the \$50 million revolving fund is adequate in the light of the experience which the State of Pennsylvania has had with a law not too dissimilar from the one which the administration here is proposing. When the experience is translated into national terms, the \$50 million fund is certainly adequate to cover the first 7 or 8 years of experience under this act and probably more.

AREA ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION

Purpose: The purpose of legislative proposals in this field is the establishment of a Federal program of assistance—technical and financial—to areas of substantial and persistent unemployment.

Cost: Under the administration bill, authority would be provided for a loan program with up to \$50 million outstanding at any one time. Grant programs of technical assistance, including studies, at the rate of \$3 million per year, would be authorized. Our preliminary estimate is that the program in its first year would involve administrative expenditures of \$1,400,000 insofar as the Department of Commerce, wherein responsibility for the program would be centered, is concerned.

S. 3683 (the Douglas bill of the 85th Cong.) which was disapproved by the President after the last session of Congress, and which presumably will provide the basis for other proposals on this subject, would provide for a \$200 million limit on loans outstanding for industrial and rural redevelopment areas; \$75 million annually for grants for public facilities; \$4.5 million annually for technical assistance; and necessary administrative expenditures.

Based upon our appraisal of the current situation, we are convinced that the amounts requested in the administration bill are adequate to meet current needs. The relative amounts of funds authorized by the two bills are not a true measure of the relative effectiveness of the two proposals. The program is new. It faces a number of problems, such as the effective limitation on the use of Federal funds to further "industry snatching" from one community for the benefit of another. Only experience will demonstrate the funds ultimately needed.

Duration: Neither program has a fixed expiration date.

Conditions imposed on loans: Under the administration program, loans could be on a second mortgage basis and could be for terms of 25 years, and would cover up to 35 percent of the cost of purchase and development of land and facilities including construction or rehabilitation of buildings for industrial use. Interest charged would reflect cost of money to the Government, administrative expenses of the loan program, and a reasonable reserve for probable losses.

Under S. 3683, loans could also be on a second mortgage basis, could be for terms of 40 years, could include machinery and equipment, and would cover up to 65 percent of the cost. The need for these terms has not been shown. Interest rates would be at an artificially low rate—cost of money to the Government plus one-fourth of 1 percent.

It should be noted that the administration proposal would require at least 15 percent of the cost to be provided locally with security therefor to be subordinate to security for Federal loans. Under similar circumstances, S. 3683 would require 10 percent participation by a State or local agency or organization, and 5 percent of the cost would be supplied by nongovernmental sources.

Public facilities: The administration proposal would provide a first priority for loans to these areas for public facilities from the existing \$100 million loan fund of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. S. 3683 would authorize \$75 million annual grants for these facilities. The greater local participation which is envisioned by the administration proposal is a fundamental policy difference in the two proposals. The aim of the administration proposal is to help communities which are helping themselves.

Criteria: Differences in the criteria used for singling out areas entitled to consideration under the loan program and other benefits of the act show clearly another major difference between the bills. The criteria of the administration proposal are tailored for the sharply defined objective of helping those communities suffering from chronic economic difficulty.

Rural and other areas: Rural areas where there exist the largest number and percentage of low-income families, and a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment would be provided a loan program of \$100 million by S. 3683. Such an area would also be eligible for grants for public facilities.

Under the administration bill, all areas of the United States would be the beneficiaries of the fully coordinated cooperation of Federal agencies in promoting the most effective use of local resources, in the establishment of new industries based on local resources, and in the expansion of existing industries. Such cooperation is to be provided through technical advice and consultation and, when necessary, through the conduct of special studies.

Further, these agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, would also focus their services on the difficulties of low-income rural areas for the purpose of developing effective ways to increase their income.

Grants of \$1.5 million annually for technical assistance, including studies, to decrease the economic vulnerability of towns predominantly dependent on one industry, small towns which could serve as centers for economic diversification of rural areas of underemployment, and rural low-income areas by helping them to develop manufacturing, processing, and other activities calculated to diversify and improve their economies would be authorized.

Rural low-income areas which qualify as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment would be eligible for direct loan benefits described below.

Grants for technical assistance: The administration bill would authorize grants of \$1,500,000 annually for technical assistance, including studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth to areas of substantial, persistent unemployment. These grants would be in addition to the grants to rural areas for technical assistance mentioned above.

S. 3683 would authorize a program of technical assistance to be performed by the Government with authority to contract for outside assistance.

Labor and HEW: The Departments of Labor and HEW would provide similar help in the two proposals directed toward better use of human resources and training of the labor force of the areas.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATING AREAS ELIGIBLE FOR LOAN PROGRAM UNDER S. 3683 (85TH CONG.)

INDUSTRIAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

Twelve percent of labor force unemployed during 12-month period preceding application; 9 percent during 15 months of preceding 18 months; or 6 percent during 18 months of preceding 24 months.

Also, if the Commissioner determines that causes of unemployment are not temporary in nature in an area and there has been unemployment of 15 percent during the 6 months preceding, he may designate such an area as eligible.

RURAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

Those rural areas within the United States where there are the largest number and percentages of low-income families and a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment. Considerations shall include: Number of low-income farm families in various rural areas of the United States, the proportion of such low-income families to the total farm families of such an area, the relationship of income levels of the families in such an area to the general levels of income in the United States, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and the availability of manpower in each such area for supplemental employment.

UNDER ADMINISTRATION BILL

(1) Rate of unemployment in the area, excluding that due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 percent and has averaged at least 6 percent for the qualifying time periods specified in (2) below; and

(2) The annual average rate of unemployment in the area has been at least:

(a) Fifty percent above the national average for 4 of the preceding 5 calendar years, or

(b) Seventy-five percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years, or

(c) One hundred percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 3 calendar years; and

(3) Nonagricultural employment in the area has declined, or has shown a smaller increase than in the country as a whole, during the preceding 5 calendar years: *Provided*, That no area shall be excluded by the requirement of this subsection if the annual average rate of unemployment in that area for 3 of the last 4 years exceeds 8 percent.

(b) In the case of labor market areas for which appropriate historical labor force data have not been compiled, the Secretary of Labor shall certify as eligible for designation as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment those areas in which the unemployment rate and duration, based on a survey of available labor force data, generally equal or exceed the rate and duration specified above.

TENTATIVE LIST OF MAJOR AREAS THAT COULD QUALIFY FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE AS AREAS WITH SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT UNDER VARIOUS LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS¹

Proposed administration bill 19 major areas
Indiana: Evansville, South Bend, Terre Haute.

Massachusetts: Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell,² New Bedford.

Michigan: Detroit, Muskegon.

New Jersey: Atlantic City.

New York.

North Carolina: Asheville.

Oregon.

Pennsylvania: Altoona, Erie, Johnstown,

Scranton, Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton.

Rhode Island: Providence.

Tennessee: Knoxville.

Washington.

West Virginia: Charleston.

Wisconsin.

Douglas-Payne Bill (S. 3683, 85th Cong.) 29 major areas

Indiana: Evansville, Terre Haute.

Massachusetts: Fall River, Lawrence,

Lowell, New Bedford.

Michigan: Detroit, Flint,² Grand Rapids,

Lansing,² Muskegon.

New Jersey: Atlantic City.

New York: Utica-Rome.²

North Carolina: Asheville, Durham.

Oregon: Portland.²

Pennsylvania: Altoona, Erie, Johnstown,

Scranton, Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton.

Rhode Island: Providence.

Tennessee: Knoxville, Chattanooga.

Washington: Spokane,² Tacoma.²

West Virginia: Charleston, Huntington-Ashland.

Wisconsin: Kenosha.

¹ This listing is preliminary and tentative, and is based largely on data for September, 1958, as compiled from bimonthly area labor market reports prepared in connection with the Bureau of Employment Security's program for classification of areas according to relative adequacy of labor supply.

² Borderline.

Area Assistance Act of 1959—Minimum estimates of personnel and other expenditures

	1st year				2d through 5th years (annual rate)			
	Man-years		Total	Cost	Man-years		Total	Cost
	Professional	Clerical			Professional	Clerical		
Administration:								
Executive direction.....	8	7	15	\$130,000	8	7	15	\$130,000
Administrative, legal, accounting.....	10	15	25	130,000	20	30	50	260,000
Loan activities.....	15	10	25	160,000	30	20	50	320,000
Economic development and area analysis.....	25	15	40	260,000	50	30	80	520,000
Field operations.....	15	10	25	215,000	50	30	80	700,000
Subtotal.....	73	57	130	895,000	158	117	275	1,930,000

Area Assistance Act of 1959—Minimum estimates of personnel and other expenditures—Con.

	1st year				2d through 5th years (annual rate)			
	Man-years		Total	Cost	Man-years		Total	Cost
	Profes- sional	Cleri- cal			Profes- sional	Cleri- cal		
Administration (continued)								
Expenditures for all purposes other than personal services.....				\$500,000				\$500,000
Total.....				1,395,000				2,430,000
Grants for technical assistance.....				3,000,000				3,000,000
Loans (capital funds). ²								

¹ \$2,000,000 expenditures, \$1,000,000 obligated.² \$50,000,000 area assistance fund available for duration of program.

Executive direction: Directs the overall program, including formulation of program policies; direction of all program and administrative activities of the administration, insuring Federal program coordination through the Area Assistance Advisory Board, and the like.

Administrative, legal, and accounting: Managerial functions, including organizational planning and methods and procedures analyses; administrative servicing; legal services, including a general counsel and staff; and budgetary control and accounting service, including a comptroller and staff.

Loan activities: Process loan applications, make necessary investigations, and carry out accounting and other details involved in the loan program.

Economic development and area analysis: Develop area aids and studies for field staff; studies of industrial location advantages of labor surplus areas, successful community experiences in industrial financing, new technology available from Government research of use to labor surplus area firms, and Federal programs useful in local development.

Field operations: Counsel community and area development groups on such matters as industrial surveys, industrial districts, methods of financing industrial growth, growth industries, how to establish small industries, and similar matters.

All nonpersonal services expenditures: Estimate covers all costs of operation except compensation as such, including lease or rental of office space if required, purchase of furniture and other office equipment and office machines, payment of utility bills, travel and transportation of persons and things, procurement of program equipment of all kinds, printing of publications, etc.

SURVEY TO ASSIST IN PROMOTING PRODUCTION OF CONCENTRATED IRON ORE AND STEEL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators YOUNG, of North Dakota, HUMPHREY, McCARTHY, MANSFIELD, MURRAY, MUNDT, and CASE of South Dakota, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel and for other purposes.

My colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I agree that all interested officials in the State of North Dakota on the State level, as well as the congressional delegation in Washington, have been very much interested in finding ways and means of bringing industry into the State of North Dakota. This

new proposed plan, which will utilize the vast lignite fields of North Dakota, is a major step in bringing industry to the State of North Dakota and greatly strengthen the economy of the entire State, as well as the States of Montana, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

The vast low-grade iron deposits of the Mesabi Range in northern Minnesota, Montana, Wisconsin, and northern Michigan, and the billions upon billions of tons of lignite in the North Dakota, Montana, and South Dakota fields available for surface mining are certain to become of major importance to the future economy of the entire United States and at the same time meet the pressing needs of iron and steel for defense and security purposes and the huge Federal highway program, and other domestic purposes.

The search for an adequate source of suitable carbon for manufacture of glimite explosive which was proposed for use for blasting taconite rock on the iron range led to the conviction that production of char as fuel for the Minnesota, Wisconsin, northern Michigan, and Montana iron mining industries would be feasible only if it was a part of a larger industrial picture. The reduction of aluminum in North Dakota using lignite as a power source had heretofore been competitively unpracticable because of higher transportation costs.

However, this factor will be overcome when industries are located in North Dakota and South Dakota and in the iron range sections of Minnesota, Wisconsin, northern Michigan, and Montana which will provide full loads for hopper railroad cars on both east and west hauls. It is proposed that bauxite be brought from the Caribbean, up the Atlantic Ocean through the St. Lawrence Seaway to the head of the Great Lakes; thence shipped by rail to North Dakota for reduction to aluminum at the fields of low-cost lignite coal.

The back haul could be both lignite char and/or aluminum pigs. The char would be utilized in producing explosives on the iron range, and for the general fuel for the iron-mining industries.

Joint utilization of railroad cars through employment of the same rolling stock (hopper ore cars) for the movement of the combination of fuels and iron and aluminum ores visualizes a complete round trip between North Dakota

and Minnesota iron mines of loaded hopper cars of approximately 1,000 miles and points in the States of Montana, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and northern Michigan.

After unloading the bauxite, the ships then would be reloaded with iron ore for shipment to steel industries at Lake Erie ports, and then reloaded with cargoes of products produced from the Great Lakes area which constitutes 42 percent of manufacturing industry of the United States of America for discharge at south Atlantic U.S. ports and Caribbean ports. After discharge of such cargoes the ships would be in the vicinity of bauxite source in the Caribbean for reloading bauxite for the Great Lakes area.

The fact that there will always be full capacity cargo loads for returning aluminum ore ships to the Caribbean provides payloads in both directions and such cargoes will be immediately available for reloading when such ore ships are available for receiving same, means low rate shipping costs for each of the cargoes.

By establishing standard hopper car trains suitable for transportation of the three commodities, the Mesabi iron ore to the head of the Great Lakes, the transportation of bauxite ores to western North Dakota and South Dakota and transportation of lignite from North Dakota and South Dakota to the Mesabi Range to Montana, and other iron ore fields in Wisconsin and northern Michigan makes possible a vast saving in the rail transportation costs of each of the three commodities.

It is further noted that the Mesabi Range iron ore deposits of low grade will be available for production in our domestic steel industries, and that means that this Nation will have available domestic iron ores in unlimited volumes for 200 years ahead for the security of United States as well as for domestic use.

Also, the production of various chemical products and char fuel from lignite coals, when established in combination with aluminum production, iron and steel industry on the Mesabi Range, will be limited only by the market at the Mesabi for lignite char.

Lignite char has about the same B.t.u. content as bituminous coal, and it is very conceivable that char for fuel at the Mesabi Range can be made available for less cost for the production of kilowatts and heat on the Mesabi than can be realized by the use of bituminous coal.

This bill has been drafted directing the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a survey of national significance in the defense and economy of our country, to determine ways and means of affirming and encouraging the production of concentrated ore for steel and its related products from the sources of ore and lignite fuel from the States of North Dakota, Minnesota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and other areas contiguous to the Great Lakes. Also, to find ways and means of making Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway open the entire year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

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. 1067) to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the production of steels and related products are and will be of vital need to the defense and the economy of our country; and

Whereas there is an abundance of iron ore in the Mesabi Range in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Montana; and

Whereas there are extensive deposits of lignite fuels in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana which are essential for the future recovery and concentration of low-grade iron ores and further direct production of iron and steel in the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Montana and for other purposes relating to the defense and economy of the country; and

Whereas the transportation facilities afforded by the Saint Lawrence Seaway and the Great Lakes, especially if available during the entire year, and the contiguous railways of the area, will promote a tremendous expansion of the facilities for industries aiding the economy and the national defense of this country; and

Whereas coordination of production and transportation facilities must be generated by effective surveys and studies tending to bring groupings of various industries in the coordination of their common problems: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a survey of national significance in the defense and economy of our country to determine ways and means of affirmatively encouraging the production of concentrated iron ore for steel and its related products from the sources of ore and fuel contiguous to the Great Lakes areas, including means of making the Great Lakes and the Saint Lawrence Seaway available for transportation during the entire year. The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization is directed to report the result of such survey to the Congress and to make such report public within ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act.

RECODIFICATION OF CHAPTER 19 OF TITLE 5 OF UNITED STATES CODE ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE"

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to be known as the "Code of Federal Administrative Procedure." This is the same bill that Senator BUTLER and I introduced in the 85th Congress, 2d session, as S. 4094.

This bill would at its effective date, 180 days after its enactment, supersede

the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946. The 1946 act, in the drafting of which the American Bar Association played a major part, was recognized at the time as being, not the final solution of the manifold problems of procedure in administrative legislation and adjudication, and of judicial review of administrative action, but a major step toward solution, which would require reappraisal as its merits and shortcomings became known through experience.

This is one of a number of related bills prepared by the American Bar Association after long and detailed study following the report in 1955 of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the Second Hoover Commission, and its Task Force on Legal Services and Procedure. The present bill is particularly closely related to the Federal Administrative Practice Act, S. 932, 85th Congress, 1st session, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri for himself and for the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, which would among other things set up an independent Office of Federal Administrative Practice and provide new improved measures for the recruitment, appointment and administration of Hearing Commissioners.

It is, I think, universally recognized that the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 has accomplished much, and all for the good. But it is equally clear that there is much still to be done before there can be that degree of public confidence in the fairness and responsibility of administrative action on which effective government in the end depends.

The present bill represents the considered and expert judgment of the American Bar Association, in the light of more than a decade of experience under the 1946 act, as to desirable changes in the text of that act. Since its provisions are so numerous and wide in coverage, I cannot commit myself in advance to support them all in detail. I am, though, convinced that the bill's purpose is vital. The widespread conferring of legislative and judicial functions on administrative agencies, justified though it be, calls for the most careful attention to the procedures by which the administrator is to exercise those functions, by which the parties affected are to be given fair opportunity to know and to make their views known, and by which the courts are to be enabled to exercise that ultimate control on which our system of government is based.

I can think of no more important matter for the earnest consideration of the Congress than the subject matter of this bill.

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

The bill (S. 1070) to recodify, with certain amendments thereto, chapter 19 of title 5 of the United States Code, entitled "Administrative Procedure," introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. BUTLER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COVERAGE OF PHYSICIANS UNDER TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1025) to provide for the coverage of physicians by the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act, introduced by me on February 12, 1959.

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

PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 3, 1959, the names of Senators CANNON, MOSS, BARTLETT, KEATING, HRUSKA, CARLSON, CLARK, CURTIS, ENGLE, BENNETT, MANSFIELD, BIBLE, ALLOTT, MCCARTHY, RANDOLPH, ANDERSON, MURRAY, JORDAN, HART, MCNAMARA, YOUNG of North Dakota, and SALTONSTALL were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 910) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators) on February 3, 1959.

DISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS BY CLERGYMEN AND NEWS REPORTERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 6, 1959, the name of Mr. HUMPHREY was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 965) to provide that clergymen and news reporters shall not be required to disclose confidential communications in Federal courts or before committees of Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEATING on February 6, 1959.

VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT PLANS BY INDIVIDUALS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 9, 1959, the names of Mr. GRUENING, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1009) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to encourage the establishment of voluntary retirement plans by individuals, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators) on February 9, 1959.

NEW METHODS AND RATES OF DEPRECIATION FOR USED PROPERTY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 9, 1959, the names of Mr. GRUENING, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Da-

kota were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1010) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the use of the new methods and rates of depreciation for used property, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators) on February 9, 1959.

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS IN ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 9, 1959, the names of Mr. GRUENING, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1011) to designate judicial precedents which shall be binding in the administration and enforcement of the internal revenue laws, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators) on February 9, 1959.

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

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address delivered by Senator BIBLE before Almas Temple Shrine Club, Washington, D.C., February 13, 1959.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Editorial entitled "Bridges Right Again," published in the Nashua (N.H.) Telegram of February 10, 1959.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Excerpts from statement by him at the All-America City Award celebration, Huntington, W. Va., February 10, 1959.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Resolution of the Guild of the Houston, Tex., Museum of Natural History, dated February 9, 1959.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today from the President of the United States the nominations of Mason Sears, of Massachusetts, and Benjamin Gerig, of Maryland, to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 13th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and some 700 promotions and appointments 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.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BEFORE ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee

of the Committee on the Judiciary tentatively plans to begin hearings on Tuesday, February 24, 1959, on S. 838 and S. 839. S. 838 was introduced by Senator O'MAHONEY and S. 839 was introduced on behalf of myself and Senator HENNING. The primary purpose of these bills is to supplement the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to prohibit automobile manufacturers from engaging in the businesses of financing and insuring automobiles purchased by consumers.

The subcommittee also tentatively plans to begin hearings on Tuesday, March 3, 1959, on S. 716 and S. 1003. S. 716 was introduced by me and S. 1003 by Senator WILEY. The purpose of these bills is to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. I understand that Senator WILEY introduced his bill at the request of the Department of Justice. In his economic message to the Congress on January 20, the President recommended that such authority be enacted into law in order that a more effective enforcement program of the antitrust laws might be carried out by the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, the subcommittee also tentatively plans to begin hearings on S. 11 and S. 138 on March 17, 1959. S. 11 was reintroduced on behalf of myself and 24 cosponsors. S. 138 was introduced by Senator CAPEHART. S. 11 and S. 138, in similar if not identical form, have been the subject matter of considerable hearings by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee during the 84th and 85th Congresses. The purpose of S. 11 is to amend the Clayton Act so as to partially reverse the decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case which was handed down in 1951. Senator CAPEHART's bill, S. 138, would basically enact into law the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, by virtue of this notice, those persons or parties desiring to be heard in support of, or in opposition to, any of these pieces of legislation should make known their desire by contacting me as chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 42, section 2251, United States Code, the Speaker had appointed Mr. THOMAS, of Texas, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on the part of the House, to fill the existing vacancy thereon, vice Mr. KILDAY, of Texas, resigned.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to section 712(a)(2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, Mr. SPENCE, of Kentucky, chairman, had appointed the following members of the Banking and Currency Committee as members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, on the part of the House: Mr. BROWN, of Georgia, Mr. PAT-

MAN, of Texas, Mr. RAINS, of Alabama, Mr. McDONOUGH, of California, and Mr. HESTAND, of California.

FORTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared commemorating the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence be printed in the RECORD following these remarks, and that following the statement there also be printed an editorial from today's New York Times entitled "Enslaved but Not Forgotten."

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

Forty-one years ago the freedom-loving people of Lithuania revolted and threw off the yoke of slavery at Vilna, February 16, 1918.

Two years later, following World War I, a treaty of peace was signed between Lithuania and Russia, July 12, 1920.

There was great rejoicing in Lithuania for the people believed that at last they were free to govern themselves after centuries of Russian aggression and suppression.

Then came recognition as a sovereign and independent state. The United States recognized the Lithuanian Government de jure, July 28, 1922, and to this day continues to recognize the Lithuanian Government as such.

But once again freedom for Lithuania was to be an elusive dream. Despite the conclusion of a peace treaty with that nation, Russia began her insidious aggression against her small neighbor by the usual methods of threats and intimidation. Thus it was in 1940, with the aid of a puppet diet under the thumb of its Soviet neighbor, a made-in-Moscow resolution was passed incorporating Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

It is to the credit of this Nation that the United States refused to recognize this annexation and continues to recognize Lithuania as an independent state with an accredited Minister in Washington with full rights, powers, and privileges.

Recently there was a Soviet visitor to our country—Anastas Mikoyan, Deputy Premier of Soviet Russia. He traveled around our country preaching peace. Upon leaving, he issued a series of statements saying rightly that the people of the United States desired peace. But—he added that it was our President and our State Department which desired to continue the cold war despite all evidence to the contrary.

In his press interviews and on television, Mr. Mikoyan, when asked about the right of the peoples in the satellite countries to free elections to determine their own governments, begged the question or stated they have that right and were exercising it.

Has he and his Government given the people of oppressed Lithuania the right to free elections to determine their own destiny? What is the situation there today? The truth of the matter is that Lithuania is a freedom-loving country—and has been for centuries—but is now occupied by a predatory nation. Ninety-eight percent of the people of Lithuania are non-Communists and are virtual slaves without rights or freedom.

If Soviet Russia, as Mikoyan and others in the hierarchy of Russia so piously proclaim, is an ardent defender of small nations, then I ask, why is she continuing to occupy Lithuania and her neighbors as well as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary whose freedom-loving people

she mowed down in cold blood while this same Mikoyan was in Budapest?

It is on deeds, not words, that the judgment of the free world rests.

Because we hold that nations cannot be held in subjugation forever—because we must hold the lantern of hope aloft that the day of freedom will dawn for these suppressed peoples, I introduced on January 20 a Senate joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating February 16 of each year as Lithuanian Independence Day.

Until the day of liberty dawns, in what I hope is the not too distant future—I feel that such recognition will not only keep the plight of Lithuania before the world but will give encouragement to all Lithuanians to keep the flame of freedom burning in their hearts and to know that their friends of the free world have not forgotten them.

It is my hope that my resolution will convey to them that we will use every moral and legal tool at our command to give her the independence for which she longs—and which she has fought so long to preserve—that she may have her independence in fact as well as in law.

When that happy day dawns, all of us will rejoice.

ENSLAVED BUT NOT FORGOTTEN

Forty-one years ago today the little ancient nation of Lithuania proclaimed her independence of Russia. Her neighbors, Estonia and Latvia, also announced their freedom, Estonia on February 24, 1918, Latvia in November. In 1940 all three were again subjugated by Russian troops and compelled to become Soviet Socialist Republics. They have had, therefore, 22 years of freedom and 19 years of servitude.

Even while Secretary Dulles was recuperating on Saturday from his operation, a previously prepared statement over his signature was going out to the press. In this he pointed out that in 1920 Russia had pledged herself "to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty in the three countries" and that she had made a similar promise in October 1939. He speaks from his sickbed, to us and for us, to "assure the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia that they are not forgotten." At the same time a proclamation from Governor Rockefeller makes this Lithuanian Independence Day and calls on all of us to join in its celebration.

We do not propose to go to war for the liberation of the Baltic States. Nor do the citizens of those states, still resident there or in exile in other lands, argue for the sort of nationalism that existed between the First and Second World Wars. What they do ask for is political, religious, and cultural freedom. They are as aware as the rest of us that such freedom can exist only in a world of freedom.

In the Baltic countries the path to a better future is still dark, but it is not lost and will not be. The day of the overlords will not last forever. The time will come when the three lost little nations will be able to come out and join us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, 41 years ago, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanians broke off all bonds with czarist Russia and established an independent Republic.

It would have been difficult to find another nation more deserving of freedom.

The Lithuanians carved themselves a place of honor in history by setting up a mighty state in the 13th century and maintaining it for 600 years against continuous Teutonic and Slavic attacks.

One hundred and twenty years of ruthless national and religious persecu-

tion imposed by Russia in 1795 did not dampen the spirit of resistance, nor did it suppress the desire to live as free men.

The independence period, 1918 to 1940, proved again that the Lithuanians were worthy of freedom. They developed a strong economy, made great strides in education and culture, and earned respect in the international community.

A coldblooded deal between Stalin and Hitler in 1939 not only plunged the world into a terrible war, but also brought an end to the independence of many peoples. Lithuania was occupied by Red troops in flagrant violation of nonaggression treaties.

But we all share the hope that Lithuania again will be free.

It is symbolic that the Lithuanian Independence Day nearly coincides with the birthday of our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln. He was the one who stood for the freedom of all peoples. It was he who denounced Russia for crushing the revolt in Hungary in 1849.

Let me conclude my brief homage to Lithuania with Abraham Lincoln's words:

No man is good enough to govern another man without that other man's consent * * *. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in all the annals of injustice and oppression, there is none more saddening or heart rending than the history of Lithuania.

For seven centuries, all the forces of evil aggression have combined against this little nation in an attempt to destroy it. Successive invasions by Teutonic knights, Tartars, czarist Russians, Communists, Nazis, and finally Communists again have made of Lithuanian history a series of terrible blood baths, each worse than the one before.

It has been Lithuania's special fate that invasion has invariably been accompanied by deliberate, organized programs of mass murder, extermination, and mass deportation that are unsurpassed and probably unequaled in their cruelty and severity.

All of the extremes of brutality, all of the devices of perverted minds, have been loosed against this little nation in a ceaseless attempt to destroy its national consciousness, its religion, its love of independence and freedom.

Yet, through it all, the Lithuanians have steadfastly maintained a religious faith, a national identity, and a yearning for independence that will surely be ultimately rewarded.

Through the ordeals of seven centuries, the Lithuanians have given constant testimony to the fundamental truth that man has an inborn yearning for freedom which cannot be destroyed or expunged.

This fundamental truth, will in the end spell defeat for Communist tyranny, if we keep faith with our ideals. That is the real meaning of this anniversary.

Forty-one years ago today, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence. Two brief decades of liberty and progress followed to be tragically snuffed out by Communist treachery.

During World War II, the United States pledged, again and again, as a solemn war aim, that the independence of all peoples would be guaranteed.

We proved tragically unequal to the task of translating these guarantees into practical reality. But this failure does not end our moral responsibility to work ceaselessly toward the goal of the four freedoms for all men.

As a Member of the House, I served on the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression which made an intensive study of Communist aggression in Eastern Europe. In the 17 reports of this committee, there is written the complete record of Red infamy, much of the story in direct eyewitness accounts. I wish every American could read these reports.

The Communist world is now engaged in a major campaign to make free men forget the Red atrocities of the past. Through cultural exchanges, good will ambassadors, offers of trade, and soft words, they seek to gain free world acceptance of the status quo in the world today, while they prepare for future aggression.

The passing years have dimmed the memories and stilled the consciences of many in the free world. Wearied of the cold war, anxious to reach accommodation with the Communists, many in important places have begun to urge policies that tacitly accept permanent Red domination of Lithuania and the other enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain.

This anniversary of Lithuanian independence should remind all Americans that we cannot close the door on Lithuania's just claims to independence without betraying our solemn obligations and denying our own heritage.

I do not believe that the United States will ever abandon our moral commitment to eventual freedom for the satellite nations, and I am proud to add my voice to so many others today in pledging that we will keep faith with the forces of freedom everywhere in the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD this morning's New York Times editorial entitled "Enslaved but Not Forgotten."

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

ENSLAVED BUT NOT FORGOTTEN

Forty-one years ago today the little ancient nation of Lithuania proclaimed her independence of Russia. Her neighbors, Estonia and Latvia, also announced their freedom, Estonia on February 24, 1918, Latvia in November. In 1940 all three were again subjugated by Russian troops and compelled to become "Soviet Socialist Republics." They have had, therefore, 22 years of freedom and 19 years of servitude.

Even while Secretary Dulles was recuperating on Saturday from his operation, a previously prepared statement over his signature was going out to the press. In this he pointed out that in 1920 Russia had pledged herself "to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty in the three countries" and that she had made a similar promise in October, 1939. He speaks from his sickbed, to us and for us, to "assure the people of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia that they are not forgotten." At the same time a proclamation from Governor Rockefeller makes this Lithuanian

Independence Day and calls on all of us to join in its celebration.

We do not propose to go to war for the liberation of the Baltic States. Nor do the citizens of those States, still resident there or in exile in other lands, argue for the sort of nationalism that existed between the First and Second World Wars. What they do ask for is political, religious and cultural freedom. They are as aware as the rest of us that such freedom can exist only in a world of freedom.

In the Baltic countries the path to a better future is still dark, but it is not lost and will not be. The day of the overlords will not last forever. The time will come when the three lost little nations will be able to come out and join us.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, today we again remember Lithuanian Independence Day.

Great changes have taken place in the world since Lithuania 41 years ago found her independence—and then lost it. Today we live in an age of missiles and nuclear submarines, an age of television and synthetics. It is an age that bears little resemblance to the world of yesterday. Yet one element has not changed. One element has remained fresh and unspoiled—man's urge for freedom. Today the people of Lithuania and of other captive countries are possessed of the same emotion as that which drove a small lonely group from the familiar rocks of England to find freedom on a strange rock off the coast of Massachusetts.

My colleagues and I are today joining many others in this country in expressions of sympathy and esteem for the men and women of Lithuania who have never accepted their subservient state. I hope that these expressions are not mere platitudes. I hope that they are manifestations of a genuine concern and interest, and that neither political nor diplomatic expediency will cause us to waver in coming to the aid of the people of Lithuania in their pursuit of freedom. If we should hesitate, let us remember William Allen White's words:

Wherever a free man is in chains, we are threatened also. Whoever is fighting for liberty is defending America.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for and on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on Lithuanian independence.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

Today, February 16, we commemorate the 41st anniversary of the independence of the gallant nation of Lithuania.

The opportunity for Lithuania to enjoy an independent and free status within the family of nations was unfortunately limited to a short span of only two decades. In 1940, the Russians annexed Lithuania into the U.S.S.R., as part of the Soviet pattern which followed immediately after World War II. Lithuania was a victim of the cold war.

During its tragically short period of independence, Lithuania held a respected position among the free nations of the world.

Since 1940, when they were annexed, the Lithuanian people have lived a life of horror. Although Lithuania seems sealed behind the Iron Curtain, yet some news filters through. Throughout this desperate period, they have held fast to their ideals. Resistance groups

have bravely operated under the gravest hazards. Their resistance has been an inspiration to freedom-loving men and women everywhere.

In this country, Americans of Lithuanian descent have kept the torch of liberty burning. Lithuanian Americans are gravely concerned over the fate of their kin in the old country. These, our friends and neighbors, are grateful for our friendship for their people. They are grateful for our never having recognized the annexation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. They are grateful for the Voice of America broadcasts to Lithuania in the Lithuanian language.

I think it is fitting, on the anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, that we in America once again declare our full support for the Lithuanian people in their fight for freedom.

We can never rest until freedom is restored to all people now living in Communist captivity.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, today marks the 41st anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania. It is entirely appropriate to recall the progress made by the peoples of Lithuania in all spheres of endeavor during the years of restored independence from 1918 to 1940, when the brave Lithuanians were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Lithuania has contributed since the 11th century to the culture, science, and welfare of European civilization. Her poets, writers, statesmen, and scientists developed a national culture, and its citizenry cherished the traditions of liberty and scholastic learning.

Unfortunately, as we all know, these people live today behind an Iron Curtain of fear and oppression. Few Lithuanians are permitted by their Soviet masters to leave the country, and no visitors from the Western World are permitted to enter this Baltic State.

Yet, we know that the spirit of freedom and liberty still breathes in the hearts of all Lithuanians. The illustrious Lithuanian poet, Maironis—1862 to 1932—aroused the nation with his unmatched verses and inspired all Lithuanians with the love of their country, its language, and its people. He preached, through verse, the gospel of national resurrection, and even today his words continue to be a source of spiritual strength, a battle cry, and a promise of ultimate triumph.

Although Lithuanians are forbidden on this 41st anniversary to sing their national anthem, we are assured that Lithuanians everywhere today will repeat these words of consolation and strength written by Maironis:

Protect, O Almighty, our beautiful homeland,
The soil where we labor, where our fathers rest.

Thy fatherly mercy is boundless and lasting;
Hear us, Thine own children, long ages oppressed.

Forsake not our land, All Highest, while the
fury rages;

For Thou art our hope and vision, now and
through the ages.

All Americans, not just the Lithuanian Americans, share, I am sure, these sentiments and look forward to the time when Lithuania will, again, take its rightful place with the free nations of the world.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, nearly 19 years have passed since the barbarian hordes of Soviet Russia swept through Lithuania, reducing that small but significant land of freedom to a slave state incorporated in the Communist empire.

Today, however, we commemorate a happier anniversary in the history of Lithuania. For it was 41 years ago today that Lithuania proclaimed her independence.

It is well that we commemorate this event. It is fitting that we recall Lithuania's days of liberty. For the spirit of freedom, the love of liberty, the conviction that Lithuania shall one day be free once more lives on in the hearts of the Lithuanian people today just as it lived through more than a century of Czarist oppression.

Let us remember that Lithuania became a free land four centuries before America was even discovered. That freedom was lost in 1795, only to be regained in 1918. The same Russian imperialism that enslaved Lithuania before holds her in thrall today. The name of the oppressor's system of government is different—but the oppression is just the same, or worse.

Through 123 years of czarist rule, suffering all sorts of hardship, the brave Lithuanian people passed on from generation to generation their national traditions, their love of liberty, their ideal of national freedom and independence. Today's generations are no less steadfast in their determination that Lithuania shall once again know freedom.

No one can tell, precisely, when the Communist colossus will begin to disintegrate—and all captive nations including Lithuania shall once again have the opportunity to breathe free air. But this we do know—that communism contains the seeds of its own destruction. For men are not born to bow to oppression; to accept terror and dictation as their lot in life. Men are born to stand erect; to rule their own destinies.

And sooner or later, whoever stands in the way of humanity's realization of this birthright, must and will go down.

Just in the past few weeks, we have had two interesting examples of how cravenly the supposedly unconquerable lords of the Kremlin fear the truth.

Nikita Khrushchev talked with an American Senator, at length, and at one point made some indiscreetly critical remarks about his partners in international crime, the Communist overlords of China. The Senator, who had taken careful notes, reported what Khrushchev had said—and Khrushchev brazenly denounced the Senator as a liar. All the world knows, of course, who the real liar is.

And then Anastas Mikoyan, Khrushchev's second in command, blandly declared during his visit to this country that the crash of an American airplane in Soviet Armenia was merely a routine aircraft accident. Shortly thereafter, we released tape recordings of the radio conversations between Soviet fighter pilots which proved beyond a doubt that this unarmed American plane, which had wandered off course, had been

deliberately shot down in as brutal a murder as you will find anywhere in the record of Soviet infamy.

Now, of course, Moscow is denouncing these tape recordings as fakes, and claiming that we are liars. But all the world knows full well who the liars are.

No nation which must resort to falsehood as an instrument of high policy, that must enslave people in order to control them, that feels impelled to use mass murder can possibly survive. The history of tyrants is written in blood, in infamy and flames, and always, in the end, in self-destruction.

All over the world, at Quemoy, in Lebanon, in Jordan, and on many other fronts, the Communists have been learning that the days they could overrun and trample other peoples have long since passed. American policies of firmness and strength, American cooperation with her allies, stand as a bulwark that has checked the tide of Communist expansion. Slowly now, but someday soon more quickly, we will see the tide of communism beginning to recede.

Communist political strength in Italy and France, for example, has faded to a shadow of its former menace. Guatemala has been freed of the Communist yoke. Unrest behind the Iron Curtain, notably in Poland, Hungary, and East Germany, show how implacably the Communists everywhere are detested.

So in commemorating today the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we engage in no futile exercise, no pointless nostalgia. Rather, we look confidently to the brighter future that must come to all brave people who remain steadfast to the principles of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

I glory in the fact that the United States has never recognized the illegal seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. Thus, as we join in this observance of the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, let us remind the world that this great Nation continues to regard Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia as sovereign nations, looking to the day when they will again be as independent in fact as they are today in the hearts of their peoples.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today is the 41st anniversary of the independence gained by the people of Lithuania in 1918 after more than a century of struggle. American citizens contributed to that struggle and our Government promptly recognized Lithuania as a sovereign nation. The world watched with admiration for the next 22 years at the transformation which occurred as these people emerged from the conditions which years of tyranny had forced upon them.

But this little land was in the way of the German and Russian juggernauts during World War II and by 1944 a Russian reign of terror forced Lithuania into the Soviet Union. Then these war-ravaged people were subjected to purges, deportations, and forced labor of typical Communist savagery.

Commemorative occasions like this one serve to call attention again to the fact that the United States does not rec-

ognize the seizure of Lithuania by the Soviet Union and has no intention of changing its position about this act of tyranny. Our statements in the Congress are a reaffirmation of this Nation's desire eventually to see all captive lands of the Communist bloc free to choose their own forms of government. Let us hope that our words find their way back to the captive peoples and give them heart to continue their never-ending battle to regain their national dignity and personal freedoms.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, today is the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

On this occasion it is fitting that we who are blessed with the heritage of freedom pause for a few moments to consider the present plight of 3 million Lithuanians now behind the Iron Curtain, and to express our fervent hope that one day Lithuanians and other suppressed peoples may rejoin the free nations of the world.

Surely, few nations have suffered so terribly at the hands of oppressors. Tragically, Lithuania had only a period of 20 or so years of freedom. Partly with American assistance, Lithuanian patriots declared their national independence from czarist Russia in 1918. During the years between the two World Wars the young nation grew and flourished. Its ties with the United States were close. Then, in the dark days of World War II, Lithuania, like the other Baltic States, became the helpless victim first of Nazi and finally of Soviet occupation.

The United States does not recognize the forcible incorporation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union. By this policy, we express through diplomatic channels our indignation that the dream of freedom of a whole nation should be snuffed out by a ruthless conqueror.

Because the human channels between this country and Lithuania are blocked by rigid censorship, we can only hope that on this day the messages of the free world will somehow reach the captive Lithuanian people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the present situation in Lithuania is not only of grave concern to Lithuanian Americans, but to all Americans, for the country whose independence was reestablished on February 16, 1918, is now behind the Iron Curtain, with travel between Lithuania and the United States sharply restricted and communication difficult.

The Lithuanian people have great cause to be proud of their nation and have cause to be proud of the indomitable Lithuanian spirit still going forward today under foreign domination. Lithuanians and Americans look forward to the day when that nation will take her place in the family of independent, freedom-loving nations. The prayers in the U.S. Senate today will be echoed throughout the free world and silently felt by those who are not free to voice their prayers. May they be granted that freedom once again.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have

issued commemorating the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, proclaimed on February 16, 1918, after her people had endured terrible suffering for many generations.

I believe that we, as American citizens and as U.S. Senators, should reflect upon the plight of the Lithuanian people today, once again suffering under the heavy hand of an aggressor—Russia.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRIDGES

Forty-one years ago on February 16, 1918, there was great rejoicing in Lithuania. After centuries of oppression, invasion, and cruel tortures of minds and bodies, the peoples of Lithuania proclaimed their freedom.

Acquiring statehood in 1200 A.D., Lithuania's historical record was one of individual liberty, of culture, of freedom of religion, and of the press. These freedoms and culture first came under the Nazi heel of oppression and then were followed by Russian domination. Despite all this, the flame of liberty never flickered in the hearts and ideals of the Lithuanian people.

Lithuania, during the Middle Ages, was a powerful nation. She turned back the warring Germans, Mongols, and Tartars successfully. Finally, in 1795, she lost her freedom to Czarist Russia and from that date to 1918 she constantly defended herself against Russia and Germany in an effort to regain her freedom.

When that day of glory came, Lithuanians everywhere thought that the terrible yoke of slavery had been removed forever. On that February day in 1918 the United States, Russia, Germany, and other nations recognized Lithuania. The Russians gave up all claims on her.

The few short years of her liberty once more gave to the world her age-old culture and the fruits of her industry. No one dreamed that the flame so recently rekindled would once more be extinguished by the treacherous act of Soviet Russia.

The occupation of Lithuania by Red Russia was in direct violation of the treaty of 1926—in direct violation of the peace pact, the nonaggression pact, and the mutual-assistance pact with Russia which guaranteed Lithuanian independence—of Russian non-interference in the domestic, social, and economic order of that country. That treaty was never disavowed and legally it is still in force between Lithuania and Soviet Russia.

As we have since found out, treaties and pacts mean nothing to Communist Russia and by the violation of this treaty the free world knows that there is vain hope of a peaceful coexistence with Soviet Russia for any state which is helpless against her aggressions.

It is only one more example of the continuous disregard of Red Russia's solemn international commitments and agreements. Not only Lithuania, but all the small Baltic States which concluded such treaties with the Soviet Union have now been forcibly incorporated into Red Russia.

It is to the everlasting credit of all the free nations as well as our own United States that this forcible incorporation has never been recognized. Instead this aggressive act has been denounced for what it is—a brutal taking over of smaller, more helpless nations in direct disregard for international law and the commitments of Soviet Russia itself.

Since the illegal and tyrannical incorporation of a once free State has taken place, what are the conditions? Today, in Lithuania hundreds of thousands of Lithuanian men, women, and children have been annihilated or deported under the guise of volunteer labor to Soviet Russia to build Soviet

industries. Few Lithuanians are permitted to leave their country except to be deported to Soviet slave-labor camps. Visitors are not allowed in to see the appalling conditions of this once free nation.

That those Lithuanians left in that unhappy country—only half of the 3 million population before annexation—may know that they are not forgotten, the Voice of America broadcasts messages to them in their own language.

At every opportunity, this Nation exposes the real motives behind any Soviet so-called peace offensive, for by the exposure of such actions as those they have taken against Lithuania and other countries with whom they had solemn treaties and pacts under international law, the true face of Russia is revealed.

Freedom cannot always be repressed. History illustrates that tyranny contains the seeds of its own destruction.

I join my prayers and hopes to those Lithuanians whose cultural attainments, whose energies and skills have added so much to the richness of our own Nation, that the dawn of a new day of liberty and justice for their captive country and peoples will not be long in coming—that Lithuania will once more take her proud place in the family of free nations.

THE COMING CRISIS IN GERMANY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last Thursday I addressed the Senate on the coming crisis in Germany. The remarks precipitated a considerable amount of editorial and other comment in the press.

I am grateful for the reactions, Mr. President, whether they express agreement with my observations, as some do, or disagreement, as do others. As I noted in my speech last Thursday, "What I suggest may not be valid in the light of the greater understanding of others. It is one Senator's views based on what he has read, what he has heard, what he has tried to reason. It is, in short, the course which suggests itself to me on the basis of the understanding which I have been able to draw out of the confusion and complexity of the German situation. I can be wrong and I stand ready to accept a better illumination of the problem through discussion and debate in the Senate."

The flood of comment on my remarks Mr. President, persuades me that the need for the remarks was very real. What matters most is not whether what I said is approved or disapproved in whole or in part. What matters most is that there be a full discussion of this situation, which, obviously, contains within it the seeds of a world-shattering war.

We have needed this discussion, which is now beginning to gather momentum. We have needed the outspoken thought—the deepest thought—of American citizens on this vital issue. We have needed it for a long time. The hour is already late. If my remarks have helped to pull the plug which has kept this thought bottled for too long then they will have served their purpose.

That, may I say, was the sole objective of my remarks. I regret that, in some quarters, the nine points which I enumerated have been labeled a "program" or a "plan" for Germany. I, myself, described these points as my personal view of the essentials of a sound Western pol-

icy for the coming crisis in Germany. Between the essentials of a policy and the policy itself there is a large area of detail which must be filled in the light of the actual problems involved in seeking solutions. This is the area of give and take, of mutual concessions.

Believe me, Mr. President, I do not underestimate the enormous task of those who must carry on these negotiations with the Communists. It seems to me certain, however, that the chances for the success of these negotiations will be enhanced if we have clearly in mind, before they begin, what is, and what is not, essential to the nation and to the survival and strengthening of freedom in the coming crisis.

Let me say again, most of the raw material, the basic source for my remarks, is to be found in the daily press which I am in the habit of reading. I have in my hand, Mr. President, various extracts from the press, as well as a sampling of editorial opinion, both favorable and unfavorable, on my speech of last Thursday. I have arranged these extracts to coincide with the nine essentials of a sound Western policy on Germany which I listed in my remarks last Thursday. I ask unanimous consent that these press extracts be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

POINT 1

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 25, 1958]

THE BERLIN MANEUVERS (By Walter Lippmann)

The most likely explanation of what the Soviet government is up to in Berlin is, it seems to me, to make the West Germans more willing to deal with the East Germans. The fact of the matter is, of course, that the two sets of Germans are already negotiating at what is called the technical level, as the trade agreement announced on Friday reminds us. The Soviet government's policy calls for a broadening of these negotiations with a view, eventually, to a political agreement for a limited reunification of the two German states.

When I was in Moscow in October I had a talk with the Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko, and when we got to the German question, I asked him what was the Soviet view of how the Germans could be reunited. Without hesitation he replied that this could be done only by a "confederation"—he was speaking English—in which each of the two German states could retain its own social institutions. Like Mr. Khrushchev, whom I had seen the day before, Mr. Gromyko maintained that German reunification by confederation would have to be brought about by negotiation between the two Germans.

The advocacy in Moscow of a German confederation seemed to me very significant in view of the fact that last March, when I was in Bonn, I had heard the same thing in so many and in such high quarters. The State Department, to be sure, continues to repeat the old official formula that Germany should be reunited by free elections in which, of course, the Communist regime would be demolished and East Germany would be absorbed into the West German state. But I doubt whether there are many responsible men in West Germany who would want Germany to be reunited in this way, even supposing that the Russians would permit it.

For the two Germans have developed very differently and the attempt to integrate them would now be enormously difficult. It would be a heavy burden for the West Germans and very probably there would be considerable resistance to it in East Germany. There are other reasons why few responsible West Germans wish to have integration in a unified state. For integration would change radically the balance of religious forces and of the political parties.

Seen realistically, and not through the fumes of the official formula, the alternatives are, on the one hand, the formation of some kind of dual state and, on the other hand, the continuing partition of the German nation.

I read the news of the Berlin maneuvers against this background. Mr. Khrushchev, who is nobody's fool, is certainly aware that there is a strong and growing sentiment in West Germany in favor of expanded negotiations with East Germany. There is already a lot more talk among the two sets of Germans than the official policy of non-recognition contemplates, and there is no doubt at all that there would be still more talking, were it not for the respect and the fear in which Dr. Adenauer is held.

So the Soviet idea of negotiations leading to confederation is one to which the West Germans are by no means unresponsive. When Dr. Adenauer leaves the scene, the idea has an excellent chance to become a live issue. Mr. Khrushchev is one who likes to ride the waves of the future.

There is, of course, no way of telling what will be the immediate course of the maneuver in Berlin. But it would be surprising indeed if the Soviet Government, though it withdrew its own forces, did not keep the East German Government under strict control. For it is committed to defend the East German Government if it is attacked, and that makes it reasonably certain that Moscow will restrain the East Germans from doing things which might provoke an attack. There is no reason at all to suppose that Moscow thinks that on the German question the United States is a "paper tiger."

I do not think, therefore, that the Soviet objective is to blockade us and force us out of West Berlin. They know that would mean war. Their objective, I believe, is to demonstrate to the West Germans in particular that the Soviet Government has, and that the Western allies do not have, a realistic and reasonable solution of the German question.

You cannot, the old saying goes, beat a horse with no horse. The Soviet idea of confederation is a horse, perhaps a poor horse, but unmistakably a horse on which a growing number in both Germanys would be willing to place their bets.

But our idea of free elections to be followed by the integration of East Germany into the West German state is no horse at all. For one thing, the Russians will not agree to free elections. For another, the West Germans do not want integration. And very probably, moreover, a very large number of East Germans, who are socialists though not Communists, also do not want integration and would fight against it.

Lacking a policy of our own for the unification of Germany, we have become hysterically attached to the status quo. It often looks as if we were not quite sure of the distinction between hardening of the will and hardening of the arteries.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 1, 1958]

THE BERLIN TRAP

The latest Kremlin proposal on Berlin, though doubtless intended to confuse the Western enemy, is actually a transparent trap which the Western Powers are most unlikely to fall into.

Originally the Russians said they were going to turn over their control rights in Berlin

to the East Germans, and they implied they were going to do it immediately. Now they say they won't do it for 6 months, and if the Western Powers will just be reasonable everything can be worked out amicably.

By being reasonable the Soviet mean the West should agree to pull out of the city and make West Berlin a free city, its freedom guaranteed by the Soviet puppet state of East Germany plus, perhaps, United Nations observers. In other words, they are merely asking the West to abandon Berlin to the Communists, and the West is not about to buy that.

But maybe it would be useful to try to explain why American, British, and French firmness—refusal to be driven out of Berlin by pretext or force—is the only possible policy in this situation.

This newspaper questioned the U.S. position regarding the other two recent international crises, Lebanon and Quemoy. Lebanon affords no parallel with Berlin, because, among other things, it involved no confrontation of American and Communist troops. Quemoy, however, might seem an almost exact parallel—like Berlin an outpost in a Communist-dominated area, and a place where American and Communist forces could clash. The Communists themselves make the analogy.

And it is true that if the Chinese Communists had actually tried to invade Quemoy, instead of just shelling it, the United States probably would have had to help the Nationalists repel the invasion. Our point, though, was that it was dubious strategy for the United States to become so deeply committed to a purely peripheral position of no value to the defense of Formosa, and we questioned whether such a place was worth a major war. It would have been a different matter if Formosa itself were under attack.

That, we think, is the big difference between Quemoy and Berlin. Berlin is not peripheral. It is the very heart and focus of the Western position in Europe. Without doubt the United States and its allies were foolish not to have taken Berlin before the Russians could get there in World War II, foolish also ever to have assumed that the city could be run on the basis of cooperation with the Soviets. But all that milk was spilled long ago.

To abandon Berlin now would be to crumble the moral foundations of Western policy, with serious practical consequences for West Germany and West Europe. If the West were not to stand in Berlin, the very microcosm of the cold war, then it is indeed hard to see where it should stand or why we are spending \$40 billion a year on the Pentagon.

Moreover, it is possible that firmness has already paid a dividend. Difficult though it is to interpret Soviet behavior, the Russians have at least put off a showdown for half a year, and that has the earmarks of retreat. The West can use that time to good advantage. It can expose the fraud of the Soviet proposal on Berlin and it can also demand that the Russians agree to the unification of Germany through free elections in both parts of the divided nation. Even though nothing is likely to come of that demand, its repetition could serve to make the Kremlin uncomfortable.

Then if the Soviets resort to force come next June, the West will have to stand up to that too. It is more probable, though, that firmness will pay off again, and that the Soviets will not choose to start a world war that soon.

In any case, we can be thankful that the Berlin issue is not smudged with doubts as were Lebanon and Quemoy. This time the issue is as clear as it is basic.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 18, 1958]

ON SEIZING THE INITIATIVE

(By Walter Lippmann)

At this point in the NATO Conference in Paris there is a deadlock between Russia and the Allies on all aspects of the German question. We refuse to discuss Berlin except as part of a discussion of the two Germanys. Khrushchev insists that we should discuss Berlin but not the two Germanys. Only the two Germanys, he says, can discuss the future of Germany. Everybody on both sides is standing firm. But, as things are now, the initiative in the next moves is in Khrushchev's hands. It is the loss of the initiative which we should take very seriously.

For having the initiative, he is able to maneuver, making all sorts of small but resounding moves, none of them important enough to justify a forcible reply by the West. Suppose, for example, that he begins by ending the Soviet military occupation of East Berlin. It will be impossible for the West to demand that the Red army reoccupy East Berlin. We cannot be in the position of insisting that the Red army occupy some territory from which it is willing to withdraw. Suppose Khrushchev turns over his powers to the East German Government, and we find that as our trucks arrive at the check points, there is waiting for us there, instead of a Soviet official, an East German official to look at the documents and to stamp them so that the trucks can proceed. Just as we cannot say to the Russians that they must keep their army in Berlin, so we cannot say that we will not allow our papers to be stamped by an East German official, if he is doing nothing to interfere with our free access to West Berlin.

Because the Russians have the initiative, they can use cat-and-mouse tactics at Berlin, and, without any overt act of violence, they can confuse and weaken the whole position of the West.

The Adenauer-Dulles policy is purely defensive, and in a diplomatic struggle as in warfare itself, a defensive strategy without the prospect of a breakout, is demoralizing.

What is more, the policy of standing pat on the German question—which is in fact the policy of Dr. Adenauer and Mr. Dulles—is very dangerous. For there is the ever-present possibility of disorder and uprising in East Germany, and a high probability that the West German forces would then be sucked in, bringing NATO and the Soviet Union to an open clash.

I think it likely that the fear of such a crisis in Germany is the main, not the only, reason why Khrushchev has posed the Berlin problem at this time, that is to say before all the problems of West German rearmament have been definitely settled. It is true, as so many say, that West Berlin presents an annoying contrast to East Berlin. It is also true that this contrast might help to provoke the kind of uprising in East Germany which might be uncontrollable.

We in the West have an interest in maintaining our presence in West Berlin. On the ground of our honorable commitments, on the ground of our political interests, on the ground of general European security, we have to maintain our presence in Berlin in order to make sure that Berlin becomes again the capital of a reunited Germany. But we have an interest, also, in getting a settlement of the whole German question before there is in East Germany a popular outbreak which could lead to a great war.

To protect these interests we need to regain the initiative, and instead of reacting to Khrushchev's actions we need to compel him to react to ours. There is a way to do this. But it involves, as any bold forward strategy does, risks. The initiative can be regained by challenging Khrushchev to show that he

will in fact permit the two German governments to negotiate a plan of German reunification. He is always saying that this is what he wants. But is he prepared to go through with it, if, instead of rejecting his offer, we took him up on it?

What are the risks of such a move? Perhaps the greatest risk, which may for the time being be too great a risk, is that it would damage severely Dr. Adenauer's prestige in Germany. He has been ardent in opposition to the idea of a negotiation by the two Germanys. But just under the surface, the idea has wide support in West Germany, even in his own party, even in his own government. Yet he is almost certain to resist the idea to the end, and the United States is too deeply committed to force such a change of policy on the grand old man.

Nevertheless, if there is any other way of dealing with the German question, which includes Berlin, I wish somebody in authority would say what it is. Everybody knows that the two Germanys cannot now be integrated by the old formula of free elections, not only because the Kremlin will not permit it but also because neither of the two Germanys is willing to accept the troubles which integration would now cause.

There is reason to doubt whether Russia, if it were put up to her, would in fact agree. If Russia does not agree, we would at least have the initiative and the preponderant moral influence in central Europe. If she did agree, there is no reason to suppose that the West Germans, with their greater numbers and greater wealth and power, are incapable of negotiating successfully with the East Germans.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1958]

BERLIN: A WESTERN PROGRAM

The Soviet threat to drive the Western troops out of Berlin presents the Western powers not only with a challenge but also with an opportunity.

The challenge has been promptly rejected. The Soviets are on notice that the Western powers will stand on their rights and honor their commitments. These commitments call for the defense of free Berlin.

But the rejection of the challenge is not enough. Berlin is only part of a much larger problem, called Germany, and the German problem itself involves not only German reunification but also European security, armament control and the security of the Western World. The "close link" between these interdependent problems was readily acknowledged at the Geneva summit meeting meeting and no proposal for a solution in Berlin can ignore it.

It is in this respect that the Western Powers now have an opportunity to take the initiative by working out and presenting a solution that will commend itself to the decent opinion of mankind. The West has of course, already done much along this line, but usually only in general principles or piecemeal, which made it easier for the Soviets to reject the Western proposals. What is needed is a broad, comprehensive and fairly detailed program covering all the related fields, a program which will tie the loose ends together and present a concrete working and negotiating basis, even to the point of draft treaties.

Such a program must, of course, meet two essential conditions. It must be in accord with the principles of freedom which are incorporated in the United Nations Charter. It must also be agreed upon by all the Western Powers, which are allied but do not always see eye to eye on all things. That is a formidable task. But the task should not be beyond Western statesmanship, and the rise of West Germany as a new postwar factor in the European balance of power might well permit a new approach to the problem.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Jan. 28, 1959]

UNITED STATES HAS 21 SOLUTIONS FOR BERLIN CRISIS

(By John P. Leacacos)

WASHINGTON, January 24—Under the spur of the recent visit of Soviet Vice Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan, the U.S. State Department has come up with at least 21 variations for a Berlin solution, a highly placed source told the Plain Dealer today.

The American theoretical alternatives will be thrown into a pot with French, British, and West German ideas as the Western allies start serious preparations for eventual negotiations with the Soviets. There also will be suggestions from the other 11 NATO members.

The practical outlook—with emphasis on the "practical"—for the working diplomats is as follows:

First, what can be done on a new status for West Berlin or for all Berlin, depending on how much "give" the Russians show across the conference table.

The irreducible United States points are a truly independent status for the city and guaranteed access of supply.

All the allies are agreed on the need to talk to the Soviets. The question is: How?

Even the West Germans, always fearful that something may be done behind their backs, appear to agree that the West must move off dead center and show, if nothing else, a new presentation on the problem of Berlin and German unification.

Second, what to do if the Soviets stay tough and do turn over their functions and responsibilities to East Germany.

Then, there would frankly be hell to pay. The allies are widely divided. Indeed, there is no firm plan among any of the Big Three (plus Bonn) on what to do if the Russians call the Western hand.

The Americans alone are determined not to quit Berlin except in a legitimate deal. The British are cautious and think above all of their coming election and a victory for the Macmillan government.

The French are simply waiting till Gen. Charles de Gaulle makes up his mind as to the historic thing to say.

The United States and Britain fear de Gaulle may gang up with the Germans for a special solution. De Gaulle wants intimate German participation in expansion of the French African economy; in short, he offers Germany colonies in Africa which she lost in World War I.

GERMANS FACE FACTS

The Germans realize they cannot stay rigid forever. They must help originate new proposals for the fate of what, after all, is their own country. The trick is to maintain postwar Germany's Western orientation. This is what Chancellor Adenauer is most inflexible about.

But Adenauer, as he advances into the eighties, is a source of deep anxiety to the Americans. Confidential reports say he can work only 2 hours a day at his urgent tasks. Skepticism grows as to what influences may surround him. Some suspect that German egos may, in the end, be won over by Russian wooing to create a combine that could dominate the world.

In the State Department, differences of opinion exist on the middle level of technical experts. No consensus of top staff recommendations has been reached. Secretary of State Dulles has given no one a tipoff as to what he really thinks.

CHANCES LOOK SLIM

What Dulles tells ambassadors who call on him is this:

The West will have to talk to the Russians. But there is very little "hard data" to make

a deal within Europe. Yet an attempt will have to be made.

The room for maneuver is over Germany and Eastern Europe.

Maybe not a permanent German solution, but perhaps interim steps. Take confederation, the Soviet notion, for instance.

Some common denominator has to underlie any joining of East and West Germany, common currency, army, commerce, or foreign policy. What should it be—and for how long?

Though some U.S. diplomats veer from the prospect of plunging into debate over details with the Soviets, a growing body of senior opinion today says that a grassroots Missouri-type of mule trading is inevitable.

WHAT PRICE TO PAY?

Westerners also tend to leave the issue of Eastern Europe alone because of the known intransigent Soviet stand. But the Russians by open implication always bring it up, as in the Rapacki plan for denuclearizing and/or demilitarizing all central Europe. To the Moscow Reds, Germany and Eastern Europe are always one strategic package.

In the end, the issue boils down to this, as one eminent diplomat expressed it:

"We have a strength in our hand in West Germany. The Russians have a weakness on their hands in Eastern Europe. Giving in for a demilitarized Germany is too high a price to pay for a liberated and neutral Eastern Europe."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 10, 1959]

BERLIN: CONCESSIONS MUST MATCH

So far as public statements can go, the result of Secretary Dulles' trip to Europe seems to be agreement on a proposition which should have been obvious—but which in practice needed serious emphasis.

This is the point stressed by Chancellor Adenauer that on the questions of Berlin or the future of Germany there can be no concessions by the West without corresponding concessions by the Soviet Union.

Put the other way around, this means that the Western Powers are willing to negotiate but that they refuse simply to cave in where the security of Berlin is concerned. The visit of Mayor Willy Brandt of West Berlin to the United States gives Americans a fresh sense of the importance of keeping alive communications with that redoubt behind the Iron Curtain. He has pointed out graphically how the Communist proposal for a "free" city would "free" it of its freedom.

Moscow proposes to turn over to a Communist puppet government the Soviet functions in control of transport in East Germany. If the West is to assent to this modification of postwar agreements there should at least be guarantees of corridors the East German regime will respect. Indeed, if Britain, France, the United States, and West Germany are to deal to this extent with the pseudo-government in East Berlin, it should be only to obtain resultant gains for freedom of travel and trade through all East Germany.

The old confrontation of positions between East and West over German reunification may well end again in deadlock even if there are negotiations over Berlin. Moscow insists on confederation of unlikes in the East and West German Governments, which would be a sellout of self-determination from the Western point of view. And Moscow has not come up with any substitute for the Western formula of free elections—which it dare not accept.

If discussions in a four power East-West conference should extend to reduction of military establishments in central Europe, the rule of two-way rather than one-sided concessions should certainly apply. Soviet spokesmen repeatedly advocate that Ger-

many should be demilitarized and possibly placed under enforced neutrality.

Germans themselves have a right to a voice in matters of their own military and foreign policy. But it is possible to assume that West Germany would be willing at least to renounce nuclear arms in return for denuclearization of a corresponding area east of the Elbe River line. To be comparable in population and industrial potential the Soviet-bloc area in such an atomic ban should include not only East Germany but also Poland, Czechoslovakia, and possibly Hungary.

These are enough examples to illustrate the meaning and importance of two-way rather than one-way concessions. A further word of warning is in order, however.

Even if bargaining should go so far as to encompass a drawback of ground troops from a central European buffer region, the free world should not infer a relaxation of tensions that would permit them safely to relax their military preparedness. The rocket-rattling speeches of Premier Khrushchev and Marshal Malinovsky at the recent party congress in Moscow make it abundantly clear that expansion is still a tenet of communism.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 12, 1959]

WEST READIES REPLY TO SOVIETS—"FLEXIBILITY" SPELLED OUT

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—While the West's position on Berlin, Germany, and European security are "flexible" this term must be spelled out carefully.

Evidences of flexibility are, in fact, more important than they first seem.

By agreeing to have Poland and Czechoslovakia join in certain talks the West recognizes the Soviet claim to parity in East-West negotiations.

By agreeing to East Germany's presence at any talks having to do with Germany (along, of course, with West Germany's presence) the West gives a certain de facto recognition to that Soviet satellite.

RESPONSIBILITY SPELLED OUT

By agreeing to discuss anything on these issues that the Soviets wish to raise (assuming, of course, reciprocity), the West agrees to give serious consideration to the Soviet-backed Polish Rapacki Plan for a nuclear-free zone in Europe and various schemes for thinning out forces in that area.

It is the West's position that Berlin and Germany's future is only the responsibility of the Big Four—and of course Germany itself.

Thus if a Big Four foreign ministers' meeting were to be arranged sometime in late April or May there would be East-West parity when talks centered on European security but the old 3-1 representation when Berlin and Germany were the order of the day.

As was anticipated, the Western note now being prepared will reject Moscow's proposal to make West Berlin a "free city." Except that the West is opposed to any such idea it might try to win a certain propaganda advantage by countering that if Berlin is to be a "free city" then it should include both East Berlin as well as West Berlin.

The Soviets have already gone on record as unalterably opposed to putting their sector of the city into a "free city" plan.

GENEVA OR VIENNA?

Moscow had proposed that this possible East-West conference be held either in Warsaw or Prague. The West is going to counter with proposing it meet either in Geneva or Vienna, with Geneva the first choice.

The deadline toward which all this negotiating points is May 27, the date on which Moscow warned it would turn over administration of the corridors to West Berlin to East Germany unless some steps had been

taken by East and West to settle their differences by then.

By that time U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles fully expects to be back at the helm at the State Department. His confinement at Walter Reed Hospital is variously expected to range from 4 to 6 weeks. That means he would be back by April and ready to lead any mission to Europe.

Also, it is recalled the Secretary made clear that he expected to spend much of his time at the hospital working on the German and Berlin questions. In other words the plans, the preparations, the spade work, will be continued. And the President and his Secretary are expected to be in frequent communication during this period.

RUMORS ACTIVE

But despite full official expectation that the Secretary will emerge from his operation and hospital stay, rumors continue to fill the capital of his possible resignation or a change in his status. One change that he himself might welcome would be to continue as the President's chief foreign policy adviser as Secretary but let others (i.e., Christian Herter and C. Douglas Dillon) take over the administrative chores and lesser diplomatic assignments.

Now that East and West are moving toward diplomatic discussions of these basic issues—Berlin, Germany, European security—even Secretary Dulles' major critics are rallying to his defense and going so far as to suggest he is now really indispensable.

As one of them, Walter Lippmann, said this week in his syndicated column: "There have been times in the past when things were at the end of a chapter, and he could with grace and dignity have made way for a younger man. But not just now. This is a period when things are moving toward a climax, after which the world may be very different, and he himself is at the climax of his career."

POINT 2

[From the New York Times]

TO REUNITE BERLIN—A FREE CITY, CAPITAL OF AN ALL-GERMAN CONFEDERATION, ENVISAGED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Premier Khrushchev has proposed that West Berlin be made a free city without foreign troops. May I suggest that in dealing with this development American spokesmen refrain from returning the eternal negative and advance some constructive, positive ideas of their own? Why not urge that all of Berlin, West and East, be converted into a free city with a United Nations police force and guaranteed communications by land, water and air with West and East Germany.

East Berliners work in West Berlin. West Berlin gets some of its electricity from East Berlin. An urban railway, part subway, part elevated, connects the two segments of the city. Even today movement between them is relatively unhindered. There is every reason to make the city whole again.

Such a reunited free Berlin might become the capital of an all-German confederation. Moscow and the East German Communist Government have repeatedly demanded this confederation. The West German Government of Dr. Adenauer has as often rejected it on the ground that there can be no union with the U.S.S.R.'s East German puppet state.

Moscow, moreover, insists that in the two-Germans confederation East Germany be allowed to retain its social achievements, by which the Kremlin undoubtedly means nationalized industry, a one-party system, labor discipline without effective trade unions, etc.

FUTURE OF EXPERIMENT

I recognize the incongruity and practical difficulty of marrying the West German ele-

phant with 50 million inhabitants to the East German seal with 17 million. Nevertheless, the experiment might succeed. West Germans could enter such a strange association with full confidence. It would not be long before East German workers would ask for free trade unions.

Instead of standing firm on free elections as a condition for German reunification—something Moscow has often rejected—why not reunify first in the faith that democracy is so attractive and compulsive, especially to people who have lived under a dictatorship, that the East Germans will soon find a way of forcing their masters to agree to free elections? I have no fear that the Communist handful in East Germany, even with Russian encouragement, could swallow the West German giant.

CREATION OF COUNCIL

I can imagine how the proposed all-German confederation would work. There would be no need for Dr. Adenauer to meet or consult with the leaders of East Germany. West and East Germany would continue to function as before in their respective capitals. But a new confederal council would be created in reunified Berlin consisting of West and East Germans to deal with all-German trade, travel, post, telephone and telegraph communications, the free entry of newspapers and other printed matter, radio broadcasts and similar questions.

In time a single stable currency might be established for both parts of Germany, the assumption being that the good would drive out the bad. Ultimately, Germany might achieve reunification on this installment plan faster than if we wait for an agreement among the great powers.

As part of the bargain for a free reunited Berlin and a two-Germans confederation West Germany might recognize the present western boundary of Poland and establish diplomatic relations with the Gomulka regime. This would serve other desirable ends. Once these steps had been taken, a favorable climate would be created for further negotiations on armaments.

No surrender on West Berlin is a necessity, but it is not the ultimate and only wisdom. Firmness without flexibility is sterile and could be dangerous. It seems that Moscow is ready to negotiate, else Mikoyan would not have come here and acted as he has. America should have a counterplan.

LOUIS FISCHER.

[From the New York Times]

POLICY FOR BERLIN—REPLACEMENT OF ALLIES BY BONN IN WESTERN SECTOR PROPOSED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

While your editorial of January 28 is thought provoking, this writer is unable to agree with your basic approach—that the Berlin impasse must be solved within the context of a general settlement with the Soviets on Germany or even on Europe. By contrast, he feels that what may be attainable at this time is a limited agreement on Berlin alone. If successful, it may decontaminate the atmosphere and open the way to a more comprehensive rapprochement. American policy should proceed on the following assumptions:

The reunification of Germany on Western and Bonn terms—free elections in both parts for the creation of an all-German democratic government, conclusion of a peace treaty with Bonn, and united Germany's freedom to remain in the Western military alliance—is impossible at this time. Consent to the establishment of a dynamic nation of 75 million people, equipped with nuclear weapons, would be suicide for the Soviets. Confronted with a militarized Germany pressing for the rectification of her borders mutilated by defeat would permanently rally the Poles and the Czechs behind the Soviets.

BONN'S CLAIM

The claim of the Bonn government, endorsed by the West, to represent all of Germany and to derive therefrom the right to ignore the existence of the German Democratic Republic, a going concern as a state, if not without moral justification, is utterly unrealistic.

In view of these hard realities the only feasible policy of the West can be that of letting the two German segments work out their own solutions. For the time being their socioeconomic divergences may render a genuine confederation impracticable and call for gradualism. Cooperative working agreements have been in force between them for years on many technical matters.

If, for the time being, a global settlement of the German issue is beyond realization for breaking the Berlin impasse, two approaches may merit attention. In each case the overriding consideration must be the preservation of the freedom of the courageous West Berliners.

One would be to expand the Soviet proposal of establishing a free city of Western Berlin. Such a regime, comprising all of Berlin could be created under United Nations auspices and supervision, and the allies would withdraw. Appealing as this proposal may seem at first, the disastrous experience of the Free City of Danzig under the League of Nations is too discouraging to recommend a repetition.

TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY

The other contingency consists in the transfer of the responsibility for Western Berlin from the allies to the Bonn government, where it rightfully belongs, and the replacement of the allied by Western German military forces. This operation of changing the guard, underwritten by the four powers and the two German governments, should be based on ironclad guarantees for free communication with the West.

The obvious dangers inherent in this proposal should not be minimized. They are counterbalanced, however, by their advantages in the long run. The Soviets may even be willing to consent, as the price for the allied withdrawal from Berlin, to the inclusion of Eastern Berlin in the government of Greater Berlin. The Bonn government may find it to its advantage to drive a wedge into the Iron Curtain and, by establishing workable contacts with the eastern regime on a limited field, develop Berlin into a testing ground for further political cooperation on a larger scale.

Obviously this bold proposal calls for the abandonment of frozen thought pattern and sterile legalisms in both Bonn and the West. On the part of Dr. Adenauer it will require a statesmanlike reappraisal of his orientation. The Berlin situation is bound to become more untenable. Time is working for the Soviets.

KARL LOEWENSTEIN.

AMHERST, MASS., January 20, 1959.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 14, 1959]

BONN STUDIES PARLEY CALL BY MANSFIELD—GERMANY PAYS CLOSE ATTENTION TO BID FOR ZONE TALKS

(By Bynum Shaw)

BONN, February 13.—Senator MANSFIELD's nine-point program for the reunification of Germany through direct negotiations between the Bonn Republic and the Communist Pankow regime stirred up great interest here today.

Heretofore the average German has not paid a great deal of attention to reunification proposals made outside the administration in the United States, but MANSFIELD's ideas were given front-page play in the newspapers here and set off discussions even in the beer halls where many Germans read them.

Officially the Adenauer government declined to comment, saying only that the plan would be given careful study, but in office after office from the Foreign Ministry to defense headquarters there was an air of concern.

RATED AS IMPORTANT MAN

A high-level source explained the attitude. He said that, while MANSFIELD's ideas do not parallel those of the Bonn Government, "We think he is a very important man."

The implication was that Bonn is afraid that proposals with which it does not agree may become a part of American policy.

The spokesman pointed out that one requirement of MANSFIELD's plan, negotiations between East and West Berlin for unified municipal services, have been going on for some time.

Since 1949, he said, technical contacts have been required for the operation of the city's underground and elevated transport system, which is operated by the East Germans but circles through both sections of the city.

BRINGS IN WEST MARKS

The transport system which nets valued West marks for the East has operated without restriction and the West Germans have contributed trackage and spare parts which were scarce on the Communist side.

There also have been negotiations over the supply of electricity and gas, but the availability of these utilities more often has been subject to Communist whim.

Bonn sees that as one of the weak points in the Mansfield plans. It would assume the Communists are ready to negotiate in good faith and Bonn maintains that is false assumption.

Another official said "It looks like everybody has plans. We cannot comment on them all."

SEEN AS GOOD SIGN

Socialist spokesman studying the Senator's proposals said everybody has a plan except the Adenauer government. He said that while his party cannot agree with every point MANSFIELD makes, it is taken as good sign that Americans are thinking deeply and seriously on the German problem.

The Free Democrats agreed that negotiations on reunification should start immediately. Ultimately, they said, unity must be achieved by the people directly.

Press comment on the nine-point plan ranged from skeptical to denunciatory. The Frankfurter Neue Presse declared "It would be very bad if MANSFIELD's naive and simplified views prevailed in U.S. foreign policy."

Dortmund's Ruhr Nachrichten called some of the Senator's points sensational and dangerous. A Berlin paper, Der Kurier, said MANSFIELD's patent recipe was a rather dubious program.

The major papers, however, did not carry editorial comment. They were still too busy studying the plan.

POINT 3

[From the New York Times, Nov. 12, 1958]
ENVOYS TO SOVIET WARY OVER BERLIN—SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES SEEN IN KHRUSHCHEV PLAN FOR EAST GERMAN CONTROL
(By Max Frankel)

Moscow, November 11.—The declaration by Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev that the Soviet Union would turn over its remaining occupation functions in Berlin to East Germany set off hasty activity in Western embassies here today.

Diplomats thought it was only a matter of time before the Soviet Government took formal steps in line with the Premier's announcement. Mr. Khrushchev said it was time for Moscow to renounce that part of the Potsdam agreement of 1945 that provided for a four-power military occupation of Berlin.

He suggested that the United States, Britain, and France also relinquish their occupation of West Berlin.

In any event, he declared, the Soviet Union will go ahead with its plans to put the East Germans in full command of their capital. Then if the West still has any interest in Berlin "let them themselves reach agreement" with East Germany, he said.

CRISIS IN WEST CALLED AIM

The plan was seemingly designed to cause at the least a diplomatic crisis in Washington, London, and Paris, since the Western Powers do not recognize East Germany and have refused to deal with it.

Diplomats here saw the planned Soviet move as a serious and daring step. It would force the West to choose between dealing with the East German Communists and encountering increasing difficulties in efforts to maintain United States, Britain, and French garrisons in West Berlin.

Mr. Khrushchev contends that all of Berlin is properly the capital of East Germany. The civilian and democratic government of West Berlin could not readily survive the withdrawal of Western occupation forces, it is generally recognized here.

Mr. Khrushchev's speech was not solely a demand for a joint four-power agreement to end the occupation of Berlin, Mr. Khrushchev said:

"It seems that the time has come for the powers signatory to the Potsdam agreement to give up the remains of the occupation regime in Berlin and thereby make it possible to create a normal situation in the capital of the German Democratic Republic [East Germany]."

"The Soviet Union, for its part, will hand over to the sovereign German Democratic Republic the functions in Berlin that are still held by Soviet agencies," Mr. Khrushchev went on. "This, I think, would be the correct thing to do."

"Let the United States, France and Britain themselves build their relations with the German Democratic Republic, let them themselves reach agreement with it if they are interested in any question concerning Berlin."

Mr. Khrushchev said this would amount to a renunciation by Moscow of a part of the Potsdam agreement and he went to great lengths to justify the breaking of what he termed "out-of-date" commitments.

A number of basic questions about Soviet intentions in Berlin were left unanswered by Mr. Khrushchev. These were the subject today of extensive conferences among Western diplomats and also of an hour-long conversation between Andrei A. Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister, and Dr. Hans Kroell, West German Ambassador.

Diplomats thought it highly unlikely that the Western capitals would alter their often-expressed aversion to any dealings with East Germany. Their position in West Berlin, however, could become endangered if East Germany chose to exercise its full authority in East-West dealings in Berlin and over the highways, railroads and air corridors linking West Berlin to the rest of West Germany.

But even without ordering the Western Powers out of Berlin, East Germany, once given full control by Moscow, would be in a strong position to demand official dealings. There are hundreds of housekeeping details in Berlin that require East-West cooperation. Furthermore East German guards and officials may assume control over all the routes between Berlin and West Germany.

By refusing to deal with East Germany the Western Powers might be deprived of any or all of the access routes to Berlin. The city sits like an island 100 miles inside East Germany.

BERLIN AIRLIFT RECALLED

During the Berlin blockade 10 years ago, the Western nations were not seriously chal-

lenged on the right to fly into West Berlin. As a result, they kept their half of the city supplied with food and fuel from June 1948 to May 1949. At that time, in addition, the Soviet Government remained an interested party and finally agreed to negotiate a settlement of Berlin's status.

But the Soviet Government now proposes to refer all disputes to the "sovereign" East German Government. Diplomats here seemed seriously concerned with the date of the proposed Soviet moves and the extent of the planned changes.

They were eager to learn just how far the East German Government would subsequently go to make its presence felt. Three times in his speech yesterday Mr. Khrushchev warned the West not to resort to force in reply to the Berlin switch. Any attack on East Germany would be considered an attack on the Soviet Union, he said.

Diplomats were curious about the timing and manner of the Soviet announcement. Mr. Khrushchev spoke yesterday at a mass rally of friendship for a Polish delegation headed by Wladyslaw Gomulka. The Polish leader, who had been denouncing the West Germans during his 17-day sojourn here, promptly supported Mr. Khrushchev's plan for Berlin.

There were, however, no readily available answers for the diplomats. They sent off messages with their own assessment of the potential gravity of the situation. Dr. Kroell's interview with Mr. Gromyko had been previously scheduled, but he tried to get more details on the Soviet plan without success.

U.N. WEIGHS ITS ROLE IN BERLIN SETTLEMENT—ALTHOUGH SOVIET HAS SUGGESTED PLACE FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION, DIRECT TALKS ARE INDICATED—WAR THREAT IS BIG FACTOR

(By Thomas J. Hamilton)

Nikita S. Khrushchev opened the current war of nerves with his speech last November demanding the withdrawal of the Western Powers from West Berlin. This was followed by a series of notes calling for the establishment of West Berlin as a free city, for the confederation of the two Germans, and the conclusion of a peace treaty under which Germany, whether united or not, would be neutralized.

The Soviet Union's possession of nuclear weapons makes the situation far more dangerous than on the occasion of the Soviet blockade of Berlin in 1948 and 1949.

The Soviet Union raised the blockade in May 1949, after it recognized the success of the allied airlift. Although the negotiations were conducted at the United Nations by Dr. Philip C. Jessup of the United States and Jacob A. Malik of the Soviet Union, the American atomic monopoly, not action by the Security Council, was responsible; a Soviet veto had killed a resolution requesting it to end the blockade.

It may be assumed therefore that once the United States, Britain, France, and West Germany agree upon a policy, they will propose direct negotiations. In other words, the matter would be placed before the United Nations only as a last resort.

Although the Soviet Union still holds, as it did before, that the unification of Germany is exclusively a matter for negotiation between the two German Governments, its proposal for a German peace conference may indicate a softening of this position. Certainly it would seem to open the way, after much haggling, for the participation of the great powers in all phases of the German question.

UNITED NATIONS ROLE

If an agreement can be reached on Berlin, the services of the United Nations would certainly be needed. The Soviet note to the United States, November 27, suggested that the four occupying powers, together with

West Germany and East Germany, guarantee the status of West Berlin as a free city.

"On its part, the Soviet Union would have no objection to the United Nations also sharing, in one way or another, in observing the free-city status of West Berlin," the note added.

Although Anastas I. Mikoyan had a talk with Secretary General Hammarskjöld during Mr. Mikoyan's visit to New York, the Soviet First Deputy Premier did nothing to clarify this vague suggestion. It is so vague, in fact, that it could mean almost anything, it might even be an indication that the Soviet Union might allow some of the 10,000 Western troops now in West Berlin to remain in the free city as United Nations observers.

However, the Soviet Union's acceptance of such an arrangement could certainly be obtained only after the hardest kind of bargaining. Even so, West Berlin could be strangled at any time that the Soviet Union decided to cut the city's communications with West Germany.

It is doubtful, therefore, whether the Western Powers would agree to a free city even if East Berlin were included in the arrangements and some Western troops were allowed to remain.

DANZIG RECALLED

Past efforts by international organizations to guarantee free cities do not offer any encouragement. The League of Nations had placed the free city of Danzig under its protection, but this did not avail against Hitler.

In 1947 the responsibility of maintaining the free territory of Trieste, which consisted not only of the city but of a fairly substantial hinterland, was assumed by the Security Council at the request of the four great powers. However, the Council was never able to agree upon a governor, and its guarantee became a dead letter when the Western Powers divided the free territory between Italy and Yugoslavia.

This record, however, is no argument against United Nations consideration of the fundamental question of separating Soviet and Western forces in Germany and the rest of Eastern Europe.

A nuclear-free zone, to be composed of West Germany, East Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, was suggested by Adam Rapacki, the Polish Foreign Minister, in a speech in the General Assembly in October 1957.

Obviously, the Rapacki plan could not have been presented without the consent of the Soviet Union, and it conforms with the Kremlin's unsleeping determination to prevent West Germany from acquiring nuclear weapons.

POLAND PERSISTS

But there are grounds for belief that the Poles were and are just as worried about the presence of Soviet atomic weapons on their side of the line.

The original version of the Rapacki plan was unacceptable to the West, since it would have forbidden the use of nuclear weapons in West Germany while permitting the Soviet Union to maintain its 22 divisions in East Germany.

Mr. Rapacki responded to these criticisms by revising his plan last November. The first stage of the revised plan would permit the United States and the Soviet Union to maintain their existing nuclear arms in the zone, but deny them to the local powers.

In the second stage the interdiction of nuclear armaments in the central European zone would extend to the United States and the Soviet Union, who would also thin out their conventional forces. It may be anticipated that the Soviet Union not only will propose the incorporation of this plan in any German settlement but will also submit it to the General Assembly next fall.

REVISED PLAN

As now revised, the Rapacki plan offers advantages and disadvantages for both the Soviet and the Western coalition. Both sides would benefit if the danger of an incident between the two superpowers could be reduced. Both would benefit if there was assurance against the emergence of a too powerful Germany.

However, this would have corresponding disadvantages for the United States and the Soviet Union. If the Russians should thin out their forces in Eastern Europe, they would find corresponding difficulty in holding down the satellite regimes there. As for the United States, the denial of nuclear weapons to West Germany, together with the shrinking of the Atlantic Alliance's conventional forces, would require a revision of the basic strategy that produced the original decision to arm West Germany.

The Rapacki plan conforms with the growing trend toward disengagement that has been championed by George F. Kennan and by the Socialist parties in Britain and other European countries.

POINT 4

[From the New York Times, Jan. 31, 1959]
FOREIGN AFFAIRS—LET'S NOT FENCE OURSELVES IN BERLIN

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, January 30.—The Western Powers have been taking their own good time about defining their views on Berlin. This is wise because the problem is extremely serious. Any misjudgment of Soviet intentions or aspirations could have disastrous consequences just as any failure by Moscow to comprehend our own intentions and aspirations would be equally grave.

It is apparent that discussions among American, British, and French experts have produced considerable divergences on how the gathering crisis should be met. One faction—ardently supported by Bonn—insists we should simply not recognize Russia's right to change the prevailing situation by unilateral action and that, therefore, we should prepare to defend the existing status quo by military means, if necessary.

It is argued that the West must insist by force, should that be required, on its legal rights to supply Berlin along the overland corridors guaranteed by the original accords worked out with the Soviet Union. Were we to demand a continuation of the present system but to rely only on another airlift, it is pointed out that new electronic devices could jam navigational instruments and gradually whittle down the value of such an airlift.

THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

This kind of talk, reasonable in terms of pure logic, tends to avoid the fundamental issue. That issue is not whether the Russians have the right to modify an international agreement and whether we should, if need be, fight to preserve its sanctity. The issue is really whether, in our own interest, we desire to maintain for an indefinite period a situation which is both awkward and embarrassing for ourselves and our allies.

Too often we automatically oppose any novel Soviet proposition and certainly when the Russians suggest changes they generally find acutely cumbersome ways of doing so. Thus they turned their Berlin proposals unnecessarily into an ultimatum. A great fanfare had to be sounded to prove it wasn't— which may or may not be true.

But if we try to isolate acceptable aspects of the problem as presented we can find much that should suit our policy. It seems strange to hear arguments that we must go to war in order to keep Soviet troops in East Berlin. It is equally strange to insist that supply shipments bound for that city can be checked by Russian officials but we must

fight if they are checked by East German officials.

If Moscow is interested in "Germanizing" Berlin by ending its occupation, we should be pleased. Cannot we accept that essential idea as a basis for discussion and announce our wish to replace allied Berlin garrisons with West German garrisons when Soviet troops pull out?

BONN'S RIGHT TO PROTECTION

The Bonn Government is a full member of NATO. It has every right to insist on allied protection. West German NATO troops could therefore protect free Berlin as effectively as American, British, and French troops.

If Moscow acts unilaterally by turning over its prerogatives to East Germany, we should do likewise with West Germany, granting it authority over the air and land corridors which assure access to Berlin. Today, with allied garrisons there, all NATO would be obliged to assist in defending against Communist armed intrusion. Bonn would be entitled to exactly the same assistance if its soldiers replaced ours.

Nor should Bonn object to dealing with East German officials at corridor checkpoints, an embarrassment Washington wishes to avoid. West Germany deals officially with East Germany every day and has extensive commercial accords.

To this basis for negotiation we might add the condition that the Soviet Army should withdraw to an agreed perimeter of perhaps 50 miles from Berlin. That could not possibly affect Moscow's security position. But it would eliminate an element of potential provocation.

We clearly hope to make Berlin only one item on the agenda of East-West parleys that are almost certain to develop. We want to raise again the entire issue of German unification. But we cannot get into such a meeting without at least some positive idea for improving the uncomfortable Berlin status quo.

This approach was first presented in this column last December 10. It is repeated to stress the folly of possibly boxing ourselves into an untenable position before negotiations. Change is desirable in Berlin. Such change need not be disadvantageous.

KHRUSHCHEV RAISES QUESTIONS

[From the New York Times, Dec. 1, 1958]

Stripped of its verbiage and its propaganda lies, the Soviet note on Berlin was an effort to undo a complex bargain reached in 1944 and 1945 by the wartime allies who defeated Hitler.

Premier Khrushchev would like to end that part of the bargain which he does not like; the existence of a West Berlin as an island of freedom guarded by Western troops inside the Communist bloc. By this effort, however, he calls into question the entire bargain, opening again for reexamination not only the status of Berlin but all the related matters. If we look into these related matters we may wonder whether Khrushchev is being wise, even from a Soviet point of view.

One part of the Berlin bargain is certainly the actual exchange of territory in early July 1945, which first made it possible for Western troops to enter Berlin. In exchange for what is now West Berlin, British and American troops retreated westward from the Elbe River and turned over to Soviet occupation Thuringia and the adjoining rich area of central Germany. When Khrushchev raises the question of ousting Western troops from Berlin, he implicitly raises the related question of ousting Soviet and other Communist troops from Leipzig, Erfurt, Halle, Weimar, and the other cities and rural areas which were first militarily conquered by Western

troops and surrendered to Soviet control only as part of the Berlin bargain.

But the matters at stake go far beyond merely central Germany. The Berlin bargain was implicit in the deliberations at the Potsdam Conference. There the West agreed to the temporary administration of eastern Germany by the Polish state and promised to support the permanent incorporation into the Soviet Union of northern East Prussia, now known by the Soviet name of Kaliningrad Province, but originally the Königsberg area.

If Khrushchev can unilaterally renounce the Berlin part of the bargain, what reason exists for the West to support the Soviet position in Kaliningrad or the Polish interest in the Oder-Neisse line? The answer is obvious: no reason at all.

Speaking for President Eisenhower at Augusta yesterday, Secretary Dulles made it clear we have no intention of abandoning the people of West Berlin. In addition, Secretary Dulles apparently looks forward to discussing the entire German issue first with our allies and eventually with the Soviet Union. Regardless of the outcome of these discussions, the present outlook is that the Soviet effort to force us to abandon Berlin will intensify over the weeks and months ahead. We suggest that before such pressure, with all its incalculable consequences, is intensified, Khrushchev and his advisers might do well to take another look.

Already it is clear that there are farsighted elements in Warsaw who have glimpsed the possible consequences for Poland of this Berlin adventure. Are there not similar farsighted people in Moscow who can see that one possible alternative to maintaining the Berlin status quo is an effort to redraw the boundary lines in Europe so as to restore the situation of, say, August 31, 1939?

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 10, 1959]

ON FLEXIBILITY

(By Walter Lippmann)

The new word in Western diplomacy is "flexibility." It has become fashionable because just under the surface of the official formulae there is going on in Washington, in London and in Bonn a reappraisal of the German problem. It is a wholly false picture of what is going on to suppose that the issue in this reappraisal is between surrendering and standing firm, between appeasement and principle, between being soft and being strong.

The real issue, to which the reappraisal is addressed, is whether to stand pat on positions that have become untenable or to move to new positions from which the Western allies can recover the political initiative.

Let us take Berlin for a concrete example, remembering, of course, that it is only the focal point of the whole larger German problem. At present there are two streams of traffic between West Berlin and West Germany. One, which is much the larger, is civilian traffic. This traffic is regulated by an agreement between the West German Government and the East German Government and it is by this traffic that the civilian population of West Berlin lives and does its business. The other traffic is military. It is between the British, French, and American forces in West Germany and their garrisons in West Berlin. This traffic is regulated by Allied agreement with the Soviet Union.

Moscow has now said that if there is no other negotiation about the status of Berlin, it will on May 27 turn over to the East German Government its authority over the military traffic. If this is done, it will mean that at the checkpoints on the highways and railroads and canals Allied military traffic will be met by East German rather than by Soviet officials.

The immediate and specific questions about Berlin are (1) what will we do when we meet these East German officials; and (2) what will the East German officials do about our military traffic?

This is where the difference between an inflexible and a flexible policy shows itself. The inflexibles say that we do not recognize the East German Government, and that we cannot, therefore, allow them to have anything to do with our traffic to Berlin. The flexibles reply that as long as no one interferes with our traffic to Berlin, it does not make any difference whether the official who stamps the papers wears an East German or a Soviet uniform. They add that if Dr. Adenauer can allow East German officials to stamp his papers for the civilian traffic, he is in no position to insist that President Eisenhower be more inflexible than he is himself.

In speculating about the use of force to keep open access to Berlin, the first question to be decided is whether we ought to be ready to go to war if we meet an East German official at the checkpoints on the highway. Do we fight because the official who wants to see the papers carried by the truck wears an East German uniform, or do we fight if he closes the highway? The flexibles say that a blockade of West Berlin is a fighting matter but that whether the official is East German or Soviet is not a fighting matter.

The flexibles say, moreover, that to announce you will fight about the official at the checkpoint is not a strong policy but a foolish one, and because it is foolish, it is weak. It is weak because the people of the Western World cannot conceivably be united to fight a world war on such an idiotic issue.

As we know, the mayor of West Berlin, the highly esteemed Willy Brandt, can be counted among the flexibles. He has suggested that the East German officials might be recognized as "agents" of the Soviet Union. An easier, and as good a way, to accomplish the same result would be to ask a Soviet guarantee of access to West Berlin until a new status can be arranged by negotiations covering the two Germanys and the two Berlins. What we want is that West Berlin should not be blockaded and strangled and that Berlin should become again the capital of a reunited Germany.

This flexible position is a strong one. We stand firm on the substance, which is that West Berlin is not to be blockaded. We are indifferent to the formalities which do not matter as long as access to West Berlin is open. We keep alive our real objective, which is not to maintain West Berlin as an island within East Germany but to restore its status as the capital city to which all parts of Germany must have equal access.

It may well be that the Soviet Union will refuse to guarantee access during the period, which would have to be a long one, when the whole German problem is being negotiated. If that is what happens, the Soviet Union will find itself in a dangerous position. It will have given the East Germans a free hand to impose a blockade, which would be an act of war, and it will be committed to come to the defense of East Germans if they provoke a war.

This is a much bigger gamble than Moscow has ever taken before, and we need not jump to the conclusion that it will take the gamble now.

POINT 5

[From the New York Times, Dec. 13, 1958]
WESTERN BIG THREE'S RIGHT OF ACCESS TO
CITY HINGES ON ORAL ACCORDS ONLY

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Western Allies' access to the present corridors to Berlin, which lie entirely within East Germany, is based on only an unwritten

agreement among the military commanders after World War II. On the other hand, the presence of the Western Allied troops in Berlin—in fact the status of Berlin as a political island in a Soviet Communist sea, or a special occupation area to be shared by the Soviet Union, Britain, the United States and France—is specifically provided for in the written agreements reached prior to Potsdam.

After the failure of the Soviet attempt 10 years ago to blockade Berlin, which ended in May 1949, a Council of Foreign Ministers of the four powers, meeting in Paris that June, in effect reaffirmed the right of four-power occupation and joint administration of Berlin.

ZONE RESPONSIBILITY

The four powers, the Soviet Union included, agreed that each in its zone would "have an obligation to take the measures necessary to insure the normal functioning and utilization of rail, water and road transport" between the Eastern and Western zones and between the zones and Berlin. There was not, however, any specific written delineation of the military corridors to Berlin, which had been arranged informally in 1945 by Gen. Lucius D. Clay for the United States.

Thus the Soviet authorities have taken advantage of Western oversights or mistakes to cloak the blockading of Berlin—imposed in 1948 and now threatened again with pseudo-legalism. But the Russians have gone beyond blockade and have claimed, starting in 1948, that Berlin is part of the Soviet Zone and that the Western Powers do not have the same status in Berlin as the Soviet Union.

Today, therefore, the United States is gathering once again the somewhat bitter fruit of its wartime naivete.

Berlin is 76 airline miles from the nearest point in Western Germany. The city itself is the hub of a large network of rail and highway communications leading to the West. The population of West Berlin and the city's economy are supplied entirely from the West in the matter of food, fuel and raw materials.

MEANS OF DELIVERY

Only about 0.1 percent of West Berlin's needs is delivered by plane; 28.3 percent is sent in via canals and waterways; 34.9 percent by rail, and 36.7 percent by highway, according to the West German Embassy in Washington.

But the Western military garrisons in Berlin have a far more limited supply access. The oral agreements reached by General Clay and perpetuated, with interruptions, until today cover only three air corridors from Hamburg, Bueckeburg-Hanover and Frankfurt to Berlin, one rail line from Helmstedt to Berlin and one highway from Marlenborn to Berlin.

And, as the Russians have demonstrated, they can and do interpret the oral agreements of 13 years ago as they please. The security of the supply routes to the United States garrisons in Berlin depends far more upon the power the United States is willing to use to keep them open than upon solemn legal agreements.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 1959]
BONN TO IMPROVE ARMY READINESS—BERLIN
CRISIS RESULTS IN NEW EMPHASIS ON
SHORT-TERM COMBAT POTENTIAL

(By Arthur J. Olsen)

BONN, GERMANY, February 10.—The West German Army was reported today to have been ordered to improve its state of readiness this spring.

The orders were issued as a result of a recent reappraisal of Bonn's military buildup schedules in the light of the intensified political struggle between the Soviet Union

and the West over Berlin and Germany. The result is a new emphasis on short-term combat potential.

The Defense Ministry does not expect the Soviet challenge of the Western position in Berlin to come down to a test of force. Lt. Gen. Adolf Heusinger, inspector general of the armed forces, is reported to have told his senior staff officers last week that political developments had nevertheless affected existing plans for a gradual buildup of the half-grown West German Army.

These plans call for the creation of 12 divisions fully equipped and at prescribed strength by 1961. The new approach will emphasize increasing the capabilities as combat units of the five divisions now in existence.

It is these divisions, already assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization command, that are to be strengthened in the next 3 months.

Ostensibly they are "combat ready" and at the disposal of Gen. Lauris Norstad, the Allied supreme commander; in fact, they are under strength and short on equipment.

The immediate effect of the new approach in the Defense Ministry would be a speedup of deliveries of weapons, equipment and division quartermaster supplies, according to military sources.

There is no sign that the army is planning to alter the present manpower rhythm, which keeps divisions fluctuating predictably between 60 and 75 percent of rated strength, that is, between 7,000 and 8,000 men.

The rhythm is fixed by the quarterly call-ups of conscripts, who make up about half of the division's manpower. After 12 months' service drafted soldiers are mustered out and division strength falls until new troops come out of the recruit camps a few weeks later.

The limited shift in Bonn's military planning, which Defense Ministry spokesmen decline to confirm publicly, is understood to be a consequence of the Berlin crisis. For the first time since the first months of the Korean war a political dispute has evoked hard thinking on the possibility of military conflict in central Europe.

Staff studies are understood to be under way at General Norstad's headquarters on various military situations that might conceivably arise from the Berlin situation.

How far the tightening the Allied and West German defense posture will go will be determined by developments between now and May. The end of that month is the time when the Soviet Union proposes to turn over its occupation rights in Berlin to the East German authorities.

POINT 6

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 4, 1959]

STATE OF THE NATIONS: DULLES GOES SHOPPING

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

John Foster Dulles' current tour through the Allied capitals of Western Europe differs from previous tours in one important respect.

Previously he has either been trying to sell something to the other Western Allies which they did not want to buy or to discourage them from doing something they very much thought they wanted to do.

In this case, for a change, Mr. Dulles and the Western European allies are in the same boat. Not one of them really wants to change the old stock Western policy on Germany, but all recognize that it is hopelessly out of date and that they are forced by circumstances beyond their control to come up with some new ideas.

This is an agonizing reappraisal trip, agonizing equally for all. It would be so much simpler to drift along with the old formula of "reunification of Germany with free elec-

tions," because all knew that Moscow would never agree to the formula and that therefore it meant, in fact, continuation of the division of Germany at the Elbe. This is precisely what all Western foreign offices consider the least objectionable condition for Germany.

But times have changed. Like it or not, Moscow has reopened the German question, and it is merely a fact, no matter how unpalatable, that it cannot be bottled up again inside the old formula. It may take months or years before a new status quo acceptable to all is devised, but not even a Metetrnich could put the old pieces back together again.

Mr. Dulles has perforce gone this time neither to sell nor unsell, but to exchange ideas—to hope that out of the collective-idea centers of the West some new policy can emerge which will at least be no more undesirable than the old.

The question of a new policy on Germany ceased to be academic and became imperative from the day Nikita S. Khrushchev announced his intention to withdraw Soviet troops from East Berlin. Mr. Dulles' subsequent admission that there might be other ways than the road of free elections toward reunification stands as the official recognition in the West that the process of rethinking the German problem has begun.

But where do we go from here?

We must start with a realization of the reasons why the existing settlement is no longer viable. Curiously enough, the most fundamental of the reasons is the weakness of communism in East Germany.

Of all the puppet Communist regimes, the East German is the shabbiest and the most unsuccessful in putting down any roots among the people it governs. It is a failure by any objective test, and it has been bled white by defections to the West through West Berlin. It survives only because it is supported by Soviet bayonets. Communism would disappear in Germany overnight if all outside influence were removed from Germany and German political nature were allowed to take its own natural course.

But twinned with this decline of communism inside Germany has been a relative growth in Soviet power. The forces of East and West inside Germany have tipped westward, but outside Germany, Moscow's relative military and political strength has grown. Moscow is strong enough to prevent the West from demanding that political nature be allowed to take its own course inside Germany.

In effect, Moscow has said that the political erosion of communism in East Germany must be stopped, and it has sketched out the way it proposes to stop it unless we of the West will cooperate in working out a different way. Barring some new agreement, Moscow proposes to seal off East Germany from the West either by isolating or by suppressing entirely the Western enclave in Berlin.

We of the West have talked boldly of meeting this by force, some say by driving a military convoy through to Berlin in case of trouble. But would we, in fact, risk a nuclear world war to preserve West Berlin? Perhaps we would if there were no other way. But is there another way?

It may sound inconceivable to anyone brought up on Mr. Dulles' bold projects for rolling back the Iron Curtain and liberating the captive peoples of Eastern Europe that the same Mr. Dulles would ever be a party to a project for shoring up the shaky, sordid, and shabby Ulbricht-Grotewohl regime in East Germany.

But as the Western experts push their thinking out into the unfamiliar jungle trails of the German problem they are finding themselves entertaining just such unorthodox and almost grotesque ideas.

They are entertaining such thoughts for the simple reason that the best and safest way of securing the ultimate best interests

of the East German people may well lie down the road of saving the outward form of the East German regime.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

STATE OF THE NATION: DULLES GOES SHOPPING—2

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

The last column in this space identified two of the factors bearing heavily on the current reappraisal of the German problem as the erosion of the Communist regime in East Germany and the growth of relative Soviet power outside of Germany.

As John Foster Dulles canvasses the German problem with his allied friends on his current shopping tour for a new German policy, he and they recognize as a third factor the enormous importance to Moscow of the survival of a Communist regime in East Germany.

The reasons are familiar enough. East Germany is both the ideological and the military seal around the Communist regimes of Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. If the East German regime should collapse the whole satellite system in Eastern Europe would be exposed and threatened. Such a convulsion is for Moscow unthinkable and intolerable.

We may be tempted to shrug our shoulders and say, "So what?" But it is merely one of the unpleasant facts of world life that Moscow must be expected to regard a nuclear world war as less intolerable than the sudden collapse of its Western political and military front.

For one thing, Nikita S. Khrushchev has not so firmly consolidated his political position at home that it could survive the loss of all the western frontier provinces of the empire Stalin built after the last war. We have to accept the unpleasant fact that Moscow most probably would accept war as a last resort rather than see the keystone fall out from its Eastern European system. A Communist regime in East Germany is the keystone of that system.

In abstract theory we have three possible courses open to us in our search for a new German policy.

First, we could insist on maintaining the present situation in Germany in which the East German regime becomes progressively weaker. But to pursue this course is to drive ever closer to the brink of world nuclear war since Moscow ultimately will fight rather than see its whole western frontier system collapse.

Second, we could abandon our enclave in West Berlin to the vengeance of the Ulbrichts and Grotewohls. But this would be a sellout of the brave citizens of that city which is unthinkable and which no Western statesmen, least of all Dwight D. Eisenhower, could for an instant contemplate.

Third, we can explore with the Soviets the possibility of a new settlement for Germany which would attempt to balance the three conflicting sets of interests which have newly come into conflict over Germany. And it is in such exploring that the experts already have found facing them the conclusion that in all probability the only way out will involve the continuation with Western approval of a Communist regime in East Germany.

This would not be a tolerable possibility for us if the East German regime were growing in strength and influence inside Germany. But it is declining rapidly in strength and influence; indeed it is its very decline which has precipitated the present reappraisal of German policy.

The time has not yet arrived when any Western diplomat or statesman is ready to say in public what many of them are thinking in private. But behind the scenes the trend of thinking is strongly in the direction sketched out here—in the direction of a

new German settlement involving a confederation within which the East German state will continue for some time to be guaranteed a government and a social system which will at least be nominally Communist and which will retain special relations with Moscow.

This does not mean that the Western statesmen are ready to abandon for all time the hope of seeing East Germans relieved of the burden of the thoroughly disreputable government which currently preys upon them, or the hope of seeing Germany move gradually toward the unity which all Germans desire and which many Germans someday might attempt to seize by force if the door were closed to any other approach.

The time has passed when the outside Western nations can impose by superior force their preferred form of a German settlement on Germany and make Moscow accept it. But the time has arrived when West Germany will exert increasing influence in East Germany as barriers to such influence are removed.

The more we can manage to allow West Germans to deal directly with East Germans the more will the lot of the East German people be relieved. And Moscow might be interested for the price of survival of at least a nominally Communist East German Government. The price is high but the more the experts study the problem the more they incline to think that it may well prove to be the only way out of a German problem short of a nuclear war.

[From the Washington Post]

MIKOYAN AND BERLIN
(By Walter Lippmann)

Mr. Mikoyan is making two visits to Washington, separated by the 10 days or so which he will spend traveling about the country. The first visit has confirmed the view, held by many who watch these things closely, that the Soviet's move in Berlin, though entirely serious and of great consequence, is not an ultimatum but a move to open up negotiations on a large range of questions.

Although no agreements have been negotiated in this first diplomatic encounter, it is reasonably certain that the door has been opened to a negotiated solution of the Berlin crisis, and it may be to bigger things than Berlin.

Apart from what has been said in these preliminary talks, which are properly confidential though they are not altogether secret, there are objective reasons for saying that the Berlin crisis is negotiable.

In the various notes that have been exchanged about Berlin two controlling propositions have been established. The first is that the Western allies will not withdraw their troops from West Berlin until there is a general German settlement, and that they will not permit anyone to interfere with their right to supply these troops. A blockade of the Western troops by the East German Government would be an act of war, and there cannot be any doubt on this subject in Moscow or in East Berlin.

On the other hand, we cannot prevent the Soviet Government from delegating to the East German Government any of the powers it now exercises. Therefore, if at the end of the 6 months period the Soviet Government transfers its authority to East Germany, the crucial question is whether this will in any way interfere with our military presence in Berlin and with our military access to Berlin. This is the question which will have to be negotiated.

It is not in itself a hopelessly difficult question. Assuming that the Soviet Government turns over to the East German Government its control over access to Berlin, the practical question is how to make sure that the East German Government will not attempt to

interfere with allied military communications by road, rail, canal, and air.

It is here that there will have to be some give and take on both sides, the point of compromise and negotiation being about the powers of the East German control officials. The nub of the problem is whether the Soviet Government will give us a guarantee that the East German officials will not interfere with our military traffic and whether, if the Soviet Government gives this guarantee, we will allow the East German officials to inspect the travel papers of our vehicles.

A Soviet guarantee that the East Germans will not interfere with our vehicles would be a compromise in which neither side would lose face. The Soviet promise to transfer its powers to the East German Government would be fulfilled and at the same time a possible cause of war would be removed. On our side, the fact that the East German officials were subject to a Soviet guarantee would go a long way toward satisfying our official view that in Berlin the Soviet Union cannot divest itself of its obligations under the old international pacts. This formula would also be in accord with the position originally taken by Secretary Dulles in his press conference of November 26, and withdrawn later only upon the insistence of Dr. Adenauer.

To those who will hurriedly exclaim that any dealings with the East German Government are appeasement, we may point out that if this is appeasement, then the leading appeaser is Dr. Adenauer himself. For the actual fact of the matter is that civilian traffic between West Germany and West Berlin is now moving, and has for some time been moving, under an agreement between the two German governments. This agreement includes acceptance by Dr. Adenauer of the right of the inspectors and control agents of the East German Government to deal with the travel papers of West German vehicles.

Dr. Adenauer is now dealing with the East German officials, and if he can do this, why in the name of common sense should we not do the same, especially if we have obtained a guarantee under which we can hold the Soviet Government responsible?

A world war arising out of a quarrel as to whether East German officials can inspect our papers when they already inspect West German papers would be the most preposterous war in history.

I do not mean to say that the formula I am describing is the only way to resolve the Berlin crisis. But it is a way. If it were taken, the real problem of Berlin would still remain, which is how this city can cease to be an island surrounded by the Red army and become the capital of a reunited and unoccupied Germany.

This is a much more difficult problem than the current problem of Berlin, and it will call for much more complicated negotiation, not only with the Soviet Union but among the Western Allies.

[From the New York Herald Tribune,
Dec. 4, 1958]

THE REPLY TO THE SOVIETS
(By Walter Lippmann)

A written reply will, of course, have to be made to the long Soviet note about Berlin. The reply will have to represent the agreed views of London, Paris, Washington and Bonn. But there are various ways of replying to the Soviet note, and we should think carefully before we choose which one.

It would be easy enough to write a reply, which is as argumentative as the Soviet note, rebutting its arguments and asserting our counterarguments. This will give a passing satisfaction to some. But it will do nobody any real good. The problem of the two Germanys and the two Berlins will still be with us.

Another way to reply would be to draft a big program of counterproposals with elaborate principles and generalizations, many of them ambiguous formulas to reconcile divergent views among the Western Powers. It would be a mistake to do this. The Western position is already in a straitjacket of the old formulas which, because they have been promulgated solemnly and publicly, make it almost impossible to maneuver and to negotiate. This suits those, some in very high places, who really do not want to negotiate. But in this changing world, in this changing Europe and changing Germany, the immobility of Western policy is a grave danger.

What then would be a better way to reply? It would be, it seems to me, to focus upon the thesis that the problem of Berlin can be settled only as and when there is a German settlement—that no solution, only at the most a de facto arrangement, is possible if Berlin is treated as an isolated problem.

If this were our thesis, then the next thing to do is to propose the beginning of negotiations about Germany. There are several ways to do this. One way would be to resume the discussion of a high level meeting, perhaps even at the summit. But this way is full of dangers and difficulties, and there is, I think, a better way.

It would be to take notice of the Soviet's standing proposal that the future of Germany be worked out by the two German governments. We could, then, ask the Soviet government whether it is willing to allow the two German governments to negotiate freely and whether it is willing to accept the result if they are able to agree upon the structure of a confederation.

It is almost certain, I believe, that the Soviet government will not agree to negotiations which are as free as that. It will insist on conditions. It will insist that the two Germanys must live within an arrangement which limits their armaments and their alliances.

Be that as it may, an Allied reply which took the line of a negotiation between the two Germanys would pose the basic question as to what are the practical conditions of a negotiated settlement—and what are the possibilities of an all-European security system.

I realize, of course, that a reply of this kind requires a serious modification of Dr. Adenauer's policy of the nonrecognition of the East German state. If he vetoes such a reply, the United States cannot now go over his head. But nevertheless it is a sound way to approach the German question, and it would have powerful support in the Western World, including Western Germany itself.

Indeed, it is hard to see how there can be any successful approach which does not begin with and recognize the facts of life—which are that there are now two Germanys and two Berlins, and that only slowly over a long period of time, and in the climate of national freedom after the foreign troops have departed, can the two Germanys become integrated again.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 1959]
WEST WILL INVITE SOVIET TO PARLEY ON GERMAN SOON—PLANNING GROUP IN UNITED STATES ALSO PUTS EUROPEAN SECURITY ON PROPOSED AGENDA—BONN'S STAND MODIFIED—INSISTENCE ON VOTE BEFORE UNIFICATION IS DROPPED—NATO TO GET DATA

(By William J. Jordan)

WASHINGTON, February 6.—The Western Allies have agreed to invite the Soviet Union to join them at a foreign ministers' meeting in the near future to settle major differences.

The United States, Britain, and France will propose that the Four Power gathering take up a broad range of issues including the reunification of Germany and European

security. They will reject a Soviet bid made January 10 for a 28-nation conference to work out a German peace treaty.

The unified Western Allied position on an East-West meeting was developed this week in Washington by a working group of diplomats representing the United States, Britain, France and West Germany. They were reliably reported to have completed the first phase of their task today.

NATO TO BE INFORMED

Their agreed position now will be transmitted to the North Atlantic Council in Paris for further discussion with other interested Governments.

It is expected here that the final form of the Western Allies notes will be decided next week and that separate messages from Washington, London and Paris will be sent to the Soviet Government within 10 days.

The West Germans are taking a new and considerably more flexible attitude toward the whole problem of German reunification. It was believed this new approach would considerably simplify the work of the Western diplomats in finding an agreed position with which to confront the Soviet leaders.

It was believed that if the Western Allies proposed a time for the foreign ministers' gathering it would be in March or April, probably April.

TALKS MAY SHIFT TO PARIS

The Western Powers probably would prefer holding such a meeting in Geneva or Vienna. They will turn down the Soviet proposals of Warsaw or Prague, mentioned in Moscow's notes as sites for a German peace conference.

The diplomats who worked out the West's answer to Moscow now will turn their attention to tougher problems. They will try to reach agreement on the positions the Western Allies will adopt on various problems likely to come up in any meeting with Soviet representatives.

There was a possibility the group might transfer its activities to Paris so it would be closer to Atlantic Pact headquarters. That would facilitate regular consultation with representatives of other Western Allied Governments, such as those of Italy, who have sometimes felt their views were not fully taken into account in determining Western diplomatic moves.

The first real sign that the Western Powers were prepared to face the Soviet Union with something new in the way of a German settlement was the fresh approach toward reunification the West Germans seemed to have adopted. Reliable sources said instructions embodying the alteration in the West German position had been received by the working group here.

Bonn's representatives now are prepared to discuss with their allies proposals for German reunification that would not include free all-German elections as a necessary first step.

As a further sign of West German willingness to compromise, the German diplomats were said to be ready also to talk about possibilities of face-to-face meetings with East German representatives. Such meetings, if they were held in the future, would not constitute negotiations in the view of the West German Foreign Ministry.

The West Germans' willingness even to consider such meetings with the East Germans represents a major shift in approach. It was believed here that West Germany's leaders were prepared to consider such meetings only because they recognized there probably would be no other way to work out steps toward unification in the absence of elections throughout Germany to select a government for a unified country.

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer is reported to be uneasy about making these shifts in his government's position. Apparently he is not

convinced that they are either wise or can succeed. He has been willing to enable his representatives here at last to discuss them only as a result of considerable pressure inside West Germany and in recognition of his allies' desire to consider all possibilities.

It is clear that before there can be a Western Allied agreement on any proposal embodying these two ideas—postponing free elections for a time and setting up meetings with East German officials—there would be long scrutiny in Bonn. Chancellor Adenauer would have to be convinced that the results of these concessions would be a major advance toward reunification of his country in freedom.

All of these moves suggest that the Western Powers are prepared to produce a somewhat new and fairly comprehensive program for solution of the German problem. There is not too much optimism, however, among most competent observers that they will lead to any speedy or easy agreement with the Soviet Union.

These observers warn against a tendency to confuse progress inside the Western Alliance with an advance toward a settlement of major problems dividing the Communist and non-Communist worlds.

WARNING SIGNALS RAISED

Experts raise the following warning signals for those who are inclined to rush to the conclusion that quick agreement with the Soviet Union may be possible:

The Soviet Union may turn down the Western plan without further ado. Moscow has called for a conference on a German peace treaty that would do nothing about unifying the country. The Soviet leaders may insist that discussion of other issues is not necessary.

Moscow may insist that, if the Western Big Three are to take part in a foreign ministers' meeting, three Communist states also should participate. The West has refused to accept this parity argument in the past.

Despite Western willingness to revise its stand on German reunification, the Soviet leaders have given no sign they want or expect the two German states to be unified under any foreseeable circumstances.

Past meetings on German reunification and on European security have floundered on issues such as setting up control machinery, and there is no sign Moscow has changed its mind about these matters.

ADVANTAGES ARE NOTED

These and other factors cause many experts here to believe that there is little likelihood that a foreign ministers' meeting such as the West is about to propose has much chance of success. But they see the following advantages:

If a meeting can be arranged, it will provide an opportunity to explore how serious Moscow is about relaxing tension in the world.

While talks about Germany and European problems are underway, it is felt the Soviet Union will not press its threats to turn over its occupation function in East Germany to the German Communists, thus endangering the Western Allies' position in Berlin.

The West is desperately anxious to assume the initiative in relations with the Soviet Union, which Moscow has enjoyed so long, and the present situation opens the way to do so.

Secretary of State Dulles went to Europe this week to help work out the position the Western Allies will adopt toward the Soviet Union at a foreign ministers' meeting and in face of a threatened crisis over Berlin. It was reported here that if Moscow accepted the new Western Allies' bid for an East-West meeting, a preliminary conference of Western foreign ministers would precede it.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 14, 1959]

STILL NO RESULT

WARSAW, February 14.—U.S. Ambassador Jacob Beam met for 2½ hours yesterday with Communist Chinese Ambassador Wang Pingnan in the marathon Formosa peace talks here.

The Ambassadors met last on January 9. They scheduled the next meeting for March 19.

POINT 7

[From the New York Times, Feb. 4, 1959]

SOVIET SHIFT SEEN ON GERMAN VOTING—KHRUSHCHEV SAID TO SUPPORT FREE ELECTIONS IF THE TWO GERMANS SET THEM UP

Moscow, February 3.—Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev was reported tonight to have offered support for a plan to unify Germany through free elections if West Germany consented to negotiate the arrangements with the East German Communist regime.

According to informed diplomats here, Mr. Khrushchev outlined this view at length for Dr. Hans Kroll, West German Ambassador, who was summoned to the Premier's Kremlin office yesterday. Deputy Foreign Minister Valerian A. Zorin attended the 2-hour-and-15-minute discussion.

[While various European capitals were sharpening discussions on Germany, Secretary of State Dulles left for London to discuss there and in Paris and Bonn a unified policy on Germany to present to the Soviet Union.]

SOVIET CRITICIZE PLAN

It was not known what other conditions and opinions were set forth by Mr. Khrushchev, who said a week ago that neither of the two Germans could be eliminated "without touching off a world war."

West German diplomats here have refused all comment on yesterday's meeting. After it Dr. Kroll would say only that the matter was "very delicate" and that he could not comment. Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., U.S. Ambassador, presumably received a full briefing on the discussion at a talk with Dr. Kroll this morning.

The traditional Soviet view has been that the unification of Germany could be negotiated only by two existing governments without interference by the Big Four. The Russians have also maintained that the West's demand for free elections was nothing but a trick designed to "swallow up" the East German Communists and to incorporate a united Germany into the Atlantic Alliance.

Soviet leaders have expressed great interests in Secretary of State Dulles' recent comment that free elections were not the only way to unite Germany. In an obvious effort to demonstrate Soviet malleability on the subject, Mr. Khrushchev, in his speech to the Communist Party Congress last Tuesday remarked that he was not opposed to free elections.

The speech was especially severe on Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of West Germany, but it included this paragraph:

"Western propaganda loudly accuses the Soviet Union of opposing German reunification by free elections. We have never objected to free elections. But again the issue must be settled by the Germans themselves. We want all questions pertaining to German reunification to be solved by negotiations between the two German states and not the way Adenauer wants it—through pressure by foreign powers, through their interference in domestic affairs of the German people and by swallowing up the German Democratic Republic [East Germany]."

Mr. Khrushchev reiterated Moscow's support of a plan to "confederate" the two

Germanys as a start toward complete reunification.

It is not known whether Mr. Khrushchev went any further yesterday. It is thought here that he wanted to outline Soviet views before the Germans, British and French began their talks with the Secretary of State Dulles, who flew to London today.

[From the New York Times]

SIGNS OF SHIFT BY BONN

(By Sydney Gruson)

BONN, GERMANY, February 3.—There are signs that Bonn is beginning to come closer to Washington's thinking on the German question even before Secretary of State Dulles arrives here this week.

The latest indication concerns the necessity of making free elections a prerequisite for any moves toward reunification.

For years Chancellor Adenauer has insisted they must come first. But last night a leading member of the Chancellor's Christian Democratic Union backed away from this stand.

Dr. Heinrich Krone, majority leader in parliament, told a party meeting in Munich that while free elections remained a basic element for a German solution, they no longer needed to take first place in negotiations with the Soviet Union.

Mr. Dulles has said that reunification might be brought about without free elections, although that is the natural and preferable way. This leaves a gap between his position and Bonn's, but one not so wide as it was only last month, when Mr. Dulles voiced his stand.

Another important sign of change was a statement yesterday giving the West German Government's support to the idea of an East-West foreign ministers' conference on Germany before the end of May. That is Moscow's deadline for transferring Soviet responsibilities for access to West Berlin to the East Germans.

In general Chancellor Adenauer's thinking seems to be reaching for a new flexibility to match the appearance of flexibility in Mr. Dulles. But it concerns tactics, not the basic attitude that Dr. Adenauer has always preached, which is that any move weakening West Germany's close ties with the Atlantic community would be disastrous.

To observers here the rapprochement between Bonn and Washington seemed to have been made possible by the conviction that Mr. Dulles' fundamental policies also remain unchanged. Observers here believe that the Secretary's newly displayed flexibility concerns approach, not content.

The analysis made by both Western diplomats and many Germans in Bonn is that Mr. Dulles' maximum aim now is to test Moscow's readiness to make concessions on its long-standing German position. For that purpose a willingness to confer and some evidence of flexibility are essential.

But none of these observers really believe that there is any chance for essential change in the Soviet position. Therefore, the test would also be designed, if its results are negative, to show up Soviet intransigence.

For years the West has taken most of the onus for standing pat on Germany and refusing to explore compromise solutions. The minimum aim of the new tactic, it is believed here, would be to shift the blame in a way that is clearly illuminated to world public opinion.

Communist sources, speaking privately, have indicated that the Western appraisal of Soviet determination to maintain communism in East Germany is correct. It has been argued in the West, especially among Socialist Parties, that the pull of West Germany in any confederation would eventually overwhelm East German communism. But

the Communists indicate that if such a thing ever seemed to be happening, the Russians would move back in, perhaps with force, to protect the territorial boundaries of their ideology.

POINTS 8 AND 9

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 29, 1958]

AN ALTERNATIVE IN EUROPE

Now that the West has delivered its reply to Moscow on the German question, the door is officially open for a Big Four conference this spring to discuss not only Berlin and not only Germany, but security arrangements for the whole of Central Europe as well.

The West has again made clear, quite properly, that it will not be thrown out of Berlin and will not recognize any unilateral changes of the present agreements controlling the city. But it has gone farther. It has invited a general negotiation on the whole problem of European security, and it has fortunately refrained from merely reiterating its own previously rejected proposals for the unification of Germany. If the Russians seriously want to talk, the stage is set.

It took the Allies just over a month to agree on this approach. They will now face a natural temptation to rest on their diplomatic oars and wait for the next step to be taken by the Russians. The temptation should be resisted. Instead of concentrating upon speculation as to what the Russians may propose in any negotiation, the West would better devote all its imagination and constructive effort to developing proposals of its own. And this means answering, first of all, soul-searching questions like these:

Can Western security requirements be satisfied without basing nuclear weapons on German soil?

Can the West get along without Germany in NATO?

Can the West accept a demilitarized zone across Central Europe including parts of all of Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia?

These questions need to be answered because they go to the heart of a possible alternative to the present situation of Central Europe. Nobody can know, of course, whether the Soviet Union would accept an alternative. We do know, however, that in its November 27 note on Berlin the Soviet Government proposed, in lieu of its threatened termination of the four-power status of Berlin, a German policy embracing:

"* * * the withdrawal of the Federal Republic of Germany from NATO with the simultaneous withdrawal of the German Democratic Republic from the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the achievement of agreement whereby, in accordance with the principles of the Potsdam agreement, neither of the two German states will have any armed forces in excess of those needed to maintain law and order at home and guard the frontiers."

Whether this suggestion offers a real basis for negotiation can be discovered only by detailed and confidential discussion. As Marquis Childs reports, a growing school of thought in Washington believes that the Russians do want an agreement on Germany, just as in 1955 they accepted an agreement on Austria, if they can get one without abandoning their position in Eastern Europe. But whatever the Soviet point of view, what is important for the West is its own point of view.

Our leaders ought to reexamine our position with great care. For if we could offer a safeguarded plan of military disengagement in Europe as an alternative to existing tensions, the West's moral position before the world would be immensely strengthened whether the Russians accepted it or not.

[From the Sunday Times, Feb. 1, 1959]

NATO LIMITS U.S. POLICY—PROBLEM OF GERMAN UNITY

(By Henry Brandon)

Neither Mr. Khrushchev's boast at the Moscow party congress this week that Russian intercontinental ballistic missiles are now in serial production, nor the prospects that the uncertainties of the Berlin situation will continue for some time, is likely to induce the United States to alter fundamentally its policy on Germany. This policy is tied directly to NATO military strategy.

With American ICBM development substantially behind Russia's. NATO, with its air and intermediate-range ballistic missile bases, is part of the diversification of the means of delivery by which the United States counterbalances the Soviet ICBM lead.

While the serious missile gap lasts, NATO, in the eyes of American military planners, will also remain for some time an indispensable supplement to the overall hydrogen deterrent of the Strategic Air Command. These facts impose limitations on substantial changes of NATO strategy and therefore on American policy on Germany. But they do not exclude the possibility of gradual modifications.

NOT INFLEXIBLE

It is ideas for such modifications that Mr. Dulles is studying now. For the first time, the American approach to the German question is not completely inflexible. Mr. Dulles is really searching for some freedom of maneuver for negotiation at the next four-power foreign ministers' meeting.

Though Mr. Dulles' modified approach to the German problem is more tactical than substantive, it has alarmed Bonn. Whenever the United States shows an inclination toward flexibility, Europe tends to tighten up anxiously; and whenever the United States remains unbending, Europe is critical.

CALL TO ADENAUER

But this time Mr. Dulles is imploring Dr. Adenauer, the West German Chancellor, that the initiative for a solution of the German problem must not become Moscow's monopoly. Mr. Dulles has finally come to this conclusion for these reasons:

1. It is no use going to a conference without having something to offer for negotiation.

2. He does not want to negotiate about Berlin only.

3. Americans believe the East German regime's position is so uneasy that it would be worth investigating some ways of associating it with an economically strong West Germany that would further test the regime's staying power.

4. There is some concern that, unless the West shows some flexibility in negotiations for the unification of Germany, West German public opinion might become restive. It is thought it is time to prove more convincingly that it is the Russians who are preventing German unification.

The reexamination of policy on Germany must not involve a withdrawal of American troops from all of West Germany—at least, not during the present stage of missile development.

This still leaves room for considering schemes such as putting the question of German nuclear rearmament on the bargaining table to find out what Russia would be willing to trade against it, and gradually associating the two Germanys with a view to eventual reunification.

If nothing else, Mr. Dulles is anxious to inquire more into the basic motives of Russian policy in Germany. His attempts to find out more about this from Mr. Mikoyan

apparently failed completely. It is now concluded here that Mr. Mikoyan's mission was public, not private, diplomacy; but officials feel that, judging by Mr. Khrushchev's speech before the party congress, it was useful in that Mr. Mikoyan must have reported in terms relatively free of old dogmas about the real state of the American economy.

It is important to find out more accurately what motivates Russian policy in Germany because at present British and American estimates differ in emphasis. British experts believe that what prompted Mr. Khrushchev to stage the Berlin crisis was to force talks about Germany in general and the nuclear rearmament of West Germany in particular.

RUSSIA'S FEAR

The assumption is that the Russians are afraid West Germany ultimately will become the strongest continental member of NATO and then will try to use the fact to advance her own national aims.

On the other hand, State Department officials are more inclined to think that Mr. Khrushchev's objective is to bolster the shaky East German regime and make East Germany more proof against further internal disintegration. The United States seeks a middle way between the stand-fast position of Bonn and the British ideas, which are considered here to be too far reaching.

France has now informed the United States that she is against a foreign ministers' meeting before Mr. Khrushchev's deadline in May.

Though Mr. Dulles' new approaches are chiefly designed to wrest the diplomatic initiative from Moscow without abandoning basic principles, it is still uncertain whether Dr. Adenauer can be brought round to accept them. Here, as well as in London, it is hoped that a new phase in negotiations with Russia will soon begin, and that gradually progress can be made which would insure a lessening of tension.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON REMARKS

[From the Washington News, Feb. 13, 1959]

THE GERMAN PROBLEM

The State Department has welcomed the various ideas on Germany offered by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD for discussion and exploration. It promises to give the Senator's suggestions "careful attention" and study, as it will others offered in the same spirit—in search of a solution to a problem that, unsolved, remains a constant danger.

Some weeks ago Secretary Dulles set in motion a complete reexamination of all facets of this problem. Many of the ideas Senator MANSFIELD discussed are being studied and reweighed in the light of today's developments.

If the partition of Germany could be satisfactorily resolved with justice, some of the heat in the East-West conflict might diminish. Until then it remains a sort of time bomb in central Europe.

The chances may not be any better today than they have been in the last 13 years. But unless we are to reconcile ourselves to the present unsatisfactory and dangerous status quo forever, periodical new efforts must be made. The world does not stand still—nor does Germany.

Whether we like it or not, the Soviets have reopened this slumbering issue—and we must be ready within months to try to negotiate with them again. It will take the product of the best minds we have in this country to find a new negotiating formula—one that fits today's conditions in contrast to formulae which are now outdated.

Senator MANSFIELD made it clear that the responsibility for a new policy rests with the President and his Secretary of State, but that in the meantime the Senate has an obligation to debate, discuss, and advise. That is the way things are done in this country. To

any who might be tempted to interpret either the Senator's speech or the continuing discussion of Germany in this country as a sign of division or confusion, Mr. MANSFIELD reminded:

"When the President speaks officially on Germany he will be speaking for all of us whether or not we agree with what he says."

[From New York Times, Feb. 14, 1959]

THE MANSFIELD PROPOSALS

The Western Powers are now engaged in a wholesale review of their policies on Germany in an effort to meet the Soviet ultimatum on Berlin with new initiatives and programs designed to test to the limit of any possible Western concessions the real Soviet intentions. Meantime the search for new programs and formulas continues, and while it continues a contribution of any new ideas and suggestions can be only welcome and helpful.

An attempt to make such a contribution has been made by Senator MANSFIELD, recognized as a Democratic expert in foreign affairs. In it the Senator has made some points which need constant emphasis. He is right in emphasizing that the problem of German reunification is the key to the peace of Europe and that this problem is now moving toward a crisis. He is equally right in calling on the administration, Congress and the whole West to stand fast in Berlin. He is also right in emphasizing that German reunification must be accompanied by a security system that safeguards both Germany's neighbors and Germany itself.

But in attempting to work out formulas for attaining these ends Senator MANSFIELD has been lured into propositions which can only throw confusion into the Western ranks, impair Western unity, and encourage the Soviets to press for a Western surrender. Indeed, there is an ominous, though of course unintentional, parallel between Senator MANSFIELD's proposals and those of Premier Khrushchev.

Like Premier Khrushchev, Senator MANSFIELD insists that there are now two German states, or political authorities, even if East Germany is ruled by puppets manipulated by Moscow, and that therefore German reunification can no longer be brought about by the Big Four Powers but only by talks between the two German regimes. If such talks involve a degree of recognition of East Germany, the Senator is willing to accept that, ignoring the fact that in practice this means either recognizing German partition or forcing West Germany into a deal with Moscow as East Germany's master.

Like Premier Khrushchev, who insists on preserving the social gains (meaning the Communist regime) in East Germany, Senator MANSFIELD is willing to accept a not fully representative democracy in East Germany, which would make the East German regime the Communist Trojan Horse in a united Germany. He thinks that East Germans should have "some genuine choice in the form of control exercised over them," but regards free elections as merely an unrealizable slogan—without making any suggestions as to how a genuine choice is to be manifested under a Communist regime.

Finally, and perhaps immediately most important, Senator MANSFIELD, like Premier Khrushchev, proposes to take Berlin out of the context of the German problem and deal with it separately. The Senator would reunite Greater Berlin under an all-Berlin government, withdraw the Western forces, and replace them first with a United Nations police force and later with German militia under NATO guarantees. Quite aside from the fact that the Soviets have already annexed East Berlin to East Germany, and that West Berlin belongs to neither West Germany nor NATO, this proposal not only prejudices Western rights in Berlin but is

the surest way to a conquest of free Berlin by a Communist-dominated militia.

Senator MANSFIELD admits that he "can be wrong." He is wrong, we believe, on these points, and the sooner he rectifies them the better for the West and for peace.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 15, 1959]

MR. DULLES' ILLNESS

The news that Secretary Dulles' illness is cancer, and that he will have to take an immediate leave of absence while undergoing radiation therapy is admittedly a shock. This is not because the prognosis for cancer is as disheartening as it used to be, Mr. Dulles has great courage and great endurance. If any man in the condition indicated can recover, Mr. Dulles can, and that he will do so is the fervent hope and prayer that will go up everywhere in this country and throughout the free world. We need John Foster Dulles.

On the verge of 71 Mr. Dulles' physical achievements as well as his intellectual labors have been remarkable—and even startling. Since becoming Secretary of State he has traveled 560,000 miles—well over a round trip to the moon. From Chancellor Adenauer in Bonn to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in Taipei he has taught powerful individuals to depend on his personal presence and advice. The strain of this travel and the profound responsibility that went with it day and night, week in and week out, year in and year out, would have worn anybody down. Mr. Dulles endured these hardships like a good soldier. Now he is wounded and must retire from action for a time. That, too, is the destiny of soldiers.

No one can realize more keenly than Mr. Dulles how unfortunate it is that he cannot at this precise moment be fully active. We are approaching a crisis over the city of Berlin, over our entire relationship with Russia, and possibly over the immediate future of the whole free world. Senator MANSFIELD appeared to be arguing last Friday for what could be called an agonizing reappraisal of our European policy. Senator MANSFIELD's main thesis seems to us to be wrong, but he does have to be answered and alternatives have to be found.

Thus, at the very moment when the fruits of 6 years of the most arduous work are at stake, it is a tormenting situation that Mr. Dulles finds himself in. We fully believe, as must everyone who knows the man and his work, that his concern today is less for his personal well-being than for the security of his country and of the democratic world.

It may be that this present emergency will require us to reexamine the role and function of the State Department. We have placed too heavy a burden on one man—a devoted, intelligent, quietly heroic man. It was too much to ask.

It will now be necessary—not, we hope, to find a successor for Mr. Dulles—but to reorganize the top levels of the State Department to meet this crisis. The Department has extraordinarily able men, including the Under Secretary of State, now Acting Secretary, Christian A. Herter, and Deputy Under Secretary of State C. Douglas Dillon. Such men can be depended upon to carry forward the policies pursued by Secretary Dulles and approved by the President. But the lesson taught by Mr. Dulles' breakdown might lead to some change in the method of day by day direction of our foreign policy. The ultimate responsibility must rest with the Secretary and through him with the President. It may be, however, that thinking is more important than traveling. Mr. Dulles has been, in a way, the victim of the very ease with which men get around the world today.

In the weeks to come we shall undoubtedly see significant shifts in the front ranks of the State Department. The expected

meeting of Western foreign ministers in Paris in March will not be called off because one man is unable to be there. Our national policies—to stand firm for even the smallest threatened islands of democracy, such as West Berlin, to offer conciliatory programs insofar as we can do so without compromising freedom—these have been fixed, are nonpartisan, and will endure.

We must now hope not merely for Secretary Dulles' safety and recovery but that we will continue for a long time to have the benefit of his advice. We need that advice far more than we need his physical presence in an airplane or in some faraway capital. For the country's sake as well as for his own, we wish him well.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 16, 1959]

THE WORLD PERSPECTIVE

It may be true, as is often said, that those who live at a given time cannot have as good a perspective on the events of their era as can historians writing decades afterward. Yet the effort to obtain perspective on one's own time is one that must be made, for without some kind of framework of interpretation there is only a chaos of unrelated, essentially meaningless facts.

The key to a perspective on the present world situation is recognition of the fact that we are right now in a time of swift change. An unfortunate symbol of that change is the news that Secretary of State Dulles is so ill that many of his difficult duties must be taken over by others. This misfortune was made known after Prime Minister Macmillan of Britain had decided to visit Moscow this week and Senator MANSFIELD had spoken on the Senate floor—in many respects unwisely—for changes in the Western approach to the problem of Germany. And behind these and other signs of ferment in Western political thinking and action is the ominous deadline Khrushchev has set for West Berlin, a deadline now little more than 3 months away.

In the Communist world there are change and tensions, too, though great efforts are made to hide that reality. The relations between the Soviet Union and China are obviously quite different today from what they were a few years ago when Communist China was still only recovering from the wounds of its civil war. Last weekend, for example, Moscow and Peking celebrated the ninth anniversary of their treaty of friendship and alliance with much talk of unshakable unity. But the world of 1959 is not the world of 1950 and Khrushchev's relation to Mao today cannot be and is not what Stalin's was.

It is also clear that the thunderous fusillades both Moscow and Peking direct so often against Yugoslavia would not be needed if Yugoslavia's successful show of independence were not even now exerting an important attractive influence upon countries still subservient to Moscow. And within the Soviet Union itself the most corrosive agents of social and political change are at work: education, greater knowledge of the outside world, and the desire for a better, freer life.

What we do not know, of course, is the end result those signs of change and forces for change will bring. Premier Khrushchev, of course, speaks confidently of his inevitable victory. But he spoke confidently at the 20th Communist Party congress three years ago, too, little dreaming of the disasters he would suffer in Poland and Hungary within a year. The future, in short, is as inscrutable to him as it is to us.

What we do know, however, is that the changes now underway in the world are powerfully affected by the knowledge on both sides of the disastrous and universally suicidal potentialities of renewed world war. That knowledge is perhaps the greatest change of all in the human condition today as against all previous recorded history.

Against this background it is clearer than ever that the changes now and in the future must take place under a compulsion if sanity prevails to maintain the peace. We may all hope that that compulsion will be effective, for otherwise humanity has no future.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, Feb. 13, 1959]

MANSFIELD SPEAKS OUT

Senator MANSFIELD has made a speech outlining positive and constructive proposals for negotiating a settlement of the Berlin problem and the reunification of Germany. He is a careful and responsible man, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the deputy leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the party leader, has by implication endorsed Mr. MANSFIELD's proposals by saying that this was a great speech.

The Mansfield speech does not, however, necessarily reflect the thinking of Democrats in the Senate as a whole. It does lend the support of an enlightened and influential Senator to the call for flexibility in the American policy and in the approach of the Western nations as a group to the thorny Berlin question. Mr. MANSFIELD does not suggest any abatement of the Western decision not to be driven out of Berlin. He upholds all that Mr. Dulles has said on that score.

If Mr. MANSFIELD's ideas can be summed up in any word, it is disengagement. He does not go as far in that direction as Mr. Mr. George Kennan, who has become the principal exponent of disengagement in the United States. However, Mr. MANSFIELD does suggest that the Rapacki plan for the establishment of a neutral zone in Central Europe be considered. That plan also figures largely in Mr. Kennan's thinking.

The deputy Democratic leader would have the United Nations help East and West Germany to negotiate an all-Berlin government, and in the case of success, United Nations might replace both Russian and Allied forces in the city. Otherwise, he would let Russian forces leave and Germanize the forces of freedom in Berlin under NATO guarantees. As for Germany as a whole, he is willing to have East and West Germans work out a plan for unification subject to the proviso that the East Germans have some choice in their own decision. And while he would limit armaments in German and Central Europe, he wishes the reunited Germany to continue its association with the Western alliance. These views are cogently presented and include a wealth of informative discussion.

This scheme goes far beyond anything that the Secretary of State could say at this time, or even hint at. Mr. Dulles must keep his plans completely covered, for as a negotiator he cannot expose his hand to the Russians. Mr. MANSFIELD can speak more freely. Mayor Willy Brandt of Berlin, now in this country, objects to his plan. Foreign diplomats in Washington are said to be shocked at the Mansfield speech. The shock may arise from fear that it may injure the West's negotiating position. However, there is nothing in the speech contrary to Mr. Dulles' Berlin statement that Western concessions were dependent on the Russians' making them too. And the speech may make it easier here at home for Mr. Dulles to offer concessions for a price. In any event, it will undoubtedly help in clarifying a situation that for the average citizen is as confusing as it is dangerous.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1959]

MR. MANSFIELD'S PRESCRIPTION

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD has given a strong nudge to the administration in his sugges-

tion of direct negotiations between West Germany and East Germany. The thoughtful discussion of the Berlin crisis by the Democratic whip goes farther than that of any other legislator to question cherished postulates of Western policy. Some of his assumptions, we think, are mistaken and others are unrealistic. Moreover, some of his remonstrances to the administration about past standpattism seem inappropriate after the State Department has begun to move in its approach to the problem. Nevertheless, it is highly useful to have encouragement from Capitol Hill for a searching examination of the possibility of arms limitation in Central Europe.

Mr. MANSFIELD would have the Western Powers safeguard their rights and access to Berlin, but he would have the East and West regimes negotiate toward a unified neutralized city. He would have a United Nations police force replace present Allied and Soviet troops; or, if this were impracticable, he would replace Allied troops with West German troops. He would abandon free all-German elections as a prerequisite for German unification (something Mr. Dulles already has done in effect). While continuing West Germany's ties to Western Europe, he would consider various proposals, including the Rapacki plan for arms control.

We have serious misgivings about two of Senator MANSFIELD's proposals. The suggestion for negotiations on unification of Berlin seems to us to approach the problem backward, because the division of Berlin reflects the division of Germany. It is difficult to conceive of any sort of city unification that would preserve freedom and still would survive as an island in Communist East Germany. Any stable unification of Berlin is likely to depend on the prior unification of Germany.

Similarly, we doubt the feasibility of bringing the United Nations into what, at root, is a dispute between two great power blocs, the Soviet Union and United States and its allies. The U.N. might be able to perform a simple police-type assignment; but without prior settlement in this situation the international organization would be subjected to impossible ideological pulling and hauling.

Mr. MANSFIELD is quite right, however, in saying that East Germany cannot be wished away. The West Germans have recognized the fact of the Communist regime in their trade relations. Of course, the practicability of negotiations would depend upon the Soviet purpose. Do the Russians want a settlement in the crisis they have created, or do they merely want to inhibit West German rearmament while perpetuating the division? It is unlikely that they will relinquish the Communist system in East Germany. How much room this leaves for acceptable compromise is debatable; but the West ought to find out.

The big point is that a divided Germany is in itself unstable. This is the basic flaw in the thinking of those who would just as soon see the division remain. The artificial separation is a canker in the consideration of other European problems. Furthermore, it is high time to abandon the shibboleth that nuclear armaments in West Germany are a sine qua non of Western defense and to look seriously at the feasibility of mutual East-West security arrangements.

That is why we think Mr. MANSFIELD has performed a service despite our disagreements on details. None of this, however, ought to obscure the basic prior necessity for specific Allied agreement on military defense of land access to Berlin. Counterproposals will be most useful if they stem from clear understanding of military intentions.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer,
Feb. 13, 1959]

ACT FOR PEACE ON BERLIN ISSUES

This newspaper has strongly believed and said so, that the Western Powers should not merely await Russian initiative in the Berlin crisis. We should have our own policies, with the allied nations united to stand by them.

We should not just say "No," sit tight, wait it out. Moscow has announced intentions to pull out of the long-established, Four Power control of Berlin by May 27, demanding that the Western Powers get out also. And thereupon to leave Berlin, its communications, and the life of its people, to the East German Communist regime.

That regime is a firsthand agency of the Kremlin. The prospects of an inert western policy—a waiting game—or, worse still, of no definite policy at all, may be dangerous in the extreme. The Berlin crisis, and all that surrounds it, carries a threat of war.

The alternative is actively to seek ways and means—and we repeat, on a united front—to develop sound solutions of the Berlin and German unification problems.

The entire question has gained new widespread interest through the trip of now ailing Secretary of State Dulles among western European capitals. This has produced affirmations of allied rights. Also a movement has taken form, attributed to western leaders, for definite consultations with the Russians.

Yesterday, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, called for United Nations conciliations to unify Berlin and ease the threats the Soviet-created crisis concerning it have raised.

Senator MANSFIELD's voice is authoritative. He is assistant Democratic leader and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. He is right in declaring the time has come for positive action and a great deal of talk between east and west Germans.

Mr. MANSFIELD put it this way: "We are approaching the beginning of the end of two Berlins and of two Germanys." He declared that standing fast in Berlin is simply a slogan and not enough.

His conclusion is profoundly significant—that immobility "• • • may well lead down the blind alley of an unnecessary conflict or disastrous diplomatic defeat."

Emphasizing that both Democratic and Republican leaders in Congress stand solidly back of the policy of refusing to be driven from Berlin, Senator MANSFIELD stresses the need for a western initiative for peace.

Such an initiative is required. Current dispatches from European capitals seem to envisage a movement for a Four Power Foreign Ministers conference to talk over the Berlin and German questions.

This would include Britain, France, Russia, and the United States. And an additional factor—the attendance as advisers of representatives of both West and East Germany.

The proposition would not, it is maintained involve recognition of Russian-controlled Communist East Germany. Its representatives would attend to consult with those of Russia; the West Germans to act in a similar way with the Western Powers.

We do not have to accept this idea as final. It may, however, be worth serious consideration.

These proposals and others aimed at German unification demand thoughtful study and action. They all look in one vital direction; that is, to prevent the Berlin situation from drifting toward perilous futility. The Berlin problem is the most important peace question of this time. On our side we should get down to cases and seek honest and honorable solutions to insure that peace, not grave new dangers, may come from them.

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Feb. 13, 1959]

TALKING ABOUT BERLIN'S FUTURE—OUTPOURING OF THOUGHTS FOR SOLUTION SEEN REPLACING FORMER INFLEXIBILITIES

(By Doris Fleson)

If there has been only a little thaw in the cold war, there has been a big one in talk about the future of Berlin and Germany which threatens to produce a flood.

Once the status quo of the Berlin situation promised to be breached, suggestions for dealing with that, with the reunification of Germany, and even with the whole European position have been pouring out from sources high and low. Thoughts which have been pent up by inflexibilities on both sides have now been released. It produces a marked contrast with periods only a short time ago in which all sides appeared bereft of ideas capable of producing any hopeful change in the cold war. Some of the ideas now being presented are useless on their face; some seem dangerous. But it should be a good thing to get talk going again, talk being, as often noted, infinitely less dangerous than war.

On the theory that the position of Berlin cannot well be dealt with without also dealing with the whole question of a united Germany, this appears to be accepted by the United States and its allies as well as the Soviet Union. It also is true that the question of a unified Germany, under whatever conditions, could hardly be dealt with without bringing up the whole European position which it would deeply affect. We are certain to be hearing about some daring proposals in this direction.

The practical difficulty of this is that if too great a task is set for the coming meeting of foreign ministers it would be less likely that it could come to the sort of agreement which would settle the immediate problem before us, which is the future of Berlin. Planning an agenda which is at the same time big enough to encompass the possibilities and limited enough to fall within the practicalities will be one of the great tasks to be accomplished before there is any meeting at all. Its accomplishment will not be as simple as falling off a log.

The direction in which State Department thinking has been going is demonstrated by the offer to have representatives of both the West and East German Governments participate in the conferences as attachés of delegations officially there. But this was followed with the tantalizing suggestion that the same might be done for representatives of Poland and Czechoslovakia. This was a bland way to pull the tail of the Russian bear.

There could be nothing more desirable to the Governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia than to be at the conference. They are as vitally concerned as France in what is going to happen to Germany. They are nearer to Germany than the Soviet Union, and for all the intimacy of their association with the Russians, they might have different ideas of where their interests lay than the Soviet Union would have. It was not a suggestion guaranteed to enchant the Russians.

Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana, who does both his homework and his fieldwork on foreign policy matters, has now reminded the Senate that 9 months ago he warned that body of the coming crisis in Germany.

"The question was never," he said, "Would Germany be unified? It was when and how Germany could be unified. We may now have begun to comprehend the 'when'; the actual process of unification is likely to begin this year. Only one question remains, How is Germany to be unified? Will it be by conflict, by negotiation, or by some mixture of the two? That is the question which

is impelling us and the rest of the world toward the coming crisis in Germany."

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Feb. 14, 1959]

BERLIN DANGER

Montana's Senator MANSFIELD has made a responsible and constructive contribution to the debate on the Berlin-German problem.

The Mansfield speech is not a partisan attack on Mr. Dulles or the Eisenhower administration. It is, rather, a notable effort to focus public attention on the great danger which lies ahead, especially with respect to Berlin, and to stimulate consideration of new approaches by the West to this problem.

The Russians have announced that, unless an agreement is reached, they intend to pull out of Berlin on May 27 and hand over their occupational responsibilities to the East Germans. We should assume that they mean what they say, and that Western protests will not stop them. It is in this context that Senator MANSFIELD, in what he described as carefully measured words, expressed to the Senate his belief that "just ahead lies the most critical period which the United States will have had to face since the conflict in Korea." At stake, he said, are the "lives of tens of millions of human beings, Americans included." This is a sober estimate, not an alarmist forecast, and it is of high importance that this be understood.

Senator MANSFIELD believes that Germany is going to be reunified—and by the West and East Germans themselves. This will come about peaceably or by force, and the latter course almost certainly would mean an enormously destructive war. Mr. MANSFIELD suggests a start in Berlin, hoping that this may produce patterns of unification which would be applicable to the problem of peaceful all-German unification.

In any event, he urges that Western policy, and particularly United States policy, be redesigned to accommodate and encourage peaceful unification.

"I submit," he said, "that a policy which merely clings to an unrealizable slogan of free all-German elections, which does not pursue German unification by other means, is no policy at all. It is a straitjacket. It is an excuse for immobility. It may well lead down the blind alley of an unnecessary conflict or disastrous diplomatic retreat."

The Montana Senator offered nine points for consideration. The first is rather vaguely stated—that "forces representing the concept of freedom in peace" not be driven out of Berlin. What he apparently has in mind is that German forces should be substituted as soon as possible for Western forces in Berlin. These German forces would be fully supported by NATO guarantees. In any plan of unification, he says, East Germans as well as West Germans must be free to express a political preference—even though the expression, in the case of the East Germans, may be recorded only in East Germany. Finally, Mr. MANSFIELD strongly urges a search for agreements which might lead to limitation of armaments through Germany and central Europe—even though this would entail genuine consideration of Communist-sponsored plans.

In a word, Senator MANSFIELD wants the West to get off dead center and begin serious work on a realistic plan. His specific suggestions may not be the best, nor does he contend that they are. And it is true, of course, that Mr. Dulles, prior to his latest illness, seemed to be moving closer to the Mansfield point of view.

But words are one thing; a policy is something else. The West has had plenty of slogans to fit the German situation.

Slogans, however, are not a policy, and it is a policy which is so urgently required.

[From the New York Daily News, Feb. 13, 1959]

ASK MARSHALL—HE KNOWS

Or should know, assuming he can learn from experience.

We're speaking of Gen. George C. Marshall. What brought him to mind was the much-touted speech Thursday by Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, on what to do about Germany.

It is MANSFIELD's lovely thought that the Western allies should gradually pull out of West Berlin and let the West German leaders and the East German Reds reunify Germany.

President Truman, back in 1945, had a similar lovely thought about China. He sent Marshall as his special envoy to pressure the Chinese Nationalists and Communists into setting up a joint government. The upshot of this cockeyed venture was that the Reds eventually squeezed Chiang Kai-shek out of mainland China.

Decent people cannot safely trust Reds—as Marshall must know now, and as MANSFIELD should have learned from Marshall's experience. When you do trust a Red, he cuts your throat.

It looks to us as if MANSFIELD, in the greatness of simple-minded good faith, is only proposing a plan to let the Reds grab all Germany sooner or later; probably sooner.

West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer is not buying the Mansfield plan. Mayor Willy Brandt of West Berlin says it is based on a dangerous illusion. We hope it will be rejected just as flatly by the United States, British, and French Governments.

[From the New York Daily Mirror, Feb. 13, 1959]

A MISTAKEN PLAN

Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana, one of our abler Senators, proposes that East and West Germany do their own peace-making and that the Soviet and United States troops in these countries be replaced by a United Nations force.

The proposal is made in the desire to avert war with Soviet Russia. Coming from Senator Mansfield, it must be regarded as representing a serious and sincere point of view.

Its weakness lies in the fact that Senator Mansfield ignores two historic factors:

1. West Germany is our ally. We have rebuilt that nation and it is a bulwark against Soviet imperialism.

2. His proposal is a modification of the Soviet plan and if accepted would represent another victory for Russia.

Therefore Soviet imperialism would be strengthened throughout the world and would become a greater problem.

It is therefore a self-defeating proposal, however well intentioned.

Furthermore, no matter how far from East Germany the Russians remove their troops, Russian trained and directed armies exist in Poland and in all the territory that surrounds East Germany.

Also, East Germany is a province of Soviet Russia politically and is governed by Kremlin appointees.

On the other hand, American troops to be moved an equidistance from Berlin, let us say, would have to be in the Atlantic Ocean and if, at a moment, Russia sent tanks into West Germany to take it over, the defensive force would be inadequate.

Finally, why should we move out of West Germany before our ally asks us to?

Mayor Willy Brandt of West Berlin does not ask us to leave that city.

Chancellor Adenauer does not ask us to leave West Germany.

Why should we accept an ultimatum from the Russians?

The day will surely come soon when even those Americans who prefer to remain blind will recognize the fact of history that, while it is true that we fought a war against Germany, it is equally true that our enemy is and has been Soviet Russia and that the Russian menace is draining our lifeblood as a nation.

Peace with Soviet Russia will not be found by sacrificing our allies until we have none. Peace with Soviet Russia can only come from strength.

The Russians understand strength; they laugh at cowardice.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 16, 1959]

RUSHING TOWARD UNITY

In an eloquent speech Senator Mansfield has offered some thoughtful and thought-provoking views on what he calls the coming crisis in Germany. His views had added significance in the light of the weekend announcement of Secretary Dulles' new illness.

Yet, for all the merit of the MANSFIELD assessment, we fear it contains a central defect. The key question, in Mr. MANSFIELD's mind, is not whether Germany will be united but when and how. He thinks the when is already at hand, is beginning this year. To arrive at the how of it, he says that we must realistically acknowledge that the Communist regime in East Germany is not going to disappear voluntarily any more than the free Government in West Germany is going to choose to go out of business. Therefore, any form of unification is going to be less than perfect from the point of view of either West or East.

From this the Senator derives two further points. It is primarily the Germans, East and West, who are going to, and should, decide the how of unification. And, if the means are not to be war, it behooves the United States to put forth promptly fresh proposals designed to help the Germans achieve unity.

Now if the assumptions are correct, then the proposals which Mr. MANSFIELD does in fact put forth have a certain validity. He proposes that the Germans in both parts of divided Berlin start serious efforts to unify the municipal government, perhaps with a U.N. force supervising the agreement. And in this pattern he sees an application to the largest problem of unifying all Germany, though at some stage of the process all Germans must have some means of expressing their political preferences without the threat of terror.

But is the Senator's central assumption correct? Is it true that time and events are rapidly pushing toward German unification one way or another, and that we must therefore do everything possible to speed the process?

The Soviets, for their part, have never shown convincing interest in any kind of unity except under their complete domination. They have spurned free election, as advocated by the West, for nearly 14 years. They talk favorably of confederation without elections, but it is by no means sure they would even permit that unless it guaranteed their continued control of East Germany and a good chance to grab West Germany.

As for the Germans, the overwhelming majority in the Soviet Zone want freedom and perhaps they will rise again as they did in 1953, despite the presence of 22 Red army divisions. But that is in the realm of conjecture, hardly the basis for policy. In West Germany reunification is an emotional and political issue, but the West Germans aren't so frantic that they are determined to have unity this year no matter what; certainly

they have no intention of trying to get unity by force.

So Mr. MANSFIELD may be offering somewhat unreal alternatives: That there must be a rapid unification of Germany, or else there will be a war. If that proposition is questionable, then there is some danger in rushing toward forms of unity, in Berlin and all Germany, that may not serve our interests in German freedom at all.

We might remember that not so many years ago this country exerted prodigious efforts to get the Chinese Nationalists and Chinese Communists to join in a coalition government. That was a tragic blunder; the upshot was not coalition but Communist conquest. The Czechs learned the same sorrowful lesson. The same danger lurks in plans for confederation or coalition with the Communists in Germany.

This newspaper believes the administration should welcome all fresh thoughts on dealing with Germany, for we agree with Senator MANSFIELD that it is a potentially explosive issue. We also believe that our policymakers should, in any new negotiations with the Soviets, be able to maneuver as much as possible within the limits of safety.

But, as these columns recently tried to indicate, it is essential to know what the limits are, to distinguish sharply between what is not vital to the interests of freedom and what is vital. In his understandable eagerness for German unity, Senator MANSFIELD comes close to confusing the two.

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch, Feb. 15, 1959]

THE OPPOSITIONS UNITE

Senator MANSFIELD's thoughtful speech on Germany in the Senate last week was a gratifying demonstration of constructive opposition. The assistant Democratic floor leader advanced not only specific proposals for the negotiation of a new status for Germany, but a most wholesome attitude. He urged our Government to accept first of all the reality that change is coming. Then he proposed that we adapt ourselves to change, that we approach it with creative imagination, that we undertake to guide it into channels serving Western security and world peace.

At last it has been clearly said by a responsible party leader that clinging to the old formula of German unification by free elections is not vital to the national interest. Now it has been said that we should go halfway toward the Soviet position and encourage direct negotiations between East and West Germany. Now it has been said that the Rapacki plan for a buffer zone free of nuclear weapons, and other plans for demilitarization of the border between East and West, should be parts of Western thinking. Now it has been said that military disengagement should be an objective.

Only a year ago ideas like these, when put forward by George F. Kennan in his English lectures, were energetically repelled by official Washington. That they are now seriously considered by the Democratic majority in the Senate, if not by the administration, is a measure of a revolution in Western thought.

It is now a deeply significant fact that the general ideas and attitude suggested by Senator MANSFIELD last week are shared by the responsible opposition leaders in Britain, Germany, and the United States. There is a strong presumption that in each country the opposition approach more nearly reflects current public opinion than does the official policy of the conservative government leaders.

The people yearn to face forward. They long to put behind them the stale deadlocks of the cold war. They seek an accommodation of national interests which involves

surrender by neither side and yet lays the foundation for disarmament and the quelling of tension. The question is whether those who now hold power can recognize and adjust to this upwelling of popular opinion.

MISCELLANEOUS

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Nov. 23-30, 1958]

SIX MONTHS OF OPPORTUNITY

Because Premier Khrushchev's German note was issued in the atmosphere of a Berlin crisis, its proposals on West Berlin got the most attention. But as the note is studied carefully in Western capitals it may well take on more significance as a serious and carefully planned attempt to initiate a settlement on Germany as a whole. Since Germany cannot be separated from central Europe, the note must be regarded as bidding seriously for negotiation on European issues as well.

It seems to us supremely important that in formulating their reply the Atlantic Powers should avoid merely knocking down the Berlin proposals—even though, standing alone, these may call for knocking down. The Berlin question cannot be solved in a vacuum, but only as part of a general German settlement. The West would err most grievously if it failed to keep the door open for that kind of settlement, and if it failed to develop its own constructive and new proposals to that end.

The need for new proposals requires emphasis because there will surely be a strong temptation to repeat what the West has been saying for 10 years—that the whole German problem can be solved simply by reuniting East and West by free elections.

This formula, however desirable it may seem in the abstract, has become the excuse for inaction rather than a fruitful basis for settlement. Among the facts which must be faced as a part of today's world is the fact that the Soviet Union does not intend to permit integration of East and West Germany in a way which would permit the new Germany to become a military ally of the West.

To be perfectly fair, let it be said that the West would not permit a reunified Germany to arise as a military ally of Russia, either. Have we the right to demand from the Russians something we would not think of conceding ourselves?

If the old Western basis for a settlement is gone it does not follow, however, that all basis is gone—provided our leaders can face up to the realities and summon the resources of imaginative leadership that are needed. In holding out the possibility that East Germany could be withdrawn from the Warsaw Treaty Organization in return for West Germany's separation from NATO, Khrushchev seems to be renewing, with great emphasis, the Rapacki plan for a demilitarized belt through central Europe. In offering to accept U.N. supervision of a demilitarized Berlin, he may be hinting that similar international jurisdiction on a larger scale might be negotiable.

The Rapacki plan in its original form had obvious defects from the Western point of view. It proposed to bar nuclear arms from the two Germanys, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, but said nothing about conventional forces. A one-sided deal like that would leave the Communists with predominant power in Central Europe.

Now the plan has been revised by the Poles to embrace a two-stage agreement. In the first stage, nuclear armament in the area would be frozen while talks were held on reduction of conventional arms; in the second, nuclear and conventional disarmament would be carried out simultaneously.

This plan also may be inadequate. But would it not be far better for the West to

bring forward its own proposals for the demilitarization of central Europe, including Germany, than to go on pressing for the permanent incorporation of Germany into the western military alliance? The West might, for example, insist on U.N. supervision of the demilitarized zone and on a balanced withdrawal of both Soviet and Western forces from it. Other conditions to assure good faith performance of the contract could be added.

Within some such central European settlement it might be possible to work out a German settlement along the lines increasingly mentioned of late in both Germany and Russia. The West could give up its aspiration for an all-democratic Germany and Moscow its hopes for an all-Communist Germany. The two Germanys could be brought together in some form of confederation or dual state which preserved the political and social structure of each but denied them both the military means to threaten aggression either way.

Whether any settlement along these lines is possible can be doubted, but it is worth thinking about if only to get away from the stereotypes and frozen formulas that have blocked any better settlement all these years. If by good fortune a confederation did work out to everybody's satisfaction, then the Berlin problem could be solved at last. It is most unlikely to be solved without a general German settlement.

In any event, the West should prepare itself to negotiate on Germany during the next 6 months, and should do its best to develop fresh, creative proposals. It is well to remember that a demilitarized central Europe verifiably free of nuclear arms might be quite as much to our advantage as to the Soviet Union's.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 12, 1959]

UNITED STATES SAYS SOVIET IS PACT VIOLATOR— ACCUSES MOSCOW OF ALTERING HISTORY— LISTS BREACHES OF POTSDAM AGREEMENT

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, November 30.—State Department officials charge that, contrary to Moscow's complaint that the West has violated the Potsdam agreement, the Soviet Union itself has broken that agreement as well as other accords on Germany.

These officials have had long experience with what is viewed as Soviet rewriting of history. Nevertheless, they are amazed at what they consider brazen historical distortion and twisted logic in last week's Soviet note on Berlin.

In a speech November 10, Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev called for ending the occupation status of Berlin on the ground that the West had violated the Potsdam agreement, which does not even mention Berlin.

Last Thursday's Soviet note proposing that West Berlin be made a free city did not repeat this error. It specifically denounced two agreements dealing with occupation zones and the four-power control of Berlin.

Nevertheless, the note still charged at length that the Western Powers had violated the Potsdam agreement, which was reached August 2, 1945, by the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union.

Following are essential provisions of the Potsdam agreement and of the accord on the Allied Powers' assumption of supreme authority, with the Soviet violations as charged here. This compilation is based on a document prepared in 1955 for the Senate Judiciary Committee by State Department sources.

THE POTSDAM AGREEMENT

Agreement: So far as practicable the occupying powers should accord uniformity of treatment to the German population in their respective zones.

Violation: Beginning in June 1952, East German authorities, under Soviet direction, undertook to isolate the East Germany population from contact with the West, particularly West Germany. The program was aimed chiefly at reducing the exodus of East Germans, which reached 1 million in 1952. Except for crossing points in Berlin, the interzonal frontier was closed. Substantial parts of the population, including entire villages, were forcibly evacuated from a 3-mile-wide zone along the West German frontier.

Agreement: Germany should be completely disarmed and demilitarized and industry capable of military production should be eliminated or controlled.

Violation: The Soviet Union established in East Germany a police force of approximately 110,000 men that, because of its training and equipment, was actually military in character. This was supplemented by an equal number of paramilitary security and border police. To counter this violation, the West decided to raise and arm a West German force to be incorporated into the Atlantic alliance.

Agreement: The administration of Germany should be directed toward the decentralization of the political structure and the development of local responsibility.

Violation: Soviet authorities restricted the activities of non-Communist parties by depriving them of facilities equal to those of the Socialist Unity Party, interfered in their affairs and coerced their leaders.

Agreement: Subject to the need for maintaining military security, freedom of speech, the press and religion was to be respected and free trade unions were to be permitted.

Violation: Soviet authorities, by police and party intimidation and suppression, have eliminated freedom of speech and the press. Basic human rights and legal processes have been denied. The authorities have resorted to arbitrary seizures of property, detentions, deportations and forced labor.

Agreement: During the occupation period Germany was to be treated as a single economic unit, with common zonal policies on transportation and communications.

Violation: From the beginning the Russians followed a unilateral economic policy, and made trade across the zonal borders more difficult than is customary across national frontiers.

Agreement: Reparations payments should be scaled to leave enough resources for the subsistence of the German people without external assistance.

Violation: The Russians took large amounts of reparations from current production and absorbed a substantial amount of industry into state-owned enterprises. They have refused to submit detailed reports on reparations removals.

Agreement: The western frontiers of Poland, in conformity with a Yalta Conference decision, were to await a peace settlement.

Violation: On July 6, 1950, East Germany and Poland signed an agreement making the Oder-Neisse demarcation line the definitive German-Polish frontier.

AGREEMENT ON GERMANY

Agreement: A Kommandatura, consisting of four commandants in Berlin, was to direct the city's joint administration.

Violation: On July 1, 1948, the Soviet representative walked out of the Kommandatura, and Soviet authorities announced they would no longer participate in any meetings. This destroyed the quadripartite control machinery. The Berlin blockade from July 2, 1948, to May 12, 1949, was also directed at destroying the four-power status and driving the West out of Berlin.

Agreement: During the period when Germany was carrying out the requirements of unconditional surrender, authority on matters concerning the whole country was to be exercised by a control council of the four zonal commanders in chief.

Violation: On March 20, 1948, the Soviet commander unilaterally adjourned a meeting of the council and walked out, thereby ending its operations.

[From the London Sunday Times, Jan. 18, 1959]

TOWARD A GERMAN SETTLEMENT

(By Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick)

Recent Russian moves in regard to Berlin and the German problem mark a significant change. At Geneva in 1955 and in the course of subsequent exchanges, Mr. Khrushchev's attitude has been that a German settlement can wait. He believes that time is on his side and that he holds the trump cards. After all, Dr. Adenauer is not eternal. When the climate becomes more favorable, ways and means could be found of reaching a settlement acceptable to Russia.

If necessary, the Soviet Government will be in a position to offer Germany massive inducements which the West could not hope to match: the return of the lost provinces and the restoration of Germany's traditional trade outlets to the east. Moreover, the rising standard of life in Russia would make communism less repugnant to the German masses and so facilitate a Russo-German understanding. Meanwhile, it is of course essential to preserve and sustain the Communist regime in Eastern Germany. This in brief has hitherto been the Russian attitude.

It would be idle to speculate on the motives which have brought the Kremlin to abandon the waiting game and to choose this moment to force the German issue. It may be Mr. Khrushchev's method of securing the conference for which he has long been pressing. If the Western Powers decide to open negotiations, their problem is to resolve on which points they must stand firm and on which a compromise is tolerable in the interests of a German settlement.

In the matter of German unity Russian and Western interests are fundamentally divergent. Russia is opposed to German unity on anything like Western terms, not because she is afraid of a German military resurgence, but on purely political grounds. Mr. Khrushchev has avowed that he will do his utmost to disrupt NATO; and no more effective step could be taken than to remove Germany from the organization and to secure the withdrawal of all remaining NATO forces to an indefensible strip on the continent.

Secondly, Russia cannot afford to sacrifice the Red leaders in Berlin, so losing her foothold in Germany and demoralizing her henchmen in the satellite countries. Thirdly, the establishment of a free Germany would bring freedom to the frontiers of Poland, which would henceforth find herself in the situation in Yugoslavia, that is to say of a country sustained in the struggle for independence by direct access to the West.

The Western Powers, on the other hand, are bound both by honor and by motives of self-interest to maintain that Germany must be unified in freedom. Article 7 of the Bonn Convention of May 26, 1952, provides that: "The three powers (Britain, United States, and France) and the Federal Republic will cooperate to achieve by peaceful means their common aim of a unified Germany enjoying a liberal-democratic constitution like that of the Federal Republic and integrated within the European community." This clear obligation has subsequently been confirmed by more than one undertaking and could not be repudiated without dishonor.

But self-interest also demands that we should not connive at the dissolution of NATO. In particular the Russian proposals for the neutralization of Germany are fraught with danger. Nobody who knows Germany believes that it will be possible to neutralize this dynamic nation for very long. If Germany's ties with the West are cut, if there ceases to be a pull from the West, it is fool-

ish to believe that there will be no pull from the East. The Germans, feeling abandoned and betrayed by the West, are likely to move in a short time into the orbit of Soviet Russia.

My conclusion, is therefore, that on the basic issue of German unity there is little room for maneuver or compromise. The same is true of Berlin. Here again the Western Powers are bound by solemn obligations and self-interest to oppose the incorporation of West Berlin with Eastern Germany. The obligations are clear enough. They have been deliberately assumed by successive Western governments and made the subject of constant public declarations over the years.

Self-interest is equally clear. No greater blow could be delivered to our position in both Germanys or to our friends behind the Iron Curtain than tamely to surrender Berlin. The Soviet Government, who are not really incommoded by our presence, are well aware of this. Hence the sporadic Russian efforts during the past 12 years to encroach on and eventually to liquidate our rights in Berlin.

The fact, however, that we cannot give much ground on the issues of German unity and Berlin does not necessarily mean that we should reject the idea of any negotiation with the Russians. On the contrary. So long as Germany is divided and Berlin remains isolated there will be a constant danger to peace in Europe. Consequently it would be worth making substantial concessions which do not violate our obligations, always provided of course that they were part of a bargain which brought us closer to a German settlement.

I do not believe that, having regard to the position taken up by both sides, it would be realistic to expect that a final comprehensive agreement could be reached at this stage. But it might be possible to take the first step toward one. The various proposals hitherto made for disengagement have for one reason or another proved unacceptable, but ingenuity might devise a scheme, which although not wholly free from objection, could be justified by the advantages flowing from the settlement of which it formed a part. I personally have always been attracted by the idea of a demilitarized strip across Europe on both sides of the Iron Curtain. It may be that this would find no favor with the Russians, but I should like to see the conception explored.

Other matters which might profitably be discussed are the old Russian proposals for European security and the possibility of achieving a progressive reduction of the rival forces in Western Europe. Finally it would be interesting to find out if the Russians really attach importance to a ban on the establishment of nuclear weapons on German territory and, if so, what concessions they would be prepared to offer in return for such a ban.

If the Western Powers embark on discussions with Russia, they must reconcile themselves to the self-evident truth that, unless they are prepared to make some concessions, the negotiations are bound to end in early deadlock and an aggravation of the situation. In their present mood of self-confidence the Russians are not going to give away anything for nothing. Secondly, the Western Powers must clear their own minds as to what is vital and what, although important, can be the subject of compromise, always provided that the price paid corresponds to the concession received.

Finally, the West must be united. Before the Conference of Foreign Ministers in Paris in 1948 representatives of the Western Powers met (Mr. Dulles was in the American team) for over 3 weeks in order to define an agreed position on all the contentious points which might arise. In the event this preparation proved very advantageous and the

example then set might well be followed again. Today in the face of Russia's growing self-assertiveness the need for Western unity is greater than before; and unless we have reason to believe that we can enter and leave a conference united, it would be better not to negotiate at all.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 1959]

GERMANY IN REVIEW

One obvious result of the accession of Senator FULBRIGHT to the chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will be to encourage the administration in new foreign policy initiatives. Those who fear that this may lead to discomfiture or disadvantage for the West are in our opinion mistaken. Mr. FULBRIGHT and his colleagues are no more anxious than Secretary Dulles to impair Western interests; and in any event the execution of foreign policy will remain an Executive responsibility. But a willingness to explore new ideas could help break the East-West ice jam to which old rigidities have contributed.

For some days Mr. Dulles has been talking a more flexible approach. Perhaps his conference last night with Mr. FULBRIGHT, and the endorsement of Senator MANSFIELD for his trip to Europe today, will supply an additional nudge. It will be useful for Mr. Dulles to confer with leaders in London, Paris, and Bonn in the light of what was learned from Mr. Mikoyan's visit, for an East-West foreign ministers' conference surely is approaching.

The most immediate problem, of course, concerns Berlin. Soviet leaders have been at pains to soften the impact of their ultimatum. But the West will need a firm plan if the Russians do proceed with their announced intention of turning the administration of East Berlin over to East Germany. Would it be wise for the West to decline to deal in any way with East German authorities as Chancellor Adenauer has urged despite West Germany's own trade with the East? Or could the West reasonably regard East Germany as an agent of the Soviet Union so long as no blockade were involved?

In this newspaper's judgment there would be no loss of principle in allowing East German officials to stamp documents so long as access to West Berlin remained unimpaired. But it ought to be made absolutely clear that such access will be defended—and on the ground as well as in the air. It is doubtful whether a 1948-49 type airlift could supply West Berlin's needs today. In any event, protection of the land corridor is basic to the Western position.

There is little indication, on the larger question of German reunification, that the Soviet Union and the West are talking the same language. Every sign still points to a Soviet intention to preserve communism in East Germany at any cost; and it is hard to see how the Soviet proposal for confederation could be anything other than a facade for continuing the division of Germany. But neither West Germany nor the West in general is under any compulsion to buy a pig in a poke. It will be worth exploring various suggestions for reunification, with accompanying security assurances, to learn how far the Russians are willing to go.

On another matter—trade with the Soviet Union—it also looks as if a Western understanding needs to be strengthened. If it is true that West Germany is undertaking to sell to Russia the same sort of steel pipe which the United States denied Mr. Mikoyan, evidently the signals have been mixed up. Under Secretary of State Dillon properly has called Mr. Mikoyan to account for exaggerating the American strategic restrictions on trade. At the same time, Western Europeans may want to inquire whether this country is withholding export permits for items not on the strategic list, and if so, why.

These are the sorts of subjects upon which it is important to have a meeting of minds in the West. It may well be, as Chancellor Adenauer and President De Gaulle of France apparently assume, that no form of disengagement or other detente with the Soviet Union would be possible now without seriously harming West Germany. But it will be useful to find out the Soviet terms, and perhaps, with Senator FULBRIGHT's encouragement, Mr. Dulles will make the effort. If nothing else should come of Western initiative, it would at least place the burden of continuing the cold war on the Russians.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 5, 1959]

KENNAN RENEWS HIS GERMAN PLAN—TELLS SENATORS U.S. POLICIES NEED A SHARP REVISION—FAVORS NEUTRAL STATUS

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON, February 4.—George F. Kennan put his controversial argument for a sweeping revision of the U.S. policy on Germany before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee today.

Testifying before its subcommittee on disarmament, Mr. Kennan, a former chief of policy planning for the State Department, proposed that the United States consider negotiating a kind of neutral status for a reunited Germany in return for a Soviet pullback from Eastern Europe.

The new status of Germany, he said, should then be enforced by making it absolutely clear to the Soviet Union that any violation would be a provocation of war.

Mr. Kennan, replying to questions, doubted that a Western withdrawal from Germany would strengthen the Communists for an attempt to win control of the Government. As a political threat, he asserted, communism has become an ineffective force in Europe when it has to work in a democratic milieu.

"I think communism as an ideology is dead, not only in Western Europe but throughout a great portion of the European continent, and it will never again be a great, pulling, emotional force," he said.

Mr. Kennan's proposals, first propounded last year in lectures for the British Broadcasting Corp., have been denounced by Secretary of State Dulles and by Dean Acheson, his predecessor in the Truman administration.

Despite this formidable opposition, the Kennan idea for a new approach to the stale-mated problem of central Europe has persisted and has had a deep impact on the thinking of the young Senators who are becoming the Democrats' influential spokesmen on foreign policy.

Today, for example, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and subcommittee chairman, put himself in broad agreement with many of Mr. Kennan's ideas. He praised Mr. Kennan for a "frank and long-overdue statement" of how the United States could take "a more flexible approach" to the German problem.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, new chairman of the full committee, said at a news conference last week that he would like to see Mr. Dulles move off "dead center" and consider new approaches to a whole range of world problems, including the possibility of a central European settlement based on the Kennan disengagement idea.

What is significant is that Mr. Kennan's proposals have survived the attacks of the eluders of both parties and are coloring the thought of influential young Senators at a time when the country seems headed for another conference with the Soviet Union on the German problem.

In his testimony today, Mr. Kennan said real disarmament would depend on prior relief of political tensions, which now exist most acutely in the "crucial and neuralgic area" of central Europe.

The "best we can hope for" from a negotiated settlement, he said, would be the following:

The reunification of Germany free of the Soviet orbit.

A new condition in which Eastern Europe could evolve toward greater national independence from Soviet dominance.

A clearly defined and mutually acceptable agreement of Germany's new status, so carefully phrased that it would not be susceptible to violation, as some agreements with Moscow have been.

The withdrawal of both Eastern and Western military forces from Germany; an agreement that Germany should not have nuclear weapons or weapons for strategic attack; a conventional German defense force strong enough to prevent incursions.

Achievement of such a result, Mr. Kennan went on, would involve Western concessions. He said that changes in Western policy should be made only as part of a package settlement, not beforehand.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 9, 1959]

IN SEARCH OF A NEW APPROACH?

(By Erwin D. Canham)

Secretary Dulles is on his way back to Washington after one of the most important diplomatic missions of his career. It seems evident in the dispatches from Bonn, Paris, and London that while there may be agreement among the four Western Allies on general aspects of the German problem, no bold new policy has been decided upon. It may be that Secretary Dulles is still in search of some constructive new approach to the Kremlin.

Indeed, the official and unofficial statements made at Bonn as the Secretary departed included hints and bids to the Soviet. Thus, Mr. Dulles and Chancellor Adenauer alike plainly intimated that concessions on the Soviet side would be matched by concessions on the Allies.

As Mr. Dulles put it, the talks "will help to assure that we shall be united and firm for our rights," although "that does not exclude being conciliatory, but it does exclude merely making concessions for which there is no counterpart." In plain language, that simply says to Moscow: "What do you have to offer?"

TIMETABLE SET

Although the Western Powers are still in the position of merely asking questions, they have at least agreed on a timetable of procedures. Prime Minister Macmillan is leaving for the Soviet Union on February 21. This trip may be the most important act of Western diplomacy thus far. Mr. Macmillan, who is the most flexible of the Western heads of state, and whose public opinion most eagerly wants an agreement with the Soviet, is going to try to find out what the Soviet leaders want, and what they intend, in Berlin and in Central Europe generally. He will be back from Moscow in time to report to a meeting of foreign ministers in Paris in mid-March.

Before that meeting, however, the Western Powers will answer the Kremlin's note of January 10 calling for a German peace conference of 28 nations from East and West alike. Doubtless they will reject this grandiose and premature proposal, and suggest instead a meeting of the foreign ministers of the United States, Britain, and France with the Soviet.

There will also be a further meeting of the Western foreign ministers in Washington in early April, when they gather to observe the 10th anniversary of NATO.

Finally, there may well be a full-dress conference with the Soviets—one report is for a meeting in Vienna in May. All to-

gether, the diplomatic schedule is full. Each of these steps seems needful in order to coordinate Western policies and to talk things over with the Soviets. But Moscow may have very different ideas. It generally does.

STILL DIFFERENCES

From the Western side, it seems apparent that not very much beyond the timetable has been agreed. Despite the amiability, and the undeniable utility, of the Dulles talks, there are hints of unresolved differences. Leaving Bonn today, the Secretary said he and Chancellor Adenauer had a similarity of thinking and planning.

He explicitly did not use the word "identity," but "similarity." And it is doubtless accurate. It might also have been applied to Paris and London.

From everything that has come from the three capitals, the basic positions of the governments remain as they were: with Bonn and Paris firmly determined to yield no ground to the Soviet; with London eager to explore new possible solution; with Washington somewhere in between. And so the so-called reappraisal of policy must continue.

The Soviets did not aid in the reappraisal last week. The statements coming from Moscow were blatantly contradictory. Premier Khrushchev was reported to have suggested to West German Ambassador Kroll a plan to unify Germany through free elections, if only Bonn would negotiate with the East German Republic. But at the final session of the party congress, this same Khrushchev said that the Soviet Union would never tolerate any plan that called for abolishing the socialist (Communist) system in East Germany.

The two statements are in flat conflict. For everybody agrees that free elections—if followed—would mean the downfall of the Communist system in East Germany. It would be voted out by overwhelming margins. Thus Khrushchev was talking out of both sides of his mouth.

It is generally agreed that the East German puppet government is the weakest Communist regime in the entire satellite system. One spokesman in Bonn declared Mr. Dulles felt East Germany was an albatross around Khrushchev's neck. But it is an albatross that he shows no willingness to give up.

In fact, East Germany is a buffer around some of the Communist boundary states which insulate the Soviet Union from the nations it regards as its enemies. Could this buffer area possibly be given up? Could the satellites be exposed to direct contact with a powerful, dynamic West-oriented German republic? At best, only if it were strictly neutralized. And that means the demilitarization of all of Germany if Germany is to be unified. Could the West accept such terms? Not in present military thinking. The Soviet has suggested such terms through the Rapacki plan, and Mr. Dulles testified the other day that this plan would place the West at a substantial military disadvantage.

Two problems should be distinguished: that of Berlin, and German reunification. Some kind of solution of the problem of Berlin alone is not very difficult. Just to deal with the East Germans as agents of Moscow might be such a solution. Mr. Dulles himself referred to this solution in November, and Mayor Brandt of Berlin, speaking on Meet the Press, replied a little ambiguously that if Moscow itself identified the East Germans as its agents perhaps it would be a workable idea.

EXPLORING SOLUTIONS

So there are solutions of the Berlin problem on which both sides could agree. Perhaps Mr. Macmillan will explore such a solution while he is in Moscow. But the problem of reunification of Germany comes back to the Soviet necessity of keeping an area of insulation around its satellite states.

The price of reunification, therefore, remains demilitarization. The West has offered a partial demilitarized belt, and has added guarantees against German aggressions. Such pledges are doubtless not enough for the Soviets.

At present, no terms which both sides could accept are in sight. A recent poll among the West Germans showed only 14 percent who thought peaceful reunification was possible. And so the question remains remote. The West Germans are understandably unwilling to cut their ties with the West for the sake of reunification which would be fraught with economic and political problems. But, of course, they are determined to help West Berlin remain free, and hence would be much more flexible on the Berlin question, which is a serious problem, than on the reunification matter, which is more remote.

From the Western capitals come expressions of respect for Secretary Dulles which have not always been the dominant notes there. It is quite apparent that few responsible statesmen indeed are very confident of next steps in the German situation apart from the diplomatic calendar, and there is an appreciation of the laborious and useful nature of Mr. Dulles' trip.

An expression of this attitude also came from Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, a Democrat who has frequently criticized Mr. Dulles' conduct of his post. Said Senator MANSFIELD: "I assume that Mr. Dulles' first-hand conversations with our allies will result in some unified move to break away from the old rigid position of trying to settle the German question on the basis of free elections alone."

"Although there has been some criticism of Mr. Dulles in the past, I think it has been largely constructive criticism and that we Democrats have given him rather solid backing for 6 years. In the 2 years that lie ahead we'd like to help him in every way we can. We want him and President Eisenhower to take the leadership in finding some solutions to our grave problems. We hope and think they will do it, and they will have our solid support."

That is as explicit a statement of bipartisan support as has been heard for some time. As given on the American Broadcasting Co. network.

THE BERLIN-GERMAN PROBLEM, AND THE SPEECH BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, February 14, comments editorially on the responsible and constructive contribution to the debate on the Berlin-German problem made by the Senator from Montana on the preceding Thursday.

Although the intervening shock of the sad news of the seriousness of the illness of the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has naturally tended to overshadow the substantive discussion of the impending crisis in Berlin and Germany, this discussion cannot be suspended for long. There is, indeed, a new urgency now.

The Star editorial is a good start.

In a word—

It concludes—

Senator MANSFIELD wants the West to get off dead center and begin serious work on a realistic plan.

I ask that the Star editorial be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

BERLIN DANGER

Montana's Senator MANSFIELD has made a responsible and constructive contribution to the debate on the Berlin-German problem.

The Mansfield speech is not a partisan attack on Mr. Dulles or the Eisenhower administration. It is, rather, a notable effort to focus public attention on the great danger which lies ahead, especially with respect to Berlin, and to stimulate consideration of new approaches by the West to this problem.

The Russians have announced that, unless an agreement is reached, they intend to pull out of Berlin on May 27 and hand over their occupational responsibilities to the East Germans. We should assume that they mean what they say, and that Western protests will not stop them. It is in this context that Senator MANSFIELD, in what he described as carefully measured words, expressed to the Senate his belief that "just ahead lies the most critical period which the United States will have had to face since the conflict in Korea." At stake, he said, are the "lives of tens of millions of human beings, Americans included." This is a sober estimate, not an alarmist forecast, and it is of high importance that this be understood.

Senator MANSFIELD believes that Germany is going to be reunified—and by the West and East Germans themselves. This will come about peaceably or by force, and the latter course almost certainly would mean an enormously destructive war. Mr. MANSFIELD suggests a start in Berlin, hoping that this may produce patterns of unification which would be applicable to the problem of peaceful all-German unification.

In any event, he urges that Western policy, and particularly the U.S. policy, be redesigned to accommodate and encourage peaceful unification.

"I submit," he said, "that a policy which merely clings to an unrealizable slogan of free all-German elections, which does not pursue German unification by other means, is no policy at all. It is a straitjacket. It is an excuse for immobility. It may well lead down the blind alley of an unnecessary conflict or disastrous diplomatic retreat."

The Montana Senator offered nine points for consideration. The first is rather vaguely stated—that "forces representing the concept of freedom in peace" not be driven out of Berlin. What he apparently has in mind is that German forces should be substituted as soon as possible for Western forces in Berlin. These German forces would be fully supported by NATO guarantees. In any plan of unification, he says, East Germans as well as West Germans must be free to express a political preference—even though the expression, in the case of the East Germans, may be recorded only in East Germany. Finally, Mr. MANSFIELD strongly urges a search for agreements which might lead to limitation of armaments through Germany and central Europe—even though this would entail genuine consideration of Communist-sponsored plans.

In a word, Senator MANSFIELD wants the West to get off dead center and begin serious work on a realistic plan. His specific suggestions may not be the best, nor does he contend that they are. And it is true, of course, that Mr. Dulles, prior to his latest illness, seemed to be moving closer to the MANSFIELD point of view.

But words are one thing; a policy is something else. The West has had plenty of slogans to fit the German situation. Slogans, however, are not a policy, and it is a policy which is so urgently required.

PROPOSED CONFERENCES ON GERMAN SITUATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to add another thought to the remarks on the German situation which I made last Thursday. At that time, the extent of the illness of the Secretary of State was still unknown. It was generally assumed that he would be physically fit to lead the Western Nations' coming conferences on the German problem. I expressed the hope, which was joined in by several other Members of the Senate, that Mr. Dulles would be able to return promptly to active duty.

It is now no longer certain, however, when the Secretary of State will leave the hospital. Nevertheless, there is every likelihood that conferences will have to be held in the near future on the critical problems of Germany. Our participation in those conferences is one which sorely needs whatever guidance Mr. Dulles may be in condition to give to it. In these circumstances, Mr. President, I should like to add a 10th point to the suggestions I made last Thursday.

I believe it would be most helpful if the coming conferences on the German situation were to be held in Washington, D.C. If the Secretary has recovered by the time they convene to the extent that he can participate in any way, he will at least be spared the necessity of traveling abroad again to make the contribution which he is so capable of making in the search for peace. It is a small thing to ask for one who has already given so much. I cannot believe any of the nations involved in this critical situation would not respond favorably, in present circumstances, to invitations from the President to hold these critical conferences in the United States.

ADVISORY PANEL ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT LAW REVISION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in mid-January, when I introduced S. 505, the labor-management reform bill, I reiterated my often stated conviction that after 11 years of experience under the Taft-Hartley Act we needed a thorough relook at our labor-management relations law. Circumstances have changed, new problems have arisen, defects in the original act need correction, and yet we have had no revision of our basic laws governing industrial relations for over a decade.

The reasons for this lack of congressional action are as complex as they are numerous. But the basic fact is that whenever we have had amendments before us we have bogged down in bitter controversy for which we could get no consensus and which had repeatedly resulted in no action whatever. As time has gone by, the strong forces which have prevented action in the past, rather than dissipating, have grown stronger and more rigid. Attitudes are firm; prejudice runs high; rationality is virtually absent. And it is the public which suffers.

Having watched this process over the years in both Houses of Congress, it

seemed to me that a wholly new start was needed. For this reason I suggested that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare appoint a panel of professionals of exceptional competence in the industrial relations field to advise us on those areas of our labor-management relations law most in need of revision. I am pleased to report to the Senate that the committee has appointed a panel of 12 experts who began work last Wednesday. The panel will meet regularly over the coming weeks and plans to make its recommendations to the committee about May 1. I am confident that the committee will act promptly on this report and that a bill will be ready for Senate consideration shortly thereafter.

May I say a word about the advisory panel. Each of the men on this panel is long experienced in the field. Each is recognized as a person of the highest professional competence although they represent diverse viewpoints. Most importantly I was impressed after my meeting with the panel last Wednesday that as a group they were dedicating themselves to the resolution of most difficult problems in the light of the public interest regardless of their own preferences.

To me this is a most hopeful sign, for if there is any legislative field which requires careful, competent, objective analysis it is this one. I share with the chairman of our committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the ranking Republican Member, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the firm belief that the work of this distinguished group of experts will mark a turning point in the development of sound legislation in this field. We believe the result will be legislation which is fair to both labor and management and which, above all, protects the interest of the public at large.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a biographic sketch of each of the 12 distinguished members of the panel, and the remarks which I made to the group at its organizational meeting last Wednesday.

There being no objection, the biographic sketches and the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHIC DATA ON MEMBERS OF ADVISORY PANEL ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT LAW REVISION

David Cole: Practicing attorney and arbitrator, active as labor relations counsel to textile employers; Chairman of War Labor Board iron and steel panels; Chairman, Presidential Inquiry in Bituminous Coal Industry and other Presidential boards; president, National Academy of Arbitrators; past Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

Archibald Cox: Professor of law, Harvard University; formerly practiced law in Boston; formerly Associate Solicitor, Department of Labor; Chairman, Wage Stabilization Board; cochairman, construction industry stabilization committee.

Guy Farmer: Practicing attorney specializing in labor law and representing management; formerly Associate General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and former Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board under the present administration.

Arthur Goldberg: Practicing attorney, counsel to various labor organizations, including Steelworkers and Industrial Union department, AFL-CIO; special counsel to AFL-CIO.

Charles Gregory: Professor of law, University of Virginia; former professor of law at the University of Wisconsin and University of Chicago; formerly practiced law in New York; formerly Solicitor of Labor.

Clark Kerr: President, University of California; arbitrator; author, numerous works on labor matters; chairman, UAW impartial review board.

Denison Kitchel: Practicing attorney from Phoenix, Ariz., representing management in labor matters; counsel, American Mining Congress.

Plato E. Papps: Counsel, International Association of Machinists; chairman, American Bar Association panel on NLRB practices and procedures.

Gerald Reilly: practicing attorney, representing management; practiced law in Boston and later in Washington, D.C.; formerly Assistant Solicitor and Solicitor of Department of Labor; member, National Labor Relations Board; former counsel, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Louis Sherman: Practicing attorney, representing labor organizations, including the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO; general counsel, IBEW (AFL-CIO); former chairman of the ABA committee on the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947; Assistant Solicitor of Labor.

Russell Smith: Professor of law, University of Michigan; arbitrator; former industry member, National War Labor Board; served on various public factfinding bodies.

W. Willard Wirtz: Practicing attorney; professor of law, Northwestern University; arbitrator; former Chairman, National Wage Stabilization Board; General Counsel and later public member of the War Labor Board.

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY AT THE ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF THE ADVISORY PANEL ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT LAW REVISION

I want to express not only my personal gratitude but also the appreciation of all the members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for your willingness to serve upon this panel to advise the committee concerning revision of our laws covering labor-management relations.

The public, management, and labor have had 12 years experience under the Taft-Hartley Act. They have been years of praise, criticism, and countless proposals for amendment. Both the Senate and House committees have heard endless testimony. We have learned a great deal but there have been two obstacles in the way of effective legislative action. One is the complexity of subjects. The other is the inevitable diffuseness of the hearings in a complex and controversial area. We are now beginning a fresh approach. By asking you to bring the problems into focus as a professional body, we hope to remove at least these two obstacles to constructive legislation.

The panel should set its own aims and its own procedure but I would like to suggest a few ways in which you can be most helpful.

First, I hope that your report will indicate what you regard as the major problems in labor-management relations for which new law is required. Your judgment upon the comparative importance of different issues will be of great assistance to the Senate committee in its deliberations.

Second, there will be important subjects on which you ought to give us a unanimous or virtually unanimous recommendation. It should be couched in legislative language taking account of its relation-

ship with other aspects of labor law. There is no need to dwell upon the great weight that such a recommendation would carry or the help that they would furnish in coalescing opinion in both Congress and throughout the country.

Third, there may be problems for which you can find no solution on which there is a substantial consensus of opinion within the group. In this area your report will nevertheless serve two useful functions. The report should narrow the issues, state the critical question fairly and present the arguments pro and con which the Congress will have to weigh. It would also be most helpful to have you state the two or three leading alternatives in legislative language which takes account of other parts of the statute and their context in labor law.

Fourth, I am much concerned by the long delays in NLRB proceedings. You are all familiar with NLRB cases. I am confident that you can develop suggestions which will greatly expedite its action. Undoubtedly there are also other technical amendments which would simplify proceedings before the NLRB and clarify the statute.

I would like to say just a word more about the problem of achieving agreement within your group. We are calling upon you for a public service in the highest traditions of your profession. It is of the utmost importance that you make every earnest effort to resolve any differences and reach a true consensus of opinion. General agreement would probably require some sacrifice of individual opinions, but if lawyers with long experience in the field, acting in the traditions of their profession, cannot submerge most of their differences the chance for constructive legislative action seems somewhat remote.

Finally we must all remember that this is a most fortuitous occasion for work—one which holds out much greater prospect for success than either the past or the future. Sentiment in both the House and Senate is now reasonable and dispassionate toward both management and labor. With the weight of opinion in the middle of the road we stand the best chance of enacting legislation which is not pro-management or pro-union but which would be directed solely toward the improvement of collective bargaining relationships and the advancement of the public interest. If constructive legislation cannot be enacted at the present Congress, there is likely to be no correction of acknowledged defects in the present statutes until either management or unions gain sufficient control to ram through legislation favoring their self-interest. This would not be a solution of the problems which we all want to solve, and would result in another period of renewed conflict in this sensitive field.

EXPANDING RESEARCH TO PREVENT FOREST BLIGHT AND DISEASE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I brought to the attention of the Senate the need for an expanded research program to eliminate blight and disease from the Nation's forests. At the time, I stressed the need for about \$250,000 additional money to carry on research in the Lake States Forest Experimental Station. Although established at La Crosse, Wis., this new branch office will carry on research to benefit the whole upper Midwest and the Nation.

Currently, the annual loss of timber destroyed by disease exceeds the volume of timber cut; in addition, it lowers the grade of timber now being utilized. Unless controlled, this situation will become progressively worse.

Unfortunately, there is a lack of fundamental information on blight and disease problems. The expansion of our forest research program, particularly through the facilities of such programs as are being carried on by the Lake States Forest Experiment Station, is essential, if knowledge is to be obtained for coping with this problem.

I want to emphasize that we, in the Midwest, are not depending solely upon the Federal Government to carry on work in this field. Rather, the Wisconsin Conservation Commission—as a fine example—is participating splendidly with Federal services in a joint effort to deal effectively with this threat to our woodlands.

This morning, I received a letter from Mr. John A. Beale, chief state forester of the Wisconsin State Conservation Department, reaffirming the needs at this experiment station.

In his letter, Chief State Forester Beale also indicates that he feels that a minimum of \$2.5 million should be added to the overall Forest Service research budget for the next fiscal year, to meet our forestry needs. I respectfully call the attention of our colleagues on the Forestry Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to Mr. Beale's recommendations, for their consideration when the matter comes before them.

I request unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

STATE OF WISCONSIN
CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
Madison, February 12, 1959.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Some time ago I received a letter from Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, in which he expressed his interest in forestry research and his concern regarding the adequacy of the present U.S. Forest Service forestry research budget.

Knowing of your personal strong interest in this field I felt you would be interested in our feelings in the matter. For your information, I have attached a copy of my reply to Senator STENNIS.

We are especially appreciative of your efforts in obtaining an appropriation for the new branch of the Lake States Forest Experiment Station at La Crosse, which is now working on forestry and watershed problems in that area. The initial appropriation for this station was \$30,000 for the 1958-59 fiscal year. The original cost estimate for this program was \$100,000 per year. You will be interested to know that the conservation commission has entered into an agreement with the U.S. Forest Service for joint effort in this program and that the State will purchase the lands needed.

It is our feeling that this program should now be strengthened to meet the urgent demand for new management information in that area.

We are also strongly interested in insect and disease research, in particular, the need for research on the maple blight problem which has caused serious losses in the State and which could easily move into the upper peninsula of Michigan.

All things considered, we feel that a minimum of \$2.5 million should be added to the Forest Service research budget in the next fiscal year.

We will certainly appreciate your support for this most important work.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. BEALE,
Chief State Forester.

WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENT REGULATIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Farm Bureau, through its president, W. I. Boone, has made some recommendations to the Director, Grain Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, regarding acreage allotment regulations, which I believe are sound, and, therefore, I want to call them to the attention of the Senate.

During the past year I have received a number of letters from wheatgrowers in Kansas stating that some were in danger of losing their acreage allotment because they did not plant the full allotment and others were threatened with loss of acreage because they overseeded.

It seems to me that the statement from the 1959 Farm Bureau policies on loss of acreage is sound. It reads as follows:

Since the purpose of allotments is to reduce the acreage devoted to specific crops, an allotment should be looked upon as a ceiling on acreage rather than a requirement to plant. No producer should be forced to plant an allotment in order to maintain history.

At a time when we are burdened with surpluses, it occurs to me that no grower should be penalized for not planting his full allotment acreage.

The Farm Bureau's stand on overplanting without excessive production is equally sound.

There are large sections in the wheat-producing areas of Kansas and other States in the Middle West where we do not produce large crops every year. Under these circumstances, a grower should be permitted to grow in excess of his allotment acreage if he does not sell more than the average acreage production in bushels off his farm. The excess should be stored for years when he produces less than his average crop.

Both of these views of the Farm Bureau are so sound that I feel they should be given every consideration by the Department and the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the Director, Grain Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, be made a part of these remarks.

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

FEBRUARY 4, 1959.

DIRECTOR,
Grain Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As president of the Kansas Farm Bureau I herewith submit recommendations in accordance with the notice published in the Federal Register for Tuesday, January 27, 1959.

Both the Kansas Farm Bureau recommendations and the American Farm Bureau Federation resolutions adopted by the voting delegates of 48 States, Puerto Rico and Hawaii have indicated similar and rather defini-

nite views on some phases of acreage allotment regulations.

LOSS OF HISTORY BECAUSE OF UNDERPLANTING

It is the belief of the above groups that underplanting of the wheat acreage allotment for a farm, regardless of the reason, should not result in loss of history. One statement in the 1959 Farm Bureau policies contains this wording, "Since the purpose of allotments is to reduce the acreage devoted to specific crops, an allotment should be looked upon as a ceiling on acreage rather than a requirement to plant. No producer should be forced to plant an allotment in order to maintain history."

The above wording would cover underplanting for the purpose of releasing previously stored excess. A study of the proposed 1960 regulations indicates that history would be lost in case of underplanting where excess is released because of either or both underplanting and underproduction.

The effect on history of underplanting not connected with release of excess is not clearly indicated. It would appear to depend upon the wording of diversion formulas, which are not specified in the proposal.

We request that final regulations be so worded that maintenance of history is independent of underplanting.

OVERPLANTING WITHOUT EXCESS PRODUCTION

We are in agreement with current statutes which specify that maintenance of history should be dependent upon storage of any farm marketing excess production. However, we do not believe that history should be lost because of overplanting in case the actual production is not greater than the normal production of the allotted acres.

It seems to us that Public Law 85-366 can and should be so interpreted. To do otherwise is to penalize a producer for failing to overproduce, (1) since, technically, he cannot store what he does not have. We are opposed to the apparent meaning of this proposed regulation and recommend revisions which will clearly state the opposite.

We welcome and appreciate this opportunity to extend our recommendations.

Sincerely yours,

KANSAS FARM BUREAU,
W. I. BOONE, President.

MEDICAL TESTS FOR OLD AIRLINE PILOTS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to draw the Senate's attention to a very informative article which appeared in Washington's Sunday Star, entitled "Tests Called Inadequate for Older Airline Pilots."

The article quotes three top authorities in aviation medicine as saying that airline pilots—especially those who are 50 and older—are not receiving adequate medical tests before flying large commercial planes.

Air traffic is increasing by leaps and bounds in the United States. This means that more and more people are entrusting their lives to the skill and fitness of pilots and to the aircraft they operate.

The Government—Federal, State, and local—is spending hundreds of millions of dollars on air safety. The industry also is continually working in many ways for greater safety in air travel. And research organizations outside of the industry and the Government are concerned with the problem.

Many factors are involved in safety of air travel.

Certainly one of the more important of these factors is the pilot himself.

I was therefore very much interested in the newspaper article mentioned.

For instance, I was surprised to read that 551 pilots in their fifties were flying for the airlines in 1957, and that 19 were above 60 years old.

I was disturbed to read that the authorities think better medical tests are needed to be sure that these hundreds of older pilots are fully capable of safely flying today's swift and complicated aircraft.

I noted with interest that the three medical authorities quoted in the article agreed that pilots in their fifties are increased risks.

I was pleased, however, to find that our new Federal Aviation Agency and the other organizations represented by the authorities seem to be on top of the situation.

The article makes it clear that these doctors and their organizations are aware of the importance of the situation, and that they are working on the problem.

The article points out, for instance, that the Federal Aviation Agency is now doing research to determine how adequate tests may be given to pilots.

I wish these men and others who are working for greater air safety speedy success in their important undertaking. And I commend the Washington Star for its enterprise in bringing the problem of pilot age and fitness to the attention of the public.

In jobs where physical or mental failure could mean disaster, adequate medical testing, perhaps coupled with some sort of retirement system, seems to me to be a definite must in the public interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be inserted at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

TESTS CALLED INADEQUATE FOR OLDER AIRLINE PILOTS—551 OVER 50 FLYING COMMERCIAL PLANES; DOCTORS CITE NEED FOR DETECTING DEFECTS

(By Andrew W. Bingham)

Airline pilots—particularly the hundreds who are 50 and older—are not receiving adequate medical tests before flying large commercial planes, three of the Nation's top authorities in aviation medicine said yesterday.

They told the Star the current situation needs urgent attention for the sake of air safety.

They feel that current testing procedures often do not show up many physiological and psychological defects which they say can exist in people over 50.

The three authorities are:

Dr. John E. Smith, acting civil air surgeon for the new Federal Aviation Agency and the former Chief of the Medical Division of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. He is in charge of examining pilots for the FAA every 6 months.

Dr. Ludwig Lederer, medical director for Capital Airlines and president-elect of the Aero Medical Association.

Dr. Ross A. McFarland, professor of environmental health at Harvard University's School of Public Health and director of the Guggenheim Center for Aviation Health and Safety. Dr. McFarland is also author of a book, *Human Factors in Air Transportation*.

FIVE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-ONE PILOTS OVER 50 FLYING

Both the airlines and the FAA conduct physical and flight exams. The FAA will add electrocardiograms to its testing program in July, although they will be only 50 percent effective for pilots who have not had heart attacks, Dr. Smith said.

According to the latest FAA figures, 551 transport pilots in their fifties were flying for the airlines in 1957; 19 were above 60 years.

Other figures from Air Transport Association show that in 1955 there were 429 pilots in their fifties flying. Another 27 were above 60 years.

Failure to bring out possible defects in these older men is a particularly serious problem today, the authorities agree, because of:

(1) Pressure from the Air Line Pilots Association that the tests, and not age, be the only basis for retirement. (The FAA has set no maximum age for pilots; only a minimum age of 23 years.)

(2) The current switch by airlines from piston-engine planes to jets. The change in equipment could be a difficult one for older pilots to make, although tests now do not reveal how difficult.

PILOTS RESIST RETIREMENT

The experiences of two airlines serve as an indication of what could happen if the testing system for pilots is not improved, the authorities say.

The first case concerns American Airlines. An arbitration award last October declared that the company could not—as it had been doing—retire qualified pilots who reach 60 years. The award said such retirement was “a violation of the employment agreement,” according to William M. Culbertson, a pilot for the airline and a member of the board which made the award.

The ruling affected three pilots who had been retired because of age, according to Mr. Culbertson. The company agreed to abide by the decision before the recent pilot contract was signed, he said.

American officials, however, refused to change their policy. They said last night that no pilot over 60 is flying for the company. It is understood the three pilots are receiving pay, but not flying.

The ALPA regards this case as a major breakthrough in ending arbitrary retirement schemes of airline companies.

The second case involves Capital Airlines, which recently switched primarily to prop-jet planes.

According to Dr. Lederer, several pilots passed all the tests but were still not deemed to be qualified for the new planes. “We sat down and talked,” he said, “and they agreed to stay on slower equipment.”

He added: “According to strict union procedures, we should not and cannot do this. The pilots, through seniority, were entitled to get the new planes.”

Capital at present insists pilots retire at 60. “We feel that beyond that age, a sudden incapacitation would be more likely to occur,” Dr. Lederer said. “For new equipment, the age may have to be lower.”

Retirement ages for most of the other airlines are 60 years. The list includes Northwest, Delta, Braniff, TWA, United, and Eastern Airlines. National Airlines has a 65-year retirement. Just 2 weeks ago Northwest retired a 62-year-old pilot who was the only exception to the company's policy.

The tests which Dr. Lederer and the other authorities want to establish would measure the pilot's overall competence—not such easily checked points as eyesight or hearing.

They want to know the pilot's ability to adjust to a new environment and the influence of aging on mental and sensory functions, such as his ability to learn, his memory, reasoning and judgment.

What they are after is to find the pilot's functional, rather than his actual age. This can be an extremely subtle determination.

As Dr. McFarland pointed out in his book, “even minor deteriorations in many of the psychological and physiological functions may interact to produce a significant loss in overall efficiency.”

At present the only way these functions are observed is indirectly through flight tests. Check pilots are our best psychologists,” Dr. Smith said. “What we need, however, are more specific criteria for performance of older men. Pilots can compensate for deficiencies with their tremendous experience. But we want to make factual, not emotional, determinations.”

Older pilots often have slower reaction, detection, and response times, according to Dr. Lederer. “We know this by experience,” he said, “although it is hard to detect.” Other pilots show their age by over-activity in the cockpit, he added, to compensate for their deficiencies.

“Night vision of older pilots is also impaired,” he said.

Currently the FAA is doing research to determine how adequate tests may be given, according to Dr. Smith. The most hopeful work is being done with a ballisto-cardiograph, he said, which would detect the velocity of blood flow.

AVIATION INDUSTRY GETTING OLD

The project is still in the developmental stage, he said. The indications are, however, that its perfection will greatly increase the effectiveness of the current tests, he noted, since the blood flow seems to be a key in understanding the physiological, and perhaps the psychological, makeup of the pilot.

“Our problem is that the aviation industry is just starting to grow old,” Dr. Smith said. “Our current tests were designed for young pilots 20 years ago. The physical examination we require every 6 months is the usual \$15 variety, and that's not too complete.”

All three authorities agree that pilots in their 50's are increased risks. “Most doctors I've talked to feel pilots should retire at 60,” Dr. Smith said.

The current requirements for pilots were drawn up by the Civil Aeronautics Board, Dr. Smith said. They are now the responsibility of the FAA.

FEAR LOSS OF HIGH INCOMES

Another problem associated with pilot-retirement is that pilots are professional men, much like doctors and lawyers, with correspondingly high incomes. Flying new equipment usually means more money for them. Retiring can mean just the opposite.

“Why should we voluntarily retire at 60 when we can still pass all the tests?” one pilot explained. “My income now is \$28,000 a year. Under the retirement plan, it would be \$18,000.”

Larry Cates, Washington representative for ALPA, explained: “Doctors are usually very conservative. They can't evaluate a man's experience to offset his deterioration.”

“Anyway,” he added, “pilots don't fly solo. There's always at least one other pilot.”

Mr. Cates pointed out that most pilots leave the airlines before they are 50. Dr. Smith, too, noted that many pilots “by nature are sensible” and quit when they feel themselves sliding.

DOUBTS AGE AS MEASURING STICK

Others, however, feel that they will rely on the tests given by their companies and the FAA to determine when they should retire.

“They aren't going to turn me loose just because someone sets an arbitrary age,” said Mr. Culbertson, who is an attorney as well as a pilot for American Airlines. “It has not been proven to me that age is a good measuring stick.”

The Public Health Service, as well as the FAA, is trying to develop another measuring stick, according to Dr. Stanley R. Mohler, of the Center for Aging Research at the National Institutes of Health.

Research centers throughout the country are doing Government-sponsored work to develop tests for each occupation where a physical or mental failure could mean disaster, Dr. Mohler said.

"The question is whether there should be some sort of retirement system for people in these sorts of jobs," he said.

EXPERT ON AGING GIVES VIEWS

Another expert in the field, Dr. James Birren, chief of the Section on Aging in the National Institutes of Mental Health, noted:

"We praise a doctor of 80 who is still practicing medicine. But there is often serious question whether he is a good doctor, and whether in the public interest that he should be allowed to practice."

In his book, Dr. McFarland suggested a retirement age of 50 years—plus or minus five—as probably best for most pilots, although each case should be thoroughly examined on its own merits.

He suggested last night that a possible way to satisfy safety requirements and the pilots would be to make these older men plane commanders.

"Their judgment and experience would be used, but they wouldn't actually be at the controls," he said.

So, far, he reported, airlines have not expressed much interest in his proposal.

J. FRANCIS SMITH, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the recent death of J. Francis Smith leaves a void in the civic, business, and political life of Connecticut and the Nation that will be sorely felt, for he possessed qualities of mind and character that can never be spared.

He carried into every field of endeavor a competitive spirit, a practical and analytical judgment, and a complete integrity. On the athletic field, in the business world, and in countless civic and charitable causes, he left a series of achievements that will long be remembered.

As Connecticut's Democratic State chairman for many years, Francis Smith ushered in a period of party rejuvenation and growth that is still yielding rich dividends.

His friendship, his ideals, his example, have given guidance and inspiration to a generation of Connecticut citizens in all walks of life, and all who knew him share my feeling of great loss at his passing.

I ask unanimous consent that the Waterbury Republican editorial of February 13, 1959, entitled "J. Francis Smith," be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

J. FRANCIS SMITH

Our city and the State are made poorer indeed by the untimely death of an outstanding businessman and citizen.

There is a sad irony in J. Francis Smith's death. He had apparently made a strong recovery a couple of years ago from a long, serious sickness, had resumed control of his business affairs, and, in managing Senator THOMAS DODD's campaign for the Democratic

nomination, had shown last summer that he still possessed an old political warrior's skill. Then came the heart attack which, after weeks in the hospital, has claimed his life.

A hardheaded sense of what was practical guided him. His was a fierce competitive spirit, shown on the tennis court when he was younger, later on the links, and carried over into business, politics, community service. He had a shrewd analytical mind. His success as president of J. E. Smith & Co. led to other business connections, to bank and corporation directorship and trade association honors. On the political side, his service as Democratic State chairman when the late Wilbur L. Cross was Governor was a very distinguished one, and the part he played over the whole political range from local to national was notable.

As drive chairman for community causes and worker for community betterment he had no superior and few peers. However much you might narrow down a list of pivotal local leaders in business, in politics, and in movements for civic improvement, his name would be bound to be there.

Such men are few, precious, hard to spare.

ST. LOUIS TORNADO DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, during the early morning hours of last Tuesday, the 10th of February, the city of St. Louis was struck by a devastating tornado.

In the few minutes during which the twister cut a path through the central part of the city, 21 persons were killed, 350 were injured, and more than 5,000 others were made homeless or were otherwise affected.

Forty-seven buildings were totally destroyed and nearly 2,000 others were damaged. A 575-foot TV tower and a radio tower were toppled; and the arena, a large sports building, was damaged.

The major damage occurred in areas occupied by multiple dwellings and small businesses.

Tornadoes are not new to our part of the country. Kansas City suffered appalling damage in 1957, as did St. Louis itself in 1927 and 1896.

Last week, wind struck suddenly and with tremendous force. The financial loss, estimated at more than \$12 million, is enormous, but we in St. Louis are fortunate that the loss of life was not greater. Had the tornado hit during daylight, many more would probably have been killed.

The people of St. Louis were quick to rise to the emergency. The speed with which personal and financial assistance came from local, State, and Federal agencies was a great comfort and help to those who had lost loved ones, personal possessions, and homes.

The Civil Defense, Red Cross, Salvation Army, and local hospital workers, as well as the municipal police and firemen, were on the scene soon after the twister struck. Their work in the early morning hours, and throughout the day, in rescue and treatment of the injured, was outstanding.

City officials are also to be congratulated for the rapid cleanup operations. Within 2 days, all streets, save for one intersection, were cleared so that dis-

ruption of the city's traffic flow was kept at a minimum.

Coordination between local, State and Federal agencies was outstanding and proved very effective.

The Presidential designation of the city as a major disaster area was prompt, and speeded financial assistance to needy persons.

The people of St. Louis, through newspaper and radio campaigns, have contributed large sums to aid their fellow citizens. Much of the property damage was covered by insurance. With funds thus available from a variety of sources, rebuilding already in progress will continue apace.

We are fortunate that the courage, community spirit and efficient work of all concerned kept injuries to a minimum, and provided relief to the victims.

Last Tuesday was a day of great sorrow for the city of St. Louis. But it will also be remembered as a proud day. City, State, and Federal officials and the people of the St. Louis area itself responded magnificently to this "challenge of disaster."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Tornado's Tragic Wake," from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 11, an editorial entitled "The Challenge of Disaster," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 11, and a letter from Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, president of the American National Red Cross.

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

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Feb. 11, 1959]

TORNADO'S TRAGIC WAKE

Death, suffering, and sudden horror rode the tornado that sliced through St. Louis and St. Louis County in the black hours of early Tuesday morning.

The grim toll was about a score slain, some 300 injured, and a property devastation running into multimillions of dollars.

The shock was tragic and savage. There had been no warning. Most of the city slept through a rainstorm, awakening unconscious of the stark path of depredation that had knifed diagonally through the community.

The worst storm to strike St. Louis in 32 years, it followed much the same course of the devastating tornado that laid a swath of demolition and killed 78 persons in 1927. This was the third worst weather disaster ever suffered by the city.

Rescue workers were still sifting through ruins late last night searching for possible victims. The hospitals were heavily taxed caring for the maimed and shock sufferers. Welfare organizations were quickly on the job, and appeal has been made to designate the city a disaster area.

Such is the capsule résumé of devastation following the 65-mile-an-hour twister. Sympathy and care for survivors caught in the vicious tornado's maw is all that can now be offered. And that, unfortunately, will be forthcoming in most generous measure.

Such violent incidents are a macabre vagary of nature, explicable perhaps to meteorologists who apparently are not yet able to forecast their coming. There is left only sorrow, sincere compassion for the bereaved.

A disaster like this, brutal as its harvest shows, is but a minuscule shadowing of the cosmic power of destruction man has shaped in his world arsenals of nuclear annihilation.

Nature, even in its deadly moments, is kinder than this generation of men, who have devised a potential of monstrous destruction that could be loosed in a moment's madness.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
Feb. 11, 1959]

THE CALAMITY OF DISASTER

Here in St. Louis the whistle of the wind is no exhilarating song. Here the whine under the eaves carries overtones of alarm. This is tornado country. Damaging storms have lashed the city since its earliest days, but only two—those of 1896 and 1927—were more deadly than the catastrophe which whipped across St. Louis early Tuesday morning. Had that calamity befallen the community in business hours, who knows how many more might have been killed or injured in the streets? For that one is grateful.

But 21 dead, 300 injured, and 1,725 buildings damaged is disaster enough. It will be ameliorated insofar as that is possible. President Eisenhower has responded to Mayor Tucker's appeal by declaring this a disaster area, eligible for Federal aid.

The firemen, the police, the doctors and nurses of hospitals, the emergency crews of the utility companies, Civil Defense, the Salvation Army, and the Red Cross responded with marvelous energy. They ministered to the injured, dug out the dead, blocked off danger zones, cleared streets, and restored facilities as quickly and as best they could. They did splendid work. For this the community honors them. Individuals and groups unable to help so directly can join in relief over the longer run.

The Post-Dispatch, KSD-TV and KSD have started a tornado relief fund with a contribution of \$5,000. Other contributions are solicited, especially because so many of those hard hit are unable to do much for themselves. Money is needed not only for emergency food and shelter, but also to help the victims of the storm in reestablishing themselves. This is a concrete way of expressing the universal sympathy for those injured in limb and property. Contributions sent in care of the Post-Dispatch will be distributed by the Red Cross.

The response this time, we are sure, will be what it has been every time St. Louis felt the wrath of storm, fire, and plague. These disasters are hardly to be prevented. But beginning with the first policeman, fireman, and doctor on the scene, the community can make good the damage. People can show not only compassion but also courage. They can and will clear away the wind-scattered debris. They can and will build anew, stronger and better. They can and will respond to the challenge of disaster.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1959.

HON. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: Once again it is my sad duty to report the measures which the Red Cross is taking in meeting the suffering caused by the tornado which struck St. Louis early yesterday morning.

Preliminary surveys from Red Cross workers indicate approximately 3,036 families have been affected. Most of these were in St. Louis in an area bounded by the following streets: Grand, St. Louis, Olive, and Newstead. Here, 21 died, 69 were hospitalized, and 350 received minor injuries. In this area 21 dwellings were destroyed, 141 dwellings received major damage, and 1,104 dwellings received minor damage. Most of those dwellings were occupied by varying numbers of families up to four. In the Brentwood area 2 homes were destroyed and 11 homes were damaged. In the Rock Hill area 1 home was destroyed and 107 homes

were damaged. In the Berkeley area 12 homes were damaged. In addition, 23 businesses were destroyed, 93 businesses received major damage, and 388 businesses received minor damage in St. Louis and in the Brentwood area. Fifty persons occupied a Red Cross shelter last night. Five canteens have been operating in the affected areas, feeding both rescue workers and victims.

Chapter volunteers and national disaster workers of the Red Cross are on the job along with Federal, State, and community agencies to bring all possible relief to the disaster sufferers in your State. The full resources of our organization have been mobilized to aid these stricken families. The Red Cross will continue its emergency and rehabilitation work until the disaster-caused needs of all families lacking the necessary funds have been met.

Red Cross help is based on the principle, not of replacing all losses, but of assisting disaster victims in need who lack sufficient resources of their own, including insurance, to start back on the road to recovery.

All assistance from the Red Cross is an outright gift from funds contributed by the American people. Unfortunately, our disaster revolving fund has been drastically reduced because of the extraordinary heavy disaster losses in the past 4 years. For that reason special appeals for funds have been inaugurated by the Red Cross in the affected areas. I am confident that the American people, as always, will contribute generously.

You may be assured that the Red Cross will remain on the job until all who need our assistance have been helped.

Sincerely,

ALFRED M. GRUENTHER.

CONGRESSIONAL COOPERATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

MR. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture is now testifying before the Senate Agriculture Committee regarding the administration's recommendations for additional farm legislation.

This is the seventh year of this administration's farm policies and programs.

Six times, either the President or his Secretary of Agriculture has come before Congress with recommendations which they said would help solve the farm problem.

Each time the Congress was assured that the farm situation was getting better, but that additional legislation was needed to further improve the economic conditions in agriculture.

Many of us did not concur with these policies and proposals. We felt that, even if administered well, many of the Secretary's farm policies would not serve the best interest of farm families.

In his recent farm message, the President argued that the Congress has not given the administration all of the legislation requested.

On other recent occasions, high officials in the Department of Agriculture have stated that Congress has not provided the legislative tools to solve the farm problem.

Let us get the facts—based on the record.

What legislation has been requested by this administration.

And what has Congress done about these requests?

I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to make a comparison of the administration's major farm price and income recommendations with the legislative action taken by Congress.

To get the facts, the Legislative Reference Service checked the recommendations of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture for each of the past 6 years.

They reviewed the bills, hearings, reports, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They used the Department of Agriculture's Digest of Legislation and other official publications.

Now let us see what the record shows.

The Library of Congress report states:

In the past 6 sessions of the Congress, some 53 recommendations have been made by the Secretary of Agriculture for price and income stabilization for commercial farmers.

According to the report, 48, or more than 90 percent, of these recommendations have received favorable legislative action.

A more detailed examination of these legislative actions shows that 41 of the 48, and I quote, "substantially fulfilled the requirements stated by the Secretary," while 7 partially met the administration requests.

To continue from the report by the impartial Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service:

Only five recommendations made by the Secretary in the past 6 years have not received favorable congressional action. They are:

1. The sale of CCC stocks at not less than support levels plus carrying charges (84th Cong., 2d sess.).
2. The sale of low-quality CCC wheat by the Secretary of Agriculture for feeding purposes (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF FOR STABILIZING FARM PRICES 83D CONGRESS,

Recommendations

1. June 30: President requested legislation which would give authority to use agricultural commodities held by the Government to meet needs arising from famine or other urgent relief requirements abroad.
2. June 10: President proposed that Congress authorize availability to Pakistan of 1 million tons of CCC-held wheat, with recommendation that legislation include authority for CCC to recover through appropriation.
3. June 2: Presidential message to Senate contained recommendation for Senate ratification of extension of International Wheat Agreement.
4. March 26: President recommended adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 2, to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture functions vested by law in other officers, agencies, and employees of the Department * * * to simplify and make effective the operation of the Department.

83D CONGRESS,

Recommendations

1. January 11: President recommended authority for price supports at 90 percent of parity be allowed to expire in favor of supports between 75 and 90 percent of parity on the five basic commodities—wheat, corn, rice, cotton, and peanuts—depending on the relationship of total to normal supply.

3. Extension of the noncommercial wheat area (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

4. The replacement of acreage allotments on cotton with quantity allotments (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

5. Provision for elimination of national acreage allotments on peanuts (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire report of the Legislative Reference Service, giving each of the 53 recommendations and the legislative action thereon, be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS FOR STABILIZING FARM PRICES AND INCOME, 1953 TO DATE

In the past six sessions of the Congress, some 53 recommendations have been made by the Secretary of Agriculture for price and income stabilization for commercial farmers.

Of this total, 41 legislative actions have substantially fulfilled the requirements stated by the Secretary, and 7 of his recommendations were only partially met, or the timing of the changes recommended were delayed. One of these occurred in the 83d Congress, four in the 84th Congress, and two in the 85th Congress.

Only five recommendations made by the Secretary in the past 6 years have not received favorable congressional action: They are:

1. The sale of CCC stocks at not less than support levels plus carrying charges (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

2. The sale of low-quality CCC wheat by the Secretary of Agriculture for feeding purposes (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

3. Extension of the noncommercial wheat area (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

4. The replacement of acreage allotments on cotton with quantity allotments (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

5. Provision for elimination of national acreage allotments on peanuts (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

**AGRICULTURE AND LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS AND INCOME, 1953 TO DATE
1ST SESSION (1953)**

Legislation

Public Law 216 authorized President to use stocks of agricultural commodities from CCC to relieve famine and relief requirements abroad.

Public Law 77 made a gift of up to 1 million long tons of wheat from CCC stocks to Government of Pakistan to relieve starvation and mass suffering.

Public Law 180 extended the International Wheat Agreement to arrange for orderly movement of wheat between exporting and importing nations.

Reorganization Plan 2 was put into effect by the President after the 60-day period when Congress did not reject the plan.

2D SESSION (1954)

Legislation

Public Law 690 (Agricultural Act of 1954) provided flexible price support program at 82½ to 90 percent of parity for the 1955 crop of wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, and rice. In 1956 and thereafter, support levels designated at 75 to 90 percent of parity.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS FOR STABILIZING FARM PRICES AND INCOME, 1953 TO DATE—Continued

Recommendations

2. January 11: President recommended provision to allow for moving from old to modernized parity in steps of five percentage points of the old parity per year until the change has been accomplished.

3. January 11: President recommended removal of excessive stocks of surpluses from commercial channels, and strengthening work of the Department of Agriculture in developing foreign markets abroad and at home.

4. January 11: President recommended that authority be provided to set aside reserves up to \$2.5 billion from stocks held by CCC.

5. January 11: President recommended increasing the amount CCC may spend or lend to support farm prices from \$6.5 to \$8.5 billion.

6. January 11: President recommended raising normal carryover allowance from 10 to 15 percent of domestic use of corn. Also, repeal of marketing quotas for corn.

7. January 11: President recommended, for fruits and vegetables, inclusion of additional commodities. Also, authority for marketing orders to be continued despite short-term price variations, and authorization for agencies established under marketing orders to use funds collected to engage in market research and development.

8. January 11: President recommended legislation for assistance to growers of potatoes in same manner as is available for growers of other fruits and vegetables.

9. January 11: President recommended for wool, direct payments to domestic producers sufficient to raise average return per pound to 90 percent of parity. Funds to meet wool payments to be taken from general revenues within the amount of unobligated tariff receipts from wool. Similar recommendations to apply to pulled wool and mohair.

Legislation

Public Law 690 contained a transitional parity provision that parity price would be decreased only 5 percent per year until the change has been accomplished.

Public Law 690 provided for transfer of agricultural attachés from State to Agriculture Department.

Public Law 480 provided for disposal of agricultural surpluses by the President for emergency assistance to friendly nations, and authorized sale for local currencies of surplus agricultural commodities to foreign nations. Authorized \$1 billion for these purposes.

Public Law 690 provided set-aside authority recommended.

Public Law 312 increased borrowing power of CCC from \$6.75 to \$8.5 billion.

Public Law 690 repealed marketing quotas for corn and increased carryover allowance from 10 to 15 percent.

Public Law 690 authorized marketing orders to continue when prices are at or above parity. Funds collected under marketing agreements authorized for use in market research and development.

Public Law 690 provided authority for inclusion of Irish potatoes in support program at 0 to 90 percent of parity.

Public Law 690 provided for use of incentive payments to wool producers for 4 years, beginning April 1, 1955, to support wool at a level up to 110 percent of parity, as the Secretary determines necessary to encourage annual production of 300 million pounds. When such goal is reached, price to be supported at between 60 and 90 percent, as Secretary determines necessary to encourage production of 360 million pounds of wool annually.

84TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION (1955)

Recommendations

1. March 3: In letter to Speaker, House of Representatives, USDA recommended legislation to extend for 2 years the period for making livestock loans.

2. March 18: House Report 238 contains USDA's recommended legislation to re-determine 1955 marketing quotas and acreage allotments for burley tobacco; to increase the penalty for marketing excess tobacco from 50 to 75 percent of average market price for previous year, to provide that any acreage of tobacco harvested in excess of allotted acreage shall not be considered in establishing allotment for the farm in the succeeding year.

3. Also, that legislation be enacted to eliminate provision whereby tobacco growers may vote for quotas either for 3 years or 1 year and provide for voting only on the question of quotas for 3 years.

4. July 20: USDA recommended legislation to increase the borrowing authority of the CCC from \$10 billion to \$12 billion.

5. Feb. 9 and March 10: In letters to Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, USDA approved proposed legislation to repeal section 348 of the AAA of 1938 as amended, denying ACP payments to any farmer who knowingly harvests any basic commodity in excess of his acreage allotment.

6. May 18: In response to request for report, USDA recommended enactment of legislation to extend period for making emer-

Legislation

Public Law 166 extended the period for making special livestock loans for 2 years.

Public Law 21 directed Secretary to re-determine national marketing quota for burley tobacco for 1955-56 marketing year, authorized reductions by not more than 1/10 of an acre for existing allotments which are 7/10 acre or less, but more than 1/2 acre. Penalizes growers who submit false reports on tobacco acreage. Increased excess-marketing penalty from 50 to 75 percent of average market price for previous year.

Public Law 279 provided for voting only on the question of quotas for 3 years.

Public Law 344 increased the borrowing power of the CCC from \$10 to \$12 billion.

Public Law 42 repealed that portion of the Agricultural Act of 1954 that denied agricultural conservation program payments to any farmer who knowingly harvests any basic commodity in excess of his acreage allotment.

Public Law 117 extended for 2 years the period for making emergency loans under P.L. 727 (83d Cong.) which provided \$15

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS FOR
STABILIZING FARM PRICES AND INCOME, 1953 TO DATE—Continued

Recommendations

agency loans under Public Law 727 (83d Cong.).

7. March 24: In response to request for report, USDA recommended enactment of H.R. 3231, unless section 102(a) of S. 752 could be reworded to remove the requirement that exporters of privately owned stocks acquire an equivalent quantity of CCC stocks.

84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION (1956)

Recommendations

January 9: President Eisenhower sent to Congress a message on a farm program with proposals designed to relieve the problems of huge agricultural surpluses. He recommended:

1. A soil-bank plan in 2 parts:
A. Acreage reserve program: Government payments for putting a part of the acreage allotments of the basic commodities in the soil bank, payments to be made to the producer by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

B. Conservation reserve: producers contract voluntarily with the Government to shift cropland into unharvested grasses, and other conservation uses, the Government to pay a fair share of costs of establishing the reserve, as well as annual payments for period of the contract.

2. Legislation to permit sale of CCC stocks at not less than support levels plus carrying charges.

3. Repeal of section 304 of Public Law 480 which restricts exports of CCC stocks to friendly nations only.

4. Corn: eliminate acreage allotments for corn and put price supports on a discretionary basis comparable with other feed grains.

5. Wheat: Authorization for the Secretary to sell for feeding purposes limited quantities of CCC wheat of less-desirable milling quality;

6. To expand the noncommercial wheat areas beyond the 12 States now so designated; and

7. The extension for 1 year of legislation exempting durum wheat from acreage and marketing controls.

8. The exemption from marketing quotas of wheat used on farms where it is produced for feed, seed, or food.

9. Cotton: Provision that the average grade and quality be utilized for parity-price computations, rather than "middling $\frac{3}{8}$."

10. The replacement of acreage allotments on cotton with quantity allotments with the crop of 1957.

11. Peanuts: Elimination of provisions for the minimum national acreage allotment.

12. Sugar: Renewal of the Sugar Act of 1948.

13. Special school milk program: That the program be extended for 2 years, with au-

Legislation

million of economic disaster loan authority.

Public Law 25 improves the operations under Public Law 480 by removing requirement that private stocks exported under title I be replaced by CCC stocks.

Legislation

Public Law 540 (The Agricultural Act of 1956) set up a \$1.2 billion-a-year soil bank in two parts:

A. Acreage reserve, designed to reduce acreages of basic commodities. Payments to farmers made to reduce acreage of crops below allotments. Maximum of \$750 million annually for next 4 years authorized.

B. Conservation reserve: designed to remove acreage from crop production on a semi-permanent basis for which payments equivalent to the rental value of the land would be made, with an annual national limit of \$450 million.

Public Law 85-128 amended section 304 to allow President to assist friendly nations to be independent of trade with U.S.S.R. and with nations dominated or controlled by U.S.S.R. and to assure that agricultural commodities sold or transferred do not result in increased availability of those or like commodities to unfriendly nations. Transactions prohibited with U.S.S.R. or Communist China.

Public Law 540: To be eligible for supports in 1956, the producer must devote to the soil bank an acreage of land equal to 15 percent of his corn base. Corn base acreage allotments shall be effective for the 1956 crop. Outside the commercial corn area, corn will be supported at 82.5 percent of the level in the commercial area. After 1956, producers in a referendum will decide between (a) base acreages in lieu of acreage allotments, with price supports discretionary with the Secretary. If producers favor base acreages, they must stay within acreages and devote 15 percent of their corn base to the soil bank, or (b) acreage allotments with supports at 75 to 90 percent of parity. (In referendum, choice "b" carried).

Public Law 431 provided possible planting in 1956 of expanded acreages of durum wheat.

Public Law 85-203 provided exemption from liability by producers of wheat grown in excess of allotments when acreage does not exceed 30 acres and none of such crop is removed from the farm and is used for seed, human food, or feed for livestock.

Public Law 85-835: Beginning in 1961 price support shall be based on the average quality of the crop cotton.

Public Law 545 reenacted and extended for 4 years, to December 31, 1960, the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Public Law 465 extended the special school milk program 2 years and increased the

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF
FOR STABILIZING FARM PRICES

Recommendations

thorizations to use CCC funds, increased from \$50 to \$75 million.

14. Creation of a Great Plains program, suggesting modification of existing legislation to (a) provide for long-time cost-sharing commitments under agricultural conservation program, and (b) relaxation of planting requirements to maintain base acreage for wheat allotments.

15. "In the budget message, I will request the maximum increase in research funds that can be effectively used next year * * * an increase of one-fourth, to a total of \$103 million for research in new products, markets, new uses for products. * * *"

16. "I recommend that legislation be passed to relieve the farmer of the Federal tax on purchases of gasoline used on the farm."

17. May 17: Secretary Benson proposed amendment to title I, Public Law 480 (83d Cong.) to increase maximum authority for reimbursement to CCC for commodity disposal operations from \$1.5 billion to \$3 billion.

85TH CONGRESS,

Recommendations

1. February 14: Secretary of Agriculture proposed bill to amend Public Law 480 (sec. 103b) to increase title I authority from \$3 to \$4 billion, to extend Public Law 480 for 1 year, and to repeal section 304 which prohibits disposal operations in Iron Curtain countries.

2. January 16: President's budget message recommended legislation authorizing "the barter of nonstrategic Government-owned agricultural surpluses to the nations of Eastern Europe."

3. January 16: President in budget message, recommended legislation authorizing exemption from marketing quotas and penalties of farmers who use all of the wheat grown on their farms for feed, seed or food.

In response to request for report, Secretary of Agriculture endorsed legislation and proposed amendments to exempt wheat producers from liability when total acreage does not exceed 30 acres and when all the production is used on the farm for food, feed and seed.

4. March 15: In response to request for report, Secretary Benson indicated Department favored enactment of bill to freeze at 75 percent of parity the support on extra long staple cotton.

5. May 20: In response to request for report, the Acting Secretary of Agriculture recommended that bill providing that preservation of allotment histories should be automatic within the period 1956-57, should pass.

85TH CONGRESS,

Recommendations

January 16: President's farm message contained the following legislative proposals:

1. The conservation reserve program of the soil bank should be strengthened and the acreage reserve program terminated after the 1958 crop.

2. Authority should be provided for the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with criteria which he will propose to the Con-

AGRICULTURE AND LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS AND INCOME, 1953 TO DATE—Continued

Legislation

amount authorized for it from \$50 to \$60 million annually for the current fiscal year and to \$75 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years.

Public Law 752 extended school milk program to nonprofit organizations whether or not they are for underprivileged children.

Public Law 1021: (The Great Plains Conservation Act) provided a broad program, in cooperation with farmers, to restore and conserve cultivated and grazing lands of a wide area in 10 Plains States. Authorized \$150 million program over a 10-year period. Authorized Secretary to formulate and announce a conservation program and to enter into 10-year contracts with operators to encourage permanent shift in land use in the Great Plains.

Public Law 540 provides for a five-member commission to be appointed by the President to make recommendations for increased industrial uses of agricultural commodities.

Public Law 466 relieved the farmer of excise taxes on gasoline and special fuels used for farming purposes.

Public Law 962 amended section 103(b) of Public Law 480 to raise the authority for appropriations from \$1.5 billion to \$3 billion.

1ST SESSION (1957)

Legislation

Public Law 85-128 extended Public Law 480 for 1 year; increased authority contained in section 103(b) from \$3 to \$4 billion. Amended section 304 to allow President to assist friendly nations to be independent of trade with the U.S.S.R. and with nations dominated or controlled by U.S.S.R., and to assure that agricultural commodities sold or transferred do not result in increased availability of those or like commodities to unfriendly nations. Transactions prohibited with U.S.S.R. or with Communist China.

Public Law 85-203 provided (a) exemption from liability by producers, of wheat grown in excess of allotments when acreage does not exceed 30 acres and none of such crop is removed (except for processing) from the farm, and the entire crop is used for seed, human food, or feed for livestock on the farm, and (b) that no acreage in the commercial wheat-producing areas seeded to wheat for harvest as grain in 1958 or thereafter in excess of allotments shall be considered in establishing future allotments.

Public Law 85-28 amended AAA of 1949 to provide that the price support levels for American upland and extra long staple cotton for 1957 and subsequent years shall be the same percentage of parity as for the 1956 crop. (The 1956 support level was 75 percent).

Public Law 85-266 amended section 377 of the AAA of 1938, to provide that preservation of allotment acreage shall be automatic within the period 1956 to 1959, inclusive, thus making it unnecessary for farm operators to notify county committees of their desire to preserve allotment history for the years involved.

2D SESSION (1958)

Legislation

Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine appropriation action strengthened conservation reserve and terminated acreage reserve.

Public Law 85-835 (Agricultural Act of 1958): Title I provides for a minimum national acreage allotment for cotton of 16

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS FOR STABILIZING FARM PRICES AND INCOME, 1953 TO DATE—Continued

Recommendations

gress, to increase acreage allotments of basic commodities up to 50 percent above the levels determined by existing formulas.

3. Acreage allotments for corn should be eliminated.

4. The escalator clause (requiring price supports be increased as surplus is reduced) should be abolished.

5. The overall range within which price supports may be provided should be substantially widened.

Price supports for basic commodities should be determined administratively between 60 and 90 percent of parity using established guidelines.

6. Price supports for cotton should be based on the average quality of the crop.

7. The agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act should be extended for 1 year and an additional \$1.5 billion authorized for sales for foreign currencies.

8. Research efforts aimed at increasing industrial uses of farm products should be expanded.

9. Congress should extend the National Wool Act.

10. Congress should continue the special school milk program.

11. March 4, 1957: In response to request for report, Secretary of Agriculture indicated approval of extension of Agricultural conservation program for 4 years, providing certain changes relating to State administration of the program be incorporated.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, despite the exceptional legislative cooperation in providing the Secretary with the tools he said he needed to solve the farm program, he has not solved it.

In fact, the opposite is true.

Over the past 6 years, total net farm income has averaged \$3 billion per year below the level in 1952.

Farm prices have averaged 15 percent below the 1952 level.

Legislation

million acres. For 1959 and 1960 the individual farmer will have a choice between his regular acreage allotments and price supports as determined by the Secretary, or an increase not to exceed 40 percent of his regular allotment with supports 15 percent lower than the level of those farmers who elect the first choice. After 1960, farmers will receive only their regular allotments, supports to be between 70 and 90 percent; after 1961, supports between 65 and 90 percent of parity.

Title III provides that the minimum national and State acreage allotments presently in effect for rice will be extended permanently.

Public Law 85-835, title II, provides for a referendum among corn producers (in the commercial area) to choose between (a) discontinuance of acreage allotments in the commercial corn area, and price support at 90 percent of the average price received by farmers for the 3 preceding years (but not less than 65 percent of parity), or (b) acreage allotments to continue in effect and the minimum level of price supports to continue at between 75 and 90 percent of parity. (In referendum, choice "a" carried.)

Public Law 85-835, title I repealed the escalator clause for cotton, effective with the 1961 crop. Title III repealed the escalator clause for rice, effective with the 1959 crop.

Public Law 85-835 provides a minimum level of supports for corn at 65 percent of parity in the event choice (a) was made in the referendum. Title I provides a minimum for cotton for 1959 of 80 percent. Title III provides 75-90 percent for rice for 1959 and 1960; 70-90 percent for 1961; and 69-90 percent after 1961.

Public Law 85-835: Beginning in 1961, price supports shall (for cotton) be based on the average quality of the crop.

Public Law 85-931 extends the termination date of both titles I and II from June 30, 1958, to December 31, 1959. Authorizes an additional \$1.5 billion per year for title I operations, or an additional \$2.25 billion for the 1½-year extension. Requires the Secretary to engage in the barter or exchange of CCC surplus commodities for strategic or other materials when he determines this to be in the best interests of the United States.

1959 appropriation action increased research funds.

Public Law 85-835, title IV extends the National Wool Act for 3 years, until March 31, 1962, and provides for the use of 70 percent of the ad valorem duties on wool (in addition to 70 percent of the specific duties).

Public Law 85-478 extends special school milk program for 3 years. Provides for each fiscal year \$75 million of CCC funds to increase consumption of fluid milk by children.

Public Law 85-553 extends the agricultural conservation program for 4 years, incorporating changes relating to State administration of the program suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The parity ratio, 100 percent in 1952, has averaged 85 percent in the past 6 years.

From the beginning of the farm program until 1953, Department of Agriculture expenditures averaged less than \$1.5 billion per year.

During the past 6 years, those expenditures have averaged nearly 5 billion per year.

And they are increasing.

Secretary Benson started his management of the Department of Agriculture with \$2.4 billion total Commodity Credit Corporation investment in farm commodities.

As of January 1, 1959—exactly 6 years later—that total inventory investment is \$8.7 billion.

And according to the President's budget message, it will soon be over \$10 billion.

This is the record of what has been done with the legislative tools he requested and which Congress has given him.

As the Senate Agriculture Committee hears the Secretary's presentation, it will be looking to the future—to new, sound programs which will help bring true prosperity to the farm families of our great country.

In planning for the future, let us this time give careful consideration to the record of the past.

FIVE BASIC PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Five Basic Problems of Education," written by Fred M. Hechinger, and published in the New York Times magazine of January 25, 1959. I commend this informed and sobering article to all Senators.

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

FIVE BASIC PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

Ever since the cold war moved into outer space, the American people have been concerned about education. No longer is the sky the limit; even the moon is only a whistle stop. And in this futuristic contest, the classrooms are the launching platforms.

Hardly a week passes without several television programs peeking behind the scenes of education. Not long ago, a broadcaster cornered a few high school students, and their deplorable ignorance set off a national storm of criticism. The Rockefeller report on education got top billing on the front pages of even small-town dailies. Rear Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, father of the atomic submarine, received a sympathetic public ear when he proclaimed that, if the money for education could not be found in the Federal budget, the defense appropriation should be cut.

President Eisenhower appointed a special Committee on Education Beyond High School. The Ford Foundation made the largest gift in the history of private philanthropy for the increase of professors' salaries. James Bryant Conant, Harvard's former president, has devoted the past 2 years to an attempt to find out what is wrong with American high school education. In fact, the "Conant Report," which is set for publication next Wednesday, has already stirred up more excitement than many Government White Papers.

Everybody is concerned about education; but "education" is an elusive, amorphous thing. Before it can be understood and improved, some of the crucial problems must be singled out and defined. As an observer of the educational scene, I have visited classrooms, talked with teachers, listened to parents, sat through speeches and conventions, scanned the statistics and studied the reports.

Let me set down what seem the five most immediate problems; then let us see what the experts recommend.

The problem: (1) How can American standards of education be raised, and what, especially, can be done to meet the challenge of the exceptionally gifted child?

American democracy promises every child a full elementary and secondary education, but the unanswered question has always been how to do this without surrendering to the lowest common denominator. Our educational laissez-faire, which permits even able students to pick "elective" snap courses, has allowed standards to slip.

The raising of educational standards for the great mass of students would mean a spectacular improvement in the country's total reservoir of skills. But what about the small number of exceptionally gifted children—the top 2 percent? The talents of these, if lost, are irreplaceable. In terms of the country's progress and of competitive coexistence in a cold war period, they may well hold the key.

The proposed solutions: There is almost unanimous agreement that the search for quality in a system of quantity rates first attention. To cope with the problem of a curriculum which has been loaded down with an almost unlimited variety of subjects from driver education to citizenship training, the Rockefeller report, entitled "The Pursuit of Excellence," demands that "we reach some agreement on priorities in subject-matter." Educators are asked to make up their minds which of the many elective courses are most important.

The Conant report will go a step further. It will clearly demand that all high school students complete four years of English, three to four years of history and related social studies, one year of mathematics and one year of science. Students in the top 20 percent would take three additional years of science, three more years of mathematics and at least three years of one foreign language.

For all students there must be improved guidance. Dr. Conant asks for 1 guidance counselor for every 250 to 300 high school students. And, in order to assure adequate programs and facilities, he asks for elimination, through consolidation of all high schools with graduating classes of fewer than 100 students.

All proposals for the improvement of education demand a greater sense of continuity of subjects and a greater scope of understanding. Study of a foreign language for less than 3 years, says Dr. Conant, is like drilling for oil and then stopping before striking it. In the study of history, too, efforts are largely wasted unless there is a sense of the natural sequence of events.

For the 2 percent of gifted pupils, even more of a concession to the difference in human talent must be made. "A school system that insists on the same instruction for the talented, average, and below average child, said Rear Admiral Rickover, "may prevent as many children from growing intellectually as would a system that excludes children because of the social, political, or economic status of their parents. Neither system is democratic."

The experts agree. "Any educational system is, among other things, a great sorting-out process," says the Rockefeller report. But while the European sorting out is achieved almost entirely by impersonal examinations, the American experts call for a variety of tests, some scoring native talent, others the actual achievement of the student, with personal observation and guidance. Once the gifted students are recognized, the experts want them to be given advanced work, without separating them from their classmates.

Toward the end of high school, the extra work would be increased. Thus, juniors and seniors would be offered college-level instruc-

tion in some subjects, as they now are under the advanced placement program sponsored by the college entrance examination board. Another program for early admission to college, initiated by the Fund for the Advancement of Education and hailed by all the experts, has sent more than 1,000 gifted students to college during the past 5 years without completion of the last year or two of high school.

The problem: (2) How can we get better teachers?

There is no way to improve the quality of the American education without an adequate supply of good teachers. Already a serious shortage of highly educated manpower exists. This shortage will become increasingly critical unless we find enough of what the Ford Foundation calls the "seed corn"—teachers who, through their superior efforts, help to raise new generations of educated brains.

Perhaps even worse, the standards set for the teachers are often pitifully low. For example, at a convention in Bowling Green, Ohio, recently, an education spokesman "demanded" that chemistry teachers be given at least thirty-two hours of college study in that subject. A Russian student in a college-preparatory high school, by comparison, gets more than 340 hours of chemistry before graduation.

The proposed solutions: "No educational system can be better than its teachers," warns the Rockefeller report. It estimates that the number of new teachers needed in the next decade is somewhere between one-third and one-half of all college graduates in that period. The present ratio of college graduates entering the teaching profession is only one out of every four or five. And yet, even today, the report warns, the problem of quality is critical. As of 1956, 33 per cent of all elementary teachers did not hold an A.B. degree, while more than 21 per cent of all public school teachers had less than four years of college.

Since the training of all teachers depends on the quality of the training of college teachers, there is special significance in a report by the National Education Association that "since 1953-54, holders of the doctor's degree among newly employed, fulltime [college] teachers have decreased 25.2 percent." And the manpower pressures of the immediate future may make this situation even worse.

The Rockefeller report calls for an improvement in the courses and training procedures given teachers. "If the programs for the preparation of teachers are rigid, formalistic and shallow, they will drive away able minds as fast as they are recruited," it warns. "Unhappily, preparation for pre-college teaching has come all too close to that condition."

The report warns against the practice of handling teachers as interchangeable units in an educational assembly line. At present, the best teacher and the poorest in a school may teach the same grade and subject, use the same textbook, handle the same number of students, get paid the same salaries, and rise in salary at the same speed to the same ceiling. The ironic result is that school administration—and the end of active teaching—often becomes the only refuge for able teachers who want to advance their careers.

The problem of getting a sufficient number of teachers is primarily one of recruiting and of offering an attractive career. "But even with aggressive recruitment there appears to be little or no likelihood that we can bring into teaching at any level anything approaching the number of qualified and gifted teachers we need," says the Rockefeller report. "We must therefore utilize our superior teachers more effectively."

All the experts agree that, in the words of the Rockefeller report, "one way to make better use of the ablest teachers is to eliminate many of the petty tasks which occupy

a teacher's time. Less highly trained classroom assistants may accomplish much in the lightening of this burden." The Fund for the Advancement of Education, putting this theory to the test in Bay City, Mich., found it successful, and it has spread from there to many communities across the country. A bonus, it was found, came when many of the aides, seeing teaching at its best, became so interested that they went back to college to get their teacher training.

Other experiments have been sparked by the success of the first one. The use of teams of teachers, made up of one master teacher, one regular teacher, and one untrained assistant has made it possible to increase the class size for some subjects to three times a normal classroom quota, while, at other times, permitting one teacher to work with only 8 to 12 pupils. The use of television has also made it possible to get more of the best teachers into contact with more students.

The problem: (3) Should we emphasize science as against the liberal arts?

However we respond to the challenge of Sputnik or speculate about the importance of moon shots, one fact is inescapable—science and technology are intimately linked with modern man's destiny.

Traditionally, there used to be a clear dividing line between the liberal arts and the sciences. The high school student who thought he had no interest in a career of science frequently was allowed to get by with a minimum of mathematics and science instruction. Reports about the Russian schools, which go to the opposite extreme of requiring a stiff dose of science and mathematics for all high school students, have intensified the problem of just how much science training should be required of every high school graduate.

The proposed solutions: The experts agree on two fundamental points: (1) that, despite the panic headlines, science must not crowd out the humanities; (2) that it is vital for all students, not just the scientifically inclined, to have a thorough measure of basic mathematics and science.

On the first point, the President's Committee on Education Beyond High School says that the country would be inexcusably blind if it failed to see that the challenge of the next 20 years will require leaders not only in science and engineering and in business and industry, but in government and politics, in foreign affairs and diplomacy, in education and civic affairs.

On the second point, Dr. I. I. Rabi, Nobel Prize physicist and chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee, says: "We must teach science as an intellectual pursuit rather than as a body of tricks." And he adds: "As yet, if a man has no feeling for art he is considered narrowminded, but if he has no feeling for science, he is considered quite normal. This is a fundamental weakness."

Probably the greatest waste of scientific talent stems from social clichés which discourage girls from studying science and mathematics as unladylike. Dr. Conant found that, even in the best high schools, fewer than half of the gifted girls elect 4 years of mathematics.

The experts agree that it is not a question of either/or between science and the liberal arts. The Rockefeller report warns as much against the narrowly trained scientist as against the educated man who is illiterate in science.

The problem: (4) Who should go to college?

Already more than 3 million young Americans are enrolled in college—a total of one-third of the eligible age group. Is universal college the next step, following the universal high school? Some State universities have, in practice, accepted this principle; they consider a high school diploma an automatic admission ticket. Other college spokesmen

warn against the danger of indiscriminate admission policies as an invitation to lowered standards. They are, however, more concerned that rising costs will price the colleges out of the market for many able students.

One fact is clear: even if the present policy of selection is continued, most colleges would have to double or triple in size by 1975 in order to accommodate the same percentage of students who go to college today.

No expert wants to restrict college admission, but all would like to see standards raised so that the restrictions could be built into the procedure of selection. They applaud current trends in that direction. They cite the announcement by the University of Illinois that by September 1960, its freshmen will no longer be nursed along in remedial English courses. They point with approval to more than a dozen colleges which have revived foreign language requirements for admission.

The problem is not so much whom to keep out of college, but rather how to make sure that those who should go to college do so.

The two roadblocks, the experts agree, are motivation and finances. To remove the first, they say that young people with talent will have to be shown more effectively that there is real value and excitement in higher education. To remove the second, they suggest more scholarships.

The President's Committee called for 10 times the present total amount of scholarship money, estimated at about \$60 million. It wants about 200,000 of the ablest and neediest high school graduates annually to be assured of a college education by having the financial burden removed from them.

In addition, it calls for between 25,000 and 50,000 subsidized campus jobs so that another large group will be able to support itself with work-study programs. In order to build higher education firmly into the American way of life, the President's Committee also suggests that the tax laws be revised so that students and their parents would be assured of credits or deductions.

All the experts agree that there should be a greater number of 2-year colleges for those who are unwilling or unable to commit themselves to 4 years of higher education.

Finally, the Conant report will urgently demand another reform plan which would eliminate those students who feel that they are inadequately prepared to make a living when they leave high school, and who go to college for vocational training rather than for education. The Conant plan would expect the high schools to offer vocational training of highest caliber to these students.

Considering the importance of the problem of who should go to college, it is disappointing to find the experts vague and hedging in their replies. The reason is simple: they are torn between rational planning and the commitment to an ideal. The first calls for toughness in setting up restrictions so that the colleges and universities can be made into institutions of excellence; the second dreams about the removal of all limitations from a child's educational horizon. At present, the American genius for compromise is in search of a formula that will be democratic without destroying the standards of scholarship and education.

The problem: (5) How do you pay for all this?

If mass and class in education are to be combined, perhaps for the first time in history, then the cost will be high. What compounds the difficulty is the almost pathological fear of Government control through Government financing. Yet, from the problem of the loss of potentially able teachers to higher paying jobs to the fact that local spending is not even beginning to catch up with school construction needs, every sign points to an inescapable truth: the present sources of money are insufficient to pay for a first-class mass education system.

Many schools are overcrowded, understaffed, and ill equipped. There is an estimated shortage of 142,000 classrooms and an "excess" of almost 2 million pupils. And within 10 years the high schools will have arrived at a point where they will face 50 to 75 percent more pupils than they now accommodate.

The proposed solutions: None of the experts has tackled the money problem with complete candor. The fear of an all-out fight over the principle of Federal aid has led to a flood of cautious statements and even more cautious legislation. Yet between the lines the implication is clear: Federal aid will have to be a permanent part of the picture.

What are the real needs? Our total expenditure for education, from elementary school through the universities, today is approximately \$14 billion annually. This is 3.6 percent of the gross national product. The experts estimate that, in order to attain the goals of quality in a system of quantity, the Nation will have to spend \$30 billion annually 10 years from now, with those \$30 billion measured in terms of today's purchasing power. This would mean, according to the best economists' predictions, about 5 percent of the gross national product.

The Rockefeller report points out that local and State tax systems are in some respects archaic. School expenditures are charged almost entirely to the revenue raised through property tax—and this is also the tax which meets with the most solidly organized and most vocal opposition. It is no coincidence that the rejection of school bond issues in New York State reached an all-time high last year—despite Sputnik.

"It is this weakness in the State and local taxing systems more than anything else that gives rise to current proposals for increased Federal support of education," says the Rockefeller report. "For those who wish to resist or postpone the resort to Federal funds and at the same time not constrict educational services, there seem to be only one alternative: a thorough, painful, politically courageous overhaul of State and local tax systems."

Almost certainly this is not going to happen, and definitely not in time to bolster a weakened edifice of education.

The only public acknowledgment of these unpleasant facts was made by the White House Conference on Education, late in 1955, which voted better than 2 to 1 in favor of Federal aid to education, to be devoted specifically to school construction.

Congress omitted all Federal aid to school construction, however, after the administration's Federal aid proposals in 1958 completely dropped the demand for money for buildings.

Congress and the public had their eyes on scholarships, which they considered the chief ingredient of a crash program to compete with the Soviet Union. When it came to a vote and a series of compromises, the less than \$1 billion aid bill offered mainly student loans (not scholarships); some graduate fellowships, plus special financial lures in the form of partly written-off loans to draw students into the teaching profession; and special funds for the improvement of guidance, language, and science teaching, vocational education and research. The largest single amount—\$300 million—was earmarked to buy science equipment for school systems in the various States. The most critically needed items, funds for buildings and for teachers' salaries, were overlooked.

Thus, the real Federal aid problem as a key to the financing of the schools remains an issue, with the fear of Federal control still the major roadblock to more sweeping appropriations. The Rockefeller report points out some safeguards that could be

built into Federal aid to prevent it from leading to Federal control:

1. Federal funds would be one source of support among many.

2. State, local, and private sources of funds should continue to be the major factor in the support of education.

3. Federal funds should be used only to balance the serious gaps in the total educational system, and should be given in such a manner as to encourage State and local governments to use their own resources.

Whatever the sources may be, the experts have no doubt whatsoever that, financially, we already face a real emergency. "It will not be enough to meet the problem grudgingly or with a little more money," says the Rockefeller report. "The Nation's need for good education is immediate; and good education is expensive. That is the fact which the American people have never been quite prepared to face. At stake is nothing less than our national greatness and our aspirations for the dignity of the individual. If the public is not prepared for this, then responsible educators, business leaders, political leaders, unions, and civic organizations must join in a national campaign to prepare them."

ORDERLY RENEWAL AND DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN LOCALITIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, ACTION—The American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods—is a national private organization for the creation and maintenance of a good environment in our Nation's cities. ACTION has recently issued a statement of intention which indicates that on May 4, 5, and 6, 1959, it will convene a selected audience of the policy and decision makers of America to determine how to handle the critical problem of the growth of our cities and the spreading of slums. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of intention by ACTION be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

A STATEMENT OF INTENTION BY ACTION

On May 4, 5, and 6, 1959, ACTION will convene a selected audience of the policy and decision makers of America to launch a new program for America's cities. The conference will be held in Newark, N.J., where an impressive partnership of private and public leadership is creating the new Newark. Attendance will be by invitation only.

The explosive growth of new areas and the accelerating obsolescence of older areas provide a framework of urgency for the conference. The special content of the meetings will be the product of nearly 3 years of ACTION's special research in housing and community development.

The American economy stands or falls upon the strength or weakness of our industrialized urban areas where the great majority of our people now live, work, and do business. Uncontrolled growth and unchecked decay are twin forces creating extraordinary problems in the proper functioning of our cities. Great sums of private and public funds have been spent and much more will be spent to cope with these problems. New resources, new methods, and new leadership must be identified and enlisted to measure up to the task and the opportunity of the American city. American private enterprise, particularly, is challenged with the future of the American city.

The ACTION method to meet this challenge is to bring together leaders from indus-

try, labor, government, and civic organizations with specialists in urban affairs. Accordingly, ACTION has called the Newark conference on the ACTION program for the American city to present the basis for the continuing, orderly renewal, and development of our cities in the tradition of American enterprise and initiative.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is important that we think of our housing, urban redevelopment, and slum clearance programs as national programs, not as programs for the benefit of vested interests which are working against the interests of the general taxpayer, not as programs for homebuilders or mayors, but as programs intended to insure the policy set forth in earlier housing acts, namely, to provide a good home for every American family.

It is important to know that a splendid organization like ACTION has been organized, and includes among its approximately 40 directors the representatives of many large American corporations, as well as several labor leaders and public servants—in fact, the whole spectrum of leadership in America which is interested in this critical program.

Mr. President, in order that the editorial writers who read the RECORD may have an opportunity to see how widespread is this support for urban renewal, slum clearance, and more and better housing, I ask unanimous consent that the names and occupations of the directors of ACTION be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ACTION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

William M. Allen, president, Boeing Airplane Co.

C. J. Backstrand, president, Armstrong Cork Co.

Harry C. Bates, vice president, chairman, housing committee, AFL-CIO.

Harold Boeschstein, president, Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp.

Ernest J. Bohn, director, Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority.

Fred J. Borch, vice president, General Electric Co.

Alan E. Brookbank, past president, National Association of Home Builders.

Dr. William G. Carr, executive secretary, National Education Association.

The Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Eleanor Stabler Clarke, member of the corporation, American Friends Service Committee.

Albert R. Connelly, partner, Cravath, Swaine & Moore.

Thomas P. Coogan, president, Housing Securities, Inc.

L. P. Cookingham, city manager, Kansas City, Mo.

C. George Dandrow, vice president, John-Manville Sales Corp.

James C. Downs, Jr., chairman, Real Estate Research Corp. (Chicago).

Earl H. Eacker, president, Boston Gas Co.

J. Howard Edgerton, president, California Federal Savings & Loan.

Dr. Dorothy Ferebee, medical director, Howard University.

Ben Fischer, international representative, United Steelworkers of America.

George A. Garrett, president, Federal City Council (Washington, D.C.).

Miss Chloe Gifford, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Philip L. Graham, president and publisher, the Washington Post Co.

Lester B. Granger, executive director, National Urban League.

Joseph A. Grazier, president, American Radiator and Standard Sanitary Corp.

Wallace Harrison, partner, Harrison & Abramovitz, architects.

Andrew Heiskell, publisher, Life magazine.

Guy T. O. Hollyday, chairman, Title Guarantee Co.

Richard Hughes, past president, National Association of Home Builders.

Alfred M. Hunt, secretary, Aluminum Co. of America.

Holgar J. Johnson, president, Institute of Life Insurance.

Roy W. Johnson, Director, Advanced Research Projects Agency.

Joseph D. Keenan, secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Charles H. Kellstadt, president, Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Philip M. Klutznick, International president, B'nai B'rith.

Ferd Kramer, former president, Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council of Chicago.

James E. Lash, executive vice president, American Council To Improve Our Neighborhood.

Elmer L. Lindseth, president, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.

Joseph Lund, executive vice president, R. M. Bradley & Co., Inc., real estate.

George Pope MacNichol, Jr., president, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co.

Stanley Marcus, president, Neiman-Marcus Co.

Howard W. McCall, Jr., executive vice president, Chemical Corn Exchange Bank.

Richard K. Mellon, chairman of the board, Mellon National Bank & Trust Co.

Robert B. Mitchell, chairman, department of land and city planning, University of Pennsylvania.

The Honorable De Lesseps S. Morrison, mayor, city of New Orleans.

Thomas W. Moses, president, Indianapolis Water Co.

Clarence J. Myers, president, New York Life Insurance Co.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Robert B. Navin, president, St. John College of Cleveland.

Aksel Nielsen, president, the Title Guaranty Co.

Charles F. Palmer, president, Palmer, Inc., real estate.

W. W. Patchell, vice president, Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Thomas F. Patton, president, Republic Steel Corp.

Jacob S. Potofsky, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

James R. Price, president, National Homes Corp.

J. Stanley Purnell, assistant to the president, T. Mellon & Sons.

Thomas R. Reid, director of civic affairs, Ford Motor Co.

Walter P. Reuther, president, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

Joseph Ross, president, Davison-Paxon Co.

James W. Rouse, president, Community Research & Development, Inc.

Dr. J. E. Wallace Sterling, president, Stanford University.

Mrs. Kathryn H. Stone, past vice president, League of Women Voters of the United States.

Henry J. Sullivan, assistant to the president, civic and community affairs, the Detroit Edison Co.

Milford A. Vieser, financial vice president, the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co.

Samuel R. Walker, vice president, City Investing Co.

Dr. Robert Weaver, former State rent administrator, Temporary State Housing Rent Commission, State of New York.

Brown Whatley, president, Stockton, Whatley, Davin & Co., real estate.

James C. Worthy, vice president, Sears, Roebuck & Co.

William Zeckendorf, president, Webb & Knapp.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. For some time since Congress convened, I have been working with the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania in an attempt to develop a vehicle for putting into effect a program in the important field to which he has just referred. I am pleased to observe that the Senator from Pennsylvania is alert and aggressive, and has manifested great leadership in this field.

I trust that very shortly Congress will be able to face up to this problem, and will conduct a study which will make a thorough exploration so as to determine the best vehicle that can be used to bring about a redevelopment of the great metropolitan areas of our country and make the people acutely aware of the obligations which they have in this respect.

I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for his diligence, for his constructiveness, and for the comprehensive approach which he has displayed in this matter.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his kind remarks. Needless to say, I welcome his support, which is essential to the making of further progress in this important field.

JUSTIFICATION OF DEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, and numerous other papers recently carried a column by Roscoe Drummond which cogently points out the need for an informed public on defense matters.

It is not enough for a relatively few Members of Congress to have the basic knowledge essential to intelligent judgment on the shape and scale of our defense effort. The defense program must have the active support and confidence of the American people and this in turn requires that the people be convinced of its adequacy.

Mr. President, I am heartily in agreement with Mr. Drummond on this point. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point both Mr. Drummond's column and my own remarks on this matter, delivered to the congressional dinner of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce which was held in Washington February 5.

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

NEED FOR MORE FACTS—PRESIDENT MUST INFORM PUBLIC TO WIN SUPPORT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

President Eisenhower is going to lose his battle for a balanced budget if he doesn't get out from behind his desk and convince the country that it is taking no risk in not spending more for defense.

There is widespread anxiety over the Soviet lead in long-range missiles and it isn't persuasive enough to suggest that, because the Soviet boast to have invented baseball is dubious, the Soviet boast on missile production can be dismissed.

It may well be dubious but I think the public is not going to take anybody's simple say-so on faith.

What we need is more facts and we are not yet getting them.

For this reason I expect that the President will shortly be taking his case to the country. That will be all to the good.

What will really count however, is what method the President takes to assure the country that the projected defense program is equal to the danger which surrounds us.

Obviously, by virtue of his military experience, Mr. Eisenhower will have great credibility. But because he has put such a high priority on balancing the budget, there will understandably be many who will want to know, and feel they have a right to know, not just the President's conclusion that all is well but also the facts on which he bases his conclusion.

In deciding how frankly and how fully he will lay out the evidence, it seems to me that Mr. Eisenhower will have to put these two questions very much to the fore:

Is there any reasonable prospect that he can persuade this Democratic Congress to keep the budget in balance, unless he can convince the country that the proposed defense spending is comfortably adequate?

Can the President convince the country that all is well with our defenses in comparison with the Soviets' unless he is prepared to tell enough of what the Government believes it knows about Soviet capability so that people can make up their own minds?

There may be, as some administration spokesmen say, a lot of people who are misled into believing that the Soviets are a lot further ahead than they are. At the same time there are plenty of sincere and intelligent people who deeply believe that the administration is resolving the risk too narrowly. With them it will take more facts—not more opinions—to do the convincing.

Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy told Congress this week that the American stockpile of operational ICBM's "will be within a few of the Russian total at the end of the year." That makes the missile gap seem not very ominous.

But if the public is going to be persuaded to share Mr. McElroy's confidence, it must have a fair amount of the facts which persuade Mr. McElroy that within 10 months our stockpile of ICBM's will be "within a few" of the Soviets. What do we know about the Soviet stockpile? How do we know? How well do we know? Those are the questions which need answering.

At his latest press conference Mr. Eisenhower was asked whether he had any information about Soviet submarines off American shores. His reply was that he did not want to discuss this because he couldn't be sure whether his knowledge "was in the public domain or restricted."

The question which many people will ask is: Why should information on Soviet submarines off U.S. shores—if there are any—not be in the public domain? Why should it be classified?

One of the complaints of Republicans was that previous recent administrations operated too often on the theory that "Papa knows best"; or, "You don't need to know, just leave it to the Government."

Admittedly there are security boundaries beyond which the Government can't go, but it seems clear to me that if the President wants to win the battle of the balanced budget, he will have to take the country into his confidence and give the people not more opinion but more information on which they can reach their own opinion.

PARTIAL TEXT OF REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE AT 22d CONGRESSIONAL DINNER OF NEW JERSEY STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AT HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 5, 1959

A few days ago hearings on the defense posture of the United States opened before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee and the Space Committee of which I am a member. For 2 days the kilig lights burned in the crowded hearing room as one after another of the Chiefs of our Defense Establishment was questioned as to his view of the adequacy of our defense effort.

The gravity of the questions the committee was endeavoring to explore dominated the proceedings. The dedication and sincerity of those who carry the immediate responsibility for the defense of the Nation was apparent. The questioning was long and intensive. Nonetheless, I doubt that any member of the committee, much less the public generally, came away satisfied he had the answers to the questions raised.

The members of the committee had the assurance of executive sessions to follow at which matters scarcely touched in the public sessions could be more thoroughly explored. This may be fine for the committee members but where does it leave John Q. Public, who, in our system, must ultimately make or at least ratify decisions of national policy?

Whatever his occupation, or his income level, the first concern of every good American is the safety of the Nation. The American people will do whatever is necessary to assure adequate protection of the national security. But they must know what is necessary. And to know this both the people and the Congress must have the facts.

This is not a little matter. The survival of the country is involved. It is intolerable that either the Congress or the country should have to decide these questions on the basis of piecemeal information, inspired stories, leaks, rumors, charges, and countercharges. Speeches about a sense of urgency, or the lack of it, are no help whatever. On the other hand, the need is not met by assurance that the Chiefs of our Defense Establishment, or even that the President himself, regard the present level of our defense effort as adequate. We must have the facts.

Only in this manner will Congressman or citizen be able to find his way through the controversy now centering on the defense budget. That controversy is by no means all political in nature though undeniably some seek to make defense a partisan issue. Nor can it be explained wholly in terms of the undoubted economic interest of some segments of industry or the long standing competition between the services. All these factors are present but they will not control the situation except by default.

The immediate question is, of course, the size of the defense budget and, in particular, the amounts allocated for missiles and space programs. I am not here arguing for a higher budget or a smaller one. I do say that the size of the budget should not be controlling. We can have a higher defense budget if it is necessary. And, of course, we should have a lower one if it can safely be cut. But I am not here expressing any view as to what the defense budget should be. I am, like everyone else in Congress or outside it, seeking the facts which I need in order to make an intelligent judgment.

Let me be specific. A few days ago, Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appeared before the Armed Services Committee to brief committee members in executive session. Following the meeting an unclassified version of his testimony was released. His testimony included

an evaluation of U.S. capabilities as compared with Soviet strength. As a noted military reporter pointed out, this is the crux of the matter. Yet the only reference in the release to this part of his testimony was the terse statement "there followed a step-by-step evaluation of our capabilities."

It was encouraging to note the view subsequently expressed by the experienced and highly respected chairman of the Armed Services Committee to the effect that he believes American strategic bombers will keep this country superior in striking power for another year. How much better, however, if the public generally knew the grounds for his confidence—and the grounds for the apprehension for the future that he also expressed. What could be more vital to the American people than the substance of the testimony of General Twining and our other military leaders on this point?

How can we justify depriving the American people of information that can alone provide the basis for intelligent judgment on the issues confronting us?

Surely we are not fooling the Soviet. We know from our own work the various ways in which knowledge of another's military and scientific effort can be gathered. It would be imprudent indeed to assume that the Soviet Union cannot and does not do the same. Some data by their nature cannot be concealed and certainly there is no longer room to doubt that the Soviet has the scientific, technical, and industrial prowess to be able to correlate and interpret them. So far as the essential facts are concerned, the question is not one of denying the Soviet but rather of denying the American people.

The essence of representative government is that it governs by and with the consent of the people. Under that system no policy can long endure without widespread public support and understanding.

I am confident that Americans can and will measure up to any challenge, whatever the cost. But they will not—they cannot—respond unless they are told promptly and fully what we are up against and what the choices before us are. I deeply believe that to give them that choice is the highest responsibility of leadership in America today.

TAXABILITY OF GIFTS OF CHRISTMAS TURKEYS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a letter written by me under date of February 4, 1959, to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and his reply to me, dated February 9, 1959, concerning an Associated Press article relating to the taxability of Christmas turkeys as gifts.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., February 4, 1959.

Hon. DANA LATHAM,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LATHAM: In an Associated Press article appearing in the papers today the Internal Revenue Service at Tacoma, Wash., is quoted as having ruled that a gift of a Christmas turkey by an employer to his employee is taxable to the employee and that the tax must be withheld.

Will you please send me a copy of this ruling along with information as to how the tax is computed; that is, is it based on the cost to the employer or on the retail price of what the employee would have paid had he purchased a turkey?

Is this ruling uniform with the Treasury Department, or is it just a ruling of the Tacoma office?

Would the ruling go further and include as taxable items, other types of small Christmas gifts by employers either to their employees or to their customers? Would this not include withholding tax on the distribution of calendars, desk pads, etc.?

I ask these questions not to be facetious, but frankly the ruling does appear to be rather ridiculous.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF
INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D.C., February 9, 1959.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have your letter of February 4, 1959, with respect to the recent Associated Press article dealing with Christmas turkeys, and affecting a certain taxpayer located at Tacoma, Wash.

In your letter you ask for a copy of the ruling purportedly applied by our Tacoma district office. You also ask other questions with respect to this ruling.

There has been no official ruling with respect to this point up until February 6. However, our various district offices had in general taken the position stated to have been applied by our Tacoma office. Accordingly, in practice our Tacoma office was not, in fact, out of line.

For more than a year this troublesome matter has been under study here. I am happy to advise you that on February 6, 1959, we issued an official technical information release, a copy of which is enclosed for your information. This TIR will be issued as Revenue Ruling 59-58, and will appear in our official Internal Revenue Bulletin on February 24, 1959. It will, of course, constitute official instructions at all our offices with respect to this matter.

You will note two excerpts from said ruling:

"It is accordingly held that the value of a turkey, ham, or other item of merchandise of similar nominal value, distributed by an employer to an employee at Christmas, or a comparable holiday, as part of a general distribution to employees engaged in the business of the employer as a means of promoting their good will, does not constitute wages subject to income tax withholding or wages for Federal Insurance Contributions Act or Federal Unemployment Tax Act purposes.

"It is further held that the cost to the employer of turkeys, hams, and other merchandise of similar nominal value which are distributed generally to the employees engaged in his business, primarily for the business purpose of promoting good relations with his employees, is deductible by the employer under section 162 of the Code as an ordinary and necessary business expense."

The first of the above excerpts will answer your particular question with respect to other small gifts, such as calendars, desk pads, etc.

It is our belief that the issuance of the official revenue ruling will dispose of this troublesome matter.

We appreciate your interest in this problem. Should anything not be entirely clear, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

DANA LATHAM,
Commissioner.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that

when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

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

GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONY AT EAST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Architect of the Capitol has arranged a ground-breaking ceremony for Monday next, February 23, at 11 o'clock. It will be held at about the middle of the construction work on the east front of the Capitol. The program will be very short; and I simply direct the attention of the Senate to the fact that the program will take place. All Senators are invited, and are urged to attend.

CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM EXPENDITURES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article which was published in the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star of February 2, and which reads in part as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE SEEKS BIG HIKE IN BUDGET

WASHINGTON.—Tucked away in President Eisenhower's new budget is a request for a big expansion of the Federal civil defense program.

Lee A. Hoegh, chief executive of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, wants Congress to double his money—

And so forth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CIVIL DEFENSE SEEKS BIG HIKE IN BUDGET

(By Robert Crater)

WASHINGTON.—Tucked away in President Eisenhower's new budget is a request for a big expansion of the Federal civil defense program.

Lee A. Hoegh, chief executive of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, wants Congress to double his money, making the new total \$87 million. This would enable him to take over financing of some civil defense activities handled by other departments and still expand the civil defense program.

Chairman ALBERT THOMAS, Democrat, Texas, of the House Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, says he is going to take a long, sharp look at the request.

Civil defense has been growing in recent years. In 1955, the agency had 737 employees. That total has moved up each year. Hoegh now is asking for 1,750 employees, of whom 225 would be from the old Office of Defense Mobilization.

Under a law enacted last year, the OCDM now shares civil defense responsibilities with the States. This also means more Federal money-matching funds to pay local civil defense salaries and administrative expenses, including civil defense uniforms.

This program calls for \$3 million for the remainder of this fiscal year and \$12 million for fiscal 1960.

Hoegh also is anxious to get nearly \$6 million for a prototype shelter program. This would be used to help cities provide

fallout retreats in buildings normally used for other purposes.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the times demand of us, as elected Senators of 49 sovereign States, that we work with fidelity and zeal to eliminate unnecessary Government spending.

It appears to me that we have a solemn duty to make this Nation one of utmost strength against the threat of aggression from the dictators of the Soviet Union. Billions of dollars of necessary expenditures—probably \$41 billion or more—will be required during the fiscal year for national defense. Dictators respect and fear strength, and might well plunge us into war were we to weaken our defenses and become "sitting ducks" for a possibly overwhelming surprise attack.

But, Mr. President, upon reading the news item which was published in the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, I made a call at the offices of civil defense. In just a short time, I obtained some 15 pamphlets and booklets which set forth their program, and so forth, for civil defense. Of course, there are many more pamphlets of this sort; but I now hold in my right hand one which is captioned "Rural Family Defense," and on my desk are 14 other booklets or pamphlets—all printed at considerable expense to the taxpayers. In reading that material, Mr. President, it seemed to me that they involved an astonishing and astounding expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, in view of this staggering burden of defense costs, we must be zealous to eliminate nonessential Government spending of every character. Today I propose to cover briefly one aspect of our domestic situation whereby, if we take proper action, I feel we may save our taxpayers many millions of dollars.

I assert that over the years there has been tremendous unnecessary spending for civil defense.

I assert that our civil defense program has become outmoded and obsolete, and that it would be a shameful waste of public money to continue in the same pattern.

We live in a jet age; and in the intense rivalry between this Nation and the Soviet Union a fearsome milestone has been passed in the successful testing and firing of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

We live in an age of challenge, Mr. President. In this space age, with jetplanes exceeding the speed of sound, and with the dread portent of intercontinental ballistic missiles and rockets soaring into space toward targets continents apart, what justification may a public servant dedicated to the welfare and defense of this Nation find in voting to continue the vast expense of a civil defense program geared to a bygone era?

Our Atlas intercontinental ballistic missiles and those of the Soviets of even greater power are presently the ultimate in military weapons. The fact is that neither we nor they have any defense against these tremendous nuclear weapons other than immediate retaliation from whatever bases may not have been destroyed in the initial surprise attack. Perhaps scientific research will develop

such defenses in the future; but about this we cannot afford to speculate.

At the present, and in the years ahead, Mr. President, Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles will span continents in approximately 20 minutes. Perhaps the director of civil defense in Cleveland, Marion, or some other Ohio city could hope to have about 5 minutes', or 3 minutes' warning of its approach. But that is all. Hydrogen warheads could lay waste to vast areas with a single blow, thus destroying entire cities, immediately, killing hundreds of thousands; later due to radiation and fallout, killing additional thousands.

In World War II, pinpoint bombing was desired. But if ever the Soviet Union attacks this Nation, there will be no effort at pinpoint bombing. Rather, the missiles and the jet bombers will aim at the mass destruction of entire key industrial centers.

The truth is that if the Communist dictators were to wage war against us next year, a child in Detroit, Cleveland, or Pittsburgh would be in the frontline, and would be in greater danger of sudden death than would members of our Armed Forces in some installations and frontier posts in the continental United States.

The fact is that industrial cities and centers would doubtless be prime targets. A State capital, such as Columbus or Springfield or Sacramento, would probably never be thought of as a possible target. Yet the high-salaried civil defense officials in my State of Ohio have preempted for their headquarters one of the best and one of the most expensive buildings in Columbus.

Mr. President, it is no secret that scientists of the Soviet Union and of the free world are seeking greater accuracy for intercontinental ballistic missiles. If and when this is achieved, of course the logical targets at the onset, at least, would not be Washington, D.C., or our key industrial centers; rather, they would be our missile bases, our retaliatory potential. Were all of the missile bases of the Nation to be destroyed, the war might be over almost as soon as commenced. But we may depend upon it that there is no possibility that the Soviet Union could accomplish this by sneak attack. This Nation has the capacity to retaliate, and will do so. Our missile bases could not be destroyed in one attack or even in several attacks. They are widely dispersed, and no doubt some are hidden beneath the ground or in other places impervious to attack.

An encouraging note, of course, is that the odds are going up from month to month against nuclear weapons ever being used in war by one nation against the other.

The facts show the futility of utilizing the time and effort of good, patriotic persons who volunteer for civil defense. They show the futility, in fact the stupidity, in this Nation's and its various States and municipalities, spending hundreds of millions of dollars for our present civil defense program. Yet, the Federal Government, the States, and hundreds of cities and towns have done so in recent years. There are hundreds of cities in the United States where civil

defense headquarters are maintained, where there are salaried civil defense employees, some holding what amounts to no more than sinecures, and where it would require a vivid imagination to conceive of any reason for an enemy attack. This is one of the categories of expenditures, and a vital one, in which real economy in Government should be sought.

Over the past 9 years, nearly \$500 million has been appropriated by the Congress for civil defense. Last year my own State of Ohio was the recipient of \$696,000 in Federal-contributed matching funds. Last year, Federal surplus property donated to the State of Ohio for civil defense purposes, consisting of vehicles, tractors, firetrucks, forklifts, generators, and other accessories, represented a total acquisition value in the sum of \$827,000. I question the preparedness of Ohio's cities in the event of attack. I question the utility of the purposes for which this money was spent and these materials donated. I question whether additional Ohioans' lives will be saved by these expenditures in the event of an attack.

I assert that most of this money has been wasted.

The expenditure of these vast sums of money for civil defense could well stand thorough investigation. I question the value of this tremendous outlay of taxpayers' money in terms of what it has done and what it will do for the defense of this Nation. Our constituents are entitled to know if their tax money is being spent wisely in the field of civil defense.

Intercontinental ballistic missiles and jetplanes with ever-increasing speeds could not possibly be observed through the services of volunteer sky watchers who, in reality, have been wasting their time and efforts.

Yet it was only recently that civil defense officials—and I am referring to salaried officials, many of them very high salaried officials—directed that sky watchers, patriotic people in my State and in other States, be disbanded.

For another example of the waste of public funds in this area, we need look no farther than here in Washington, D.C. A 2-year study was undertaken—and, of course, all the persons who undertook that study here in Washington were being paid high salaries—and now the civil defense agency is about to publish and distribute 850,000 copies of a guidebook to be distributed, at Government expense, to all residing within a 20-mile radius of the Washington Monument. The purpose is to indicate an evacuation zone and escape route to cities in Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia, where help is supposed to be available to persons forced to evacuate Washington, D.C.

The book also gives instructions to every family, every one of the 850,000 recipients of the book, to follow directions and build basement shelters and build up food supplies for their families. The book lists survival items, so-called, and suggests the purchase of 2 weeks' food supply for a family. Those who desire and can afford to spend money and follow these directions will be helping grocers and building contractors; otherwise,

it is difficult to see any good that is accomplished.

One hundred and ninety-five sirens are to be installed, so it appears the citizens will be annoyed by a lot of practice, screeching sirens, which, incidentally, cost money.

The expenditures to which I have referred have been made in many instances without any justification whatsoever.

I pay tribute to the thousands of good, loyal, patriotic men and women who are presently volunteering, or have in the past volunteered, for service in civil defense. They sought to render this Nation real and needful public service.

Volunteer workers in the recent past in floods, windstorms, and raging fires have performed nobly, unselfishly, and effectively, and this is a fact of which they and all of us may take pride. Some civil defense volunteer workers have lost their lives and others have been injured in assisting local police and military authorities. But no high salaried civil defense officials, anywhere in this Nation, have made any such sacrifice.

This Congress should put an end to topheavy expenditures from Washington on down in civil defense and stop the flow of wasted millions of dollars, saving that money for our taxpayers, or, if necessary, spending it for more useful purposes.

Let us hope that the armaments race to acquire these terrible weapons of destruction will cease, and that the example of outlawing poison gases will be followed. Let us hope that the nations of the world will come to their senses, if only for the fear of retaliation, so that we and the generations to come shall never fear or know the effects of a nuclear war.

It may well be that eventually a stalemate will be reached in the missile field and in scientific research, and that the nations of the free world, as well as the Soviet Union, will have a stockpile of nuclear weapons so great that neither will dare attack the other; and that after conference and negotiations, definite enforceable agreements may be entered into, with full and adequate supervision provided, so that there will be an end to the present grim and threatening period.

This time may be far off. Yet, whether it is far off or immediate, we owe a duty to the citizens of the States we represent to carefully review all appropriations sought for and considered in the name of civil defense.

My view is that here is a place where we may save taxpayers millions of dollars and in no manner place this Nation in jeopardy, were we to curtail or eliminate civil defense expenditures and do away with unnecessary and unproductive high-salaried civil defense officials.

In a cold war or a limited shooting war our air, military, and naval might are the deterrents which are effective in restraining potential enemies, such as Red China, or the Soviet Union, from starting world war III by a sudden, all-out surprise attack. Civil defense has no function in such a situation.

If a tremendous worldwide conflagration is brought upon us by a surprise at-

tack upon our missile installations, and our retaliatory attacks instantly follow, if we are suddenly plunged into world war III by the surprise attacks of the Soviet Union or the Communist Chinese Republic, civil defense will be ineffective. Civil defense activities, as they are presently proposed, might even hinder military defense and interfere with important movements of our Armed Forces with the onset of an all-out war.

The time is here for a reappraisal of civil defense.

Mr. President, I assert that the demand made by Leo A. Hoegh, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, that Congress double the appropriation for civil defense, is shocking. We should oppose any expansion of the civil defense program. This agency has grown by leaps and bounds and is top-heavy now with high salaried officials.

If the Congress would be so wasteful of taxpayers' money as to include in the appropriations \$87 million, this useless and topheavy civil defense Federal setup would be increased from its present status of some 1,634 officials and employees, all with good salaries, to between 1,750 and 1,800 officials and employees; useless shelters would be constructed; and approximately \$14 million worth of emergency supplies and equipment of doubtful value would be procured.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have been following the Senator's very lucid statement with great interest. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the proposal was to increase the number of employees in civil defense from 1,650 to 1,750?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. From approximately 1,650 to about 1,750. At present the number is 1,634, I want the distinguished Senator from Texas to know. The increase, if the application shall be granted, will increase the salaried positions, many of which are for very high salaried officials employed in Washington and elsewhere, to approximately 1,750 or 1,800 salaried positions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much in dollars is involved?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. \$87 million at the present time. Over the years, some \$800 million, I am sorry to say, has been expended. I want the distinguished majority leader to know that, in my humble opinion, practically all the expenditure has been a waste of money.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much increase is contemplated in fiscal 1960 compared to fiscal 1959?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The amount would be doubled. The news item which I saw, published in the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, stated that the Administrator was seeking to double the budget of the last application.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In other words, the budget recommendations for fiscal 1960 would double the civilian defense funds, over those provided by the Congress in fiscal 1959, if granted?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. That is correct. The news item went on to say that in President Eisenhower's budget, the ap-

plication of the Civil Defense Administrator was for double the amount provided last year. The distinguished Representative from Texas who is handling the appropriation in the other body stated he was startled over this matter, and would give it a clear look.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator for the observations he has made. Of course as a member of the committee, I should like to reserve judgment on the specifics, until I hear the testimony to justify a proposal which would seek to double the appropriations in any sphere.

I recognize, as does the Senator, that we must stop, look, and listen, and exercise great caution and prudence in connection with each and every appropriation bill.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio has made a real contribution today. I am proud to say the Senator is a member of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. That committee will meet tomorrow to start reviewing some of the authorizations which the agency is asking for the coming fiscal year. I contemplate the naming of a subcommittee, and I am going to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio to serve on the subcommittee.

While I do not care to pass judgment on the merits or demerits of what the Senator may have said, I think that in the days ahead we are going to have to scrutinize very carefully every single budget proposal in every field. For instance, I was shocked to learn that even the Justice Department is asking for a substantial increase in the number of lawyers it employs. One day we are told that we are spenders, and the next day we are asked to please increase the number of lawyers in the Justice Department. One day we are told we are spenders, and the next day we are asked, "Please double our civil defense funds."

I can understand that an emergency situation may arise, and I am sympathetic to real needs, but I observe to the Senator that I think he is performing a real function, and I hope the members of the Appropriations Committee, such as the distinguished Senator from Nevada, whom I see present in the Chamber, will stop, look and listen, and will review what the Senator from Ohio has said. I hope the members of the Appropriations Committee will go very thoroughly into all questions raised by anyone asking increases, in an attempt to penetrate and get the real justifications, if any, for the increases.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the senior Senator from Texas very sincerely.

In another minute I shall bring my remarks to a close, Mr. President. It is my hope that we shall all reserve our judgment, and scrutinize very carefully each matter presented to us.

Mr. President, in addition, in the demand made of Congress there is an item for \$12 million, carried under the heading "X." That item will be scrutinized very carefully, because the American people are entitled to have the facts, and surely their representatives in the Congress should hit this proposal and hit it hard.

The cruel facts are, from the taxpayers' standpoint, that in addition to the Federal expenditures called for, hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent and are being spent by State and municipal governments of practically every State in the Union for civil defense.

Most of this money is wasted. Many high-salaried officials have sinecures. The fine patriotic men and women who volunteer for civil defense service and the taxpayers, generally, are the victims.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Ohio to say that he thought all the money appropriated for civil defense was virtually wasted?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. If the distinguished Senator from Illinois heard that and if I said it, I will say now I do not feel that all of the money spent for civil defense over the years from 1952 to the present time has been wasted by any means, but I think there has been great waste. When the Administration comes in to ask for a doubling of the amount of last year's expenditures, I think we should scrutinize the request very carefully, because I am confident that many hundreds of thousands of dollars, or even millions of dollars, in fact, appropriated for civil defense, have been wasted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, the Senator knows that the Civil Defense Administration was created by an act of Congress, and that from time to time new duties have been assigned to that Administration. Only last year there was considerable discussion on the floor of the Senate with respect to those duties and responsibilities in a different field. Obviously, if the Congress is to give the Administration new duties, those duties can be articulated only if the necessary money and necessary personnel to execute them are provided.

I have one further question. I could not tell whether the figures the Senator used were figures derived from the Budget Bureau, or whether they were from press dispatches.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. They are derived from both sources; also from the records of the State of Ohio and other States, as well as cities which keep records of their expenditures in this field.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did the Senator document which portion of his figures came from the press and which came from the Budget Bureau?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I have not documented that point in detail, but I can very easily do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would it be possible, in reading the Senator's remarks, for a person to distinguish between what was officially documented and what came from the Washington Post?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* at this point a compilation such as is suggested by the Senator from Illinois.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO

The figures that I have referred to earlier are substantiated by the annual statistical reports of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and by further memorandums from the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

The reference I made to the press concerned the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star and not, by the way, the Washington Post, to which Senator DIRKSEN referred.

These press remarks were simply a corroboration on their part of the figures which were supplied to me by the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may yield to me for the purpose of moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and that, during the consideration of the Executive Calendar, I may yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], without the Senator from Illinois losing the floor.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT 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.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Cuba.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip K. Crowe, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of South Africa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas obtained the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President—
Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the majority leader for his characteristic courtesy. I wish to make a brief statement concerning Sheldon T. Mills, of Portland, Oreg., who fortunately is to be the new Ambassador of our country to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

Ambassador Mills has recently served with great distinction in Afghanistan.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement from the International Cooperation Administration describing the effective use of our mutual security program under the direction of Ambassador Sheldon T. Mills.

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

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION, Washington, D.C., May 19, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Prior to returning to his post in Kabul, Afghanistan, early this month, Ambassador Sheldon Mills requested that we provide you with a comparative statement of U.S. and Soviet assistance to Afghanistan.

In making a comparison of the relative amounts of aid supplied by the Soviet bloc and by the United States, it is important that the different character of the two programs be recognized. Many conceptual difficulties are involved in making exact comparisons of aid data. These difficulties result in large part from the characteristics of the two aid programs. One important distinguishing characteristic of bloc aid is that it is generally presented on a long-term basis without reference to annual commitments, and in a package form which may include a long-term line of credit, technical assistance, training, military assistance and, in particular, increased trade opportunities. Such single package offers can have great appeal, particularly when the recipient country is having difficulty in marketing its export products. In addition, this Soviet combination provides arrangements for repayment of loans. There is no Soviet private sector active in foreign markets, and since most of the Soviet assistance is repayable in commodities, it must be assumed that much of what previously passed for trade is now aid.

The U.S. mutual security program has generally provided aid in annual increments, supplemented by loans from the U.S. Export-Import Bank, by agricultural commodity sales, where the local currency proceeds are loaned to the country for economic development and by private investment. Trade is mostly outside the U.S. aid program. In the nature of the ICA operation, there is no commitment stage involving a signed umbrella agreement which is comparable with the long-term line of credit commitments made by the Soviet bloc. U.S. assistance necessarily is limited to yearly appropriations by the Congress, while the bloc countries extend lines of credit which can be drawn down over a period of time as projects are agreed upon. A large part of U.S. assistance has been in the form of grants. In contrast, it is doubtful if more than \$200,000 equivalent of the more than \$160 million of bloc assistance to Afghanistan has been on a grant basis.

Economic and military assistance has been provided to Afghanistan in substantial volume by the Soviet bloc since the first credits were extended by the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia in 1954. By the end of April 1958, the total credit provided for by agreements in effect was \$161 million, including \$129 million for economic assistance and \$32 million for military assistance. This amount includes the \$100 million line of credit extended by the U.S.S.R. in 1956 for a variety of vaguely described development projects, including airfields, roads, irrigation projects, motor repair shops, hydroelectric projects, and a laboratory.

It is believed that by now the arms and other military equipment to be supplied by the bloc have been largely delivered. Although perhaps less than one-fourth of the credit extended under the economic aid agreement has been drawn down, substantial progress has been reported on many of the projects covered by the agreements. Streets of Kabul were paved and one asphalt factory near Kabul was completed with a line of credit extended in 1954. Construction has been completed on a grain silo, flour mill, bakery, petroleum storage tanks, and cement plant. Surveys have been made or construction begun on various other projects, including a new highway over the Hindu Kush mountains and airport construction. A number of buses and taxicabs were delivered, and also equipment for a 100-bed hospital. Although a substantial part of the \$100 million credit from the U.S.S.R. has been obligated for specific projects, actual expenditures to date have probably been relatively small.

It has been estimated that in the last half of 1955 there were more than 450 bloc technicians in Afghanistan, most of whom were Russian, the remainder Czech. It is expected that the Afghan petroleum development program will more than double the number of bloc technicians in Afghanistan over the next 4 years. In addition, a number of Russian military specialists were in the country engaged on a training program.

Standard U.S. procedure requires that any project be economically justifiable and feasible from an engineering standpoint before a commitment is made. Clearly, these considerations have not worried the U.S.S.R. at the time they have made their initial commitments, as their real intent has been to draw the Afghan economy into the Soviet orbit, without regard to the technical feasibility of the individual projects. Recently the cost estimates for several of the projects to which the U.S.S.R. committed itself in the first months of 1956 have doubled and in some cases quadrupled as Soviet engineers have been able to do actual feasibility appraisals.

Not only is the character of the Soviet assistance different, but their methods of implementation also vary considerably from the typical U.S. operation. From what we know of the Soviet operation it appears that they can draft technicians and commandeer commodities as needed, without going through the formalities generally characterizing the U.S. operation of recruiting volunteers and obtaining competitive bids, etc. Moreover, the Soviets do not need to negotiate any service contracts with private firms. Thus, their operation can be faster and their costs can be completely flexible. As a monolithic entity, the U.S.S.R. can, for political expediency, absorb any loss which may be inherent in any particular transaction. The Soviet bloc is not bound by the competitive pricing limitations of the free market.

The United States is attempting not merely to assist free world nations in their efforts to develop their own resources, but to promote joint activity by neighboring countries to

attack common problems. This joint activity can have a most significant influence on the reduction of regional tensions. The President's fund for Asian economic development was established for this specific purpose, and, if current negotiations are successful it may shortly provide nearly \$27 million additional funding for improvement over the next few years of the connecting Afghan and Pakistan surface transportation systems.

Briefly then, U.S. and Soviet aid are not directly comparable. They are two very different types of undertakings and Soviet and U.S. aid cannot be compared in a truly useful line-item tabulation. Thus, the tabulation attached covers only the official U.S. bilateral assistance from the beginning of its program in Afghanistan.

Sincerely yours,

GUILFORD JAMESON,
Deputy Director for Congressional
Relations.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD, at this point as a part of my remarks a brief biography of Sheldon T. Mills, who is in the career service of the State Department.

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

SHELDON T. MILLS

Born: Seattle, Wash., August 13, 1904.
Education: A.B., Reed College, Portland, Oreg., 1927; student Crawford Foreign Service School, Washington, 1927-28; Harvard, 1939-40.

Marital status: Married (former Francesca Dekum).

Experience: Nongovernment: 1928, reporter on the U.S. Daily.

Government: 1928, appointed Foreign Service officer, unclassified and vice consul of career; Foreign Service School; 1929, vice consul at La Paz, Bolivia; 1931, secretary in diplomatic service; third secretary, Panama; 1934, vice consul at Bucharest, Rumania; 1935, Foreign Service officer, 8, consul, consul and third secretary, Bucharest; 1938, Foreign Service officer, 7; 1939, second secretary, Bucharest, in addition to duties as consul; detailed to Harvard University for special study; 1940, second secretary at Santiago; Foreign Service officer, 6; 1942, Foreign Service officer, 5, secretary Inter-American Congress on Social Planning, Santiago, Chile; 1943, Secretary at New Delhi; 1944, Foreign Service officer, 4; 1945, Foreign Service officer, 3; 1946, assigned to department, adviser, Division of Commercial Policy; 1947, Foreign Service officer, 2; assistant chief, Division of Northern and Western Coast Affairs, chief; 1949, Foreign Service officer, 1, Director, Office of Northern and Western Coast Affairs; 1950, consul of embassy, with personal rank of Minister, Rio de Janeiro; 1952, assigned to Department, consul of embassy, with personal rank of Minister, New Delhi; 1954, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ecuador; 1955, Foreign Service officer, class of career Minister; 1956, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Afghanistan.

Membership and clubs: not stated.

Office: American Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan.

Home: Care of the American Embassy, Kabul, Afghanistan.

Legal residence: Portland, Oreg.

Present position: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Afghanistan.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am very much pleased that the Senate is apparently about to confirm the nomination of Sheldon T. Mills, of Portland,

Oreg., to be our Ambassador to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. I believe the President and the Secretary of State have made a wise selection in entrusting to him the discharge of this duty in a key and strategic area of the world. It is very gratifying to know that our operations in this crucial area of the world will be under the able direction of this trained diplomat. We in Oregon are very proud of the distinction which has come to him. I wish more career Foreign Service officers might be similarly recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the confirmation of the nomination of Sheldon T. Mills to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the remaining nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

FARM SURPLUSES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from a Pennsylvania newspaper on the subject of Government agriculture programs. I have here another editorial, this one from the Harrisburg Patriot of February 5, which indicates how widespread is the feeling in my State on the subject of excess farm surpluses. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SURPLUSES AND SUPPORTS: OVERDUE FOR AN OVERHAUL

The time long since has passed when the Nation's ever-mounting agricultural surpluses could be called a "farm problem."

As President Eisenhower mentioned in his farm message last month, the Federal Government is spending more than a billion dollars a year just to store the commodities and pay various interest and other charges. By next July, the Government will have sunk \$9.1 billion in mountainous stockpiles the country does not want or need.

The "farm problem," at that rate of spending, is a matter of serious concern for every citizen who pays taxes.

Few Americans can go back in their family trees more than two or three generations without encountering an ancestor who made

his living on a farm, either in this country or Europe. This may explain in part the sentiment which the most confirmed of city dwellers exhibits for the farm as the spawning ground of self-reliance and other grass-root virtues.

Although the American farm population has been shrinking since World War II, the farm vote still swings a formidable stick in both national and State politics. Particularly in the South and Middle West, this is so.

The time has come however, to strip aside both sentiment and politics to look at the facts of farm surpluses and to examine the high, fixed price supports which in large measure are responsible.

Government price supports aren't nearly as vital to the small family farm as is popularly supposed. For instance, there are about a million farmers who grow cotton, the crop which is still a king among price-supported commodities. Some 250,000 cotton farmers—one-fourth of the total—get three-fourths of the Government price support money in this category. If that \$5.4 billion a year we are spending for price supports is meant to help the family farmer, the money is missing its mark. The lion's share is ending up in the pocket of the big producer, who needs it least.

Fifteen years ago, there was complete justification for the Government to guarantee the producer of so-called basic crops fixed, high prices to encourage production. World War II was in full swing and our Armed Forces and allies needed every pound of cotton and wheat our farmers could grow. At the close of the war, however, the Government didn't continue to buy Army uniforms to keep clothing factories in operation. Aside from sentiment or politics, there seems little reason why subsidization of farmers should have been extended beyond a few years' transition period.

Acreage restrictions have been imposed, to be sure. But at the same time, Government agents have been instructing farmers on ways—in effect—to negate the controls by raising yields through more intensive cultivation.

For these and other reasons, President Eisenhower's proposal to relate Government support prices to recent market levels instead of parity makes economic sense although it may not appeal either to sentiment or politics. Most of us didn't understand what parity meant anyway, much less how it could be justified so long after our need for farm stockpiles had ended. By agreeing to buy basic crops for 75 to 90 percent of recent market prices, as the President proposes, the farmer would be protected against the loss of his investment in a particular crop to a large degree. He would not be encouraged to grow something that only the Government would buy. And indeed why should he?

The thousands of farmers who raise vegetables, fruits, cattle and poultry without high fixed supports would seem to indicate that President Eisenhower and his farm advisers are on the right track.

The Federal Government is on the right track in another farm program, too. It is now operating pilot rural development programs in more than 60 counties. It is offering leadership to local agencies, which help farmers find jobs in nearby industries and which try to stimulate interest in new crops. This program stands in marked contrast to the system of paying a continuous dole to farmers. It is much more in keeping with the spirit of self-reliance many a city dweller associates with his grandfather's farm.

Besides, the specter inflation has begun to becloud the image of grandfather's farm. Both politically and sentimentally, this may be an excellent reason for the Congress to

pay serious attention to the Eisenhower farm proposal.

THE BUDGET

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the address delivered by Carl Sandburg to the joint session of the two Houses last week he used a rather interesting expression from Abraham Lincoln, which evidently appeared in one of Lincoln's messages to Congress, on the 1st of December 1862. Lincoln said:

In times like the present, men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and eternity.

I believe that goes pretty nearly for everything that is uttered and the figures which are used from time to time on the floor of the Senate. That goes back, of course, to the battle of the budget. We have had a very friendly discussion with our amiable and distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. I have only one purpose in pursuing this matter, and that is the well-being of our country. I saw in the press yesterday that it was remarked that balancing the budget was something of a fetish. It was remarked that Abraham Lincoln had never balanced the budget.

Of course, what is forgotten when that is said, is that the whole career of Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States, with the exception of five weeks between the 4th of March 1861, and the 12th of April 1861, was a war period in the country, not a peace period. That makes quite a difference.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am sure the Senator is not quoting any statement made by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume he is quoting from a statement made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was commenting on what was said in the press. I commented on no statement made by the distinguished majority leader.

The statements made by the majority leader on a number of occasions on the floor and in the tables he inserted in the RECORD are quite correct, so far as they go. As I said before, however, it is like the man who fell off the 20th floor of a building. As he passed the 6th floor, a friend of his shouted to him "Mike, so far you are all right." [Laughter.] So I believe, in the interest of the whole story, rather than a fraction of the story, I should discuss this subject additionally. I do so because I have some fears about our fiscal basis at the present time.

At the moment France is climbing out of its inflationary policies, which have existed for more than 44 years. In that time there have been 11 devaluations of the franc, the last one under De Gaulle. De Gaulle has a tight hand on the country, and it will remain to be seen exactly what he can do. When inflation sets upon a country, it is not bred or incubated in a day. The one thing on which the '71 economists who appeared before the Committee on Finance agreed was

that an unbalanced budget has a contributory effect toward inflation. If and when inflation becomes a settled, continuing, and constant fever in the country, it is the little people who get hurt. The big people can take care of themselves. I shed no particular tears for them. It is the people who live on fixed incomes who cannot help themselves. It is the people who have retired under the railroad retirement plan or who are beneficiaries under other retirement or pension plans who are caught in the vise. If I had to speak for any group, I would speak for those little people. Of course, I speak for the whole country, I believe.

I was heartened by the fact that the most recent Gallup poll held in the country was overwhelmingly in favor of keeping a balanced budget. The poll also showed that the people are opposed to taking on any new tax burden, knowing that that burden has been with us for a long time.

It has been said, "You want to use a balanced budget as a criterion, instead of what the country needs." If need is to be the criterion, let us all have Cadillacs instead of Fords. Why should we not, even though we can afford only a Ford, have a Cadillac or Mercury or Lincoln?

I have learned from long, frugal experience that one must do with what he has. It is necessary for a person to live within the framework of his physical capacity to acquire. In so doing we give substance and validity to the whole economy. If we do not pursue that course, what kind of lesson will we give to the people who have pursued the course of thrift?

A rather interesting article appeared in yesterday's Sunday Star. It was written by Jerry O'Leary. He quotes the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] as saying that the Democratic Party wants to balance the budget just as badly as the Republicans do, and Jerry O'Leary quotes the Senator from Missouri as adding:

But we want to do it by expanding the economy and the Republicans want to do it by shrinking the economy.

In other words, we are the shrinkers of the economy and they are the expanders of the economy.

I do not know how we can understand that within the format of the various programs which have been suggested to the Congress without spending a great deal of money and going beyond the President's budget. When that is done, it is necessary to float securities and thus to borrow money, and that money must be spent; and certainly that is a definite contribution to the inflationary pressures.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Or does he prefer to finish his statement before yielding?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall be glad to finish my statement; and then I shall be happy to yield.

I have only one further observation to make on this point before I get into my budget statement. It has been said, and it has been hinted, and it has been intimated, that the budget can be balanced,

if we go on spending, by taking it out of the "last bill."

The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] was quoted on that point yesterday. He said that the \$2.6 billion housing bill and the \$465 million airport aid measure already passed by the Senate can be fitted into the budget without causing a deficit "if we cut the water and fat from foreign aid spending."

Those are not my remarks. Those are the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida, as quoted in yesterday's Washington Sunday Star.

I do not inquire whether that is the format or whether that is the technicality. I also note the statement in the Washington News that, when the time comes, they will love to see the "wincing look on the face of the minority leader."

Mr. President, there will be no wincing look on my face, I am sure. I will do my duty and perform my chores, and take it all in my stride, and then abide by the judgment of the majority. I can do that without wincing. I have not inquired of the majority leader whether that is the program. I would not inquire.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Illinois need not inquire, because he knows that, so far as the majority leader is concerned, he will support every dollar that we can justify, not only for foreign aid, but for any other purpose. Specifically, so far as foreign aid is concerned, the majority leader has been rather active in restoring substantial cuts which had been made by the other body in that field.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In all fairness, I wish to say that that is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be controlled by only one interest, and that is the national interest. If I feel that the money requested should be appropriated in the national interest, I will vote to appropriate it. I do not believe we can pass judgment on that question this far in advance of what the testimony will show.

I raised the question at the White House the other day that it would seem passing strange that the administration would ask for \$825 million, or approximately 25 percent, more in foreign aid this year than Congress appropriated last year. That additional 25 percent may be justified. If it is justified, and if the testimony supports it, the Senator from Texas will join the Senator from Illinois in supporting it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have seen the majority leader in action on the Committee on Appropriations. I have the distinction of serving there with him. I pay him that compliment. He has acted as fairly, as equitably, and as honorably as he knew how.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I feel certain that other Senators do not speak for the majority leader. I have not queried him as to whether the last bill will be the scapegoat. Who knows what will hap-

pen in the last bill? I was simply going to say—and I would not want to impugn the distinguished junior Senator from Florida—that it occurs to me that the only time he ever appeared before the Committee on Appropriations with respect to the foreign aid bill, so far as I know, was to get an increase in the amount in foreign aid for certain Latin American purposes.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I trust the Senator will not suggest that the failure of a Senator to appear before a committee indicates his support of or his opposition to measures on which he did not appear. All Senators are members of committees which occupy their full time. It may be that a Senator feels that with respect to a particular item of which he has knowledge, and in which he has a particular interest, he should appear; but none of us should be charged with any lack of diligence for his failure to appear concerning a particular item or a particular bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I certainly entertain no such thought. There is no such implication in what I said. I simply recited that the distinguished junior Senator from Florida said they were going to cut the fat and water out of foreign aid. Then I adduced evidence which, in my judgment, is completely factual—and the hearings, I think, will bear out the fact that the only time I noticed he appeared, though he may have appeared on other occasions, was for the purpose of securing an increase in the foreign aid funds.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In fairness to the junior Senator from Florida, who I assume has not been notified of the Senator's address, I should like to observe that it is my memory that the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has frequently voted on the floor for reductions in foreign aid and has had his name recorded accordingly. Although he and I have not agreed on some votes, I think fairness compels me to say that he has never seen fit to go as far as the administration would go in spreading this money throughout the world.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall let the record speak for itself. I do not wish to carry on a discussion about foreign aid, which is a subject we will reach later. There is no certainty as to what Congress, in either branch, will do about it. I am perfectly willing to let that matter come up in due time. I think I am a little like the Scotchman who refused to buy a world atlas until the world got just a little more settled. I am willing to let this matter rest until that part of the discussion becomes a little more settled. I must get around to what I really intended to say.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain tables from the Bureau of the Budget in this connection.

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

EXPLANATION OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY CONGRESS ON PRESIDENTIAL BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

This summary of actions by the Congress on Presidential budgetary recommendations since January 1953, is arranged:

First, to tabulate those actions which specifically provided new obligational authority, beginning with appropriation actions as tabulated by the Appropriations Committee.

Then, to list other legislation which authorized or required appropriations.

And finally to identify the effects of Presidential vetoes and of changes in tax legislation which departed from Presidential recommendations.

For those actions which provided authority for a specified period, the amounts shown include the total effect for the period covered. For those actions for which the effect was indefinite in period of time, the amounts shown represent the annual effect.

Action on appropriations figures at the beginning of each table do not include loan authorizations and reappropriations made in appropriations acts, and amounts for these types of authority are then added to account for all changes in appropriations acts.

Amounts shown for "congressional reductions requiring supplemental appropriations" are confined to clearly identifiable program decreases which specifically required subsequent supplemental requests. Other but small reductions may exist since wholly precise analysis was not deemed necessary. Congressional action on substantive legislation may also be incomplete as to some small items for similar reasons, but this would not significantly affect the results shown.

Data tabulated are based upon information of record available in the Bureau of the Budget or in documents published by the congressional Appropriations Committees.

Congressional actions affecting receipts or expenditures, 85th Cong., 2d sess.

[In millions]

ACTIONS AFFECTING EXPENDITURES	
Action on appropriations (appropriations, estimates, etc., 1958-59, p. 972, document prepared by Appropriations Committees).....	—\$617
Amounts included in appropriation acts but excluded from above appropriations:	
Loan authorizations (appropriations, estimates, etc., 1958-59, p. 914):	
Rural Electrification Administration.....	+228
Farmers' Home Administration.....	+55
District of Columbia.....	—3
Subtotal.....	+280
Increase in authority to incur obligations in other than appropriate acts:	
Emergency Housing Act (Public Law 85-364).....	+1,810
Small business investments (Public Law 85-699, sec. 602).....	+28
Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation (Public Law 85-740).....	+20
Highway Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-381).....	+235
Capitol Power Plant, contract authorization (Public Law 85-895).....	+6
Other acts.....	+3
Subtotal.....	+2,102

Congressional actions affecting receipts or expenditures, 85th Cong., 2d sess.—Con.

[In millions]

Substantive legislation authorizing spending which was enacted but for which appropriations were not made at time of enactment: Full annual effect of pay raises beyond the President's recommendation.....	+398
Retroactive pay increase.....	+444
Federal aid for impacted areas (1959 appropriation increases resulting from rejection of President's recommendation).....	+80
Atomic Energy Commission, authorization in excess of President's recommendation.....	+193
Public assistance grants to States, full-year effect of liberalization.....	+197
Superliner construction, authorization of.....	+100
Forward authorization for agricultural conservation program.....	+125
Veterans' pensions and burial allowances (Public Law 85-425, 85-674, and 85-782).....	+35
Subtotal.....	+1,572

Other congressional actions:

Federal Aid Highway Act increase in highway fund deficit beyond President's request (for period covered by legislation to June 30, 1962).....	+725
Increase in postal fund deficit in fiscal 1959 because of lesser rate increase than requested by the President.....	+232
Congressional reductions requiring supplemental appropriations.....	+86
Subtotal.....	+1,043

Expenditures avoided as a result of Presidential veto:

Independent Offices Appropriation Act (H.R. 11574—civil service retirement payment).....	+589
Airport grants (S. 3502).....	+437
Depressed areas (S. 3683).....	+280
Rivers and harbors authorization (S. 497).....	+191
Atomic icebreaker (H.R. 9196).....	+60
Metals production and purchase (S. 3186).....	+5
Subtotal.....	+1,562

Total, actions affecting expenditures.....	+5,942
--	--------

ACTIONS AFFECTING RECEIPTS

Tax Rate Extension Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-475).....	+498
Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-859).....	+47
Technical Amendments Act and small business tax extension.....	+120

Total, actions affecting receipts.....	+665
--	------

Net budgetary effect, all actions.....	+6,607
--	--------

¹ Difference between smaller programs proposed by the administration and program included in bill.

² Difference between cost of objectionable projects (\$351,000,000) in bill vetoed and cost of same kind of projects (\$160,000,000) in bill signed.

CV—148

Congressional action affecting receipts or expenditures, 85th Cong., 1st sess.

[In millions]

ACTIONS AFFECTING EXPENDITURES	
Action on appropriations (appropriations, estimates, etc., 1957-58, p. 488, document prepared by Appropriations Committees).....	-\$5,043
Amounts included in appropriation acts but excluded from above appropriations:	
Loan authorizations (appropriations, estimates, etc., 1957-58, p. 439):	
Rural Electrification Administration.....	+200
Farmers' Home Administration.....	-26
District of Columbia.....	-7
Subtotal.....	+167
Reappropriations (making available prior year balances in lieu of new appropriations):	
Maritime Administration: Operating differential subsidies.....	+65
Defense: Preparation for sale or salvage.....	+10
Public Health Service.....	+2
Subtotal.....	+77
Authority to incur obligations in other than appropriation acts:	
Housing Act of 1957 (Public Law 85-104).....	+1,115
Contract authorization for old and new Senate office buildings.....	+5
Subtotal.....	+1,120
Substantive legislation authorizing spending which was enacted, but for which appropriations were not made at time of enactment:	
Veterans compensation (Public Law 85-168).....	+170
School construction for impacted areas.....	+57
Mutual security program reduction in authorization not included in amounts shown for action on appropriations.....	-477
Atomic Energy Commission, authorization in excess of President's recommendation.....	+12
Subtotal.....	-238

Authority to incur obligations in other than appropriation acts:

Housing Act of 1957 (Public Law 85-104).....	+1,115
Contract authorization for old and new Senate office buildings.....	+5
Subtotal.....	+1,120

Substantive legislation authorizing spending which was enacted, but for which appropriations were not made at time of enactment:

Veterans compensation (Public Law 85-168).....	+170
School construction for impacted areas.....	+57
Mutual security program reduction in authorization not included in amounts shown for action on appropriations.....	-477
Atomic Energy Commission, authorization in excess of President's recommendation.....	+12
Subtotal.....	-238

Other congressional actions:

Increase in postal fund deficit in 1958 because of failure to enact rate increases requested by President.....	+462
Congressional reductions requiring subsequent supplemental appropriations.....	+322
Subtotal.....	+784

Expenditures avoided as a result of Presidential veto:

Classified and postal pay rates (H.R. 2462 and H.R. 2472) (limited to estimated amount that would have been expended for pay increases in period between effective date (Sept. 1, 1957) of vetoed acts and effective date of 1959 pay increase acts (January 1958)).....	+314
--	------

Total actions affecting expenditures.....	-2,819
---	--------

Congressional actions affecting receipts or expenditures, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

[In millions]

ACTIONS AFFECTING EXPENDITURES	
Action on appropriations (appropriations, estimates, etc., 1956-57, p. 834, document prepared by Appropriations Committees).....	-\$257
Amounts included in appropriation acts but excluded from above appropriations:	
Loan authorizations (appropriations, estimates, etc., 1956-57, p. 149):	
Rural Electrification Administration.....	+119
Farmers Home Administration.....	+30
Subtotal.....	+149
Reappropriations (making available prior year balances in lieu of new appropriations):	
Independent Office Appropriations Act, 1957, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	+2

Authority to incur obligations in other than appropriation acts:

Housing and Home Finance Agency, borrowing authority.....	+581
House Office Building, contract authority.....	+67
Commodity Credit Corporation.....	+500
Farmers' Home Administration.....	+457
Mutual Security: Investment guarantees borrowing authority.....	+37
Capitol power plant, contract authority.....	+1
Commerce, Public Roads contract authority.....	+10
Interior, National Park Service and Indian Roads, contract authority.....	+44
Subtotal.....	+1,697

Substantive legislation authorizing spending which was enacted but for which appropriations were not made at time of enactment:

War Orphans Education (Public Law 85-364).....	+15
Public assistance grants (full year effect).....	+55
Subtotal.....	+70

Other congressional action:

Congressional reductions requiring supplemental appropriations.....	+15
Increase in postal fund deficit in fiscal 1957 because of failure to enact rate increases requested by the President.....	+406
Subtotal.....	+421

Expenditures avoided as a result of Presidential veto:

Payments to Crow Indian tribe (S.J. Res. 135).....	+5
Rates charged for energy and power marketed by Southwest Power Administration (S. 3338).....	+2
Agricultural Act of 1956 (H.R. 12).....	+300
Subtotal.....	+307

Total actions affecting expenditures.....	+2,389
---	--------

Congressional actions affecting receipts or expenditures, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

[In millions]

ACTIONS AFFECTING EXPENDITURES

Action on appropriations (appropriations, estimates, etc., 1955-56, p. 655, document prepared by Appropriations Committees)-----	-\$2,076
Amounts included in appropriation acts but excluded from above appropriations:	
Loan authorizations (appropriations, estimates, etc., 1955-56, p. 604):	
Rural Electrification Administration-----	+5
Farmers' Home Administration-----	-9
Subtotal-----	-4
Reappropriations (making available prior year balances in lieu of new appropriations):	
Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956, Atomic Energy Commission-----	+65
Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1956-----	+86
	+151
Authority to incur obligations in other than appropriation acts:	
Veterans' Administration: Direct loans, borrowing authority--	+200
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Borrowing authority--	+552
Federal-aid airports: Contract authorization-----	+42
Subtotal-----	+794
Substantive legislation authorizing spending which was enacted, but for which appropriations were not made at time of enactment:	
Veterans education benefits, full year effect of liberalization (Public Law 84-7)-----	+90
Full annual effect of pay raises beyond the President's recommendations-----	+182
Retroactive pay increases-----	+152
Mutual security program, reduction in authorization not included in amounts shown for action on appropriations-----	-141
Forward authorization for agricultural conservation program-----	+75
Subtotal-----	+358
Other congressional actions: Increase in postal fund deficit in fiscal 1956 because of failure to enact rate increase requested by the President-----	+343
Expenditures avoided as a result of Presidential veto:	
Increase in rates of compensation in field services of the Post Office Department (S. 1)-----	+180
Amendments to Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act (H.R. 6373)-----	+150
Subtotal-----	+330
Total actions affecting expenditures-----	-104

Congressional actions affecting receipts or expenditures, 83d Cong., 2d sess.

[In millions]

ACTIONS AFFECTING EXPENDITURES

Action on appropriations (appropriations, estimates, etc., 1954-55, p. 764, document prepared by Appropriations Committees)-----	-\$2,610
Amounts included in appropriation acts but excluded from above appropriations:	
Loan authorizations (appropriations, estimates, etc., 1954-55, p. 719):	
Rural Electrification Administration-----	+80
Farmers' Home Administration-----	+2
Subtotal-----	+82
Authority to incur obligations in other than appropriation acts:	
Extension of veterans' direct home and farmhouse loan authority (Public Law 83-611)-----	+150
Substantive legislation authorizing spending which was enacted, but for which appropriations were not made at time of enactment:	
Mutual security program, reduction in authorization not included in amount shown for action on appropriations-----	-3
Public assistance grants (1956 effect)-----	+85
Veterans' compensation, full year effect of liberalization (Public Law 83-695 and Public Law 83-698)-----	+146
Subtotal-----	+288
Other congressional actions: Increase in postal fund deficit in fiscal 1955 because of failure to enact rate increase requested by the President-----	+240
Expenditures avoided as a result of Presidential veto: Classified and postal service pay increases (H.R. 7774)-----	+312
Total, actions affecting expenditures-----	-1,598
ACTIONS AFFECTING RECEIPTS	
Reduction in excise taxes beyond Presidential recommendations (Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954)-----	+1,000
Net budgetary effect, all actions-----	-598
Congressional actions affecting receipts or expenditures, 83d Cong., 1st sess.	
[In millions]	
ACTIONS AFFECTING EXPENDITURES	
Action on appropriations (appropriations, estimates, etc., 1953-54, p. 493, document prepared by Appropriations Committees)-----	-\$12,034
Amounts included in appropriation acts but excluded from above appropriations:	
Loan authorizations (appropriations, estimates, etc., 1953-54, p. 450):	
Rural Electrification Administration-----	+10
Farmers Home Administration-----	+17
Subtotal-----	+27

Congressional actions affecting receipts or expenditures, 83d Cong., 1st sess.—Con.

[In millions]

Amounts included in appropriation acts but excluded from above appropriations—Con.	
Reappropriations (making available prior-year balances in lieu of new appropriations):	
Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1954-----	+188
Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriation Act, 1954-----	+4
Subtotal-----	+192
Authority to incur obligations in other than appropriation acts:	
Extension of veteran home loan program (Public Law 83-101)---	+98
Substantive legislation authorizing spending which was enacted but for which appropriations were not made at time of enactment: Mutual security program, reduction in authorization not included in amounts shown for actions on appropriations-----	-350
Total, actions affecting expenditures-----	-12,067

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the statement is made that a Democrat Congress cut the President's budget by more than \$5 billion in the 85th Congress, it can leave but one impression with the average citizen, namely, that the President is a spender and that Congress is an economizer.

To establish this point, the majority leader has submitted estimates and tables to show the total appropriations made by the 85th Congress compared with the estimates submitted by the President. That is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. Let us get to the bottom of the matter and see what the Democrat 85th Congress really did.

Mr. President, I desire to say at this point that the tables submitted by the majority leader were factual and were correct. So far as it goes, the contention he made was correct.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Since the Senator has referred to the 85th Congress as a Democratic Congress, will he give me the specific citation? I have attempted to keep this discussion free of party labels.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator be specific as to the statement he desires?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to know the statement to which the Senator from Illinois is referring, because I hope to be able to refute it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The statement appears on page 2101 of the RECORD of February 9, 1959.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can just as well read it into the RECORD:

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The fact is that in the 85th Congress we appropriated almost \$6 billion less than the administration asked us to appropriate. Which course is more likely to lead us into national fiscal suicide—a course in which we add \$6 billion, or a

course in which we reduce spending by \$6 billion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Where is the reference to a Democratic Congress?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no reference made to it there; that is my reference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas attempted to give credit to the entire Congress, because many times such reductions as were made were made on a bipartisan basis. Even the authorizations which were made were made on a bipartisan basis.

I vividly recall the housing bill, on which the vote on passage was 88 to 0. Every Senator present voted for it. Even the President approved it. So I assume, even if it did go in the back door, the President approved of that bill.

I do not want to get the matter of appropriations into party politics any more than I want to get foreign relations or defense matters into party politics. I hope we shall have a yea and nay vote on each appropriation bill this year.

I think the legislative history will show that, generally speaking, in the history of this Republic Congress has made reductions in most appropriation bills. There have been exceptions, but Senators who have served longer than I have can correct me if I am wrong. The tendency is for the House to reduce the budget estimates. The Senate sometimes restores, or most times restores, some of the reductions. The committee of conference comes to the final agreement. But over the entire budget year the legislative process will result in a reduction from the budget estimate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I try to keep this matter free from partisan passion, but here is a statement I had not meant to use. It was an Associated Press dispatch from Albuquerque. The majority leader is not quoted, but this is the content of a portion of the dispatch:

JOHNSON ridiculed contentions that Congress may go on wild spending spree. He said the Democratic Congress clipped more than \$5 billion from Mr. Eisenhower's last budget recommendation.

If such contentions are made throughout the country, I think in all fairness, if the party label is put on, it is our duty and responsibility, if we can do so, to defend our own administration. I try to do it as factually and as fairly as I know how. Were it not for such statements, obviously I would not have put any label on Congress and would not have said it was Republican or Democratic. But these statements were made; and, of course, this is a matter which is being handled for the country. It does generate mail, and the people want to know what a person's attitude is. So I like to be as factual about it as I can be.

The majority leader's figures were correct, so far as appropriations are concerned. His contentions were correct, so far as appropriations are concerned. But here is the rest of the story:

First. The 85th Congress enacted laws, in addition to Appropriation Acts, which permit the Federal Government to spend money without going through

the Committees on Appropriations. The best illustration I can give of that is the colloquy which took place in the Senate on June 9, 1958, between the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], when the Senate was considering the small-business bill. This is the colloquy:

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I to understand that it is the opinion of the Senator from Virginia that the Committee on Banking and Currency in this year, by indirection, has in effect appropriated approximately \$9 billion without having the particular appropriations submitted to the Committee on Appropriations for consideration?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct. We have already reported \$5 billion. The amount provided in this bill is \$2,500 million. The so-called big housing bill, which is before the committee, provides a total of \$4,400 million. So those figures add up to more than \$9 billion, assuming that the big bill is reported in its intended form.

Amendments are pending to reduce the amount for public housing and to cut something from the funds for urban redevelopment. But that amount has been proposed and is pending.

If all the amounts are approved, the total will be more than \$9 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency provided \$2 billion for the Export-Import Bank. Was that merely an authorization, or was it an appropriation, in effect?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That was the continuation of a precedent which had previously been set. Not knowing how much the bank would need for its operation in a given time, we authorized it to obtain its needs from the Treasury. But the bank is supposed to get good bonds and good security, and the amount will come back into the assets of the Treasury at some future time.

But the bill provides a revolving fund of \$250 million, with no provision for that amount ever to be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. LAUSCHE. About \$1,800 million is provided for emergency housing. Was the Committee on Finance bypassed on that subject?

He meant the Appropriations Committee.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] said, "That is correct."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that the Administration recommended the increase for the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must say to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania that I am not dealing with the recommendation of the administration. I am dealing with the allegation that over \$5 billion was cut out of the budget by the Congress.

Mr. CLARK. But the answer to my question is, "Yes," is it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly the answer is "Yes."

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I do not like to have other matters placed across the

trail. I wish to pursue for a moment the matter of the fiscal year budget.

Mr. President, at the outset I wish to make clear that the budget is the national purse. The very word "budget" means "purse." It is derived from the old French word "bouge," which means "purse" or "pocketbook." Our budget is our national pocketbook. What goes in is part of the budget; what is taken out is part of the budget. And it can come out in many ways.

I have said that these appropriation figures do not take account of the fact that, in addition to appropriation acts, there were still other things which permitted the Federal Government to spend money without having the items go through the Appropriations Committees.

Second. It piled up spending laws for which appropriations were not made at the time when the laws went on the statute books.

In other words, Congress can authorize spending, but not cover it at that time with the necessary appropriations.

Third. It increased the drain on the general fund of the Treasury by allowing certain revolving and trust funds to incur greater deficits; and it had to restore some budget cuts by supplemental appropriations.

Fourth. It sent to the President spending items which he had to veto.

Fifth. It increased budget problems by not providing the revenue requested.

Sixth. In addition to appropriating funds, it authorized loans directly out of the Treasury, and reappropriated prior year balances.

Seventh. It did reduce budget requests for new spending authority by making smaller appropriations. It is this seventh item for which they take credit, and they let it stand by itself as a measure of achievement.

The seventh item is represented by the tables which were placed in the RECORD. But the rest of the story is not there. If we are to have a sound predicate from which to proceed in the interest of telling about our solvency, the entire story must be told.

Now I return to the claim, as made to the country, that the budget was reduced by the Congress by more than \$5 billion. Actually, the amount was \$5,600 million, on an appropriation basis, for the two sessions of the 85th Congress.

Now let me return to the first item I have mentioned. The 2d session of the 85th Congress, without the matter going through the Appropriations Committee, increased the authority to incur obligations in the sum of \$2,102 million. This includes the Emergency Housing Act, the Small Business Investments Act, the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act, the Highway Act of 1958, the Capital Power Plant Act, and some minor items. All these are as painful to the taxpayers as if these items had gone through the Appropriations Committee and as if there had been direct charges upon the budget.

Second, the legislation which requires increased spending for which appropriations were not made at the time of enactment includes that for the full annual effect of pay raises over and above the

President's recommendation, retroactive pay increases, Federal aid for impacted areas, the Atomic Energy Commission, the full year effect of liberalizing public assistance grants to the States, the authorization for the construction of a superliner, forward authorization for the agricultural conservation program, and veterans' pensions and burial allowances. All this involves the tidy sum of \$1,572 million. That was done by the Democratic 85th Congress, 2d session.

Mr. President, that amount of money is not hay; at least, it is not in the area in which I live—even though it may be in the Nation's Capital.

The point I make is that all those actions were taken by the Congress; and I wish to accept my full share of the responsibility for them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it not a fact that the Senator from Illinois voted for those acts?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is entirely possible that I did.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would say to the Senator from Illinois that it is more than possible; it is a fact, in most instances.

Is it not a fact, also, that the President signed those bills and approved them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not all of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it not a fact that the President signed and approved all the bills the Senator from Illinois has enumerated?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I forget what the situation was in the case of the veterans' pensions; but the President did sign a good many.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

When references are made to "the back-door route," let me point out that a bill does not become a law unless the President signs it or unless the Congress overrides a Presidential veto. Upon occasion, the Senate has voted to override a Presidential veto, but such action has not been taken by both bodies of the Congress in recent years. So a bill cannot become a law unless the President signs it or unless the Congress overrides a veto.

I am aware of the fact that in most of the instances which have been enumerated the Congress voted unanimously, and in a good many of those instances the action was taken as a result of the plea of the executive branch itself—for instance, in the case of the Export-Import Bank and the housing funds. I remember that in the Senate there was one vote of 88 to 0, and we had a call of the roll just because I was fearful that someone, at some time, somehow, somewhere, would attempt to blame someone for the action. But when the roll was called, 88 Senators voted in favor of passage of the bill, and thus indicated their approval of that procedure, and the President signed the bill.

I have not made an examination of all 1,200 of the bills the Congress passed and the President approved, out of the 20,000 introduced. I could do so, and I could submit the complete story. But I

believe it is fair to say that many of the authorization measures the Senator from Illinois has been discussing were finally implemented by appropriations, and the appropriation figures, as given by the Appropriations Committee, show that the Congress made reductions.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, all that discussion is beside the point. I am laboring only one point; namely, the contention that the 85th Congress cut the budget by more than \$5,600,000,000.

It is not a matter of who voted for what; it is not a matter of whether there were 1,200 bills or whether there were 12,000 bills. I am pointing out the procedures under which the country is given the impression that the Congress was the economizer and the President was the spender. These figures will refute in complete detail that allegation. That is the only reason why I take the floor today.

In other words, there have been many instances in which the Congress has voted to bypass the Appropriations Committee, or has voted to permit money to be obtained directly from the Treasury, or has failed to pass appropriation bills to implement the necessary spending obligations.

Then there is the item—the third one—which includes the failure of the second session of the 85th Congress to comply with the President's request for additional postal revenues. The increase in the postal deficit in the fiscal year 1959, as a result of this denial, totaled \$232 million.

After all, Mr. President, the budget is based upon two sides of the ledger: One is made up of the anticipated revenues which go into the national purse, and the other is composed of the spending which takes the money out of the national purse. The President made his request for additional postal revenues, but that request was denied by the Congress; and, as I have already stated, the increase in the postal deficit in the fiscal year 1959 was, as a result of that denial, \$232 million.

Another item in this category was the action taken by the Democrat 85th Congress in increasing the highway fund deficit beyond the President's request—beyond it to the tune of \$725 million.

Furthermore, Congress later had to restore \$86 million of the budget cuts by supplemental appropriations. So, the effect of this action was to charge the budget with \$1,043 million, or, if we want to be more factual, charge the Treasury of the United States with \$1,043 million.

The next item, spending items sent to the President by the 2d session of the 85th Congress which he was compelled to veto, totaled \$1,562 million. If it had not been for the President's vetoes, the Government would have been committed to spend this extra \$1½ billion. So the administration provided a real saving to the taxpayers.

The point is that the 85th Congress tried to commit the Government to these huge expenditures. That was congressional action. Vetoes were the Independent Offices Appropriation Act—

there was in it \$589 million for civil service retirement—bills for airport grants, depressed areas, rivers and harbors authorization, atomic icebreaker, and the metals production and purchase program.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has said that there was a reduction of \$1½ billion in spending as a result of Presidential vetoes, and that otherwise the President would have been forced to spend the funds voted. How would he spend those extra funds Congress voted for?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know, but I know I have read the budget hearings before the House committee. I read all 175 pages, from beginning to end. I saw there the statement of the Budget Director as to the items which have been put in reserve, which either could not be spent at the time or had not yet been spent by the agency. I think Mr. Stans made an excellent answer to the interrogations propounded by Members of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to have an answer to my question. Congress cut drastically the President's requests in the two sessions of the 85th Congress. The figures will show, despite what the distinguished minority leader has said, that Congress reduced the President's budget by \$5 billion in the first session, and by \$576 million in the second session, and would have reduced it in excess of \$1 billion in the latter if the President had not personally requested restoration of funds for his foreign aid program.

Congress, in spite of the fact that it reduced the budget last year, increased funds for the Army to maintain it at a strength of 925,000 men, increased appropriations for the Marine Corps so it could maintain its strength at 200,000 men, and increased appropriations to maintain the personnel of the Army and the Navy to a greater degree than the administration wanted. Still the Senator from Illinois tells us that if authorizations had been made on the basis of legislation enacted, the President, if he had signed those bills, would have been forced to make those expenditures. How would he have been forced to make those expenditures when he had been thwarting the will of Congress, so far as the defense of this country is concerned, by not doing what Congress had specifically said should be done, under the Constitution?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The President of the United States is not thwarting the will of Congress. He cannot spend the money until the purposes for which it is authorized are accomplished and the spending agency says, "We are ready for the apportionment made by the Budget Bureau."

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Marine Corps is always ready to have a 200,000-man corps, but its request is being knocked down. How can the corps maintain three combat divisions and three airwings on that basis?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not the Commandant of the Marine Corps. When they are ready for the money, they ask for it.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We vote many authorizations for which no appropriations are subsequently made. We all know that. The general public may not know it, but we all know it. We vote many appropriations for which there are no authorizations. We vote appropriations pursuant to authorizations and then sometimes the Executive impounds those funds. That happened under a Democratic President and under a Republican President. In answer to what the Senator from Montana has said, let us not get confused in that respect. We have put more than \$1 billion in excess of the requests in the defense appropriation bill, anticipating the Executive would use it. A considerable portion of that money has not been used as of now. It was impounded, in the wisdom of the President, or in his lack of wisdom. The President decided the national interest did not require it. Those are the facts. For all the list of bills the Senator has given, he may as well get up and refer to a bill for the relief of Joe James, \$1 million. Congress has to make the appropriation. Congress appropriates pursuant to authorizations. While we do appropriate pursuant to authorizations, there are many more billions of dollars authorized than are appropriated. When all the figures are considered, it will be found that Congress, in the last two sessions, appropriated \$5,600 million less than the budget estimates.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of this running and desultory discussion, the statement I hold in my hand may appear at the end of my remarks, so it will be a continuous statement, with the figures grouped together.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—as I understand, this is a statement prepared by the Budget Bureau. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is a statement prepared by the minority leader, with figures obtained from the Budget Bureau, the Treasury Department, and from some other sources.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall not object. Just as the Senator wanted to clarify figures offered by the Senator from Ohio, I am attempting to determine whether it is the Senator's personal statement or a statement of the Budget Bureau.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is the statement of the Senator from Illinois. He has been working on it for quite a while. The Senator from Illinois advised the Senate several weeks ago he would assemble all these figures and put the whole story into the Record. But I must say to my delightful friend from Texas and to my beloved friend from Montana I feel like Cato, who signed every letter and ended every speech with the ringing words, "Delenda est Carthago"—"Carthage must be destroyed."

I am not dealing in this colloquy with any one bill that came up. I am dealing with one matter—the contention that the 85th Congress was the great economizing Congress to the tune of \$5,660 million, to be exact, and I am here to review only one thing, and that is it.

I know what a budget is. I worked with a budget for 18 years in the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and I know how the taxpayers' money is gotten out of the Federal Treasury in circuitous ways. They do not go through the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations figures are the ones which were inserted in the Record, but that is only a part of the budget; and I mean to make the whole budget come into focus for the people of this country, because inflation, resulting from deficit and continuing deficit, is going to place its clammy hand upon the people.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. CLARK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, are my figures correct when I say that the total of the items which the Senator from Illinois has been mentioning amounts to an increase of \$3,788,000,000?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not totaled the figures. I shall total them at the end.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, what does that include? The Senator adds up all the apples and oranges and potatoes, and he gets a cantaloup. Is that it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With all the apples and the oranges—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the figure include all of the authorizations? What is included?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Action on appropriations; other congressional actions; expenditures avoided by veto; and actions affecting receipts. There is net total budgetary actions for the two sessions of the 85th Congress, if my addition is correct, of \$3,788 million.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have a summary I shall present directly, and we can then discuss that.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I have been enjoying the discussion. It seems to me there are some things which may confuse rather than explain. For instance, in his statement the Senator refers to the Emergency Housing Act of 1958. Of course the Senator will recall that we made available to the Federal National Mortgage Association a billion dollars, which is charged up in the Senator's statement, yet by the first of this year only \$95 million of the money had been used.

I should also like to mention another item.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that does not make any difference. The money has been committed for expenditure.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will use another example. The Senator refers to the small business investments. Someone who reads the statement may think all the money provided for in the Small Business Investment Act is a backdoor method of obligation. As a matter of fact, practically all of the money is provided through appropriations.

It is true there is an item of \$28 million which was lifted from the Federal Reserve Act, section 13(b), if I correctly remember, which made the money available for small business purposes years ago. The Federal Reserve never used the money. Under the terms of the new act it is impossible to spend the money in less than 14 years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. SPARKMAN. It seems to me when one talks about something like this happening in 1 year, he gives the impression that all of it is 1 year's doing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that has nothing to do with "Who stole the wheelbarrow?"

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are trying a case here.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is an issue, and I have joined the issue. I mean to rebut the proposal, and to refute and successfully refute the contention that the 85th Congress cut the budget by \$5.6 billion; and no red herring, no matter how up-hoisted or embroidered it may be, is going to wash out the contention.

I have the figures in my hand. It does not make any difference what the money was spent for. It does not make any difference if the fund is in hock. I take the statement at face value. This is what was said. It was said at Albuquerque. It was said on the floor of the Senate. The story went out in an Associated Press dispatch.

I mean to prove, if the newspapers will carry the proof, that the story is entirely different and that there are amazing methods which the Congress has used—it is the responsibility of Congress—to take money out of the Federal Treasury for spending, although the President did a pretty good job of trying to keep the spending in line.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator used the term which I said would confuse the country. The Senator used the term "spending," when as a matter of fact it is going to take 14 years to spend the \$28 million I mentioned. It will take longer than that to spend the money which is carried in the provisions of the housing bill for slum clearance and urban renewal. And a large portion is for lending at interest, not spending.

The Senator also speaks about obligations, the obligations incurred outside the Appropriations Committee. As I understood his statement, the Senator was condemning that system, yet I think

everyone in this body knows that the present administration has asked for that system of financing over and over and over again.

As a matter of fact, in the consideration of the housing bill recently passed, testimony was given in the hearings by Mr. Norman Mason. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] raised the very same point about the financing of programs outside of appropriations. The point was made that we were carrying out programs under the bill exactly as such programs had been carried out before.

I asked Mr. Mason:

Both in the bill that I introduced and also in the administrative bill; and in present operations.

And Mr. Mason said:

That is correct.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said:

So is college housing.

Then the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] asked Mr. Mason this question:

Is there any difference in the method of financing between S. 57 and S. 612?

S. 612 was the administration bill. And Mr. Mason's answer was:

No; they follow the same pattern.

In other words, there is nothing new about this procedure. The present administration has asked for it. It is true that sometimes Congress may increase the amount which the administration asks for, and sometimes Congress may decrease the amount which the administration asks for.

I subscribe to the statement made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] the other day, that the ultimate responsibility for making appropriations is in the Congress of the United States. The President has the duty and the right to recommend, but the ultimate responsibility for passing upon appropriations is in the Congress. When the Congress follows the recommendations of the administration and provides ways for incurring obligations outside of the appropriations, I do not see that we are to be condemned for it, as I understand the statement of the Senator from Illinois to imply, if not to include.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if all of this testimony of my genial friend from Alabama had been adduced in a court of law and I were opposing counsel, I would say to the court, "I ask that all of it be stricken from the record, because it is immaterial and it is irrelevant." Mr. President, it is.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. My good friend said a minute or two ago—and I agree with him completely—that he knows about budgets. Of course the Senator knows about budgets, because he has been an astute and able Member of this body for a long while. I would therefore like to ask my friend a question.

The Senator from Illinois referred a little while ago to a \$2.1 billion grant

reservation authorization in the housing bill as one of these items which gave him budgetary concern; yet my friend is well aware, is he not, that not 1 cent of that money will be in the 1960 budget; not 1 cent of the money will be in the 1961 budget; and by the time the money is in the budget the present administration will have gone to history? Is that not correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under the Senate rules I would have to ask for a division of the question, Mr. President.

I will let the figures speak for themselves. We have 450 people working at the Bureau of the Budget. Their business is to know. Only the facts count. There can be no guesswork. I have the facts in my hand.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think it is quite clear that no part of the \$2.1 billion can ever be any concern of the Eisenhower administration budgets; is that not true?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What difference does it make?

Mr. CLARK. It is important because the Senator is trying to tell us it is of concern, is he not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Delenda est Carthago. I am dealing with one proposition.

Mr. CLARK. My suggestion would be to my good friend that he stick to the proposition, which is the budget.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not trying the housing bill over and over again, or any other bill. I am attempting in this forum to consider the contention that a Democratic Congress cut \$5,660 million from the President's budgets.

Mr. CLARK. Well, it did, did it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It did not.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is familiar with budget procedures because of his long service on the Appropriations Committee. I should like to ask if it is not a fact that in every budget recommendation from the President, he recommends obligatory authority under which expenditure may or may not be reflected in the budget of the particular year, but which will be reflected in future budget years; and in another part of the budget he recommends exact expenditure to be made in the next fiscal year. Is that not correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I notice on the second page of the budget message which the President sent to the Congress this year that the two divisions of the budget—one for obligatory authority and one for exact spending authority—are marked out in every year President Eisenhower has been in office, from 1954 to the present year. First, there is the record of obligatory authority. I believe it is possible to study the President's budget messages and find out what obligatory authority the President recommended in each year, and what obligatory authority Congress fixed for those years. The record would tell the

story, it seems to me, so far as obligatory authority is concerned.

Then I note, in the budget message this year, for each of the years, a statement of the actual expenditures made under appropriations voted by the Congress. That is the record.

It is possible, of course, to find out what the President recommended in the way of expenditures for each fiscal year. Then we would know whether or not Congress had increased or decreased his recommendations. I believe that the Senator from Illinois and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] can supply the information. I do not know the exact figure it would disclose. However, I have been a Member of this body for 4 of the 6 years during President Eisenhower's administration, and I venture the belief that if such information is supplied it would show that in every year the Congress, by increases in obligatory authority, as well as appropriations, has caused larger spending than the President recommended.

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

Mr. COOPER. I should like to see this record supplied. I recall the 1957 session. When the budget for fiscal year 1957 came to Congress there was—as there is today—a great budget debate.

Our friends on the other side said the budget was too large. Last year—1958—when the 1959 budget came before us, they said it was too small. We know that the Congress increased the budget last year over the President's recommendation. This year his budget recommendations are again said to be too small. The Senate has already increased his recommendations in two bills. Last year and this year, our good friends on the other side said that the budget was too small. They know that we increased it last year, and we know that we have started to increase it this year. It would be a hoax on the American people for our friends on the other side of the aisle to claim both sides of the coin—first, to claim that the budgets offered have been too small and raise them, and now to claim that they have been reduced.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now proceed to the fifth item. This started as a 15-minute speech. Perhaps that was in shorthand. [Laughter.]

While the 85th Congress was voting higher spending authority, it was also voting to cut the Government's income. A budget is a purse. Nothing can come out of it that does not first go into it. We cannot divorce the two processes. If we cut income, there is an impact on the budget.

The 85th Congress, in the 2d session, reduced tax receipts of the Government by \$665 million annually. The American taxpayer was not reminded of this when the claims for cutting the budget were made; but he must be reminded of it, in the interest of a complete story.

Another class of congressional action which has the effect of increasing Federal spending is loan authorizations. As approved by the 2d session of the 85th

Congress, such loan authorizations totaled \$280 million.

Taking appropriations actions alone, we find that the second session did indeed reduce new obligational authority requested by the President by \$617 million.

Now we come to the first session of that Congress, in which the Appropriations Committee was again bypassed. The increased authority included the Housing Act and the contract authorization for the Senate Office Building. The total was \$1,120 million.

In that same session, legislation which required spending, for which no appropriations were made at the time of enactment, included veterans' compensation, an authorization for the Atomic Energy Commission in excess of the President's recommendation, and school construction in impacted areas totaling \$239 million, offset by reductions in authorizations of the mutual security program of \$477 million.

If we put those together, the total impact is \$238 million.

In that same first session the Congress also rejected the President's request for a postal-rate increase. The result was what? The result was to increase the postal deficit by \$462 million, which came out of the Treasury. It could not have been done unless that action was taken by the Congress. That is where the emphasis and the accent must be.

In addition, there were congressional reductions which required supplemental appropriations thereafter, totaling \$322 million.

To me that is one of the interesting techniques. I do not know how to avoid it. We cannot always estimate the needs of an agency up to the minute. Events and circumstances arise to change our estimates and cause us to increase or decrease them. So, always there will be deficiencies and supplemental appropriations.

I remember how I argued, in connection with the independent offices bill last year, against cutting the veterans' pension fund. That is a contract. I argued that we would have to make a supplemental appropriation. That is exactly what happened.

Supplemental appropriations show up in the next Congress, and the people become bewildered. Senators become bewildered. I wish the budget technique were simpler. We cannot expect people to understand it. I used to lecture on the budget. I called it "the book no one knows." I think that is a pretty good title.

In that same session, there were expenditures which were avoided as the result of a Presidential veto. If such expenditures had not been vetoed, they would have been a tax on the country and the Treasury. By vetoing the classified and postal pay-rate bills passed by the first session, \$314 million was saved in the period from September 1, 1957, to January 1958.

Again, we must include in this consideration \$244 million in loan authorizations and reappropriations of prior year balances approved by the first session of the 85th Congress.

Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that I will put this information together in summary form. Appropriations were decreased, by the aid of Congress, in the sum of \$5,043 million in the first session, and \$617 million in the second session, or a total of \$5,660 million.

The figures which the majority leader placed in the RECORD are correct up to that point.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has been very gracious in yielding. I understand his desire to complete his statement. I was about to make a comment, ask one further question, and then desist, thanking the Senator for his courtesy.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] made a fine suggestion a moment or two ago. A great many people are confused by the figures. If we could have one statement showing the result on each year's cash budget of the action of the Congress, I think we would find, as the majority leader has said—and the minority leader has been kind enough to admit—that his figures are accurate. Then if we were to add in another statement the additional contract authorizations and additional grant authorizations, to which future Congresses might perhaps find themselves committed in such a way that it would be difficult for them to change to large figures, then we might understand better just what the facts are.

However, these later figures of contract and grant authorizations have no effect on the 1960 budget, and little, if any, effect on the 1961 budget. I think that fact should be made abundantly clear.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not talking about the 1960 budget. I have not been talking about the 1960 budget.

Mr. CLARK. That is good.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not been talking about the 1960 budget.

Mr. CLARK. Or the 1961 budget, either?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I have been talking about a fait accompli which all the wit and piety on the floor of the Senate cannot sponge out, because it is a matter of record.

Mr. CLARK. Inasmuch as the Senator has been gracious enough to say that his entire address is irrelevant to the 1960 and 1961 budgets, I shall content myself with one further question.

Does my friend know of any Member of the Senate who is not in favor of a balanced budget, and who is in favor of deficit spending?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must recur to Scripture and use the oft-repeated phrase, "By their works ye shall know them."

Mr. CLARK. I suspect my friend would come to the same conclusion I have reached, that there is no Member of this body who favors deficit spending. Therefore, I suggest, in all good humor—and I know my friend will not resent it—that perhaps we are creating a straw man which is rather easy to knock down.

I thank my friend for his courtesy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I could add to that Biblical quotation by saying that faith without works is dead. I hope we can summon up not only the necessary faith, but also the works that go with it, so that we may stand and hold the budget line.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I believe the Senator is giving us a good deal of information about the current fiscal year, when we face a deficit of upwards of \$12 billion. My recollection is that at the time the Treasury indicated there would likely be a deficit, it pointed out that approximately \$5 billion of it was due to increased spending which was forced upon the country by actions of the last session of the 85th Congress; that it was the action of that Congress in large part which increased the expenditures in this year's budget by close to \$5 billion, with 7 billion of the estimated 12 billion deficit resulting from decreased receipts as a result of the depression.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. Due in part also to the fact that the administration was denied income, such as the postal increase which would have helped to close the gap.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. Therefore, I believe the Senator is making a big contribution by pointing out that it was the action of this same Congress last year which was responsible to a large extent for the estimated \$12 billion deficit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to summarize, instead of going through the various categories, by showing that the total charge on the budget is \$9,448 million. I now take the majority leader's figure, because it is correct. It shows \$5,660 million in reduced appropriations in both sessions. We then do what is done in any schoolroom; we draw a line and subtract. The net result is that the 1st and 2d sessions of the 85th Congress did not reduce the budget; on the contrary, they actually approved increases amounting to \$3,788 million.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not correct to say, following what the Senator from Kentucky has said, and what the Senator from Connecticut has said, that there are, really, two budgets? One is the obligatory budget, and the other the actual receipts and expenditures budget. In other words, the deficit or surplus is based on what is actually received or spent.

It will be seen that in 1958 the actual budget receipts were \$69.1 billion and the actual budget expenditures were \$71.9 billion, or a deficit of \$2.8 billion.

The estimated receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, were \$68 billion, and the expenditures \$80.9 billion, with a deficit of \$12.9 billion.

In the next year, 1960, the estimated budget receipts are shown as \$77.1 billion and the estimated budget expenditures as \$77 billion, with a surplus of \$100 million.

Those figures are found at page M-4 of the 1960 budget.

I cite those figures because our friends on the other side of the aisle have been pointing to the fact that some things may not come into the expenditures in the 1960 budget or during the Eisenhower administration, but that they are ultimately a burden on the taxpayers, whichever administration may be in office at the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct; and a burden on the Treasury.

Mr. President, I have finished. I am sorry I have taken so long. I have already received unanimous consent to insert the tables which have been furnished by the Bureau of the Budget, showing the details. As a lawyer says in court, I rest my case. I was going to say that the defense rests its case. I will not do that. It is not the defense resting its case. We are prosecuting the case. We rest it there.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT PREPARED BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

When the statement is made that a Democrat Congress cut the President's budget by more than \$5 billion, it can leave but one impression with the average citizen, namely, that the President is a spender and that the Congress is an economizer.

To prove this point the majority leader has submitted estimates and tables to show total appropriations made by the 85th Congress compared with the estimates submitted by the President. That is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. Let us get to the bottom of the matter and see what the Democrat 85th Congress really did do.

First, it enacted laws in addition to appropriation acts which permit the Federal Government to spend money without going through the Appropriations Committees.

Second, it piled up spending laws for which appropriations were not made at the time the laws went on the statute books.

Third, it increased the drain on the general fund of the Treasury by allowing certain revolving and trust funds to incur greater deficits, and it had to restore some budget cuts by supplemental appropriations.

Fourth, it sent spending items to the President which he had to veto.

Fifth, it increased budget problems by not providing the revenue requested.

Sixth, in addition to appropriating funds, it authorized loans directly out of the Treasury and reappropriated prior year balances.

Seventh, it did reduce budget requests for new spending authority by making smaller appropriations. It is this seventh item for which they take credit and let it stand by itself as a measure of achievement.

The claim was made to the country that the budget was reduced by more than \$5 billion. The budget reflects what is taken in in the form of taxes and what goes out in the form of expenditures.

On the first item, the 2d session of the 85th Congress, without going through the Appropriations Committee, increased the authority to incur obligations in the sum of \$2,102 million. This includes the Emergency Housing Act, small business investments, Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation, the Highway Act of 1958, the Capital Power Plant, and some minor items. This is as painful to the taxpayer as if these items had gone through the Appropriations Committee.

Secondly, the legislation which requires increased spending for which appropriations were not made at the time of enactment includes the full annual effect of pay raises over and above the President's recommendation, retroactive pay increases, Federal aid for impacted areas, the Atomic Energy Commission, the full year effect of liberalizing

public assistance grants to the States, the authorization for the construction of a supersonic, forward authorization for the agricultural conservation program, and veterans' pensions and burial allowances. This involves the tidy sum of \$1,572 million. That was done by the Democrat 85th Congress, 2d session.

The third item includes the failure of the 2d session of the 85th Congress to comply with the President's request for additional postal revenues. The increase in the postal deficit in fiscal 1959 as a result of this denial totaled \$232 million. Another item in this category was the action taken by the Democrat 85th Congress in increasing the highway fund deficit beyond the President's request to the tune of \$725 million. Furthermore, the Congress later had to restore \$86 million of the budget cuts by supplemental appropriations. The effect of these three actions by the second session was to require \$1,043 million additional from the Treasury.

Spending items sent to the President by the 2d session of the 85th Congress which he was compelled to veto totaled \$1,562 million. If it had not been for the President's vetoes, the Government would have been committed to spend this extra \$1½ billion. Thus, the administration provided a real saving to the taxpayers. The point is, the 85th Congress tried to commit the Government to these huge expenditures. Vetoed bills were the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, and bills for airport grants, depressed areas, rivers and harbors authorization, atomic icebreaker, and the metals production and purchase program.

While the 85th Congress was voting higher spending authority, it was also voting to cut the Government's income. This is the fifth category which I cited. The 85th Congress in the 2d session reduced tax receipts of the Government by \$665 million annually. The American taxpayer was not reminded of this when the claims for cutting the budget were made.

Another class of congressional action which has the effect of increasing Federal spending is loan authorizations. As approved by the 2d session of the 85th Congress, these loan authorizations totaled \$280 million.

Taking "appropriations" actions alone, we find that the second session did indeed reduce new obligatory authority requested by the President by \$617 million.

In the first session of the 85th Congress the increased authority to incur spending obligations where the Appropriations Committee was bypassed includes the Housing Act and the contract authorization for the Senate Office Building, and totaled \$1,120 million.

In that same session legislation which required spending for which no appropriations were made at the time of enactment included veterans compensation, an authorization for the Atomic Energy Commission in excess of the President's recommendation, and school construction in impacted areas totaling \$239 million, offset by reductions in authorizations of the mutual security program of \$477 million. In this category, therefore, there was a net reduction of \$238 million.

In that same first session the rejection of the President's requested postal rate increase increased the postal deficit in 1958 by \$462 million. In addition there were congressional reductions which required supplemental appropriations thereafter totaling \$322 million.

To all this must be added the expenditures which were avoided as a result of a Presidential veto. By vetoing the classified and postal pay rates bills passed by the first session, \$314 million was saved in the period September 1, 1957, to January 1958.

Again, we must include in this consideration \$244 million in loan authorizations and reappropriations of prior year balances approved by the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

SUMMARY

We are now ready for a summary of what actually happened in the Democrat 85th Congress.

The appropriations were decreased by that Congress in the sum of \$5,043 million in the first session and \$617 million in the second session, for a total of \$5,660 million.

Now, let us offset these with the increased authority to incur obligations other than by appropriation acts in the sum of \$3,222 million.

Then, add the legislation which required additional spending for which appropriations were not made at the time of enactment and which totaled \$1,334 million.

Now add the increases in postal and highway fund deficits and in supplemental appropriations which totaled \$1,827 million.

We must also add the \$1,876 million in spending which was avoided as a result of the President's vetoes.

Next, we must add the reduction in tax receipts which increased the drain on the general fund of the Treasury by \$665 million.

Finally, we must add the \$524 million for increases in loan authorizations and reappropriations.

The grand total of these additional items is \$9,448 million, from which the appropriation decreases of \$5,660 million can be deducted.

The net result is that the 1st and 2d sessions of the 85th Congress did not reduce the budget, but, on the contrary, actually approved increases amounting to \$3,788 million.

These actions of the 85th Congress apart from the strictly appropriations bills are what might well be called the back-door approach to the Treasury. It is an interesting technique, and how it fools the people. But we are determined that the whole story shall be told and that every effort to bypass the Appropriations Committee or to mislead the people about the budget will be vigorously exposed.

This question of bypassing the annual appropriation process is not new. It has been explored over a period of several years and is alluded to in considerable detail in the hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations on the budget for 1960. Those hearings were held on the 20th of January, and I am delighted to note how many Democrats are interested in putting an end to this practice so that when the fiscal story is told to the country, it will be complete.

It is quite evident from the latest Gallup poll that the Nation overwhelmingly favors economy in government and a balanced budget. Every action and every effort to throw it out of balance must be presented so that the people know the whole story and will also know where the full responsibility lies.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, when the Senator from Illinois discussed this matter with me, we agreed that he would discuss the budget of the 85th Congress. I should like to go back very briefly for a minute to the five Eisenhower budgets. I speak of the five Eisenhower budgets because we are now acting on the sixth budget. The budget before Congress in the first calendar year he was in office was not an Eisenhower budget, but was actually a Truman budget which was submitted before President Eisenhower took office.

Mr. President, on February 9 the Senate was told that the Congress has reduced the budget requests of the incumbent President by a total of \$22 billion

during the years he has been in office. In support of this claim a table was put into the RECORD listing actions by the Congress beginning with the 83d Congress, 1st session. The table shows the 1953 session of the Congress decreased budget estimates by \$12 billion.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that the \$12 billion cut was made—not in the Eisenhower budget—but in the Truman budget.

The fact of the matter is that before Mr. Truman left office in January 1953 he submitted his budget for fiscal year 1954.

It is this budget which totaled \$77 billion in new appropriations requests.

It is this budget which the Congress reduced by \$12 billion.

The incoming administration, under President Eisenhower, did not submit a formal budget for fiscal year 1954. From January 20, when the President took the oath of office, to July 1, 1953, there remained only slightly more than 5 months in which to review the huge Truman budget. There was not enough time to prepare an entirely new budget, to have it printed, to submit it to Congress, and to give Congress enough time to study the budget before the new fiscal year began. Therefore, the Eisenhower administration presented its budget requests for fiscal year 1954 on an agency-by-agency basis, as these officials appeared before congressional committees.

Nevertheless, Assistant Budget Director Rowland R. Hughes, told the House Ways and Means Committee on June 1, 1953, that the Eisenhower administration had already reduced the Truman budget requests for new appropriations for 1954 by more than \$8.5 billion. He said further reductions would be made.

It is incorrect, therefore, Mr. President, to charge the \$12 billion cut by the first session of the 83d Congress to the Eisenhower budget.

As a matter of fact, the incumbent President has submitted six budgets since he took office. These budgets are for fiscal years 1955 through 1960.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I heartily agree with the Senator's statement. If at any time I have contended that President Eisenhower was completely, totally, and absolutely responsible for the fiscal year 1954 budget, I stand corrected. I am not aware of the fact that I have said so, but the Senator's statement is correct, and I desire to confirm it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the Senator's saying that. From what I have heard the Senator say in the Chamber and from what I have read in the RECORD, he has not made such a statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have attempted to refer to it as the administration budget. I realize that the first budget confronting President Eisenhower was the budget prepared by President Truman. President Eisenhower made numerous changes in it, and so did Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

The Congress has not yet acted on the fiscal year 1960 budget, so that we can only compare congressional appropriations against Eisenhower budget requests for the fiscal years 1955 through 1959. Reductions in appropriations made by Congress in these years total \$10,603,874,716.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to point out that every session of Congress, beginning with the 79th Congress in 1945, has reduced the executive branch requests for new appropriations.

This was true during years of war, as well as during years of peace.

For example, although the Korean war began June 25, 1950, the Congress in session at the time was able to reduce budget estimates by a total of \$1.9 billion. The following year, with the war going full blast, the Congress cut budget estimates by \$4.7 billion.

Comparison of estimates and appropriations by sessions of Congress (fiscal years 1946-59)

Congress, session	Estimates	Appropriations	Reductions
85th Cong., 2d sess.	\$81,737,060,999	\$81,119,818,276	—\$617,242,723
85th Cong., 1st sess.	78,108,417,112	73,064,958,328	—5,043,458,784
84th Cong., 2d sess.	73,298,859,629	73,041,364,417	—257,495,212
84th Cong., 1st sess.	66,023,089,195	63,947,281,321	—2,075,807,874
83d Cong., 2d sess.	60,770,315,686	58,160,445,563	—2,609,870,123
83d Cong., 1st sess.	77,190,083,599	65,156,254,797	—12,033,828,802
82d Cong., 2d sess.	94,608,763,252	85,999,646,411	—8,609,116,841
82d Cong., 1st sess.	105,837,897,537	101,117,786,897	—4,720,110,640
81st Cong., 2d sess. (after Nov. 27, 1950)	19,926,529,938	19,841,684,745	—84,845,193
81st Cong., 1st sess. (to Nov. 27, 1950)	63,090,905,227	61,203,355,696	—1,887,549,531
80th Cong., 2d sess.	48,313,575,167	46,497,456,898	—1,816,118,269
80th Cong., 1st sess.	44,446,109,713	41,675,480,957	—2,770,628,756
79th Cong., 2d sess.	39,349,663,652	35,982,887,708	—3,366,775,944
79th Cong., 1st sess.	37,315,954,247	35,734,209,165	—1,581,745,082
	71,175,840,878	69,780,137,110	—1,395,703,768

NOTE.—Foregoing figures pertain only to "Appropriations" in appropriation bills and "Appropriations" pursuant to permanent law, and therefore does not include other forms of obligatory authority such as contract authority and authority to expend from public debt receipts, some of which are enacted in other than appropriation bills.

Source: "Estimates, Appropriations, etc." 1946-59, table VIIa, "Grand total, regular annual, deficiency, supplemental, and miscellaneous acts and permanent appropriations."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I remind my colleagues that appropriations actions are not the only ones taken by Congress which affect budget receipts and expenditures and the state of the Federal Treasury.

Apart from appropriation acts, the Congress may in other enactments increase the authority of the Federal Government to incur obligations which will increase actual spending in the future.

Congress may also enact laws which have the effect of reducing Government receipts, thus increasing the outflow of Federal funds and decreasing Federal income.

Congress may enact laws authorizing Federal spending and fail to vote appropriations at the time of enactment. This increases Federal spending but the increase does not show up in the appropriations tables for that particular year.

Thus, while Congress reduced Mr. Eisenhower's five budget requests for new appropriations by a total of \$10,603 million, other actions of the Congress increased Federal spending by a total of \$11,588 million.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask the Senator for information, because he is one of the most diligent, thorough members of the Committee on Appropriations.

The point I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, is that, in peace and in war, the Congress, regardless of which party was in control, has managed since 1945 to reduce the overall budget totals. This is the prerogative of the Congress, and Congress has indeed exercised this right over the years.

For the information of Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table comparing estimates and appropriations by sessions of Congress for fiscal years beginning 1946 through 1959, which appears in the hearings on the budget for 1960, held by the House Committee on Appropriations, 86th Congress, 1st session.

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

Did not Congress also reduce some of the budget requests made by the President for fiscal year 1954?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That would be the budget—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That was the budget prepared by President Truman, revised by President Eisenhower, and further revised by Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That would be the budget prepared for the first session of Congress during the first year of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My figure shows that Congress reduced the budget by \$12,034 million. The net reduction in that year, including, as I stated to the majority leader before, other congressional actions, was \$12,067 million.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In addition, Congress enacted in this same period legislation which the President was forced to veto. These acts called for additional Federal spending totaling \$2,825 million.

In these two areas, then, Congress voted increased Federal spending in the amount of \$14,413 million. This was \$3,810 million more than the appropriations cuts.

In addition, Congress passed legislation reducing receipts by a total of

\$1,665 million under the five Eisenhower budgets.

Considering all these actions by Congress affecting expenditures and receipts, it will be seen that the Congress actually voted to increase Federal spending by a net total of \$5,475 million—which is a far cry from the \$10,603 million reduction in the five Eisenhower budgets as claimed.

The net \$5,475 million increase by the Congress in the five Eisenhower budgets is made up of the total \$6,073 million increases made by Congress under Democratic control and the \$598 million net reduction by the Congress under

Republican control in calendar year 1954.

In 1953, the Congress, then under control of Republicans, cut \$12 billion off the budget appropriation requests, but as I have already mentioned, that was the final Truman budget and not the Eisenhower budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table analyzing the actions of the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses relating to the budget.

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

Actions taken by Congress on Presidential budgetary recommendations

(In millions)

	Actions affecting expenditures				Actions affecting receipts	Net total budgetary actions
	Action on appropriations	Other congressional actions	Expenditures avoided by veto	Net total		
Action on Eisenhower recommendations:						
Congresses controlled by Democrats:						
85th Cong., 2d sess.....	—\$617	+\$4,997	+\$1,562	+\$5,942	+\$665	+\$6,607
85th Cong., 1st sess.....	—5,043	+1,910	+314	—2,819		—2,819
84th Cong., 2d sess.....	—257	+2,339	+307	+2,389		+2,389
84th Cong., 1st sess.....	—2,076	+1,642	+330	—104		—104
Total, Congresses controlled by Democrats..	—7,993	+10,888	+2,513	+5,408	+665	+6,073
Congresses controlled by Republicans: 83d Cong., 2d sess.....						
	—2,610	+700	+312	—1,598	+1,000	—598
Total, action on Eisenhower recommendations.....	—10,603	+11,588	+2,825	+3,810	+1,665	+5,475
Action on Truman recommendations:						
Congress controlled by Republicans: 83d Cong., 1st sess.....						
	—12,034	—33		—12,067		—12,067
Grand total.....	—22,637	+11,555	+2,825	—8,257	+1,665	—6,592

¹ Reflects final action by the Congress on President Truman's fiscal year 1954 budget, which was submitted in January 1953 before Eisenhower took office. Although the new Republican administration requested substantially less than the Truman budget when agency heads appeared before Appropriations Committees, the exact total of Eisenhower recommendations for fiscal year 1954 is not available. Thus, no comparison between congressional action and Eisenhower for fiscal year 1954 is possible. Assistant Budget Director Hughes, on June 1, 1953, told the House Ways and Means Committee the Eisenhower administration had at that time reduced Truman's budget by \$8.5 billion and that undoubtedly there would be further cuts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I may say also that my analysis is based upon figures found in a statement entitled, "Congressional Actions Affecting Receipts or Expenditures," dated February 12, 1959, and prepared by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, when all the collateral actions of the Congress are considered, along with the strictly appropriations actions, we see that the Congress actually voted to increase Federal spending by a net total of \$5,475 million over the five Eisenhower budgets.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the Senator from Massachusetts included in his recapitulation the amount contained in bills which did not pass; the amount which was saved by the failure of Congress to pass about 19,000 bills which were introduced?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The figures do not include that item.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Since the Senator has spoken about bills vetoed and the amount saved by vetoes, would it not be comparable to include a statement that Congress also "vetoed" about 19,000 bills in the 85th Congress?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the majority leader that Congress by

failing to act did not, of course, actually appropriate or spend that money; but I think it would be impossible to reach an actual figure on that item, because the committees did not act on many of those bills.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But would not that amount be just as relevant as the figures which the Senator cited?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No, I would not agree with that statement, because the figures I cited came from the budget. They are the actual amounts on which Congress acted. I would read again to the distinguished Senator five titles, because I want this to be absolutely clear:

Actions on appropriations. These are the figures which the distinguished Senator discussed when he spoke of the \$5,600 million cut.

Other congressional actions. Those are the actions which Congress actually took on bills which were signed.

Next, expenditures avoided by veto. This was the estimate of the cost to the Government of bills passed by Congress if the President had not vetoed them.

There is also the figure for actions affecting receipts; that is, what happened to bills relating to taxes.

That would make the net total of budgetary actions on Eisenhower recommendations a net increase of \$5,475 million. But if we include the action

on the Truman recommendations—a cut of \$12,065 million—this would leave a net cut in the budget, including everything, over the five Eisenhower budgets and the one Truman budget.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. One combination is a better way to put it, is it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. It was, however, a Truman budget.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As revised by President Eisenhower.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was revised by President Eisenhower and further revised by Congress. The table shows a net cut, for 6 years, of \$6,592 million. This is derived from an increase of \$5,400 million in the five Eisenhower budgets, offset by \$12 billion cut from the Truman budget.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If I may so presume from his statement, the Senator is saying that the Nation would be better off if Congress had never proposed to spend any money for any of the various programs to which he has referred. I hope he does not suggest by his statement that it would have been better if Congress had never met at all and never conceived any new ideas.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we were to go back and analyze our actions in the last 5 years, I am certain the RECORD will show that I voted for a number of the bills which Congress enacted. I would not be truthful if I said otherwise.

Mr. LONG. I hope the Senator is not suggesting that he, together with the rest of us, was in error when we did so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not suggesting anything about motives. I say that, in most cases, the actions which we took were thoroughly justified.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his statement.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am always captivated by the eloquence of my delightful friend and minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. One of my most stirring recollections is of an occasion 26 years ago, when the present minority leader made his maiden speech in the House of Representatives.

Then, again, I recall the very able, persuasive statement which the minority leader made when he nominated our beloved friend, the late Senator Robert A. Taft, at the Republican National Convention in 1952. In warm tones, the minority leader nominated Senator Taft and warned the people of the country against the error they would make by following the advice of the former Governor of New York, Mr. Dewey, and supporting the present President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower.

Today, I heard the minority leader defend the administration. He first admitted that every statement we have made with regard to the reductions which Congress has made in appropriations is correct. He then pulled in some authorizations, some vetoes, some bills which did not pass, some taxes which

were not levied, and some postal receipts which were not raised and came to the conclusion that, after all, the resulting figure was the fault of Congress.

Mr. President, that performance reminds me very much of a situation which developed in our hill country during the early days of the depression. A poor schoolteacher in search of a job applied to the hill country school board. The members of the board were rather impressed by his presentation. He was eloquent; generally, he was rather factual; he was impressive. So the members of the school board said to him, "Well, we think we would like to have you teach, and we would like to retain your services. But tell us this: There is some difference of opinion, in our community, about geography; and we want to know which side you are on. Do you teach that the world is round, or do you teach that the world is flat?"

The eloquent applicant responded immediately by saying, "I can teach it either way." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, notwithstanding everything that has been said here today, notwithstanding the stirring statement which has been made, the minority leader has demonstrated that he can "teach it either way."

First of all, the appropriations he outlined were reduced by the Congress. Second, in the case of the authorization bills which were passed—and which thus resulted in having appropriation items go in by the so-called "back door" method—every dollar spent under them was approved by the President, and most of them were voted for by the minority leader. So, Mr. President, I do not know who is trying to kid whom.

Mr. President, what have we done here? The Senator from Illinois has lumped together some items for ships and shoes and sealing wax and cabbages and kings, and then he has jumped into a pile of authorization bills, and has said, "This is how much money the Congress overspent the President's budget."

Well, Mr. President, I desire to warn the Foreign Relations Committee, which I trust will soon commence hearings on a very important matter, that it is likely to be faced with similar charges in the next few days. Last week the President sent to the Senate a message in which he made a request for an urgent supplemental item for the fiscal year 1959—even though the administration already has on hand for this purpose more than \$1 billion. Now the President says he must have immediate action, applicable to the fiscal year 1959, for an additional \$3,175 million of obligational authority for the International Bank. He has also requested, for the fiscal year 1959, an additional \$1,375 million of new obligational authority for estimated expenditures for the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. President, when that committee considers those items, I know it is going to consider them in the national interest, and it is going to do what it thinks it ought to do.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Does the Senator

from Texas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Is the Senator from Texas suggesting that the request for the International Bank would have any impact on this year's budget, or even on next year's budget?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, I am not. But I am suggesting that after we carry out the President's request, we may have to defend ourselves as we do today in the case of the Export-Import Bank against charges of having passed some authorization legislation; and we may have to defend ourselves against such accusations, coming from spokesmen of the President's own party, because we vote to carry out the President's own wishes. That is what I am suggesting.

Mr. BUSH. But the Senator from Texas agrees with me, does he not, that the recommendations in regard to the International Bank do not have any impact on this year's budget or on next year's budget?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agree; and I did not say they would have such an impact.

Mr. BUSH. I did not say the Senator from Texas said that. I merely say that I am sure the Senator from Texas knows that they do not affect the budget.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Connecticut sure?

Mr. BUSH. Yes; I am sure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Where will the \$3 billion-plus which the President has requested, come from?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, he is requesting obligational authority; and I think that is not a great deal different from a good deal of the obligational authority for which we have been criticized today by the minority leader.

All I wish to do is point out that when, at the request of the President, we vote to increase the authority of the Export-Import Bank or the authorizations for the Government's guarantees in various fields, Senators are likely to find themselves attacked, in a few weeks, for having voted to comply with the President's requests.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me ask the distinguished majority leader whether it is not true that the President asked that this item be placed in the 1959 budget.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And, of course, the 1959 budget has a deficit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It has.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Everyone recognizes that. Yet here is an item which ordinarily should have been included in the 1960 budget. But in an effort to balance the 1960 budget, it is proposed that this item be pushed back into the budget for the previous year, for which the officials know there is a deficit. In other words, if there is to be a \$13 bil-

lion deficit, a little more will not matter very much, so they seem to think. Furthermore, they seem to take the position that such an item will not have to be budgeted.

They condemn us for "bringing things in by the back door"; but in this case the President brings this item in by the back door, and attempts to slip it into last year's account. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to point out that in the supplemental budget message which has been received from the President, the Congress is requested to make an immediate appropriation. We are told that they cannot wait for the 1960 budget, but that they must have \$225 million at once for the Development Loan Fund, and that that amount will be added to the 1959 budget. They are asking for \$1 billion-plus to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for losses sustained from the sale of agricultural-commodity surpluses.

Of course, it is all right to ask Congress to appropriate \$1 billion-plus for this purpose, if someone down town can tell us how the administration is going to use the local currencies. By such means, local currencies will be "generated" and "warehoused," and the Government will have to "pay the rent" on the "warehouse," in much the same way that the Government is having to pay rent on the wheat that is placed in storage. Little attention is being paid to what is done with the local currencies; but everything that can be dumped into the budget for the fiscal year 1959—as the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has said—will go into that budget.

It does not seem to matter to this administration whether the deficit for the fiscal year 1959 amounts to \$12 billion, \$13 billion, \$15 billion, or \$20 billion. The administration's attitude seems to be that everything pertaining to the 1959 budget is old hat.

The administration seems to say, "We are going to be Simon pure budget-balancers for the fiscal year 1960! That is the only year that amounts to anything. Dump all these other items into the 1959 fiscal year budget. It shows a big deficit, anyway."

Strangely enough, Mr. President, fiscal year 1960 happens to end in a presidential election year, and is the last full year for which this administration will be accountable. So Mr. Eisenhower says, "Forget about the 1959 budget, but look out for the 1960 budget."

The administration will tell us how to rig the budget items so they will not have to be counted in the 1960 budget, and so the "cat will be put on the back" of the next President. The administration's advice to us seems to be, "Kill the country's progress; destroy the country's safety and security, if necessary; but keep our record on the 1960 budget crystal clear, because 1960 is an election year."

Mr. President, evidently that is the slogan of the Republican Party, and that is what all the shouting is about.

When the majority leader said that the President's budget is a political budget, that description is as accurate as anything could be; and that statement should be blazoned in neon light 11 feet high, so that all can see it clearly.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In just a moment, Mr. President.

I should like to point out what is happening here, today. The other day we had a preview of it in the Washington Post and Times Herald, which contained a statement to the effect that the Bureau of the Budget plans "to keep the box score," and is going "to keep the box score," so it will be able to "blow the whistle" on the Congress.

Well, Mr. President, I do not know about that; but certainly the Republican Party "blew" the last election. [Laughter.]

In the last campaign, spokesmen for the Republican Party charged various candidates with being Socialists and spenders. And when we stood them up one by one, the chairmen of the committees and the Members of Congress, and let the people look at them and see which ones were the "Socialists," the people gave their answer.

When we gave the people the box score on appropriations, what happened? Not a single member of the majority party who was a candidate for reelection failed to obtain approval of the people, and 15 Democratic Senators were elected; and the people got the Republican Party down just about as low as one can get it—I mean in numbers. [Laughter.] There is an election every 2 years. We have 98 Members of this body. That means 32 Members were up for election then. The Republicans now have 34 Members on their side of the aisle. So I think the people understood these charges. But in order that nobody can confuse the situation, I want to point out what the Senator from Illinois has done.

He has admitted the Congress reduced appropriations by \$22 billion. He does not deny it. But, he says, Congress makes some authorizations. I do not deny that. I am glad the Senator from Illinois has learned the legislative process. We do make authorizations.

Then he says, "Well, you went in some back door and had some Government guarantees." The Budget Bureau said it is like giving one's wife a budget, and then having the wife charge for food. It is not like that. It is like having money for food, and then signing a note. When we do that they say we "go in the back door," but we do not go in there alone. Who went in the back door with us? The same people who have made all the fuss about the back door today.

Here is the emergency housing bill. It was passed in a great emergency. What was the vote on it? Eighty-six to nothing. That was approved by the President, or it would not have been effective. That measure was voted for by every Member of this body.

The highway construction bill was another back door, but who was elbowing me trying to get in the back door? Why, the distinguished minority leader

himself, plus 82 of his colleagues. The vote was 84 to 4.

Where was the President? He signed on the dotted line, saying, "I approve." The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], did not approve.

I could go on for a good deal of the afternoon.

Here is one bill for the construction of superliners. I see my friend from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] present, who tries to economize on every action. I remember vividly his activities in connection with that bill. The vote was 41 to 18. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] voted "nay" on it. I think that was one of the vetoed items.

I have before me the rollcall on the Agricultural Act. The vote was 62 to 11. That was one of the bills referred to.

Here is the area redevelopment bill. The vote on that bill was 46 to 36. A good many Senators voted against that bill. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] voted against it, but not my beloved friend from Illinois. He was for it. He was in there at the back door. He must have felt like the preacher of the little country church. The church caught fire and he got to the door. All the brethren were shoving and trying to get out the door. The preacher said "The church has got just one door." [Laughter.] That is the way my friend must have felt—he was trying to get in the back door.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With reference to the last two bills the Senator mentioned, did the Senator from Massachusetts not vote in the negative? I believe I did vote in the negative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I certainly want to see that the Senator is accurately recorded. If the Senator believes he voted "nay" and wants the Record to show that, the Senator's word is all I need for it.

Let me refer now to the Housing Act of 1957, which has been talked about. That is another "back door" approach. We called the roll on that one. We ought to have more roll calls. I wish to announce that, so far as I am concerned, if the Senate will support me, I am going to ask for the yeas and nays on every appropriation bill this year. Do not tell me votes on appropriation bills count for nothing. We can see who votes for what.

On this housing bill, another back door approach, the vote was 69 to 1. That was the Housing Act of 1957. The one negative vote was by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

I desire to summarize very briefly by saying we have a great deal of confusion here. The minority leader admits the Congress has reduced the budget estimates on various bills by a total of \$22 billion over a period of 6 years. That has been confirmed by my friend from Massachusetts. He has stated there were also some vetoes. I was aware of the fact that there were some vetoes. There were 20,000 bills introduced in

Congress during the 85th Congress. Only 1200 became law, so about 19,000 of them were "vetoed" by the Congress, and a half dozen or so were vetoed by the President. It is enlightening to have it repeated, but it does not affect the appropriation situation one iota, because it was not what I was talking about.

Then the Senator from Illinois referred to the fact that we come in the "back door." That is true. All the money spent by the Government does not come through the Appropriations Committees. We have guarantees. We frequently make a profit on these guarantees. We have obligations. We frequently make a profit on those obligations. But legislation like the housing bill is what is popularly referred to as "a back-door approach." We have made those back-door approaches, but we have made them together. We have made them unanimously. We have made them with the President's approval. When we vote, in a good many instances—not in all of them—unanimously in this Chamber, I see no basis on which to criticize such action. As a matter of fact, I think the whole issue was set up in an attempt to confuse the situation.

It reminds me of the story former Vice President Barkley used to tell about the cuckoo clock a fellow had in the hills of Kentucky. Some of his neighbors wanted him to get rid of it because they did not think it was keeping good time. He said, "It keeps good time." He said, "When the hands point at 2 and the clock strikes 4, it is half past 6." [Laughter.] That is comparable to what the other side is trying to say about the reductions made by Congress in the appropriations.

The 85th Congress was a prudent Congress—not because we had a margin of two votes in it. It was prudent on the part of both sides. I have referred to the policy of that Congress as a prudent, progressive policy. Most of the appropriation bills were passed by unanimous votes, and those bills were signed by the President, indicating he approved the reductions we made. As a matter of fact, the President invited us to cut his budget estimate.

I think there is enough credit for all of us. I did not say anything about the Republican National Committee. I did not say anything about the Republican Party. They got themselves in this mess.

I have found that if one gives them enough time they will always get involved. That is what they have done now.

I have said that the Congress would look at each appropriation bill and would try to be prudent, and that is what we are going to do.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to make two comments with regard to what the Senator has said and also with regard to the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma, who has now left the Chamber.

My first comment is with regard to the reference the Senator from Texas made to the back-door procedure. Such a phrase is a little bit of an expression, that one does not go in the front door but goes in the back door.

Congress has a right to do all of the things which have been recounted, and has a duty to do all of these things, as the Senator pointed out to the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Massachusetts simply says that these congressional actions of the Senate and the House are actions of bodies having an obligation or a duty to do as they see fit with regard to these actions, even if it does increase the appropriations recommended by the President. We have to take that into consideration in deciding on our actions.

Furthermore, with regard to the 86 to 0 votes, it is necessary to concern ourselves with the amendments. The fights took place as to the amendments. When the amendments were lost, as they were lost in many instances, those of us who felt that some bill was better than no bill voted for the bill, yet in all instances we did not do so, as the Senator from Texas pointed out with respect to the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Massachusetts and other Senators.

What I should like to point out to my colleague from Texas is that what I should like to have him remark is not something as to a back-door operation, but something as to an overall operation which has to be considered in deciding what the Congress has done.

I should also like to make one observation to the Senator from Oklahoma. If a sound budget is a political budget and is a propaganda budget, then I am in favor of that kind of a budget.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, so long as the Senator from Massachusetts has brought up the question of a political budget, I think it should be said we ought to face up to the realities as they exist and not as the administration wishes them to be. The so-called balanced budget is based upon a recommendation by the President that postal rates on first-class mail be increased from 4 cents to 5 cents; that the Federal gasoline tax be increased by 1½ cents; and that the interest rates paid by the REA's be increased by 100 percent, from 2 percent to 4 percent. Only with those "ifs, ands, and buts" will it be a balanced budget of the type which the President desires.

I am a little bit surprised by the attitude of the Republican leader and some of his colleagues, who are taking the side of the administration against the Senate, of which they are Members, because there have been \$22 billion in reductions below what the President asked for, on an overall basis, during the past 6 years of his administration; 2 years when the Republicans were in control and 4 years when the Democrats were in control. We ought to be standing up shoulder to shoulder, instead of having the majority leader carry the burden for all of us, because this is what the Con-

gress has done, not what the administration has done. The record will speak for itself. It is about time that we stick together and brag about what Congress has done in the past 6 years, under both Democratic and Republican control. It is a record to be proud of instead of to be sniped at, such as we are observing. We ought to be standing up and boasting about what we did in this body.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana. I have no doubt that this discussion will be healthy so far as the budget is concerned, and so far as the appropriation bills which will soon be before the Senate are concerned.

I should like now to conclude my statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator continues, will he yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A few minutes ago the distinguished Senator from Texas was talking about some of the housing programs which are carried on under the obligatory authority, or outside the appropriations, at least, and it was stated that some of the programs had made a profit. I think it would be well to note at this time that housing, overall, has made a profit.

The FHA program, during the 20 years or so in which it has been operating, has accrued a net profit of nearly \$800 million; and the Federal National Mortgage Association during its time of operations, in providing a market for the mortgages, has made a profit of nearly \$300 million. In other words, those operations have made a profit of more than a billion dollars, and I am speaking only of the field of housing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator could include the REA program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the Senator from Montana would include the RFC. Of course, we have followed this same type of financing for all the programs. I have a table in my hand with regard to our housing programs, which shows how each one of the programs is financed, though I shall not take the time to read it all. Every single program financed outside of the direct appropriations has been approved—and most of the programs have been initiated—by the administration itself. That is the way the programs have been carried on. We know that is true with respect to many other programs.

I agree with what the Senator from Texas has said.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to comment on the remarks of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A great deal of what has been said today serves only to confuse the minds of the people of the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It will make the people critical of programs which both the present administration and preceding administrations have followed as perfectly good practices.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have asked the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to immediately proceed to consider the President's message and to conduct hearings which will probably result in this Government taking on additional obligations pursuant to the President's request. I hope we have not reached a time when we will be criticized because we comply with such requests.

I do not want to reflect on this "back door" approach. I think the administration did what was right when it recommended we take this approach in several instances. I think Congress did what was right when we took the approach without the recommendation of the administration.

In each instance, however, I would point out that every dollar spent was spent pursuant to the approval of the President, because we have not overridden a single veto. I think the Record should show that. All of these things the Senator is talking about—the oranges and apples and bananas, adding up to one grapefruit—were considered with the approval of the President of the United States. Most of those actions were taken by a unanimous vote or nearly a unanimous vote. With a few exceptions the actions were taken with the approval of the minority leader.

Mr. President, I am not going to apologize for that. I say we reduced appropriations in the Congress \$22 billion over a 6-year period. I am not here to say how much we authorized during that period, because we authorized much more than we appropriated. We authorized some things for which there will never be appropriations. I am not going to try to pull the wool over anybody's eyes.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Illinois says that the budget reflects what is taken in in the form of taxes and what goes out in the form of expenditures. I agree with that statement. If that is the case, why has the Senator lumped together authorizations which run for 10 years ahead, in some instances; expenditures which never did take place; tax increases which were never made; postal bills which were never passed; and legislation which was vetoed and never signed into law?

In common with my colleagues of both parties in the Senate, I have a desire to balance the budget. I have tried to put that desire into effect by cutting the appropriations, and we have been successful in doing so.

If the President determines that in his judgment the bills which we send to him from the Congress are unwise, then the President has the prerogative—yes, he has the duty—to veto such bills. The President could have exercised that prerogative as to any bill which the Senator mentioned.

The only thing I know that Congress can do about the budget is to operate on the appropriations requests. I believe if we go over each one of the requests line by line, and base our judgment on the facts which are developed, the ultimate result will satisfy the majority of the people of this country.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will permit, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Massachusetts so that the Senator may ask a question of the Senator from Alabama, without my losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask one question and to make one brief comment.

As I understand the figures provided by the Bureau of the Budget, with respect to the Emergency Housing Act of 1958, there are estimated expenditures of \$144 million for 1959 and of \$133 million for 1960. My question of the Senator from Alabama is: The receipts, I assume, go into the General Treasury, so they are not shown. Am I correct in that belief?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would be very much interested, for the sake of clearing the record and making it all-inclusive, to have the Senator from Alabama show what the receipts for 1959 were under that act, and the estimated receipts for 1960, if he has those figures.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I do not have them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have the President's original estimate of spending for 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959, the actual result of that spending, and the amount that was spent over what the President estimated would be spent.

For the fiscal year 1959, the President estimated that he would spend \$73,900 million. He actually spent \$80,900 million. He spent a total of \$7 billion over the estimate, notwithstanding the fact that during the fiscal year 1959 the Congress reduced his appropriations requests.

For the fiscal year 1958 the President estimated that he would spend \$71.8 billion. He spent \$71.9 billion, a difference of \$100 million.

For the fiscal year 1957 the President estimated that he would spend \$65.1 billion. He spent \$69.4 billion, an increase of \$4,300 million.

For the fiscal year 1956 the President estimated that he would spend \$62.4 billion. He spent \$66.5 billion, or an increase of \$4.1 billion.

On the basis of this record the American people are entitled to their doubts as to the validity of the precariously balanced 1960 budget to which the Senator from Montana referred.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator from Alabama can answer my question if he will place in the RECORD the figures to which I have referred.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, let me correct something which both the Senator and I said erroneously a few moments ago, namely, that the receipts would go into the Treasury. This money was made available to the Federal National Mortgage Association, and with it that Association bought mortgages. When

the mortgages are paid off, or when it sells the mortgages, the money comes to the Federal National Mortgage Association, which makes disposition of the funds. However, the program has been in operation for such a short time that I dare say there are no returns as yet.

The information which the Senator has may be subsequent to mine, but according to my information only \$95 million was spent up to December 31, 1958, out of \$1 billion. Much of that sum would have been committed, but not yet spent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The figures I have are estimated expenditures of \$144 million for the fiscal year 1959 and \$133 million for the fiscal year 1960. I wonder if the Senator knows how much came in, in the form of receipts, to offset those figures.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The receipts would be inconsequential so soon after the beginning of the program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the Senator from Massachusetts concluded his questions?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me make an observation. On page M-4 of the 1960 budget the figures for expenditures and receipts for the past 8 years are shown. While the Senator from Alabama was absent from the Chamber, I placed those figures in the RECORD, in the form of a statement to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I assume those are the same figures which the Senator from Texas was just reading.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know; but I am sure that the Senator from Massachusetts has been fair and accurate with whatever figures he has handled.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I try to be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Not only does the Senator try to be fair, but I am sure he is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to make this comment to my friend from Montana:

As I see it, in connection with any budget, the President has a right to estimate the revenues, the obligations, and the expenditures. Congress has the responsibility of raising taxes. If Congress does not see fit to do so, that is another matter. But I do not believe that such a budget request can be considered a political request. It may have political implications, but essentially it is sound practice to make estimates in an effort to keep a balanced budget.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has the President requested that tax increases be brought about?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Such a request would go to the House of Representatives. I am frank to say that I do not know as yet, but, from conversations I have heard, I assume that such requests will come in due course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think the President not only has the right to make estimates, but he has the duty to do so, and he carries out that duty. As a coequal branch of the Government, we have the right and duty to make our estimates.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is the judgment of many people that over a

period of time the administration has made grievous errors as to the amount it proposed to spend. In other words, it spends more than it estimates it will spend.

Some people seriously question the optimistic picture of revenue presented in this year's budget. I do not question anyone's motives or accuracy. I have not heard all the arguments pro and con, but let me cite an example. I now read excerpts from the testimony given before the House committee. I ask the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] to listen to the following excerpts from the testimony on this subject:

Mr. MAHON. The effect of it in this case is not to make any money or lose any money for the Government but to make the Government look better from a budgetary and fiscal standpoint, is that it?

Mr. STANS. I think I can answer you this way: The alternative, sir, is as you imply to show a deficit, to go out and finance a deficit by selling more bonds or raising taxes.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. MAHON a moment ago was asking you about FNMA. Are you not swapping some 4 and 4½ percent bonds for some 2 and 2½ percent bonds? Do you make a calculation for that difference in that interest, or is there any difference in interest?

Mr. STANS. There is a difference in interest rates. There is also a difference in the cost of servicing.

Mr. THOMAS. Who gets that difference in the interest rate, the buyer?

Mr. STANS. The owner.

Mr. THOMAS. And the Government loses it?

Mr. STANS. There will be a difference in the interest.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Government lose the difference in the two rates?

Mr. STANS. Yes, but it is also relieved from servicing the mortgages; is that not a fact?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, yes; by how much actually does the taxpayer lose in the deal? You have a Government guaranteed obligation. Of course, it does not necessarily mean to me that that obligation is ever going to cost the Government anything because most of those funds are repaid. I do not know that the FHA has ever cost the taxpayers a penny yet. Their outside liability is about \$20 billion, and I think their cash in bank is about \$650 million. After some 20 or 25 years that has not cost the taxpayers anything, so why give away that spread?

Mr. STANS. Mr. THOMAS, we are not giving away any spread because the alternative to this exchange is to issue new debts by the Federal Government and if the Federal Government issues long-term debt equal to the length of these mortgages, as of now it is paying at least 4 percent—

Mr. THOMAS. Most of FNMA's is 4½ and 5½.

Mr. STANS. Yes; and they have to be serviced and U.S. Government bonds do not have to be serviced.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right; but FNMA does not pay a full point and a half for servicing its bonds anyway.

Mr. STANS. I do not know what it costs to service them.

I think the RECORD should show that testimony.

I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if, as a result of that exchange, in his opinion the taxpayer will pay additional money.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand that transaction—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not familiar with it. All I know is what is

contained in this colloquy. That is the reason why I ask the Senator's judgment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand—and I am not sure I am correct—it is a question whether one would rather have a Government bond as such than to hold an FNMA mortgage, which may not be a very good mortgage.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? That is not the question at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There may be a difference in interest.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the question is not at all as the senior Senator from Massachusetts has stated it. The question the senior Senator from Texas has raised is whether this transaction is an actual budgetary saving to the U.S. Government, or an actual loss which is claimed as a saving.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What is the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GORE. It is an actual loss to the taxpayers. It is bookkeeping legerdemain to lay claim to a balanced budget in this way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Why does the Senator think it is done that way?

Mr. GORE. In order to claim that the budget is balanced. It is a phony claim to make. It is no more balanced than the President's budgets have been balanced for the past 3 fiscal years, including the budget for this fiscal year. The figures show that in the last 4 fiscal years, including the present one, the actual expenditures have been more than \$15 billion in excess of estimated budgetary expenditures.

The budget presented for the next fiscal year is no more balanced than is the budget for the present fiscal year, which was claimed to be balanced a year ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A year ago it was claimed to be balanced; is that correct?

Mr. GORE. Yes, I believe so. The senior Senator from Massachusetts stated that the budget has political implications. He further stated, a moment ago, that it was essentially sound if an attempt was made to balance the budget. No genuine attempt is made. The claim is made, instead. The proposed budget is not balanced. I doubt that any Member of the Senate would rise to the responsibility of saying that it is balanced. It will not be balanced 1 year from now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not intend to get into any argument on that point. I believe the President is sincere in representing the budget. He feels it is a balanced budget. What Congress will do with it ultimately, on receipts and expenditures, is the responsibility of Congress ultimately to submit back to the President. On the item referred to, that is a very technical item—

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First I should like to say that the item referred to is a very technical item. I believe that my answer was a reasonably correct answer, based on the information that has been furnished to me. I do not know whether

I answered it 100 percent correctly. I believe I answered it correctly, however.

Mr. GORE. I should like to inquire of the senior Senator from Massachusetts if he likewise believes that President Eisenhower was sincere in the presentation of his budget for fiscal year 1959.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I assume so. I do not know what the Senator has in mind specifically.

Mr. GORE. I question the accuracy of the estimates. While I do not question the sincerity of the President, I do question the accuracy of the estimates, or the accuracy of the people who gave the President the estimates. I am not sure how sincere they were.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We can always question that.

Mr. GORE. The record shows that there will be an estimated expenditure of \$7 billion more than the budget estimate of a year ago. I should like to ask the senior Senator from Massachusetts if he assumes that President Eisenhower was sincere in presenting the budget for 1958, for fiscal year 1957, and for fiscal year 1956.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course I do.

Mr. GORE. I take it that he so assumes. The fact is that the Presidential budget has not been balanced in any of the 4 years, and the budget for the next fiscal year is, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, no more balanced or as nearly balanced as the budget in any of the preceding 4 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to make one further comment. Of course the estimates are never the same as the figures actually come out. Sometimes the estimates are more and sometimes they are less. Sometimes the expenditures are more and sometimes they are less. The estimates are made, as a general rule, and the figures are submitted, somewhere between 12 and 18 months prior to the time Congress acts.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Furthermore, I should like to say to the senior Senator from Massachusetts that if Congress had appropriated the amounts requested by the President, the unbalance to which I have referred, would have been greater.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not believe that is the full statement. If we had appropriated the full amounts, we would have appropriated, in the five Eisenhower budgets, \$10,600 million more, but Congress added \$11,500 million.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In what form?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the form of congressional action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In bookkeeping financing, in bills vetoed, and all the other things. By adding all of them together we get an Amos and Andy figure. That only confuses the Senate and the country. Congress did not appropriate \$10 billion more. It actually reduced appropriations by \$10 billion. There have been added some authorizations, some pledges, and some vetoes. The point I make is that I do not believe we have a true and accurate picture of how much money was spent and that the Government will owe.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The figures which the Senator from Texas has brought out and the figures that I have brought out show the picture. I can get those figures again, if it is necessary to do so.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has included authorizations. There are authorizations in effect for over 100 years for which not one dime has been expended. An authorization does not make an expenditure. I referred to actual appropriations. Neither do authorizations make appropriations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And appropriations do not make expenditures.

Mr. GORE. The statement I made was that if Congress had actually appropriated the total amount requested by President Eisenhower, the deficits would have been greater.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They would have been increased by \$5 billion.

Mr. GORE. Yes.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to go back to the statement with respect to the FNMA mortgages in the amount of \$350 million—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. \$335 million, I believe.

Mr. BUSH. What is the figure?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. \$335 million.

Mr. BUSH. The \$335 million, which the Senator said is being labeled for sale in order to balance the budget. I should like to say to the Senator—because those mortgages were paid for with taxpayers' money—if they are sold, there is no other place where they can be credited, but in the same account to which they were charged originally.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood that they were swapped for Government bonds.

Mr. BUSH. It would be a good thing for this country if the Treasury were able to sell a good many more of those bonds. We have approximately \$5,400 million tied up right now, in taxpayers' money, in those mortgages. It seems to me that a move to liquidate some of them is a very sensible thing to do. There is no other place where we can credit the income from those mortgages except in the place from which they were paid.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I welcome and respect the opinion of such an authority in this field as the able Senator from Connecticut.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I merely refer the Senator to the exchange which occurred in the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations between that committee and the Budget Director, in which it was stated that we were trading 2½ percent for 4½ percent, and that the 2-percent difference was going to cost the taxpayers some money. I did not testify to that effect. The Director of the Budget evidently is willing to admit that it will cost money, but that we ought to allow him something for servicing the mortgages. The question was asked: "Will the Government lose the difference in the two rates?" The answer was "Yes."

I do not know who will benefit from it. Mr. BUSH. I do not believe it is very beneficial to the taxpayers—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When a loss of 2 percent is sustained in an operation, maybe it will be beneficial to the bankers.

Mr. BUSH. I do not believe it is beneficial to the taxpayers to build up a surplus in mortgages to the extent of over \$5 billion, any more than it is beneficial to build up farm products to the extent of eight or nine billion dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator may be correct.

Mr. BUSH. I do not believe the administration should be condemned for trying to get rid of some mortgages and crediting something to the taxpayers, for a change.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not condemning anyone. I do not believe in condemnations. I do not want to condemn anyone. I am merely reciting the colloquy in the House Committee on Appropriations which shows that the Government was losing 2½ percent, and that the difference between 2½ and 4½ or 5 percent can be as much as 2 or 2½ percent. I was reciting the Budget Director's testimony, and I am glad to have the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts and also the opinion of my cherished friend from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not wish to get into the argument as to who killed Cock Robin. I am sure a great many people feel that neither political party has strained any muscles in cutting Government expenditures.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the Senator is right. I agree with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understood the Senator from Tennessee to make the statement that there has not been a balanced budget in 5 or 6 years.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I made no such statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Anyway, to keep the record straight what did you say?

Mr. GORE. Let us keep it straight. Just what did I say?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator will wait just a moment I will tell him since he has forgotten.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Delaware says he wants to keep the Record straight.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understood the Senator from Tennessee to say that there was not a balanced budget in 1956, 1957, or 1958.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the budget was balanced in 1956 and 1957.

Mr. GORE. I was referring to expenditures.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is what I am referring to. The expenditures in 1956 and 1957 were less than the receipts. The budget was balanced. That is what I am trying to straighten out.

Mr. GORE. I was referring to the Presidential estimates—the budgetary estimates of expenditures.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We have learned long ago that budgets are not balanced by estimates made either by the President or by the Congress.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Delaware has taken a different cue. We were talking about budgets presented by the President of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am speaking of actual expenditures as they are related to our income.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas further yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the real answer to this question is not which political party voted for the most cuts or which political party talks the loudest. Actually, the question is which political party lived within its income by spending less than the amount of revenue.

Going back to 1900, there have been only 25 times when either political party has lived within the income of the U.S. Government. In the other 34 years, the Government has lived beyond its income. During this period there were only 11 times that the Republican Party operated our Government at a deficit, whereas the Democrat Party operated at a deficit in 23 of the 26 years.

In 22 years the Republican Party operated with a surplus. That does not take into consideration the estimated deficit of from \$10 billion to \$12 billion this year for which the actual figures are not as yet available.

On the other hand, the Democratic Party, which has had control of the Government for 26 years since 1900, has lived within its income but 3 years out of the 26. In arriving at the 26-year figure for Democratic control, I charged the 80th Congress to the Republican Party since President Truman disclaimed all responsibility.

The total shows that in 26 years the Democratic Party's deficits amounted to over \$268 billion. Their surpluses in 3 years amounted to \$3,800 million, leaving a net deficit of \$265 billion. That is the amount which the Democratic Party spent over and above what it took in during their 26-year tenure in office.

On the other hand, in the years when the Republican Party was in control of the Government—33 years—in 11 years we had a deficit of \$22,900 million. In the 22 years in which we had surpluses, we took in \$20,800 million more than we spent. Therefore, our net deficit for the 33 years is a little over \$2 billion. That does not include this year's deficit, which could bring the amount up to near \$15 billion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a table showing the complete record of both Republican and Democratic Parties.

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

Year	Republican		Democrat		Year	Republican		Democrat	
	Deficit	Surplus	Deficit	Surplus		Deficit	Surplus	Deficit	Surplus
1900		\$46,380,005			1931	\$461,877,080			
1901		63,068,413			1932	2,735,289,708			
1902		77,243,984			1933			\$2,601,652,085	
1903		44,874,595			1934			3,629,631,943	
1904	\$42,572,815				1935			2,791,052,100	
1905	23,004,229				1936			4,424,549,230	
1906		24,782,168			1937			2,777,420,714	
1907		86,731,544			1938			1,176,616,598	
1908	57,334,413				1939			3,862,158,040	
1909	80,423,387				1940			3,918,019,161	
1910	18,105,350				1941			6,159,272,358	
1911		10,631,399			1942			21,490,242,732	
1912		2,727,870			1943			57,420,430,365	
1913			\$400,733		1944			51,423,302,541	
1914			408,264		1945			53,940,916,126	
1915			62,675,975		1946			20,676,170,609	
1916				\$48,478,346	1947	\$753,787,660			
1917			853,356,956		1948	8,419,469,844			
1918			9,032,119,606		1949			1,811,440,048	
1919			13,362,622,819		1950			3,122,102,357	
1920				291,221,548	1951				\$3,509,782,624
1921		509,005,271			1952			4,016,640,378	
1922		736,496,251			1953	9,449,213,457			
1923		712,507,952			1954	3,116,966,256			
1924		963,366,737			1955	4,180,228,921			
1925		717,043,353			1956		1,625,553,403		
1926		895,143,867			1957		1,595,671,550		
1927		1,155,364,766			1958	2,819,000,000			
1928		939,083,301			Total	22,993,015,616	20,820,897,490	268,553,291,738	3,849,482,518
1929		734,390,739							
1930		737,672,818							

¹ Republican 80th Cong. President Truman disclaimed all responsibility.

Source: 1957 Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, pp. 336-339.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as the Senator from Texas himself has said, I do not think it makes any difference which political party talks the loudest about cutting the budget. It is what is actually done by a party when in power that counts. The record shows that in the last 26 years when it was in power, the Democratic Party spent \$265 billion more than it took in.

That startling fact stands unchallenged.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has demonstrated how partisanship can be brought into the debate. I have no objection. If the Senator wants to go back to 1900, or even to 1800, that is all right with me. I have never maintained that the Republican Party was not concerned with dollars. I think they are. I have never indicted the Republican Party for creating a deficit by themselves, or for creating a surplus.

I have said that Congress as an institution, over a period of 6 years, has reduced the amounts in appropriation bills. I have expressed the hope that we will do the same thing in the year ahead of us.

If anyone wishes to go back to 1900, he is perfectly willing to do so. He can go back and discuss McKinley and high-button shoes and many other things which happened in those days. He can even talk about Eugene Debs. But I am not interested in getting into that kind of discussion.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I heard the Senator from Texas tell the story of my former colleague, the late Vice President Barkley, about the cuckoo clock. I must say, with all deference to my late friend, and the friend of all of us, that I am certain no one in my State could ever be so confused, except, perhaps, by today's debate in the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, he has repeated the point I attempted to make, namely, that I thought a good deal of confusion would result from dragging in the cuts in authorizations, the vetoes, the amounts which might have been introduced, and the amounts which were introduced. I think that was the purpose of it.

Mr. COOPER. I think that anyone who has heard the debate or who will read the RECORD will know that it is a political debate and will look upon it with suspicion.

Perhaps my suggestion may seem elementary. I believe the debate can be resolved by determining the recommendations which the President made both for obligatory authority and actual expenditures; and the action the Congress took in both fields, and then see what the result is. That is my comment on budget debate in past years.

Now I direct my remarks to the present. I do so because we are dealing with today's issues and because I believe the majority leader is a man of responsibility and a patriot.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

CV—149

Mr. COOPER. The President has submitted a budget of \$77 billion. Some of those on the other side of the aisle have said today that, if it is not political, it is unrealistic. What they are saying is that the budget will not be balanced, even if all the President's recommendations shall be accepted. That is what they are saying.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I do not know of anyone on this side of the aisle who has said that.

Mr. COOPER. I do not say that the majority leader said it. But the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] suggested it, as did the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. If what they say is true—that it cannot be balanced—then it calls for even greater responsibility upon the part of Congress. I must say that the responsibility will devolve chiefly upon the majority, because the Democratic Party is in power.

During the debate upon the two bills upon which the Senate voted recently, amendments were offered, the housing and the airport bill, on our side, but they had no chance against the majority side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Kentucky was a Member of the Senate in the 1st session of the 85th Congress. Does he not recall that there was a yea-and-nay vote on every appropriation bill in that session, and that, with very few exceptions, the votes were unanimous?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I am speaking of today and I am saying that the Democratic Party is in power, and responsibility falls on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let us live up to our responsibility. The Senator's party needs advice. If he would simply confine his advice to the Members of his own party—

Mr. COOPER. I am speaking to the Senator from Texas, because I believe he is a man of responsibility. When the housing bill was before the Senate, the Senator from Texas himself urged a reduction in expenditures proposed in the bill. He said he believed the amounts in the bill could be reduced. I think that was a proper exercise of responsibility.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator will recall that in the 85th Congress that was done time and time again on practically every bill.

Mr. COOPER. A few days ago, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] made an excellent speech, one which has been noted in the country, upon the tremendous problem and possible danger which the United States is facing in regard to Berlin. That brings up the question of defense. The Senator from Texas has been laboring hard in the vineyard to find out what we should do about defense—whether the funds proposed in the budget are sufficient.

I suggest to the Senator from Texas that before we launch into all other kinds of expenditures for things which we may desire, but may be able to postpone, that we decide what we need for defense.

Since the Senator from Texas is a responsible man, I ask him in all sincerity, Why would it not be possible for him to

bring before the Senate the primary issue—what we need in the field of defense? Then we will be able to decide whether we can have all the other things, too, that are being proposed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the Senator has asked a very good question.

Mr. COOPER. I hope the Senator will take this action. All of us would feel more responsible and responsibility could be fixed on our parties, if we knew what the necessities of the country in defense were, and had made fast provision for defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is a very constructive suggestion. The Senator from Kentucky is always constructive, as I have observed through the years.

The appropriate committees of the Senate have been conducting hearings in an attempt to ascertain the facts and to ascertain what is needed. They have heard from the highest authorities in the executive branch of the Government. The Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee has been holding hearings, day in and day out, in an attempt to determine whether the President's budget for the Defense Department should be increased or should be reduced. I am sure that committee will make a report as early as possible, consistent with obtaining all the facts.

We have had a series of hearings, both morning and afternoon, at which we have heard from almost everyone concerned, beginning with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and those who represent the Space Agency.

Tomorrow morning the Space Committee will hold a meeting, at which it will appoint subcommittees to go into all the authorization requests the administration has made.

So I will say to the Senator that since this is early in February, I cannot give him any definite date. But, judging by my experience, at this time we are further along with the studies of this type, in this field, than we normally are; and I am encouraged by the fact—and, as the Senator from Kentucky knows, the Senate must wait for the House of Representatives to act first on appropriation matters—that Secretary McElroy or some of his agents had published in the newspapers, the other day, a story about the number of hours he had testified before congressional committees; and I observed that a considerable part of that time was before the Appropriations Committees.

So I hope we shall be able to comply in spirit, at least, with the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In order to set the record straight—as the senior Senator from Delaware said he wished to do—let me state that what I was referring to was, not the expenditure budget, but the actual outgo, as compared with the President's estimates. I shall be glad again to read the figures into the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is no dispute about them.

Mr. GORE. There seems to have been some dispute.

For the fiscal year 1956, the President's original estimate amounted to \$62,400 million. The actual result was, not \$62,400 million, or any lesser amount, but, rather, \$66,500 million, or an increase of \$4,100 million over the estimate.

For the fiscal year 1957, the President's original estimate was \$65,100 million. The actual result again was, not a lesser amount, but a larger one—namely, \$69,400 million, or \$4,300 million over the estimate.

For the fiscal year 1958 the President's original estimate was \$71,800 million. Again, the actual result was an increase—this time, a small increase of \$100 million.

For the present fiscal year, the President's original estimate was \$73,900 million. The latest figures show the actual result to be \$80,900 million. But according to the estimates of the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], when the fiscal year closes there will be a deficit of approximately \$12 billion or \$13 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not disputing those figures, Mr. President. The Senator placed them in the RECORD the other day; and I said then that I thought those figures were correct. I did not question them. I said I recognized that the Congress had cut some of the appropriation items. But I understood the Senator from Tennessee to say the budget had not been balanced.

Of course, in balancing the budget, the items of income are placed in juxtaposition to the items of expenditure. But that has nothing to do with authorizations. The expenditures show the amounts spent this year, as a result of authorizations made, whether made last year or the year before that or as long as 10 years ago.

I was not taking exception to the figures the Senator placed in the RECORD. I understood him to say at the time that the budget was not balanced during those 3 or 4 years. I said that if the Senator made that statement, he was in error.

On the other hand, we are in complete agreement as to the figures he submitted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think the two Senators have misunderstood each other.

Mr. GORE. Then I wish to correct the RECORD by saying that evidently I misunderstood the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have said that several times.

But again I say the RECORD shows that the budget was balanced 2 years before.

I say that we shall have a deficit this year.

I repeat that I think Senators on both sides of the aisle can, if they wish, do a great deal of boasting about who was responsible for one appropriation item or another; but the fact is that both sides could have done better if they had tried; and I think the American people

wish we had, because during the past number of years the deficit has been built up to \$280 billion, as the result of the expenditures the Congress has made.

It is unfortunate that there were any deficits at all. However, I repeat that during the 33 years of Republican administrations, there were deficits in only 11 years; whereas during the 26 years of Democratic administrations, there were deficits in 23 years.

However, Mr. President, talk will not get us anywhere. Instead of talking, let us cut down this budget, so the Government will be able to live within its income.

I do not think there is anything sacred about a Presidential budget which is sent to the Congress. I believe the Government must live within its income, regardless of the political-party allegiance of the President who sends the budget to the Congress.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield. In fact, Mr. President, I should like to yield the floor. However, at this time I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. A few minutes ago our friend referred to the \$335 million of Federal National Mortgage Association mortgages; and the Senator from Connecticut undertook to speak about the status of that item.

Inasmuch as I have been joined by the Senator from Tennessee in suggesting that the President's budget for the fiscal year 1960 was not actually balanced in accordance with good accounting procedure, I should like to make this brief statement for the RECORD: The \$335 million of Federal National Mortgage Association mortgages is a capital asset of the Government which, if held to maturity, will be paid off in full. In order to obtain revenue sufficient to show a balanced budget, it is proposed that those mortgages be sold—probably at a discount. The Government will lose if it sells them; and it is not good accounting procedure to sell a capital asset in order to balance an operating budget. I think that is as plain as the nose on one's face.

I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his statement.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude—and then I shall yield the floor—by saying that I think the debate today has been a very helpful one. I believe the Senate has been informed, and I believe the country will be informed.

I listened with great interest to what was said by my friend, the Senator from Illinois, who always is polite and courteous and thorough. The only objection I have to his statement is that he included authorizations and a number of vetoed items and other matters which were not included in my original statement.

I am glad we still can disagree on matters, even including the budget, without being disagreeable. I have enjoyed the discussion.

Mr. President, at this time I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before turning to the few matters which I shall discuss briefly, I desire to make a brief comment on the debate had this afternoon on the issue of balancing the budget. At every opportunity that I have to make this comment, I shall make it, in the hope that perhaps eventually some heed will be given to the recommendations of those in this country who I think are unquestionably our greatest experts on budgets. I mentioned them briefly the other day. I refer to the recommendations of the great industrialists of this country who are members of the Committee for Economic Development—most of them Republicans.

I am always surprised when I listen to my Republican colleagues in the Senate talk about the budget issue; for from their side of the aisle we get no comment about a capital budget. One would think that those Republicans in the Senate who are so concerned about this issue of a balanced budget would have joined some of us on this side of the aisle in support of a capital budget bill which would present the information to the American people about national facts.

The arguments by way of subjectivity that were heard on the Republican side of the aisle today are rather surprising. If anybody questions the President on anything, one or two of my Republican colleagues jump up and talk about the President's sincerity. Well, that is a very subjective term. I like to talk about his judgment or lack of it; and it is his lack of judgment on many issues which ought to be considered the basis for fair debate in the Senate.

PRESIDENT SHOULD STUDY UP ON CAPITAL BUDGETING

On the budget issue, the President is again showing his gross lack of information or understanding. If he had some understanding of the budget problem, we would hear something from him that would present the facts about expenditures to the American people, which it is necessary to do when we talk about a capital budget.

Sometimes I wonder whether the President knows the difference between a capital budget and the kind of budget he recommends to the Congress. I sometimes wonder if he knows that American industry and business is conducted on the basis of a capital budget, and not on the kind of budget that he is talking about balancing, one which lumps together administrative costs of Government and capital investments. The fact that business uses a capital budget should impress the President with the idea that it may have some virtues for the Nation, too.

I am at a complete loss to understand why my Republican friends, particularly my good friend from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is now present in the Chamber, and who is one of the great authorities here in the Senate on all fiscal matters, does not support a capital budget. He knows whereof I speak when I point out that the Committee on Economic Development, which is composed of great financiers, industrialists, and businessmen of this country, are dead right when they recommend, as they

have since 1947, the setting up of a capital budget, which would present to the American people for the first time the facts about the fiscal condition of Uncle Sam.

When one takes into account the expenditures by the American people for capital investment—the revenue-producing, profitmaking capital investments of the Federal Government—which should never be carried as a part of the operating expense budget, then it becomes clear to the American people that all this talk about balancing a budget is empty politics—just empty politics.

Mr. President, I have no intention of voting, under the catchy label of "a balanced budget," against investing Federal funds in capital improvements necessary to promote the economic welfare of the American people. When we invest in such projects, we are not unbalancing a true budget. When we sit in this session of the Senate, as I hope we shall, and vote to override the President of the United States in his "knifing" of some needed capital investments so essential to improve the economic welfare of our people, we shall be strengthening the fiscal condition of this Government, and not weakening it. I shall soon have my capital budget bill ready again; it is now being perfected by fiscal experts. When I reintroduce it again in the not too distant future, Mr. President, I shall be presenting a proposal for a budget which will strengthen the fiscal condition of this country. I will not be joining with the President of the United States, but I will be voting against him, as he attempts to postpone appropriations for the needed developments in our country which are so essential if we are going to maintain a strong economy.

It is difficult to understand a President of the United States who thinks, for example, that we are helping the fiscal condition of this country by making recommendations which will hold back further the development of the energy resources of America. This civilization of ours is going to climb on the energy we produce, not on the energy Dwight D. Eisenhower prevents us from producing. Our civilization is going to climb on an expanding economy. We are not going to feed any flames of inflation, Mr. President, by appropriations of that type.

I will tell Senators what is likely to happen to us. If we follow the fiscal recommendations of the President of the United States, unemployment is going to increase again, because we are already beginning to see that in connection with a subject matter I shall discuss shortly. We are a long way from solving the problems of the recession.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon a question concerning a statement he has made regarding the preparation of a bill in the form of a capital budget. I have read, not only recently, but for many years, the very strong position taken by the distinguished Senator from Oregon

about the capital budget theory. It is a very appealing matter to the junior Senator from Colorado.

As I listened to this very learned discussion, I wondered whether it would be possible to translate the President's present budget into a capital budget, to give us an idea of what would be involved.

Mr. MORSE. It would be easy to do so, and we will do it when the bill is presented and when we present the argument in support of the bill. We can take from the President's budget the capital investment items, putting on those items the capital investment label. The President now includes those items in his combined budget, carrying them as operating costs. When we consider the capital investments, we can easily see that Uncle Sam's budget is in fact not out of balance. This is a matter of definition, as to whether the budget is balanced or whether the budget is not balanced.

What do we mean when we say "balanced"? Do we mean we should include the cost of Grand Coulee as an operating expense, and have a balanced budget, or that we should take out those expenditures that will be repaid and set them aside in a capital investment budget, when we are considering a balanced or unbalanced budget?

Some of this is nonsense. The fact is that the President has added up two columns of figures, and he is frightening the American people into believing that because those columns do not come out even, as the Congress has been appropriating the money, we have an unbalanced budget. The President knows the average citizen is not going to put to himself questions dealing with such abstractions as "Well, what is included in the budget? Does the budget include capital, revenue-producing investments?"

The answer is "Yes."

When one looks at the budget from that the standpoint instead of using the President's major thesis, then the budget looks quite different. When one takes out the capital investments and looks at them as revenue-producing assets, as wealth belonging to the American people, the budget does not look bad at all, in terms of "balance." It would look bad, however, in that it provides so little for capital investments, compared to what is needed.

I was interested in the remarks made this afternoon by the Senator from Connecticut about the FHA mortgages. The Senator said that, after all, those were taxpayers' dollars which were invested in the mortgages. Those are not lost dollars. We have not burned up the greenbacks which went into those mortgages. Those mortgages are wealth belonging to all the American people. Why do we talk about those things as though they were liabilities?

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator, then, would distinguish between those appropriations and that type of Government money which is spent, for example, for the military for items which may become

obsolete, and that type of Government money which is spent to increase the wealth of the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to reduce it to a very simple example. Let the RECORD show that I do not carry this argument by analogy too far, but it will illustrate my point.

Let us consider as an example the household budget of the Senator from Colorado. Let us assume that when the Senator makes his annual bookkeeping account he finds that he has a vacant lot in Boulder, Colo.; that he has \$10,000 in bonds in a safety deposit box in a Denver bank; and that he has a farm in southeast Colorado. How would the Senator include those items on his books? He would include them as capital investment assets. That is what the FHA mortgages are, so far as Uncle Sam's books are concerned. That is what Grand Coulee, Bonneville, McNary, and all the other great dams are.

We ought to consider these items as separate and distinct items. That is what the Committee for Economic Development has been telling us ever since 1947, in its proposal for a capital budget. That is what the first Hoover Commission told us to do. We ought to consider these things separately from the problem of balancing administrative costs of the Government against income. It is that simple, and every corporation in America does it. But the Federal Government does not.

This practice is not limited to the Republican administration. I was pleading for a capital budget when we had a Democratic administration.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield further.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to ask another question for information, because I think this can be developed into a very interesting discussion. I asked if we could have a capital investment budget on a comparative basis with the President's budget, because I read in the RECORD the other day, I believe, that many municipalities have capital investment budgets.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] pointed out in our colloquy the other day, that the Federal Government has not done nearly so well as many cities in this country in the setting up of business-like budgets. When one considers the budget account of a city one gets a much more—I was about to say "honest" but I will say "accurate"—accurate presentation of the fiscal facts than one gets from the Federal budget. All I am requesting, in urging the adoption of a capital budget, is that we set up our budget in a form so that the American people will really see, when they take a look at the budget, what are the assets and what are the liabilities.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to continue searching for information, because I have followed the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon on this matter for many years.

Why would the Democrats not adopt such a system? What is the reason both

administrations have failed to follow the recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development?

Mr. MORSE. I cannot give the Senator the reason. I do not know the reason. I will give the Senator my surmise.

In the administration of the Federal Government we are creatures of habit. It is very difficult to change old habits. We have done our national budgeting this way so long that there does not seem to be very much interest in changing it. I think the Senator observes the same is true with regard to many things connected with the operation of the Senate. Can the Senator give me any reason for a lot of rules which we have and under which we keep operating? We are creatures of habit about these things.

Could anyone really justify the meeting hours of the Senate before the Committee on Rules and Administration? Can they possibly be justified on the basis of efficiency? We begin our sessions at 12 o'clock noon with half a dozen Senators present. During the next 2 hours we eat in relays. There is no orderly, businesslike procedure for transacting the business of the Senate. We like to think there is. If we were to bring in some high school seniors as judges, we would flunk the test of efficiency in Senate procedure.

For many years I have proposed that in the early part of each session the Senate should begin its sessions from Monday to Thursday at 9 o'clock a.m., continuing until 12:30, with a recess, resuming at 2 o'clock and continuing until 5. I have advocated a rule of germaneness during those hours. Beginning at 5 o'clock we could do our so-called chore work and discuss any item other than the business before the Senate.

Let any Senator make that proposal, and see how many votes he gets. Yet that is the only common sense, orderly procedure for any parliamentary body.

People sit in the galleries and cannot understand the slipshod, inefficient manner in which the Senate conducts its business. It is wasteful. I cannot explain why the Senate does so, except that we are creatures of habit and historic tradition, but that is not efficiency. I make the same explanation as to why for years, Democratic and Republican administrations alike have not followed the recommendations of the experts on budget making.

Mr. CARROLL. Have not the Treasury Department and the other agencies of Government heard of the requests from the Committee for Economic Development? Has any administration, Democratic or Republican, ever given reasons for not following this sensible system of budgeting?

Mr. MORSE. The nearest approach we have made has been recommendations for study.

Mr. CARROLL. And that study has been in progress over 10 years, has it not?

Mr. MORSE. The Committee for Economic Development completed its study several years ago. So did the first Hoover Commission. I think we should act on the recommendations.

Mr. CARROLL. Is that committee still in existence?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. Of course it works on a great many other problems.

Mr. CARROLL. Do the recommendations still stand?

Mr. MORSE. The first such proposal was made in 1947, when Paul Hoffman was Chairman. I brought the recommendations to the floor of the Senate in 1947 and offered them. That was one of the recommendations.

In my judgment the Committee for Economic Development has done a magnificent job in the field of taxation over the years. I believe the tax reports of the Committee for Economic Development are among the best that have been made available to us. We did not follow many of the Committee's recommendations.

I believe the Committee for Economic Development was very helpful to the Hoover Commission, in bringing about the adoption of some of its recommendations.

It is my hope that my bill and my speech on the capital budget will be ready in about 2 weeks. I shall give the Senator advance notice, because I should like to have him present during the discussion. Knowing him as I do, I shall be very much surprised if I do not find him among my partners in the endeavor to have this recommendation adopted.

Mr. CARROLL. I shall follow the subject with a great deal of attention. I know that we need some constructive thinking in this field, and I hope we can effectuate a change. I believe it would be in the public interest.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I now turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

MINIMUM WAGE AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join with my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in cosponsoring the legislation he has introduced which will make certain amendments and improvements to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. In doing so, it is my profound hope that under his leadership this long overdue measure, so desperately needed, will at last become law.

It is not the first time I have advocated such changes which I deem to be so necessary for the well-being of the lowest paid American citizens and for the stability and health of our national economy. Both in 1958 and in 1957 I joined with other of my distinguished colleagues in introducing such legislation. Last year, in a speech before this body on May 1, I noted that we were confronted with two inescapable facts—a major recession and an unimaginative leadership. We are today confronted with no appreciable improvement in either of these two conditions. The financial pages of our newspapers have only recently described the slowness with which the Nation's economy is recover-

ing from its low point of last year. In many States, large numbers of unemployed remain as a challenge to the ingenuity of our free economic system and illustrate a tragic waste of human resources.

As I said last year, the President's program is limited to a plea for salesmen to sell harder and for the consumers to buy what they cannot afford. In its plea for a so-called balanced budget without regard to consequences, the administration has gone even further than before in its failure to supply leadership in the midst of what continues to be, for multitudes of people, a serious recession.

One way to speed our recovery is to build up the purchasing power of the consumer. Confidence, not only to the consumer, but also for the businessman, large and small, depends upon such restored purchasing power. This calls for immediate action—not McKinley economic policy.

Whenever we fail to guarantee the worker a minimum wage, we risk the possibility of denying him the necessary purchasing power to satisfy his own needs, and those of the economy. By permitting employers the opportunity to pay substandard wages we encourage them, in fact, to do so. By paying substandard wages, the employer weakens the ability of his employee to buy his neighbors goods and services, to pay for better schools, to acquire living space so that his family may grow up in human dignity. Not only is the employee unable to meet a minimum standard of living, but in turn, his neighbor, from whom he buys, becomes unable to purchase. Thus, the vicious cycle of depression starts and runs its course. Once a recession gets underway, great pressure is placed upon the employer to lower his wages. Shrinking markets mean layoffs and reduced wages for employees.

To meet these conditions, the legislation which we introduce today establishes a floor below which the free run of economic forces is unable to force the further exploitation of low-wage workers. The more people are covered by minimum wage laws, the less is the temptation and the necessity for lower rates.

Perhaps even more important than the raising of the present minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.25 is the necessity to extend minimum wage coverage to large numbers of hitherto exempt wage earners. It strikes me just as unbelievable as it did last year, that more than a million retail and service workers make less than a dollar an hour. Indeed, that a hundred thousand of them make less than 75 cents an hour is astounding. I wonder how many of us, or indeed anybody we know of, could support a family, indeed even one person, on such remuneration.

Senator KENNEDY has made note of the fact that we will come to grips with the problems facing agricultural employees in separate bills. The farm labor problem, as he says, presents many special complexities but, nonetheless, it

is our determined intention to press forward with legislation in aid of the farm employee with as much sense of urgency as that which we will expend in behalf of the bill we are introducing today.

MIGRANT WORKERS NEED ATTENTION

I digress to say that while sitting here chatting with my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], we were talking about the need for special legislation to come to grips with the agricultural employee problem, particularly the problem of the migrant worker. Some of us attended the meeting at the Mayflower Hotel the other night, and listened to a discussion of the migrant workers' problem. Conditions are so sad and shocking that I am satisfied that if we could get the facts out to the farm population of the country, we would find a resounding rejection of any idea that such conditions should be permitted to continue.

Of course what is actually happening is that we are asking the migrant workers to be the contributors to a subsidy by working for less than a decent wage, and living, in many areas, under living conditions which are so deplorable that they can be characterized only as truly un-American.

Therefore I believe the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] hit the nail on the head when, in conversation with me this afternoon—and I am sure he will not object to my saying it on the floor—he said that at one time, when he was a Member of the House, he suggested we ought to have some legislation which would guarantee at least 90 percent of the minimum wage being paid in every area of agriculture where there was an advocacy of 90 percent of parity.

He could not have stated the matter more clearly. Of course I am in favor of 100 percent of parity so far as the application of the minimum wage is concerned. I know of no good reason why the minimum wage should not be applied to people who produce the food of this Nation, the same as it is applied to those who produce any other consumer goods.

As I said, I recognize the complexities of this problem and the necessity of dealing with it in specific legislation. In making my statement today, I wish to serve notice that I shall participate in the introduction of separate legislation in the field of minimum wages for agricultural employees.

There is just one observation I should like to add to those offered by my colleague from Massachusetts. I have heard much from certain quarters about the terrible danger of inflation. In particular, we have been told that labor should exercise restraint in seeking higher earnings. I would be most impressed by these pronouncements if they were accompanied by some evidence of concern for employees. Indeed, every Member of this Senate would deplore wages that are substandard and conditions of living that are below standards of decency. The time has come, I believe, to proceed promptly to correct wage inequities now suffered by millions of our fellow Americans.

I deem it a high honor and privilege to join the Senator from Massachusetts

[Mr. KENNEDY] in cosponsoring the bill which he has introduced on behalf of the two of us, and which is being introduced in the House by that very fine Representative, JAMES ROOSEVELT.

I now turn to another subject. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE OATH AND AFFIDAVIT PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, shortly after the National Defense Education Act became law last year, I received from the American Association of University Professors, as did all members of the Senate committee, a detailed explanation of why that organization opposes the loyalty affidavit provision of the act. That provision was added to the bill on the floor of the Senate by a floor amendment.

This provision is section 1001(f) (1) in title X of the National Defense Education Act. It provides that no funds "shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual, first, has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Last December, I asked the staff of the Senate Labor Committee to prepare a memorandum on the subject of this provision, discussing the need for it. I also asked that the memorandum include the pertinent information on where else in Federal law such affidavits are required, or where an oath of allegiance or information about membership in such organizations described is required as a condition of doing business with the Government or receiving some benefits from the Government.

I pointed out to the AAUP that public officeholders, for example, must take an oath to uphold the Constitution, and information about activities in subversive organizations is requested of applicants for Federal jobs.

The AAUP then indicated that it has no objection to the affirmative oath of allegiance contained in the National Defense Education Act in section 1001 (f) (2).

A few days ago, Reed College, in Portland, Oreg., turned down its grant of money for its student loan fund because its administrators object to the affidavit requirement.

The loss of the \$3,349 allocation to Reed College for student loans means a great deal to that institution. I know the decision was not taken lightly or easily. Nonetheless, this school has stood up for a principle.

It is my earnest hope that the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Labor Committee will act soon on S. 819, introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] repealing the affidavit requirement in this act. It is quite possible that neither the oath nor the

affidavit is desirable in the act. Certainly the affidavit is not.

I hope the information I have requested be furnished to the committee members by the staff will give us the background on the whole subject, so we can proceed to consider the bill. It is important that a school like Reed College not be penalized any longer for standing up for a principle.

I ask consent to have printed at this point an editorial from the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of February 4, entitled "Reed College and a High Principle," and editorials from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and Medford Mail-Tribune.

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

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Feb. 4, 1959]

REED COLLEGE AND A HIGH PRINCIPLE

Reed College, through its president, Richard H. Sullivan, has turned down a \$3,349 grant from the Federal Government. The scholarship money, made available through the National Defense Education Act, is forthcoming only if beneficiaries of this largess sign loyalty oaths. Reed's president says he turned down the money because "singling out teachers and students as people not to be trusted gets under my skin."

Good for Reed. Perhaps this action will call attention to Senate bill 819, introduced by JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts. This measure would remove the loyalty-oath requirement from the act. It has the support of numerous Senators, including RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon.

The idea of the loyalty oath is a direct slap at the intellectual community. It is a hangover from the "know-nothingism" that swept America before the Civil War and that recurs periodically in the form of Ku Kluxism or McCarthyism. The target in all cases is the educated man.

We do not think it can be shown that a loyalty oath has ever, ever been used to trap a spy. Any spy worth his rubles will sign anything if his signature will help him in his dirty business. Those who refuse to sign have been persons of principle who objected to being singled out as unduly suspect because of their professions. If refusal to sign is taken as an admission of guilt—a "fifth-amendment Communist" kind of thinking—are we to believe that any really subversive person would refuse?

The scholarship program that Reed will not be a part of costs the Federal Government \$250 million a year. It is small potatoes, indeed, compared with the farm-subsidy program, which costs nearly \$5 billion a year. Yet those who receive money under the subsidy program, 18 times as costly as the scholarship program, are not asked to sign loyalty oaths. For all that subversion on the farm is not a common problem, it is just as true that it is no great problem in the colleges and universities.

Oregon, alone among the States on the coast, has never required a loyalty oath of its professors. This is due in part to the intensive lobbying in legislative halls in 1951 by W. M. Tugman, former editor of this newspaper; Charles A. Sprague, editor of the Oregon Statesman; and State Representative Earl Hill. All are Republicans. They were joined by Democrats like Maurine Neuberger and Robert Holmes. It was a tough battle, fought in a year when McCarthyism was riding high. They found support for loyalty oaths in surprising places, but they persevered and they won.

It is fitting that Reed, an Oregon college which is badly in need of all the money it can get, holds firm to the high principle.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 5, 1959]

AN OATH THAT HURTS THE NATION

Reed College in Portland, Oreg., one of the better small colleges, has refused to accept money under the National Defense Education Act because a loyalty oath is demanded of those receiving grants or loans. This positive action follows appeals by the presidents of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton for repeal of the oath provision. The Association of American Colleges meanwhile is polling its 750 members on the question.

Such oaths, said President Griswold of Yale, "seem to represent a lack of confidence in young people and in their future, as well as in the educational process itself. They tend to alienate the good will of the loyal citizens without gaining a corresponding advantage in protecting the public against the actions or intentions of the disloyal."

More concretely, the oath requirement is preventing the use of a good part of the \$900 million made available under the legislation, and thus it is delaying the training of the scientists, mathematicians and linguists needed in the defense of the Nation. After all, this law was not passed merely to aid education, but to make educated persons available for national service. Without repeal of the oath requirement, it is partly self-defeating.

[From the Medford Mail-Tribune, Feb. 8, 1959]

OBJECTIONABLE LOYALTY OATH

Most Americans are patriotic, and completely dedicated to the welfare of their nation. They abhor this Nation's enemies. And many of them cannot understand why anyone would object to taking a so-called loyalty oath.

They, in their patriotic fervor, would be willing to raise their right hands and swear that they never have, do not now, and never will, advocate the forceful or illegal overthrow of the U.S. Government.

And they can't understand why anyone else would.

Let's look at it this way:

If they were applying for a job, and one of the conditions of employment was that they swear they had never beaten a small child to death, and will never do so, they'd probably be mad as hops.

"What kind of a stinking bum do you think I am?" would be their rejoinder, as they stalked off in search of a job where they could hold up their heads in pride and dignity.

It is for very similar reasons that the teaching profession feels discriminated against when asked to take such a negative loyalty oath.

They have no objection to a positive oath—one in which they declare they will uphold and support the Constitution and the laws and the ideals of the Nation.

One of the most lucid explanations of this situation we have seen was in a recent editorial in the Eugene Register-Guard, which said:

"The idea of the loyalty oath is a direct slap at the intellectual community. It is a hangover from the 'Know-Nothingism' that swept America before the Civil War and that recurs periodically in the form of Ku Kluxism or McCarthyism. The target, in all cases, is the educated man.

"We do not think it can be shown that a loyalty oath has ever, been used to trap a spy. Any spy worth his rubles will sign anything if his signature will help him in his dirty business. Those who refuse to sign have been persons of principle who objected to being singled out as unduly sus-

pect because of their professions. If refusal to sign is taken as an admission of guilt—a fifth amendment Communist kind of thinking—are we to believe that any really subversive person would refuse?"

The president of Reed College, Richard H. Sullivan, recently announced the college would turn down a \$3,349 grant from the Federal Government for scholarships, because of the fact that beneficiaries must take a form of the negative and discriminatory loyalty oath.

Dr. Sullivan objected because "singling out teachers and students as people not to be trusted gets under my skin."

The objections can be summed up in two points:

1. It is useless.

2. It is a gratuitous insult to an honorable profession.

That is why teachers object to it, and we think they are right.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask consent to have appear at this point my radio broadcast to Oregon of February 10, in which I touched on this point; and letters I have received from the President of Oberlin College, the dean of the Liberal Arts College of the University of Oregon, the faculty of Lewis and Clark College in Oregon, the American Association of University Professors, and the Oregon chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union.

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

RADIO BROADCAST OF SENATOR MORSE, FEBRUARY 10, 1959

Fellow Oregonians, before taking a brief recess for the Lincoln and Washington birthday holidays, the Senate concluded work on a very important piece of legislation. This was the housing bill, a bill like the one the Senate passed last year and which was lost in the House of Representatives largely because of the administration's opposition to it. I was a cosponsor of the bill and, because it is so important to Oregon, I would like to discuss it briefly on this broadcast.

Briefly, here is what the new Housing Act of 1959 provided: First, it revitalized the veterans' housing program. Under it, \$150 million was added to the revolving fund for direct loans to veterans for homes. We had figures from the Veterans' Administration showing a tremendous backlog of applications for direct loans that could not be granted because the money had run out. The bill as introduced provided a fund of \$300 million for that purpose because that is the amount the Veterans' Administration says is needed to take care of this backlog. But the cry of "economy" from the administration carried the day for the forces that wanted to cut in half the veterans' direct-loan program. They reduced it to \$150 million. I very much regret the adoption of that administration amendment, and I am hopeful that, since the House of Representatives provided the necessary \$300 million for veterans' loans, most of it can be retained in the final bill.

These veterans' loans are primarily for those veterans living in rural or small town areas where credit for home loans is not readily available. It is of vital importance to States like Oregon, and to our veterans, that funds be available for home loans regardless of the area in which the veteran happens to live.

I might point out that these direct loans are above and beyond the regular private loans to veterans that are only insured by the Veterans' Administration. This important program continues as before, except in one important respect, and that is the interest rate.

The private sources of money for housing loans have been on what amounts to a financial strike against veterans for the simple reason that the interest rate was fixed by law, and they could get a higher interest rate by lending to nonveterans. As the people of Oregon well know, I have fought at every opportunity against the administration policy of raising interest rates. Higher interest rates were largely responsible for the decline in housing starts; they priced homes out of the market, so to speak. The cost of borrowing the money to build became so high, so many families who wanted and needed new homes put off the decision to build.

We did succeed for a time in holding the line on the interest rate that could be charged to veterans. But eventually lenders simply stopped lending to veterans. That unfortunate situation was remedied only in part by the direct Government loans, because these were available only in rural areas. This year, the hue and cry for higher interest rates on veterans' loans was louder than ever. And by the time the bill had passed the Senate, the rate was raised from 4½ percent to 5¼ percent.

I am proud to say that once again I was among those who cosponsored the amendment to leave the interest rate where it was. I do not believe in giving in to this kind of political blackmail on the part of money-lenders and the administration. Every time Congress has given in on the subject of interest rates for one particular type of loan, it has merely increased the pressure to raise rates all the way around, both of private and public financial transactions. Had our amendment to hold the line on veterans interest rates prevailed, we would then have required that mortgages at that rate be supported at par by the Government.

That would have held the line on inflationary interest rates, and assured the veterans of a source of loans, as well.

We lost on that round, and that was one deficiency in the bill, in my opinion.

But weighted against it are the continuation of loans to veterans, and the extension of the Federal Housing, or FHA loan guarantees. The authority of FHA to guarantee nonveteran loans had run out, and in this measure we authorized the FHA to guarantee an additional \$5 billion worth of home loans in fiscal 1959, and another \$5 billion worth in 1960. This does not mean the Government is putting up the money. It is only insuring loans totaling that amount.

At the same time, we extended and improved the loans for property improvement. This is the program that enables American families to borrow money to repair or modernize their homes. A great deal of construction work has been made possible under this program, and it is important that it be continued.

These were the major provisions in the housing bill. Although I believed the bill should have gone further in providing for slum clearance and public housing in our great cities, it will certainly have a stimulating effect upon the lumber industry.

In the committee hearings on this measure, it was estimated that if the bill were enacted into law before the spring construction season begins, it could increase the number of housing starts this year by 200,000. That would bring the annual rate to 1,400,000 new homes.

It was also estimated that half a million new jobs would be created by the bill. A great many of these new jobs would, of course, be in the lumber industry.

That is why I cosponsored this legislation even though I believe it had some defects. Its overall impact upon Oregon and the construction industry will be good. It could have been better, but faced with so much opposition from the administration, it is a pretty good housing bill.

I took the time to discuss it today because it came before the Senate just at the time when unemployment in Oregon was the highest in the Nation. For the first week of 1959, the rate of unemployment across the Nation was 6.2 percent; but in Oregon it was 10.4 percent. For the following week, the national average of working people drawing their unemployment compensation was 6 percent; in Oregon it was 9.8 percent.

This high rate of unemployment, is, of course, in large part seasonal. It reflects directly the winter slowdown in lumber. But it also reflects the fact that our State is tied very closely to the lumber industry.

It is also important to bear in mind that as home construction has revived and the lumber industry has returned to the levels of production of 2 and 3 years ago, employment has not picked up at the same rate.

The lumber industry, in Oregon and elsewhere, is finding ways of turning out the same amount of lumber without rehiring all the people it laid off during hard times. I do not fool myself into thinking that this housing bill will solve the unemployment problem for Oregon. It will help; but it will not do the whole job.

We must continue to renew our efforts to diversify the industry of our State and of the entire Pacific Northwest. In addition to lumber, we must develop our other great natural resources, that of low-cost water power.

Cheap power is a great attraction to new industry, and it is one we must take more advantage of than we have to date. New industry using low-cost power can bring new payrolls to Oregon, and relieve our dependence upon lumber for prosperity and progress.

I pledge my continuing efforts to do whatever is necessary at the Federal level to achieve that goal.

One additional item I wish to mention on this broadcast is one that grew out of the National Defense Education Act passed by the Congress last year. I told this audience about that bill several times last year, and I believe it was a great forward step in meeting this country's obligation to maintain high educational standards, particularly in science and mathematics.

Unfortunately, there was added to this law on the floor of the Senate a provision called the loyalty oath. It required all persons receiving any financial assistance, either by loan or grant, to file with the Commissioner of Education an affidavit that he does not believe in, is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the violent overthrow of the Federal Government.

The American Association of University Professors and the heads of several of the outstanding colleges and universities of the country have denounced this requirement in the law. They point out that they have no objection to an affirmative oath of allegiance of the kind taken by a public official or members of the Armed Forces.

But those who would receive loans or grants under the bill are required to do much more than pledge allegiance to the Government. And as a result, Reed College in Portland has turned down its share of the loan money made available to it under the law. As President Richard Sullivan of Reed College put it, he turned down the money because, and I quote him: "Singling out teachers and students as people not to be trusted gets under my skin."

I am happy to report that legislation is already before the Congress to eliminate this requirement from the law. The Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Labor Committee, of which I am a member, informs me that it expects to take up the matter within a very few days. Several weeks

ago, I had asked the staff of the committee to make a study of this provision to determine whether it went beyond the pledges required of others who receive aid from the Federal Government, and whether it was in fact deemed necessary by those responsible for administering the law.

Since then, the administration itself has requested that the "loyalty oath" be removed from the law. I hope this will be done quickly, and I shall urge early consideration of it upon my colleagues on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate.

Reed College and the many other fine colleges and universities in Oregon and throughout the country should be able to set up their loan funds just as quickly as possible; they should not be deterred from doing so because of their natural and understandable dislike of taking oaths and signing affidavits of this kind.

There are better and more efficient ways of keeping track of the handful of conspirators in our country than this method of demanding that hundreds of thousands of students, teachers, and school administrators sign this kind of affidavit. I shall be making every effort to get it repealed as soon as possible.

There are a great many other issues I would like to have the time to talk to you about but they will have to be postponed until our next broadcast. I do want to say that I am particularly pleased with the progress that we are making in this session of the Senate. Already we have passed the housing bill, we have passed the airport bill. I had hoped to talk about that today. We are well on our way to the consideration of a labor bill, the education bill is under hearing, and my hearings on the railroad retirement bill of the Labor Committee are about to be completed. I think that the performance of this session of the Congress thus far has just been plain remarkable.

This is WAYNE MORSE reporting to you from Washington, D.C.

OBERLIN COLLEGE,

Oberlin, Ohio, February 6, 1959.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing for the faculty of Oberlin College to express strong opposition to title X, section 1001(f)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which reads:

"No . . . funds . . . shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Our opposition is not directed against the oath of allegiance (title X, sec. 1001(f)(2)) which the act includes, but only to the foregoing quoted provision which is, in effect, a test oath. Such test oaths have aroused resistance many times before in the course of English and American history. An individual is compelled to make a statement disclaiming objectionable associations and beliefs in order to gain the benefits of the program. In our view this is unnecessary and unreasonable.

The provision of the oath concerning belief is particularly repugnant. We object to the notion that an individual should be penalized because of a mental state where no overt act has occurred. We fail to see how justice can be done in any proceeding to enforce this provision concerning the content of a human mind. We agree heartily with the late Justice Jackson, who said:

"Our forefathers found the evil of free thinking more to be endured than the evils of inquest or suppression. They gave the

status of almost absolute individual rights to the outward means of expressing belief. I cannot believe they left open a way for legislation to embarrass or impede the mere mental processes by which those expressions of belief are examined and formulated. This is not only because individual thinking presents no danger to society, but because thoughtful, bold, and independent minds are essential to wise and considered self-government."

Suspicion directed at the students and teachers in our colleges and universities is completely unwarranted. Their understanding of and devotion to freedom and the cause of democracy is not surpassed by any other group in our society. We concur in the statement of Mr. Bentley Glass, president of the American Association of University Professors, who commented on the test oath as follows:

"If an individual refuses to sign, he raises a suspicion that he is unworthy of public trust or benefit. If he signs, he endorses the pertinency of the generally suspicious about him and his kind which it embodies in the requirement."

The stand now taken by the Oberlin faculty against the test oath in the 1958 act is fully in accord with its proudest traditions. In 1952 the faculty unanimously adopted a resolution which included these statements relevant to the present issue:

"Times of crisis present sharp challenges to the professed values of a democratic society. At such times it is tempting to measure all things by the rough standards of unity, loyalty, and orthodoxy. The inevitable tendency is to restrict such fundamentals of democracy as discussion and debate, and even to make divergence of opinion appear dangerous."

"The Oberlin College faculty regards all forms of interference with intellectual freedom, discriminatory loyalty oaths, censorship, and other restrictions on free speech and thought as inimical to the democratic way of life."

In view of the objections and considerations stated above, we earnestly request that the test oath incorporated in title X, section 1001(f)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 be immediately repealed.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. LOVE,
Secretary of the Faculty.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS,

Eugene, Oreg., February 11, 1959.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The department heads of the College of Liberal Arts at their meeting last week requested that I write to you to ask your support of Senator KENNEDY's amendment to repeal the negative oath requirement of the National Defense Education Act. As you know, the act contains two provisions respecting the oath: (1) An oath (or affirmation) of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, and (2) a disclaimer oath that asks recipients of loans or fellowships to declare that they "do not believe in, and are not a member of and do not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

It is the second of these to which department heads object on the basis that the negative oath is wrong in principle, that it is unnecessary in view of the affirmative oath carried in the act, and that it sets apart and discriminates against a small segment of American people.

May I add that earlier in the week, Dean Charles T. Duncan and I jointly offered a resolution to the faculty in support of the Kennedy amendment. Under our faculty

provisions, this resolution will not be acted upon until it has been reviewed by the senate and is presented to the faculty again at its March meeting.

I know that you will understand the position of faculty members on this matter as few other Senators do and I shall, therefore, greatly appreciate your efforts on our behalf.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT D. CLARK, *Dean.*

LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., December 30, 1958.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Lewis and Clark College Chapter of the American Association of University Professors has unanimously voted to urge the repeal of the "loyalty oath" section 1001 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The national A.A.U.P. has long opposed such oaths as both contrary to academic freedom and useless to national defense. The chapter has instructed me to notify you of this vote, and to secure your opinion on this section and to determine what specific steps you will take to remove this oath from the law.

We all recognize the need for a strengthened financial basis for higher education, but we deplore the attaching of such an oath to this otherwise commendable measure.

Sincerely,

DONALD G. BALMER,
President, Lewis and Clark College
Chapter, A.A.U.P.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS,

Washington, D.C., December 19, 1958.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With this letter you receive a copy of a letter of November 1 by the president and the general secretary of the American Association of University Professors objecting to title X, section 1001(f) (1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Shortly after the letter was sent, it received the unanimous endorsement of the council of the association in session.

You will observe that no objection has been made to section 1001(f) (2) which calls for an affirmative oath of allegiance. Furthermore, although not relevant to our specific objection, I am sure that many association members share my feeling of gratitude and admiration for the work of the Congress in this act and other legislation beneficial to American education.

We would be very grateful for your opinion on the disclaimer affidavit requirement, and we hope that the consensus of legislative opinion will bring about reconsideration in the 86th Congress.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM P. FIDLER,
General Secretary.

A LETTER SENT TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE AND
THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COM-
MITTEE BY THE OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

NOVEMBER 1, 1958.

DEAR —: The American Association of University Professors has in mind petitioning the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the 86th Congress to reconsider the requirement of section 1001(f), title X, of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which reads:

"No . . . funds . . . shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and

filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

This disclaimer requirement, which will apply to large numbers of young people seeking loans, fellowships and grants to carry on their education, and to many teachers and to consulting experts, seems thoroughly harmful. It singles out persons in education as objects of suspicion; it imposes a "test oath" repugnant to our traditions; and it exposes those signing the affidavit to the possibility of perjury prosecutions resting on vague allegations or improper and intimidating inquiries about their conduct and their beliefs.

The affidavit requirement appears certainly to affect at least these persons:

1. Undergraduate students receiving loans (including minors).
2. Graduate students receiving fellowships.
3. Secondary school guidance and counseling personnel who attend training institutes.
4. Staff of language research centers.
5. Foreign scholars teaching at language research centers.
6. Individuals receiving stipends for advanced training in foreign languages.
7. Staff of language institutes.
8. Individuals attending language institutes who receive stipends.
9. Members of the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media.
10. Special personnel under title VII (TV, radio, cinema).
11. Members of the Science Information Council.

The American Association of University Professors believes that the requirement which it opposes is subject to the following specific objections:

1. Vagueness: A person required to execute a disclaimer statement is given no guidance as to the organizations which are of the designated variety, and no definition of the support to such organizations which he must disclaim. We submit that it is a denial of due process of law to compel an individual to gauge his conduct by such vague criteria, when criminal liability may turn on his action.
2. Unconstitutionality of the substance of the disclaimer: There is ground for grave question concerning the validity of requiring a disclaimer of the sort specified in the act, as a condition of enjoying governmental benefits. The justification which a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court held to be present with relation to the requirement of the Labor-Management Relations Act involved in *American Communications Association v. Douds*, 339 U.S. 382, is of doubtful applicability here. Moreover, the provision here in question is not in terms limited to knowing support of the specified type of organization; without such a limitation, the provision probably falls under condemnation of the view of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Wieman v. Updegraff*, 344 U.S. 183.

It is difficult to leave unquestioned legislation which borders so closely on unconstitutionality in a first amendment area, and which may well overstep the line.

3. The invidiousness of the requirement: A disclaimer requirement or test oath by its nature cannot fail to be invidious. If an individual refuses to sign, he raises a suspicion that he is unworthy of public trust or benefit. If he signs, he endorses the pertinency of the general suspicion about him and his kind which is embodied in the requirement. Social safeguards should be directed to specific dangers; they should not, as in this instance, take the

form of inescapable and unwarranted derogatory implications directed toward a whole class of persons and all its members.

This association, with a membership of 40,000 college and university teachers, is particularly concerned about the application of the disclaimer to education. In the past, the Federal Government has made available numerous benefits to individuals and organizations whose activities have been of national importance, and who have had a clearly established special need; rarely has there been a requirement of an affidavit or statement disclaiming subversive belief or association. Now, in 1958, we are shocked and alarmed to find that students and teachers, when they are to receive funds, are placed in a special category and must enter a humiliating disclaimer. The act seems to say to members of the educational community: "You are an important part of American life and you have an admitted real need, but let there be no mistake about the fact that you are a particularly suspect part of the population and will have to pass a special test that other citizens need not take." This is a prejudgment of the teachers and students of America which we cannot believe the Congress intended to make.

We respectfully request that you give consideration to the objections stated in this letter. It is our hope that you will conclude that the position of the American Association of University Professors is correct and that you will be able to share it with us.

Sincerely yours,

BENTLEY GLASS,
President.
WILLIAM P. FIDLER,
General Secretary.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION OF OREGON,
Portland, Oreg., February 6, 1959.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On behalf of the executive board of the American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon, I am writing to urge you to use your influence to secure the deletion of section 1001(f), title X, of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which provides for a disclaimer oath for all the beneficiaries of the act. These include young people seeking loans, fellowships and grants, and many teachers and consulting experts involved in foreign language institutes and in other activities authorized by the act.

The American Civil Liberties Union has for a long time opposed such negative disclaimer oaths on the grounds of their vagueness and the presumption of unreliability which attaches to those individuals and groups selected for this kind of treatment. Since there is no definition of the organizations which are proscribed by the act nor of the term "support," it becomes most difficult for an individual to determine whether he is in a position to subscribe to such an oath. Furthermore, we believe it most undesirable to single out for this invidious treatment some of the ablest and potentially most valuable citizens of our country.

At a time when public opinion is coming increasingly to recognize the importance of higher education, it seems most unfortunate that this kind of an oath should be required. The history of such oaths indicates that they do not achieve their stated objective but may interfere with the attainment of valuable goals such as those which the National Defense Education Act seeks to implement. We trust that you will use your best efforts to secure the removal of this obnoxious provision.

Sincerely yours,

JUDAH BIEMAN,
Chairman.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am interested in the remarks which the Senator from Oregon has been making with respect to the affidavit provision in the Defense Education Act. I am a member of the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I should like to say that I am wholly in accord with the view of the Senator from Oregon, so far as the affidavit is concerned. I believe that the Government should not encroach upon freedom of thought and belief in our universities.

Mr. MORSE. I serve on the committee with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I not only appreciate his contribution to the discussion this afternoon, but I also wish the RECORD to show that of my own knowledge, based upon the position of the Senator from Kentucky, as I know it from working with him on the committee, that was his position last year when the affidavit proposal was made on the floor of the Senate. I shared his view then.

I am hopeful that the bill being offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will be passed soon, and that we will eliminate the amendment that was added to the bill when it was before the Senate last year. It is discriminatory, and, in the opinion of the university people involved, it carries a nasty implication. It is uncalled for. It ought to be repealed, and repealed quickly at this session of Congress.

The Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Labor Committee is now doing a wonderful job in preparing legislation for Federal financial aid to the States for school construction and teachers' salaries, and I am delighted to extend my full cooperation and assistance in that work. I do hope that as soon as the opportunity arises, however, the subcommittee will turn to this problem of the loyalty affidavit that is a blot upon the fine achievement of the National Defense Education Act.

Most respectfully, let me say that the adoption of that amendment last year is bringing the Congress into disrepute in circles of educators in this country. They cannot understand why we seem to go out of our way to inflict upon the educators of this country an affidavit requirement which we do not impose upon others who are the beneficiaries of Federal legislation.

No educator that I know would be unwilling to take the same oath we take when we become Members of this body; the general oath of allegiance to this form of government of ours; and our swearing under oath our intention to uphold the Constitution of this Government. The correspondence I have inserted makes that clear. But what further oath should we ask? What stronger manifestation of patriotism has the Government a right to ask from any citizen?

I am not at all surprised that this feeling of resentment exists in educational circles in this country because of

the affidavit requirement we placed in the bill during the course of the debate in the Senate last year.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1935, AS AMENDED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act of 1935, as amended.

The bill I propose is the same as the bill which passed the Senate in the 84th Congress. In the 85th Congress, the Senate also passed an Unemployment Compensation Act change which provided for less in the way of benefits than does the proposed legislation. Since the House of Representatives declined to accept the modified version of the bill passed by the Senate in the 85th Congress, I feel, as do the proponents of the proposed legislation, that the Senate should again give consideration to the sounder concepts of unemployment compensation administration contained in the earlier measure.

Mr. President, the major provisions of the bill are:

First, it increases the maximum weekly benefit amount.

Second, it changes the duration period for all eligible claimants to a uniform maximum period of 39 weeks.

Third, it changes the disqualification provisions to a straight 6-week disqualification, with no cancellation of benefits.

The bill makes the maximum weekly benefit amount a specified percentage—67 percent of the average wage of all workers covered by the existing District Unemployment Compensation law, as well as that of Federal employees who are covered by other legislation, computed annually—rather than—a fixed dollar amount.

In order to permit automatic adjustments in the maximum weekly benefit in line with wage trends, the bill provides for annual computation by the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board of the average weekly wage of workers covered by the law. This computation will be based on reports by employers, including the Federal Government agencies.

It should be noted that the bill does not provide that all claimants shall receive the maximum weekly benefit amount or that any claimant will receive 67 percent of his own average weekly wage. Neither does it change the limitation in the present law, which limits the worker to no more than 50 percent of his weekly wage, or one twenty-third of his wages in a calendar quarter.

The bill provides that all claimants who are eligible for benefits will be able to draw 39 weeks of benefits if they remain unemployed for that long a period. During the period of unemployment, the worker would, of course, be required to be able to work, to be available for work, and to accept suitable work when offered to him. In short, the benefits will be payable for the full period only if

the worker's unemployment is due to the lack of suitable job opportunities.

Under the present law, 26 weeks is the maximum for most unemployed, although some get substantially less because of an earnings formula. In addition to lengthening the benefit period of 39 weeks, the bill will eliminate the limiting formula.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

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. 1074) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act of 1935, as amended, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, 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 (a) section 7(b) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 946), as amended (title 46, ch. 3, D.C. Code, 1951 edition; 68 Stat. 993), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The weekly benefit amount of any individual qualified therefore under section 7(c) shall be an amount equal to the lesser of the following: (1) One twenty-third of the amount of his earnings for the quarter in his base period in which his earnings were the highest, or (2) 67 per centum of the average weekly earnings of all individuals performing service which constitutes employment (as defined in section 1(b)) and of all individuals performing service which, if such service were not performed in the employ of the United States or of any wholly owned instrumentality thereof, would constitute employment (as defined in section 1(b)) for the latest year for which such average weekly earnings have been computed. Such average weekly earnings shall be computed annually on the basis of reports of earnings and employment by all employers and by the United States, and shall be arrived at by dividing the total earnings paid to all individuals referred to in clause (2) of this subsection during the last completed calendar year for which reports have been received by a quantity equal to four and one-third times the total monthly employment of such individuals for such period. For the purposes of this subsection the term 'earnings' shall have the same meaning as that assigned to such term in section 1(d). All departments, agencies, and wholly owned instrumentalities of the United States shall submit reports to the Board containing such information as may be necessary to make the determination required by this subsection."

(b) Section 7 (c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To qualify for benefits an individual must have (1) been paid wages for employment of not less than \$130 in one quarter in his base period, (2) been paid wages for employment in not less than two quarters in such period, and (3) earned during such period wages the total amount of which is equal to at least one and one-half times the amount of his wages for the quarter in such period in which his wages were the highest. Notwithstanding the provisions of clause (3), any otherwise qualified individual the total amount of whose wages during such period is less than the amount required to have been earned during such period under such clause

may qualify for benefits if the difference between the amount so required to have been earned and the total amount of his wages during such period does not exceed \$70, but the amount of his weekly benefit, as computed under section 7(b), shall be reduced by \$1 if such difference does not exceed \$35 or by \$2 if such difference is more than \$35."

(c) Section 7(d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any otherwise eligible individual shall be entitled during any benefit year to a total amount of benefits equal to thirty-nine times his weekly benefit amount: *Provided*, That such total amount of benefits, if not a multiple of one dollar, shall be computed to the next higher multiple of one dollar."

(d) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 10 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) An individual who has left his most recent work voluntarily without good cause, as determined by the Board under regulations prescribed by it, shall not be eligible for benefits with respect to the week in which such leaving occurred and with respect to the six consecutive weeks of unemployment which immediately follow such week.

"(b) An individual who has been discharged for misconduct occurring in the course of his most recent work proved to the satisfaction of the Board shall not be eligible for benefits with respect to the week in which such discharge occurred and for the six weeks of consecutive unemployment immediately following such week.

"(c) If an individual otherwise eligible for benefits fails, without good cause as determined by the Board under regulations prescribed by it, either to apply for new work found by the Board to be suitable when notified by any employment office, or to accept any suitable work when offered to him by any employment office, his union hiring hall, or any employer direct, he shall not be eligible for benefits with respect to the week in which such failure occurred and with respect to the six consecutive weeks of unemployment which immediately follow such week. In determining whether or not work is suitable within the meaning of this subsection the Board shall consider (1) the physical fitness and prior training, experience, and earnings of the individual, (2) the distance of the place of work from the individual's place of residence, and (3) the risk involved as to health, safety, or morals."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall be effective on and after July 1, 1959, and the benefit rights of any individual having a benefit year current on or after the effective date shall be redetermined and benefits for calendar weeks ending subsequent to the effective date shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act as amended by this Act: *Provided*, That no claimant shall have his benefits reduced or denied by redetermination resulting from the application of this provision. All initial and continued claims for benefits for weeks occurring within a benefit year which commences on or after the effective date shall be computed and paid in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act as amended by this Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table I have received from the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board giving a comparison of District unemployed in equivalent weeks in 1957, 1958, and 1959, and other data be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Number of unemployed individuals filing as of the calendar week ending—	
Feb. 7, 1959.....	10,580
Feb. 8, 1958.....	11,899
Feb. 9, 1957.....	8,942
Exhaustions by calendar years—	
1958.....	10,692
1957.....	6,273
1956.....	5,490
Percentage of individuals filing claims whose benefit year ended in the calendar year who exhausted benefits—	
1958.....	34
1957.....	21
1956.....	29
Percentage of individuals whose benefit year ended during the calendar year and who received 1 or more payments who exhausted their benefits—	
1958.....	42
1957.....	26
1956.....	35
Number of individuals exhausting their benefits during the most recent 6 months:	
January 1959.....	738
December 1958.....	843
November 1958.....	746
October 1958.....	975
September 1958.....	986
August 1958.....	946
Average check for individuals receiving benefits for the week ending Feb. 7, 1959.....	
Duration ratio (average number of weeks taken by claimants who received first payment):	\$26.50
1958.....	14.4
1957.....	12.6

EFFORTS TO MAKE FARMER ECONOMIC SCAPEGOAT RETARD REALISTIC APPROACH TO FARM PROBLEMS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the current public debate concerning the President's budget for fiscal year 1960, it frequently appears that a concerted effort has been made to make the American farmer an economic scapegoat. Adverse references by the press, public officials, and nonagricultural groups to the costs and benefits of existing farm programs are often phrased in terms which portray the farmer as a taxpayer's liability—an irritating and unnecessary budgetary burden.

Critical and continuous examination of the justification for Federal programs, as provided in the annual budget process, is an essential procedure in determining the allocation of public funds. But the value of such discussion is reduced in direct proportion to the degree by which analysis disregards facts. Farm programs—and farmers—are presently the victim of much carping criticism based on superficial study.

No person claims that existing farm policy is an unqualified success. For fiscal 1959 the Agricultural Department expenditures will total \$6.8 billion. Nearly 70 percent of this sum, or more than \$4.8 billion, goes for price-support payments or soil bank bounties to the growers of six basic crops—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. In 1957, I was one of only seven Senators voting to abolish the costly and wasteful acreage-reserve phase of the soil bank program.

Government subsidies do not reach three-fourths of American farms, including most of the farms in Oregon. Over 82 percent of price supports are paid to the growers of only 4 commodities, out of some 172 different crops.

One of the real difficulties, in my opinion, is the partisan, political nature of much of the farm discussion. Some Democrats with political ambitions have tried to blame Secretary of Agriculture Benson for technological adjustments on the farm which have been occurring for decades. This is unfair and untrue. In the long run, it will not even prove to be good politics. On the other hand, there are prominent Republicans who pretend unctuously to be shocked over price supports and acreage controls for certain crops, and yet who demand even greater benefactions of this sort for corn—because corn happens to be the dominant crop in key States which generally elect Republicans to the Senate and the House.

This approach to the farm question may serve well a few political goals, but I doubt if it constitutes a service either to agriculture generally or to the Nation.

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund has stated:

The price-support program does little for the poorest farmers. It is estimated that the 2.7 million farms which sold less than \$2,500 of product each averaged only \$109 in price supports—far too little to bring those families up to satisfactory living standards. At the same time, 1.3 million farms that sold \$5,000 or more of products received an average of \$1,993, with many individual support payments running into tens of thousands of dollars.

Inequities and inadequacies of U.S. agricultural policy beg correction. But meaningful revision will be achieved only if the facts of the farm situation are fully known and understood by the public.

Critics of farm programs frequently attack the size of sums appropriated for their implementation on the basis that the amount is too large in relation to the number of persons actually tilling the soil. Such an argument ignores not only the peculiarities of production and marketing inherent in the agricultural sector, which have served to justify Government assistance for over 100 years, but the obvious interrelation and overlap which exist in our complex economy.

Crucial to comprehension of the farm problem is realization of the multiple benefits included in the functional classification "agriculture." Helen Henley, farm editor of the Christian Science Monitor, writing in the January 14, 1959, issue of that newspaper, effectively destroys the statistical strawman erected by some antifarm zealots. She states:

Before the program can be intelligently revised, the budget needs to be studied. Such study discloses the startling fact that a number of programs are being charged against farmers which, many informed people feel, actually benefit the Nation as a whole more than the farmer. Is it fair, they ask, that programs serving State Department and Defense Department purposes or the public in general be charged entirely to farmers?

Of the total \$6,872 million estimated for the agricultural budget for fiscal 1959, \$3,022 million or about 44 percent is going for programs which, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture records, have multiple benefits extending far beyond agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this revealing article by the Christian Science Monitor's capable farm editor appear in its entirety at this point in my remarks.

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

THE FARM EDITOR SAYS

"In the past 50 years, for every \$1,000 this country has spent for subsidies the American farmer has received only \$5. That's why farmers get awfully tired of metropolitan newspapers headlining the cost of farm subsidies." So spoke Capper's Farmer in an editorial.

With the annual agricultural budget now approaching \$7 billion, this statement from a long-respected farm magazine sharply reminds us that the whole farm program—and public opinion about it—may be due for reexamination in depth and drastic revision.

But before the program can be intelligently revised the budget needs to be studied. Such study discloses the startling fact that a number of programs are being charged against farmers which, many informed people feel, actually benefit the Nation as a whole more than the farmer. Is it fair, they ask, that programs serving State Department and Defense Department purposes or the public in general be charged entirely to farmers?

Of the total \$6,872 million estimated for the agricultural budget for fiscal 1959, \$3,022 million, or about 44 percent, is going for programs which, according to U.S. Department of Agriculture records, have multiple benefits extending far beyond agriculture.

A sum of \$1,383 million, for instance, goes for what the USDA classifies as programs relating to foreign aid, including Public Law 480 and the International Wheat Agreement. Under Public Law 480, American surplus agricultural commodities are sold for foreign currencies or given away abroad where there is need.

This program, of course, was developed to help dispose of surplus crops. But the USDA points out concerning the giveaway program, "The main objective here is to strengthen international relations in areas where shaky economic conditions could create a political climate favorable to communism."

Wouldn't it be fair to charge at least part of the cost of this program to the State Department? More and more voices are being raised to ask questions like this.

Among other items inviting review as to classification are \$70 million which pays the cost of transferring bartered strategic materials to the national stockpile; \$26 million for milk and other dairy products for the armed services and Veterans' Administration, both of which, it seems, might logically be charged to the Defense Department rather than to agriculture.

Some other items involve: \$145 million for the school lunch program; \$74 million for the school milk program; \$21 million for meat inspection; \$53 million for disease and pest control—all of which primarily benefit the general public. Why should all these costs be charged against farmers?

Transfer of items from one budget to another would not reduce your taxes by a single dollar, but it would give a more accurate view of the purpose for which your money is being spent and whom, exactly, it benefits.

Although many farmers want the Government to get out of farming and let farmers manage their own business as soon as it can be done without disaster, many others feel that Federal aid of various sorts must continue indefinitely. Several logical answers are ready for the frequently asked question: "Why should we subsidize farmers?"

For one thing, the farmer is perhaps the one man in the economy whom the Nation cannot do without. The food and fiber he produces are essential for us all. If the continuing cost-price squeeze threatens to put him out of business, then for the general welfare, aid must be provided to keep him producing.

And, say many farmers, why should subsidies for agriculture be any more under fire than the subsidies paid to many other groups?

These include, according to Government figures, such annual amounts as: \$670 million to the Post Office; \$137 million for aid to navigation; \$50 million for ship operations; \$93 million for aid to air navigation.

Then there is some \$200 million in the form of grants to States for operating employment service and unemployment compensation programs which, some feel, might be considered a subsidy to labor. The question has also been raised as to whether tax writeoffs accorded certain industries might not also be labeled as subsidies.

Farmers are paying tax money to support all these programs, it has been pointed out—why should not they in turn receive help when they need it?

All this does not change the fact that the farm program, even if pared down to the items legitimately chargeable to agriculture, is costing tremendous sums—nor does it lessen one iota the responsibility of citizens to demand that the new Congress devise more realistic, and possibly less expensive, plans.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, proper assignment of costs to those benefited permits a more realistic picture of the farm problem. But this accounting procedure does not reveal that—

In the past 18 years, farmers have increased productivity as much as in preceding 120 years; if farm efficiency today were what it was back in 1940, consumers' food bill would be \$13 billion higher.

Production and distribution of farm products, together with servicing of farmers, constitutes the Nation's largest single industry, employing 37 percent of the Nation's working force.

While making up 12 percent of the population and producing 65 percent of the raw materials for industry, farmers in 1957 got only 4 percent of the national income.

One-third of net farm income in 1957 came from off-farm jobs.

From 1952 through 1957 farm prices declined 20 percent.

In the past 50 years, for every \$1,000 this country has spent for subsidies, the American farmer has received only \$5.

These facts taken from an article, "What City People Should Know About Farmers" in the December 1958 issue of Capper's Farmer, illustrate the nature of the farmer's plight. I ask unanimous consent that this cogent presentation be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

WHAT CITY PEOPLE SHOULD KNOW ABOUT FARMERS

What's the world coming to? The Government is paying farmers billions so they won't grow stuff, and we get stuck with high food prices. Wish they'd pay me for not working."

You don't need oversized ears to hear remarks like this in almost any grocery store.

It's easy for city consumers to get worked up over grocery bills and the expense of farm programs. No matter how you slice it, food bills are high in dollars and cents, and we've been spending lots of tax dollars to control crop surpluses—and we still have surpluses.

It's easy, too, to single out the farmer as the scoundrel. He's far removed from the supermarket scene and has no well integrated organization behind him to tell his story. There's no real spokesman for farmers; no one to filter the facts from a fog of headlines and oratory.

Is the farmer a highwayman, riding high, with one hand in your pocket and the other in Uncle Sam's? Is he so rich that we should stop using tax dollars in his behalf?

What is the real story? Let's look at the facts.

We're just as dependent on the land for food and clothing as when we shot the buffalo and deer. But in 1820 one man could provide food for himself and three other people. Today one farmer feeds himself and 20 others. Soon it will be himself and 25 others.

Here is the core of the farm problem: In any normal peacetime year farmers can produce more than the market will take at prices fair to everyone concerned.

The reason is that we have, through research, education, and the application of mechanical power to agriculture, created a whole new way of producing farm products. The revolution is still going on. In the past 18 years farmers have boosted their efficiency as much as in the preceding 120 years.

Farmers have much more help from city workers than they did 100 years ago—tractors, chemicals, fertilizers, fuels, an abundance of many other services. Farmers are free to specialize in producing food. And, since the early 1940's, the combined per-acre yield of 18 leading field crops has increased dramatically—40 percent. But producing food is only part of it.

The food business is a chain with farmers at one end. In between farms and shelves of supermarkets is the marketing system.

The off-farm operations are handled by some 6 million persons who are producing for and serving farmers and around 10 million who are distributing farm products. Adding these to around 8 million farm operators and farmhands makes about 24 million persons.

We call this combination of functions by a new term—agribusiness. It's the Nation's largest business, accounting for 37 percent of the U.S. working force. In their part of it, farmers are a \$14-billion-a-year customer of industry and labor—not counting the billions farm people spend for consumer goods.

Are farmers to blame for high food prices? You be the judge. Last year, some 60 cents out of every dollar we Americans spent for food went to the people who bought, handled, sold, processed, transported, and packaged farm products.

A little less than 40 cents went to farmers.

Or let's put it another way: If a farmer in Kansas gave away his wheat, we'd still pay 17½ cents for that 20-cent loaf of bread. If a cotton producer in Texas worked only for his health, we'd still shell out \$2.75 for that \$3 shirt.

Percentagewise and dollarwise, food marketing costs are at the highest level since 1940. In 1957, we spent \$55 billion for farm food products, against only \$15 billion in 1940. Of this increase, \$27 billion went for marketing.

But before we start pointing the finger in a new direction, let's remember a couple of things. A lot happens to food on its journey from farm to supermarket. Consumers are demanding more all the time. We want "convenience foods," for example, with built-in maid service, heat-and-serve

rolls, smaller units, better packaging, prebaking, precutting, and preselection. We didn't have these services in 1940—and they aren't free.

Take a look at the chart on the right. It shows how the cost of all farm products bought by the average family has changed in recent years.

[Chart omitted in the RECORD.]

In 1946, the typical market basket of food cost \$767. Of that the farmer got \$397. By 1957 that same basket cost \$1,010, but the farmer was getting only \$400.

To bring that closer to home, that means that from 1946 to 1957 the farmer's share went up \$3; the marketing share, \$240.

Here's how the increase in spread was largely accounted for: labor, \$296, up \$130; transportation, \$73, up \$33; other business costs \$178, up \$69; and Federal income taxes added \$4.

Before you come to a verdict, let's look at still more facts: From 1952 through 1957, with ever-increasing inflation, farm prices actually decreased 20 percent. Here are the figures: Total farm income in 1952 is estimated at \$15.1 billion. By 1956 it had dropped to \$12.1 billion. Last year it skidded to a low of \$10.8 billion.

This is the reason why food prices remained fairly stable in this 1952-57 period. Think what would have happened had farm prices gone up at the same rate as other cost-of-living items. We would have paid some 25 percent more for food and clothing.

Net result would have been a really whopping burden for consumers—some \$70 billion, at least, say economists.

So * * * it's only fair to point out that in the 1952-57 period farmers actually subsidized consumers.

While nearly all other phases of our national economy have been moving upward in recent years, agriculture simply hasn't kept pace.

Although they make up 12 percent of the population and produce 65 percent of the raw materials for industry, farmers in 1957 got only 4 percent of the national income.

And during this time, the cost of practically all the farmer's tools of production has increased. His costs in 1957 were some \$3.7 billion higher than in 1952. This is what farmers are talking about when they mention "cost-price squeeze."

The squeeze has put a lot of farmers out of business. In 1950, for example, 25,058,000 people lived on farms. That's 16.6 percent of all of us. Now, 8 years later, though population has increased, there are some 5 million fewer farmers—and they represent only 12 percent of the population of the United States.

And remember, too, many of those who remain have to work off the farm to make ends meet. In 1957, for example, one-third of the net farm income came from off-the-farm jobs.

SUBSIDIES

Now, what about farm subsidies? Sure, the Federal Government helps farmers. But so does it help airlines, schools, the petroleum industry, housing, shipping, and so on. A fast tax writeoff plan saves power companies billions of dollars. Just try to name a business that is not receiving some type of government aid.

In the past 50 years, for every \$1,000 this country has spent for subsidies, the American farmer has received only \$5. That's why farmers get awfully tired of metropolitan newspapers headlining the cost of farm subsidies.

Because food and fiber have been at bargain prices compared with other cost-of-living items, it's discouraging to farmers to defend half-truths about the \$5 billion the Federal Government takes from the taxpayers to run the national agricultural budget. Also, to continually hear the

charge: "You're taking money out of my pocket to support farm prices."

What makes up the agricultural budget? How much of it goes to farmers? The farm budget is something of a catchall. Many of the items have nothing to do with supporting farm prices, but are primarily a public service. Take meat inspection, for example. It has been a \$17 million item conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to assure the public a safe meat supply.

Other public services include a Government school lunch program and a food donation plan. In fiscal 1958 the Government gave 872 million pounds of food from surplus food stocks for school lunch programs and institutions. It gave 1,400,000 pounds to victims of national disasters. And 1,973,000 pounds were donated for distribution to the needy abroad.

We could name more items similar to these. Even the USDA's crop and livestock estimates are issued more by processors and merchants than by farmers.

Moreover, look at all the agricultural exports to friendly nations since World War II. A big portion of these would have been purchased at U.S. Government expense even if there had been no surplus disposal problem. Using our food abundance has given our foreign policy "leverage." Farmers feel the costs of this should not be charged to agriculture alone.

Sooner or later, of course, the Government must collect from taxpayers every dollar that it spends. If the Government loses money on price supports—and it certainly has—then it must be made up in taxes. No one's satisfied in a situation like this—neither the rural taxpayer nor the city taxpayer.

What should be done to spread out the national income? Even farmers don't agree on just what the Government should do about getting them a fairer share of the national income. Most of them realize the thing that's responsible for depressing their prices—surpluses.

But how do you get rid of surpluses? That's been the big problem. No matter how much wealth we now have we can eat only so much—stomachs are pretty inelastic.

We have an excellent disposal record for moving our surplus stocks out of inventory and into some useful consumption at home or abroad. Our export market is important. It accounted for 12 cents of every dollar the farmer got in 1957. But this is a market that must be cultivated intensely. We can't get rid of all our overproduction in foreign lands without acquiring more problems.

Actually, farmers would need to cut production only about 8 percent to get rid of troublesome surpluses.

Then why don't farmers just produce less? That would be fairly easy to do if the big business that is farming were big agriculture. But it isn't. It is some 4½ million farmers scattered over a Nation which has swelled to 173 million.

Organizationwise, agriculture stands about where industry and labor stood some 50 to 75 years ago. The farmer is an individual in a great sea of competition. He is a price taker, not a price setter.

A farmer works with an uncontrollable business partner—nature. Sun, wind, and rains control his cash register like a fickle bookkeeper.

No single farmer can do much about changing the supply of food, fiber, and tobacco coming to market. And collectively, farmers can't produce just exactly what our Nation demands. Agriculture is a biological process which cannot be greatly accelerated or retarded in any short time.

Too, 90 percent of our production is accomplished by 2.1 million farmers. Some 2.4 million farmers struggle for the remaining 10 percent. Working out satisfactory answers in a farm program for both groups is no easy chore.

What farm programs have been tried so far? Congress has taken two broad approaches. It has built floors under prices to assure the farmer minimum guarantees for his basic crops. These crops are corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. And it has tried to cut down acreages of these crops on the assumption that if less is planted, surpluses will melt away and prices will go up on their own.

The soil bank is an example of the second approach. In 1957 some 5,235,000 acres of land were taken out by corn farmers, 12,785,000 by wheat farmers, and 3,015,000 acres by cotton farmers as part of the program. This part of the soil bank—called the acreage reserve—has been dropped. But the conservation reserve portion is still in effect. Farmers are asked to put some portion of their land into grass or trees and an annual rental is paid the farmer for each year of the contract—up to 10 years.

Our major farm policy revolves around the six basic crops which make up only 24 percent of the value of all our crops. Congress sets the rules, and the Government through the Secretary of Agriculture and its agencies such as the Commodity Credit Corporation, buys or takes over commodities as required to provide price support. Such commodities are stored, sold, disposed of.

But don't price supports cost a lot of money? Not as much as you might think. For the 4 fiscal years ending July 1957, the total cost of all programs—primarily to stabilize farm prices and income, including Commodity Credit Corp. losses—was about \$7½ billion.

But only part of this went to farmers. Part of it went to business for storage of products and other costs.

To make this kind of price support less costly to the Government, there have been marketing quotas and acreage allotments. In this way farmers pay for the help they get from the Government; they submit to regulations that divide up the right to produce.

As a result, farmers are much more efficient now than 10 years ago. Progress in know-how makes food cheaper.

If farmers farmed today as they did in 1940, the consumers' food bill would be at least \$13 billion a year higher than it currently is. So this question is raised: Which is better, to have a surplus costing the consumer \$3 to \$4 billion a year in taxes, or to save him \$13 billion a year on food?

What does the farmer want? At the moment some farm leaders are pressing hard for lower price supports, greater flexibility, and more freedom in agriculture. A good many farmers think this goal is desirable. They want to outgrow Federal programs by gradually strengthening the farm economy.

At the same time, farmers realize we live in an era characterized by the minimum wage and generally stabilized industrial prices. Farmers want to protect themselves against the increasing costs of production and distribution. They want to mobilize their strength to bargain on a more equal basis with highly organized industry and labor.

Considering the independent character of the farmer, he has in general cooperated well with Government programs. He has withstood the hard knocks of low prices, a rising cost of living and higher prices for what he must buy, and reduction of acres.

He has tried hard to compensate for reduced acres—and succeeded. It is the basic philosophy of a farmer to produce. Traditionally he feels it is a contradiction of nature to say he cannot use technology to best advantage.

Just how much does a farmer have invested? Farm investment per worker in the Corn Belt is about \$50,000. That compares with about \$15,000 per worker in industry. Farmers have \$3 invested in production for every \$1 that is invested in marketing of their products.

When prices are falling, the only way the heavily capitalized commercial farmer can stay in business is to cut his costs and produce more volume. So farmers have by greater capital and more know-how produced more on less acres.

In 1957, there were about 319 million acres of 59 crops harvested in the United States. Our harvest almost equaled the largest in history—and on the smallest acreage. The 1958 harvest may equal the highest ever recorded in this country despite a record low in acres.

As total supplies of grain have been built up during the years, increasing percentages of carryover stocks have been coming under Government control. This is inevitable under the system of price supports we have used, with Government storage frequently substituting for actual marketing.

Have any steps been taken to correct this? The 1958 Congress made several changes in our farm laws. More changes are being proposed. These may move us away from Government domination of the agriculture industry. And they may allow market prices more influence in guiding production and consumption.

Farmers' net income climbed to an annual rate of \$13.3 billion in the first half of 1958. The total for all of 1958 may show some improvement over 1957.

This gain was partially due to winter freezes in 1957-58 which cut citrus and vegetable crops in the South. Too, cattle prices climbed a bit because ranchers held back cattle to restock ranges blasted by 4 or 5 drought years.

Despite seasonal price fluctuations that may seem temporarily to favor the farmer, the farm problem remains. It belongs to all of us. It is as near to all of us as our next meal. We gain 8,000 new mouths to feed every day. By 1975 we may well have 230 million people in this country. We'll have fewer farmers to feed us, but we can count on a healthy agriculture to respond to this challenge.

WHAT ABOUT THE FUTURE?

What's in the future? We can't hope to eat our way out of our surpluses, but while we are working our way out of them, let's understand just what our situation really is.

Consumers should continue to benefit from agricultural research and marketing research which is now being emphasized as it never has been before.

Chances are good that the actual proportion of your disposable income spent for food will continue to remain fairly constant—about 25 percent.

You may feel food prices are higher than formerly. But stop and think if you are eating meat 10 times a week instead of 7. Or if you are eating chicken instead of beans, or eggs instead of oatmeal.

Remember—everything is high in terms of dollars compared with prewar prices. But this isn't due to inefficiency in production and marketing of food. It is evidence of inflation or of a depreciation in the value of our money.

Realize that it took the average factory employee 30 minutes to earn enough to buy 1 pound of choice steak in 1947. In 1957 it took him 18 minutes.

Think, too, of all the conveniences that come with food, all of which put direct pressure on the budget. And consider your supermarket may have 7,000 items on the shelves. Nonfood items go into the grocery sack, too.

The important thing is to make wise decisions, now and in the future. Many farmers feel that, before we drop everything in our farm program for something new, we should demonstrate that there is a road back if new plans fail.

The farm population is shrinking; it will be only a little more than 5 percent of our

population by 1975. So, if wise decisions are to be made in the field of farm policy, non-farm people must be well informed.

This, we believe, is the real story. This is what city people should know about farmers.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Conference on Economic Progress recently published a detailed and comprehensive study of the results of the current farm program. This review, directed by the respected economist Leon Keyserling, and entitled, "Toward a New Farm Policy," represents a detailed and penetrating analysis of the farm problem.

The CEP report points out that—

Since 1947, the farmer's income from all sources has been pushed downward 23 percent in real terms, while incomes of the nonfarm population have moved upward 48 percent in real terms. After a brief upward flurry in 1958, farm incomes and prices are again moving downward. Our farm families now have only about 50 percent of income parity with other groups.

Findings of the study indicate that farm families—

are being driven off the land without opportunity for full employment at good incomes elsewhere. The "factory in the field" is supplanting the family-type farm. And this change, instead of lifting farm living standards, is accentuating the impoverishment of farm families. The land care and machinery needed to conserve and prepare agriculture for the growing needs of a growing population are being neglected. To achieve good diets for all American families, and add fairly to the food and fiber supply of the free world, would require nearly one-fourth more U.S. farm production by 1964 than in 1957.

Report statistics reveal farm price-support program losses "totaled less than \$6 billion for the 25-year period from October 1933 through September 1958, or about \$235 million annually. From July 1953 through June 1958 they averaged annually about \$913 million, or almost 5½ times as much as during the previous 7-year period." But despite the increased rate, farm surpluses during this period were small when compared with our other economic surpluses such as idle steel capacity and unemployment.

Mr. President, the CEP review of the farm situation represents an excellent survey of the effect of agricultural depression on our economy, and I ask unanimous consent that selected excerpts of the report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE DEPRESSION OF FARM INCOME

Farmers are the human element in the farm problem. Therefore, depressed farm income is the most serious moral aspect of this problem. It is also the more serious economic aspect. Depressed farm income hurts farmers more, injures workers and consumers more, and costs the country more, than farm surpluses or other aspects of the farm problem.*

Comparing 1958 with 1947, net farm operators' income has gone down 32 percent in real terms. Even including the farmer's income from nonfarm work and nonfarm investments, total farm income from all sources has gone down 23 percent in real terms.

During the same time, the income of the non-farm population has gone up 48 percent in real terms.

From 1953 through 1958, net farm operators' income has declined almost 2 percent a year on the average, while nonfarm income has risen more than 2 percent a year. The average rise in dividend income has been almost 4 percent a year, and in interest income almost 6 percent.

The apologists say that shrinking farm income is being divided among fewer farm families. This ignores the hurt to farm families driven from poverty on the farm to poverty off the farm. Counting those still on the farm, per capita farm income from farm sources, adjusted for price change, declined from a peak of \$872 in 1948 to only \$701 in 1958. Per capita farm income from all sources was \$1,096 in 1948. By 1958, it was only \$999, compared with per capita non-farm income of \$1,985. While these comparisons are subject to statistical imperfections, and while brief treatment prevents more refined analysis, the disparities of farm incomes and living standards are clear. * * *

Allowing for the size of the farm population relative to the nonfarm population, poor families with incomes of less than \$1,000 a year are about 8 times as heavily concentrated in the farm sector as elsewhere. Poor families below \$2,000 are about 6 times as heavily concentrated in the farm sector. Many farm families are deprived of such elementary needs as running water and other sanitary facilities. They also suffer from a low level of public services—especially education and health.

The rise in farm income during 1958 was very small, compared with the long beating farm income had taken, and most of this rise was due to exceptional weather and other unusual and temporary factors. And by late 1958, farm income and the parity ratio were again moving downward. The Department of Agriculture now estimates 1959 farm income 5-10 percent lower than in 1958—while other incomes are again rising.

THE FARM DEPRESSION HURTS OTHER WORKERS AND CONSUMERS

To count the hurtful effects of the farm depression upon others, we must look at our whole economy. During the 6-year period 1953-58, our total economic expansion (averaging only 1.3 percent a year) has been considerably less than a third of the amount needed for full production and full employment. In consequence, our total national production has been more than \$150 billion below full production. Man-years of employment opportunity have been about 10 million too low. The average American family, for this 6-year period as a whole, has had about \$2,800 less income than it would have had with full prosperity for all.

How have these trends, so damaging to our whole economy, been influenced by the farm depression? All of our economic trouble has come largely from a deficiency in private consumption, which during the 6-year period as a whole has been equal to about 63 percent of the total production deficiency. The farm population, during this period, has averaged only about 12½ percent of our total population. But the deficiency in consumer spending by farm operators' families alone has amounted to about 17 percent of the total deficiency in private consumption.

Farmers are also big spenders for capital goods, even when their incomes are depressed. And it is clear that capital expenditures by farmers would have been much higher, if agriculture had enjoyed prosperity. During the 6-year period 1953-58, the deficiency in capital spending by farmers came to almost 28 percent of the deficiency in total private capital spending.

During this period, the deficiency in farm operators' net income has been about 23 percent of the total income deficiency of all American consumers.

In 1958, total true unemployment in the United States was about 3.4 million higher than in 1953. Comparing the same 2 years, farm employment (as measured by the Department of Agriculture) declined by more than 1.3 million. The decline in farm employment thus was a substantial factor in the increase in unemployment throughout the Nation.

Putting all of these facts together, it may be estimated that somewhere between one-fourth and one-third of our gigantic deficiencies in total production and employment opportunity, during the past 6 years, have been due to the farm depression.

ADMINISTERED PRICES, INDUSTRIAL WAGES, AND THE FARMER

The farm depression is due largely to falling farm prices. But it is also due to rising industrial prices—the "administered" prices of the things the farmer buys. In addition, rising consumer prices for food and clothing decrease the real consumption of farm products; they also prejudice the consumer against the farmer. And rising prices for other consumer items cut into the amount which the consumer can spend for food and clothing.

A sound approach to the farm problem requires that we know the causes of this price inflation. Especially, we must understand whether there is a connection between wage trends and price inflation. For the opinion is widespread—though not correct—that rising wages have been responsible for the price inflation so damaging to farmers and others.

In the period leading up to the recent economic recession, administered industrial prices rose rapidly. And the profits earned by great industries which lifted their prices were enormous; their profits rose far more than their prices. Accordingly, this is very clear: Even with the wage increases which actually occurred these prices could have been held steady—or raised very little—and still yielded fair profits. Looking at administered consumer prices, the situation was much the same.

During this same period leading up to the economic recession, the profits of leading corporations rose very much faster than wage rates. Correspondingly, investment in the means of production outran consumption. The most serious economic recession since World War II resulted. And even after a sharp recession in their own sales commenced, these big industries, instead of reducing prices to expand sales, raised prices still faster. Administered consumer prices also rose rapidly during the recession.

The agitation against wage earners, undertaken by the same forces who have been deflating farm income, seems to be part of an effort to divide farmers and workers. This hurts both groups. It benefits only those between the farmer and the consumer, who buy farm products too cheaply, and who hire labor for less than they should pay.

Of course, those who work for wages in agriculture are paid far less than industrial workers. But the remedy is not to reduce industrial wages; it is to lift farm wages. The very low level of farm wages has a depressive effect upon agricultural life. And if farm wages today are "high" relative to the farmer's ability to pay, the remedy is to restore farm income.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there is no easy legislative solution to the economic troubles which face many of today's farmers. But efforts to correct the current situation are not aided by misstatement of the facts. I hope that

the statements and statistics cited above will assist in placing the farm problem in proper perspective.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has some other matter he wishes to bring before the Senate, I am ready to move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. I so move.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 17, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 16, 1959:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister:

Lampton Berry, of Mississippi.
Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio.
Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee.
Clifton R. Wharton, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

John D. Tomlinson, of Illinois.
J. Raymond Ylitalo, of Minnesota.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

Loren Carroll, of Illinois.
John B. Holt, of Maine.
C. Montagu Pigott, of California.
George F. Wilson, of California.
Thomas K. Wright, of Florida.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1 and to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Orville C. Anderson, of California.
Willis C. Armstrong, of Maine.
N. Spencer Barnes, of California.
Robert G. Barnes, of Pennsylvania.
Ben H. Brown, Jr., of South Carolina.
Norman Burns, of Ohio.
Sterling J. Cottrell, of Rhode Island.
Thomas S. Estes, of Maine.
Mose L. Harvey, of Maryland.
Sidney B. Jacques, of New York.
Edward A. Jamison, of Illinois.
Coburn B. Kidd, of Oklahoma.
Edwin M. J. Kretzmann, of the District of Columbia.

Raymond E. Lisle, of New York.
Robinson McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania.
Edwin G. Moline, of Maryland.
Jeremiah J. O'Connor, of the District of Columbia.

Robert J. Ryan, of Massachusetts.
Charles C. Stelle, of Maryland.
Philip H. Trezise, of Michigan.
H. Bartlett Wells, of New Jersey.
Lincoln White, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

John W. Auchincloss, of the District of Columbia.
Louis F. Blanchard, of California.
John A. Bovey, Jr., of Minnesota.
Mrs. Katherine W. Bracken, of Florida.
D. Chadwick Braggiotti, of Connecticut.
Howard E. Chaillé, of Virginia.
G. Edward Clark, of New York.

Wesley Harris Collins, of Mississippi.
James N. Cortada, of Florida.
Edwin M. Cronk, of Virginia.
Perry H. Culley, of California.
D. Eugene Delgado-Arias, of Virginia.
John E. Devine, of Illinois.
Juan de Zengotita, of Pennsylvania.
Dwight Dickinson, of New Jersey.
Joseph F. Donelan, Jr., of New York.
Donald P. Downs, of Nevada.
Louis Mason Drury, of Texas.
Philip F. Dur, of Massachusetts.
Nicholas Feld, of Mississippi.
E. Allen Fidel, of Wyoming.
John W. Ford, of Virginia.
William N. Fraleigh, of New Jersey.
Edward R. Fried, of Maryland.
Francis J. Galbraith, of South Dakota.
Raymond L. Harrell, of Connecticut.
John W. Henderson, of Iowa.
Russell B. Jordan, of Wyoming.
Joseph J. Jova, of New York.
M. Hollis Kannenberg, of Minnesota.
Henry L. T. Koren, of New Jersey.
Sylvain R. Loupe, of Louisiana.
Philip A. Mangano, of Maryland.
Robert M. Marr, of Ohio.
Roswell D. McClelland, of Connecticut.
Thomas W. McElhiney, of Maryland.
Kyle B. Mitchell, Jr., of Alabama.
Thomas G. Murdock, of North Carolina.
Trevanion H. E. Nesbitt, of Maryland.
David D. Newsom, of California.
Carl F. Norden, of New York.
Clinton L. Olson, of California.
James L. O'Sullivan, of Connecticut.
George M. Pollard, of Florida.
Leon B. Poullada, of California.
Herbert D. Spivack, of New York.
Nicholas G. Thacher, of New York.
Harold N. Waddell, of Georgia.
Miss Rebecca G. Wellington, of the District of Columbia.
Edward C. Wilson, of Florida.
Miss Marion W. Worthing, of Maryland.
Irvin S. Lippe, of Michigan, 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.
The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:
Edwin M. Adams, of Illinois.
Oscar V. Armstrong, of North Carolina.
Powhatan M. Baber, of West Virginia.
Herbert W. Baker, of Montana.
Josiah W. Bennett, of Maryland.
Arthur P. Biggs, of California.
Warren P. Blumberg, of New York.
Philip S. Bogart, of New York.
Davis Eugene Boster, of Ohio.
Robert C. Brewster, of Nebraska.
Paul R. S. Brumby, of Missouri.
William H. Bruns, of the District of Columbia.
William B. Buffum, of New York.
Edward West Burgess, of Wisconsin.
Waldemar B. Campbell, of Washington.
Delmar R. Carlson, of Colorado.
William T. Carpenter, Jr., of Alabama.
Raymond Cary, Jr., of Missouri.
Frank E. Cash, Jr., of Florida.
Wilbur P. Chase, of Ohio.
James S. Cunningham, Jr., of California.
Donald M. Davies, of Montana.
Richard T. Davies, of Maryland.
Robert C. Davis, of Florida.
Frank J. Devine, of New York.
Enoch S. Duncan, of Texas.
Thomas J. Dunnigan, of Ohio.
James B. Engle, of Iowa.
Asa L. Evans, of Florida.
Richard T. Ewing, of Maryland.
Mrs. Florence H. Finne, of California.
John W. Fisher, of Washington.
Miss Selma G. Freedman, of the District of Columbia.
Robert C. F. Gordon, of California.
Robert H. Harlan, of Illinois.
Grant G. Hilliker, of Virginia.
Peter Hooper, Jr., of Massachusetts.

Ernest J. Hortum, of Virginia.
 John J. Janke, of Ohio.
 Alexander C. Johnpoll, of New Mexico.
 Richard G. Johnson, of New Jersey.
 William M. Johnson, Jr., of Florida.
 Dallas L. Jones, Jr., of Louisiana.
 Ralph A. Jones, of Pennsylvania.
 John M. Kavanaugh, of Louisiana.
 Stephen A. Kozak, of New Jersey.
 William C. Lakeland, of New York.
 Terrance G. Leonhardy, of North Dakota.
 Edward T. Long, of Illinois.
 Matthew J. Lorum, Jr., of New York.
 Paul D. McCusker, of Colorado.
 Ralph J. McGuire, of the District of Columbia.
 John Y. Millar, of New York.
 Harry J. Milton, of Pennsylvania.
 John H. Morris, of Arizona.
 Thomas H. Murfin, of Washington.
 Bernard Norwood, of New Jersey.
 Albert V. Nyren, of Virginia.
 Patrick O'Sheel, of West Virginia.
 G. Etzel Pearcy, of California.
 Rupert Prohme, of California.
 Herbert F. Propps, of Wisconsin.
 Albert A. Rabida, of Colorado.
 Ernest E. Ramsaur, Jr., of California.
 Thomas M. Recknagel, of New York.
 Herbert Reiner, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
 Ralph J. Ribble, of Texas.
 Neil M. Ruge, of Virginia.
 Joseph S. Sagana, of Maryland.
 Peter J. Skoufis, of Maine.
 Sidney Sober, of New York.
 Charles G. Sommer, of Ohio.
 Curtis C. Strong, of Oregon.
 Frank D. Taylor, of Maryland.
 George S. Vest, of Virginia.
 John Patrick Walsh, of Illinois.
 Temple Wanamaker, of Washington.
 Hugh N. Whitaker, of Louisiana.
 George D. Whittinghill, of New York.
 Hugh W. Wolff, of Maryland.
 Park F. Wollam, of California.
 Donald L. Woolf, of California.
 Sam L. Yates, Jr., of California.

Norman L. Smith, of Illinois, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class four, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

Forest E. Abbuhl, of Ohio.
 Thomas W. Ainsworth, of New Hampshire.
 Miss Norah H. Alsterlund, of Illinois.
 Robert Anderson, of Massachusetts.
 Nicholas G. Andrews, of New Jersey.
 Howard J. Ashford, Jr., of Colorado.
 John G. Bacon, of Washington.
 Michael P. Balla, of Pennsylvania.
 Robert J. Barnard, of Wisconsin.
 Robert M. Beaudry, of Maine.
 S. Cole Blasler, of Michigan.
 William P. Boswell, of New Jersey.
 William G. Bowdler, of Virginia.
 James W. Boyd, of North Carolina.
 Edward T. Brennan, of Massachusetts.
 William D. Broderick, of Michigan.
 North C. Burn, of Washington.
 William D. Calderhead, of Texas.
 Thomas A. Cassilly, of Maryland.
 Frederic L. Chapin, of New Jersey.
 Miss Marjorie L. Cheatham, of Washington.
 Edward R. Cheney, of New Hampshire.
 Albert C. Cizauskas, of New York.
 Miss Marian C. Conroy, of Pennsylvania.
 Carleton S. Coon, Jr., of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Lee Cotterman, of Ohio.
 Franklin J. Crawford, of Ohio.
 William R. Crawford, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
 William E. Culbert, of Connecticut.
 John E. Cunningham, of the District of Columbia.
 Edmund A. da Silveira, of Virginia.
 Robert D. Davis, of Oklahoma.
 Robert W. Day, of Maryland.
 Philbert Deyman, of Minnesota.
 John R. Diggins, Jr., of Maine.

Miss Ollie G. Edmundson, of Missouri.
 Athol H. Ellis, of Maryland.
 Neils E. Erickson, of Virginia.
 Miss Sara G. Falkener, of North Carolina.
 Charles B. Ferguson, of Indiana.
 Joseph Fernandez, of Pennsylvania.
 James J. Ferretti, of Connecticut.
 Emmett B. Ford, Jr., of North Carolina.
 Welko A. Forsten, of Washington.
 Rockwood H. Foster, of the District of Columbia.
 Theodore R. Frye, of Ohio.
 Robert J. Gibbons, of Ohio.
 William G. Gibson, of California.
 Charles C. Gidney, Jr., of Texas.
 William H. Gleysteen, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
 Gerald Goldstein, of New York.
 Raymond E. Gonzalez, of California.
 John L. Hagan, of Nevada.
 William C. Hamilton, of Connecticut.
 John H. Hermanson, of Massachusetts.
 Harrison M. Holland, of Washington.
 Wharton Drexel Hubbard, of New York.
 Robert C. Huffman, of Washington.
 Leaman R. Hunt, of Oklahoma.
 Miss Margaret Hussman, of Idaho.
 Borrie I. Hyman, of California.
 Edward C. Ingraham, Jr., of New York.
 Heyward Isham, of New York.
 Charles K. Johnson, of California.
 Miss Marie A. Johnson, of Minnesota.
 Richard E. Johnson, of Illinois.
 William C. Jones III, of Texas.
 Abraham Katz, of New York.
 Gordon D. King, of Texas.
 Nicholas S. Lakas, of Connecticut.
 Donald E. Larimore, of Illinois.
 Raymond W. Laugel, of Ohio.
 William W. Lehfeldt, of California.
 Arthur C. Lillig, of Oregon.
 Kenneth W. Linde, of Connecticut.
 Mrs. Ruth A. Lovell, of California.
 Hobart N. Luppi, of Connecticut.
 Francis N. Magliozzi, of Massachusetts.
 Edward E. Masters, of Ohio.
 H. Freeman Matthews, Jr., of Virginia.
 Walter M. McClelland, of Oklahoma.
 Allan F. McLean, Jr., of Texas.
 Francis J. Meehan, of Maryland.
 Miss Anne W. Meriam, of Massachusetts.
 Earl R. Michalka, of Michigan.
 James D. Moffett, of Minnesota.
 John A. Moran III, of New Jersey.
 James F. Moriarty, of Massachusetts.
 Clifford R. Nelson, of California.
 Harvey F. Nelson, Jr., of California.
 Howard F. Newsom, of the District of Columbia.
 Harry I. Odell, of New York.
 Glen S. Olsen, of Utah.
 Mathias J. Ortwein, of Pennsylvania.
 Miss Wilma C. Patterson, of Indiana.
 J. H. Cameron Peake, of Connecticut.
 Richard F. Pedersen, of California.
 John M. Perry, of Massachusetts.
 Hilding A. Peterson, of Minnesota.
 Richard W. Petree, of Virginia.
 Laurence G. Pickering, of Nebraska.
 Joseph H. Quintanilla, of Texas.
 Mrs. Virginia C. Ralston, of Washington.
 Ralph C. Rehberg, of South Carolina.
 Lloyd M. Rives, of New Jersey.
 Arthur H. Rosen, of Missouri.
 H. Earle Russell, Jr., of Michigan.
 Irvin C. Scarbeck, of California.
 Stanley D. Schiff, of New Jersey.
 Irving I. Schiffman, of New York.
 David Scott, of Maryland.
 Talcott W. Seelye, of Massachusetts.
 William C. Sherman, of Illinois.
 Robert K. Sherwood, of Nebraska.
 Thomas P. Shoesmith, of Pennsylvania.
 Schubert E. Smith, of New York.
 J. Harlan Southerland, of the District of Columbia.
 Moncrieff J. Spear, of New York.
 Heywood H. Stackhouse, of Virginia.
 Andrew Stalder, of New York.
 Monteagle Stearns, of Virginia.
 Robert A. Stein, of New Jersey.
 Godfrey Harvey Summ, of Virginia.

Miss Margarite H. Tanck, of South Dakota.
 Mrs. Kathleen Clifton Taylor, of Washington.
 Malcolm Thompson, of Massachusetts.
 Miss LaVerne L. Thomsen, of Washington.
 Vladimir I. Toumanoff, of New Hampshire.
 William N. Turpin, of Georgia.
 August Velletri, of Maryland.
 Harold C. Voorhees, of Connecticut.
 Miss Mary L. Walker, of Georgia.
 Robert Gill Walker, of Pennsylvania.
 Aloysius J. Warnecki, of Pennsylvania.
 Miss Alice D. Westbrook, of California.
 Robert A. Wooldridge, of Indiana.
 Jean E. Zimmermann, of Missouri.

Louis A. Gallo, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

John R. Bartelt, Jr., of Massachusetts.
 Henry E. Dumas, of California.
 John D. Gough, of California.
 Theodore J. C. Heavner, of Ohio.
 Paul J. Hoylen, of Maryland.
 Benjamin L. Sowell, of Maryland.
 Anthony E. Starcevic, of California.
 Francis M. Withey, of Michigan.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Robert J. Allen, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

William G. Allen, of Vermont.
 James F. Amory, of Virginia.
 John W. Anderson, of Texas.
 Miss Marion E. Anderson, of Connecticut.
 Melvin J. Anthony, of Illinois.
 Miss Alma M. Armstrong, of the District of Columbia.

Leroy C. Aycock, of Texas.
 Miss Helen M. Bailey, of Virginia.
 Robert M. Balthaser, of Pennsylvania.
 Joseph P. Bandoni, of California.
 John Daniel Barfield, of Tennessee.
 Miss Edna H. Barr, of Ohio.
 Jack Beni, of West Virginia.
 Miss Helen Biggane, of California.
 Carl A. Bischoff, Jr., of Missouri.
 William W. Blackerby, of Texas.
 Hyman Bloom, of the District of Columbia.
 Richard W. Boehm, of New York.
 Miss Eleanor R. Borrowdale, of California.
 Roger C. Brewin, of Arizona.
 Miss Dorothy V. Broussard, of Texas.
 Edward H. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
 Miss Eleanor A. Burnett, of Florida.
 Max R. Caldwell, of Texas.
 Mario Calvani, of Massachusetts.
 Robert V. Carey, of Colorado.
 Robert J. Carle, of California.
 William L. Carr, of Massachusetts.
 James L. Carson, of Oregon.
 Harvey J. Cash, of Arizona.
 Miss Marie C. Chabot, of Rhode Island.
 Miss Ann Child, of California.
 Harold T. Christie, of New York.
 Miss Kathryn O. Clark, of the District of Columbia.

Walter F. X. Collopy, of Connecticut.
 Philip R. Cook, Jr., of Virginia.
 Jeffery R. D. Crockett, of the District of Columbia.

John J. Crowley, Jr., of West Virginia.
 John R. Davis, Jr., of California.
 John G. Dean, of New York.
 Thomas A. DeHart, of California.
 Stephen A. Dobrenchuk, of Massachusetts.
 A. Hugh Douglas, Jr., of Rhode Island.
 William J. Drew, of Massachusetts.
 John T. Dreyfuss, of California.
 John Dubois, of Massachusetts.
 Donald B. Easum, of Wisconsin.
 Edward L. Eberhardt, of Virginia.
 Hunter L. Estep, of New Mexico.
 Miss Marybel Eversole, of Illinois.
 Stockwell Everts, of New York.

George Falk, of Maryland.
Miss Jean L. Farr, of Massachusetts.
James D. Farrell, of Kansas.
John E. Feissner, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Arthur W. Feldman, of Washington.
Robert E. Ferris, of California.
Thomas W. Flina, of Florida.
Arva C. Floyd, Jr., of Georgia.
Robert T. Follstad, of California.
Richard T. Foote, of West Virginia.
Carl E. Forkel, Jr., of Texas.
Charles M. Gage, of Illinois.
Stephen G. Gebelt, of California.
Miss Bernice A. Goldstein, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Alice M. Griffith, of Maryland.
Robert P. Gwynn, of the District of Columbia.

Holsey G. Handyside, of Ohio.
Alfred Harding IV, of New York.
Richard C. Harmstone, of the District of Columbia.
William A. Hayne, of California.
George A. Hays, of Pennsylvania.
John D. Hemenway, of Washington.
Roy R. Hermesman, of Pennsylvania.
Henry L. Heymann, of Pennsylvania.
Martin B. Hickman, of Utah.
Deion L. Hixon, of Alabama.
Edward J. Holway, Jr., of Ohio.
Herbert M. Hutchinson, of New Jersey.
Samuel M. Janney, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Anthony J. Jay, of Illinois.
William R. Jochimsen, of California.
Robert S. Johnson, of Michigan.
Lewis D. Junlor, of Missouri.
Ralph M. Kearney, of Illinois.
William Kelley, of Florida.
Thomas A. Kelly, of Pennsylvania.
Earl A. Kessler II, of Oregon.
Hugh D. Kessler, of Florida.
Lucien L. Kinsolving, of New York.
Richard N. Kirby, of Ohio.
Charles A. Kiselyak, of Washington.
Elmer G. Kryza, of Michigan.
Miss Inez E. Larson, of Minnesota.
Malcolm Lawrence, of Maryland.
Myron Brockway Lawrence, of Oregon.
Mrs. Elvira L. Lawyer, of the District of Columbia.

Owen B. Lee, of Massachusetts.
Charles A. Lemmo, of Pennsylvania.
Joe Lill, of Kansas.
Eric G. Lindahl, of Michigan.
Ralph E. Lindstrom, of Minnesota.
Joseph A. Livornese, of Colorado.
Richard G. Long, of Illinois.
Miss Ingeborg M. Lueders, of Virginia.
John C. Mallon, of Kentucky.
Louis B. Marr, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Elvira P. Martin, of Connecticut.
Kenneth W. Martindale, of Florida.
William G. Marvin, Jr., of California.
C. Thomas Mayfield, of Wisconsin.
Charles W. McCaskill, of Virginia.
Francis P. McCormick, of Massachusetts.
William H. McLean, of Kentucky.
Miss Ruth A. McLendon, of Texas.
Thomas N. Metcalf, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Miss Gertrude M. Meyers, of Minnesota.
Miss Clorene A. Miller, of Texas.
S. Paul Miller, Jr., of California.
Miss Marion K. Mitchell, of New York.
William D. Morgan, of New York.
Miss Martha J. Moses, of Texas.
Paul Moy, of Illinois.
Charles G. Mueller, of Montana.
Miss Helen J. Mullen, of New York.
John Patrick Mulligan, of California.
Richard W. Murphy, of Massachusetts.
Philip C. Narten, of Ohio.
Marshall Hays Noble, of New York.
Robert C. Ode, of Michigan.
Kiyonao Okami, of Maryland.
Herbert S. Okun, of New York.
Waldemar A. Olson, of Wisconsin.
J. Theodore Papendorp, of New Jersey.
Miss Marjorie L. Pea, of Indiana.
Grover W. Penberthy, of Oregon.
Raymond L. Perkins, Jr., of Colorado.

J. Stanley Phillips, of Tennessee.
Charles H. Pletcher, of Minnesota.
Howard W. Potter, Jr., of New York.
John M. Powell, of Illinois.
John Reed, of California.
W. Courtlandt Rhodes, of California.
Robert E. Rosselot, of Virginia.
James T. Rousseau, of Florida.
William F. Ryan, of New York.
William W. Sabbagh, of Maryland.
Munee Sakaue, of California.
Charles B. Selak, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Goodwin Shapiro, of Maryland.
Miss Lucy A. Shults, of New York.
Peter Simon, of New York.
Robert W. Skiff, of Florida.
Miss Alice M. Smith, of North Carolina.
Jack M. Smith, Jr., of Georgia.
Robert P. Smith, of Texas.
Miss Cecil Sporn, of New York.
Paul K. Stahnke, of Illinois.
Denman F. Stanfield, of California.
Edward O. Stellmacher, of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Edith A. Stensby, of Tennessee.
Birney A. Stokes, of New Jersey.
George H. Strunz, of Arizona.
Harold C. Swope, of Missouri.
Edward H. Thomas, of New Jersey.
James M. Turner, of Tennessee.
Marcel van Essen, of New York.
Doroslav S. Vlahovich, of New Jersey.
Frank J. Walters, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Dorothy H. Webb, of California.
Miss Jessie L. Webb, of Tennessee.
Ralph H. Wheeler, Jr., of Florida.
John T. Wheelock, of Illinois.
Ray E. White, Jr., of Virginia.
Richard W. White, of Maryland.
William Marshall Wright, of Arkansas.
Charles T. York, of New York.
Eric V. Youngquist, of Illinois.
Hubert L. Zwald, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Nannette Choate, of the District of Columbia.
Michael M. Conlin, of California.
Miss Eleanor S. Foote, of Colorado.
Mrs. Aasta B. Haugen, of California.
Bernard F. Platek, of Illinois.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

John A. Anderegg, of New Jersey.
Curtis B. Brooks, of Vermont.
Carleton C. Brower, of California.
Davis S. Chamberlain III, of New Jersey.
Richard D. Christiansen, of Michigan.
Edward M. Cohen, of New York.
John C. Dorrance, of California.
Robert A. England, of Connecticut.
Charles E. Exum III, of North Carolina.
Louis P. Goetz III, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Earl Gordon, of Oregon.
Myles L. Greene, of Florida.
Mrs. Winifred T. Hall, of New Jersey.
George Berman High, of Illinois.
Robert W. Huddleston, of New Jersey.
Harry W. Jacobs, of Alaska.
George F. Jones, of Texas.
Edward E. Keller, Jr., of California.
Thomas F. Killoran, of Massachusetts.
William E. Knepper, of Kansas.
Dennis H. Kux, of New York.
Joseph P. Leahy, of the District of Columbia.
Herbert Levin, of New York.
W. Wyatt Martin, Jr., of Tennessee.
Jack F. Matlock, Jr., of Vermont.
Robert W. Maule, of California.
Richard H. Morefield, of California.
John J. Mullin, of California.
James C. Nelson, of Illinois.
Robert K. Olson, of Minnesota.
William B. Pounds, Jr., of Florida.
Robert F. Rogers, of California.
James D. Rosenthal, of California.

Thomas J. Scotese, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas W. M. Smith, of Massachusetts.
Miss Nancy L. Snider, of California.
Richard L. Springer, of Ohio.
Franklyn E. Stevens, of California.
Edward J. Streater, Jr., of New York.
Francis Hugh Thomas, of Pennsylvania.
Samuel H. Weaver, of New York.

The following-named persons 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:

Andrew Andranovich, of Connecticut.
Charles A. Cariddi, of California.
Shelby M. Currie, Jr., of Oregon.
Edward J. Dolezal, of Illinois.
Miss Kathryn M. Geoghegan, of Colorado.
Mrs. Marcia L. Martin, of California.
Mrs. Wilma E. Mayo, of Florida.
Henry R. Mills, of Kansas.
Miss Jane M. Potter, of Maryland.
Jerry M. Reynolds, of Missouri.
Paul Roman, of California.
Miss Thelma R. Thurtell, of California.
Sidney L. Woollons, of Ohio.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

Madison M. Adams, Jr., of Alabama.
Philip M. Allen, of Pennsylvania.
Robert G. Anders, of Wisconsin.
Dexter Anderson, of New Jersey.
George A. Anderson, of Iowa.
Harry M. Angelus, of Massachusetts.
Alfonso Arenales, of New York.
Diego C. Asencio, of New Jersey.
Bryan H. Baas, of Texas.
Arthur C. Bauman, of Michigan.
Maxwell K. Berry, of Kentucky.
Gordon R. Beyer, of Florida.
Robert O. Blucker, of Arkansas.
Michael P. Boerner, of Maryland.
Harold A. Bratt, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Peter S. Bridges, of Illinois.
James E. Briggs, of North Carolina.
William A. Brown, of Massachusetts.
John R. Burke, of Wisconsin.
Harry A. Cahill, of Virginia.
Miss Martha C. Carbone, of Washington.
Vincent J. Cherry, of New York.
J. Chapman Chester, of Wisconsin.
Raymond C. Collins, Jr., of New Jersey.
Peter D. Constable, of New York.
Thomas E. Cummings, of California.
Walter L. Cutler, of Maine.
Curtis C. Cutter, of California.
William P. Deary, of New York.
Francis De Tarr, of California.
Robert P. DeVecchi, of Pennsylvania.
William C. Dixon, of California.
Charles E. Duffy, of Iowa.
John M. DuPont, of Maine.
Lawrence S. Eagleburger, of Wisconsin.
Rudy V. Fimbres, of Arizona.
Bruce A. Flatin, of Minnesota.
Robert S. Gershenson, of Pennsylvania.
William L. Givens, of Tennessee.
Leopold Gotzlinger, of Ohio.
Benson Lee Grayson, of New York.
Thomas Gustafson, of Oklahoma.
John T. Haldane, of the District of Columbia.
Kent H. Hall, of California.
Charles H. Hallock, of Virginia.
Richard R. Hart, of Indiana.
Douglas G. Hartley, of the District of Columbia.
Maxwell S. Heighe, of California.
John J. Helble, of Illinois.
Miss Evelyn R. Hessler, of New York.
Thomas J. Hill, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Marvin J. Hoffenberg, of Maryland.
Harold E. Horan, of Texas.
Robert E. Jelley, of California.
William P. Keasbey, Jr., of California.
Lowell C. Kilday, of Wisconsin.
Barrington King, Jr., of South Carolina.
George L. Kinter, of Vermont.
John W. Kizler, of Texas.
David Korn, of Missouri.

George M. Lane, of Massachusetts.
 Alan Logan, of California.
 Shepard C. Lowman, of Texas.
 Arthur L. Lowrie, of Pennsylvania.
 William H. Luers, of Illinois.
 Miss Barbara J. Marvin, of California.
 Richard C. Matheron, of California.
 Frank A. Mau, of Wyoming.
 Sherrod B. McCall, of Illinois.
 Miss Mary E. McDonnell, of Massachusetts.
 Carl H. McMillan, Jr., of Maryland.
 Francis J. McNell III, of Florida.
 Alan G. Mencher, of California.
 Miss Mary L. Merges, of Pennsylvania.
 William H. Mills, of Maryland.
 Richard B. Moon, of Missouri.
 Richard M. Moose, of Arkansas.
 Donald R. Morris, of New York.
 Miss Dorothy H. Myers, of Maryland.
 Theodore C. Nelson, of Connecticut.
 F. Pierce Olson, of Minnesota.
 Russell E. Olson, of Illinois.
 Theodore K. Osgood, of Massachusetts.
 Ross C. Parr, of Florida.
 Douglas R. Perry, of Maryland.
 Robert J. Perry, of Ohio.
 John G. Peters, of Maryland.
 Gerald S. Pierce, of Oklahoma.
 J. Keith Powell, of Texas.
 Robert G. Rich, Jr., of Florida.
 Stephen E. Schneider, of Illinois.
 Richard C. Searing, of New Jersey.
 Peter Sebastian, of New York.
 Walter John Silva, of Massachusetts.
 Kenneth N. Skoug, Jr., of Minnesota.
 Donnell D. Smith, of Rhode Island.
 R. Peter Spicer, of Ohio.
 Michael Sterner, of New York.
 Ulrich A. Straus, of Michigan.
 Joseph O. Streicher, of Illinois.
 John J. Sullivan, of Massachusetts.
 Herbert D. Swett, of California.
 Francis J. Tatu, of California.
 Harry E. T. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.
 Richard H. Thompson, of Indiana.
 Donald B. Wallace, Jr., of Indiana.
 Harry Weiner, of New York.
 Miss Winifred S. Weislogel, of New Jersey.
 Miss Virginia A. Weyres, of Wisconsin.
 James W. White, of Florida.
 Kenneth D. Whitehead, of Utah.
 William M. Woessner, of New York.
 Robert G. Wright, of Illinois.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Raymond E. Benson, of New York.
 Philip W. Carroll, of Maryland.
 Earl Blake Cox, of Washington.
 Robert W. Crawford, of Ohio.
 Duncan B. M. Emrich, of Nevada.
 Arnold C. Hanson, of Maine.
 Paul E. Kelly, of Pennsylvania.
 Robert F. Lent, of New York.
 Edward B. Maguire, of California.
 Harold R. Thain, of Oklahoma.
 Fred W. Welty, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Leland C. Altaffer, of Ohio.
 Leon Kelston, of New York.
 Louis L. Kirley, of New York.
 Boyce E. Powell, of Florida.
 Casimir T. Zawadzki, of New York.

Wheaton B. Byers, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a vice consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Dale H. Baker, of Arkansas.
 Warren P. Cleary, of Michigan.
 Joseph O. Eblan, of Massachusetts.
 Charles F. McKay, of Florida.
 Jack M. Mangham, of Virginia.
 William C. Mathers, of Virginia.
 Dorwin M. Wilson, of Indiana.

Robert J. Baker, of California, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America. (This nomination is submitted for the purpose of correcting an error in the nomination as submitted to the Senate on June 20, 1958, and confirmed by the Senate on July 10, 1958.)

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John L. Bender, of Virginia.
 F. Willard Calder, of Florida.
 David L. Gilsinn, of Virginia.
 Marcus J. Gordon, of California.
 Jerome W. Greiner, of Michigan.
 George T. Kalaris, of Montana.
 Harrington Littell, of California.
 Seymour I. Nadler, of the District of Columbia.
 Richard Ober, of Virginia.
 William P. Roessner, of New York.
 Ted M. G. Tanen, of California.
 John H. Terjellan, of Minnesota.
 Robert B. Whittinghill, of New York.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Rubye H. Killough, Alpine, Ala., in place of W. F. Killough, retired.
 Norman C. Minor, Beaverton, Ala., in place of J. N. White, transferred.
 Virgil B. Huff, Brundidge, Ala., in place of V. B. Huff, transferred.
 Donald Ray Morgan, Eva, Ala., in place of Bertha Morgan, retired.
 J. Fred Wilcutt, Falkville, Ala., in place of A. K. B. Patterson, retired.
 Joe A. Hamilton, McCalla, Ala., in place of N. T. Waldrup, retired.
 Ramon N. Days, Sr., Magazine, Ala., in place of Zada Davis, resigned.
 Sylvia W. Knight, Millry, Ala., in place of G. C. Warrick, retired.
 Marvin S. Ward, Pine Apple, Ala., in place of Herman Grimes, retired.
 John C. Williams, Jr., Sylacauga, Ala., in place of R. P. Greer, retired.

ARIZONA

Pauline L. Clark, Eloy, Ariz., in place of L. O. Vittitow, removed.
 Forrest C. Bacus, Jr., Prescott, Ariz., in place of G. I. Gardner, retired.
 Roberta M. Hill, Sells, Ariz., in place of B. L. Savage, retired.
 Bessie L. Pierce, Tumacacori, Ariz., in place of M. E. Spencer, resigned.

ARKANSAS

James Overton Thomson, Aubrey, Ark., in place of O. O. Chappelle, retired.
 Pauline J. Anderson, Bismarck, Ark., in place of F. G. Williams, transferred.
 Ruth J. Crouse, Carthage, Ark., in place of S. K. Purdy, retired.
 Henry T. Hogg, El Dorado, Ark., in place of S. B. McCall, retired.
 Edgar L. Fergeson, Havana, Ark., in place of L. G. Smith, transferred.
 James A. Leighton, Helena, Ark., in place of K. B. Lasswell, retired.
 Kathryn P. Slocum, Hickory Ridge, Ark., in place of O. A. Teague, retired.
 Edward Harrison, Jr., Huntington, Ark., in place of E. M. Harvey, retired.
 Helen G. Webb, Mountain View, Ark., in place of M. R. Lancaster, retired.
 Mattie M. Suagee, Norphlet, Ark., in place of A. J. Wages, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Harry P. Dowdell, Alhambra, Calif., in place of E. R. Stanford, retired.
 Alvina E. Brune, Alvarado, Calif., in place of G. P. Dutra, resigned.
 Richard A. Wallace, Anderson, Calif., in place of M. E. Dow, resigned.

Chester B. Schmill, Camarillo, Calif., in place of J. E. Osborne, retired.
 Mary M. Parker, Capitola, Calif., in place of H. B. Hooper, retired.
 Norman Warren, Elk Grove, Calif., in place of W. E. Dixon, Jr., retired.
 Violet A. Schultz, Elverta, Calif., in place of L. D. Siler, retired.

Lulu Ellen Spradlin, Homeland, Calif. Office established December 16, 1949.

Louis E. Mitchell, Huntington Beach, Calif., in place of M. G. Murray, retired.
 Orlando P. Farnesi, Jackson, Calif., in place of H. V. Tallon, deceased.
 Leslie B. Hall, Jolon, Calif., in place of Ramona Sutfin, removed.
 Ada W. Stone, Lewiston, Calif., in place of I. J. Short, resigned.
 Ralph W. Boyd, Norwalk, Calif., in place of J. D. Stephenson, retired.
 John W. Baker, Porterville, Calif., in place of C. P. Dunning, deceased.
 Ray E. Taylor, Roseville, Calif., in place of R. A. Bates, retired.
 Ralph W. Davis, Sr., San Bernardino, Calif., in place of R. K. Bates, retired.
 Ernest G. Kuhn, Sunnymead, Calif., in place of Joseph Beeson, resigned.
 Ray O. Durning, Thermal, Calif., in place of R. M. Wood, retired.
 Rose V. Brown, Warm Springs, Calif., in place of J. S. Brown, retired.
 Genaro A. Villegas, Wasco, Calif., in place of H. P. Pritschke, deceased.
 Lloyd R. Varner, Winton, Calif., in place of G. A. King, retired.

COLORADO

George J. Ware, Aspen, Colo., in place of C. A. Beck, resigned.
 John C. Warren, Fruita, Colo., in place of J. T. Weaver, transferred.
 Harold E. Hendrix, Limon, Colo., in place of R. E. Snyder, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Clarence P. Meier, Cornwall, Conn., in place of E. A. Goan, resigned.
 Carolyn R. Kirchhoff, Quaker Hill, Conn., in place of C. E. Kirchhoff, deceased.
 Doris M. Madden, Vernon, Conn., in place of F. L. Foley, resigned.

GEORGIA

Larree Johnston, Cartersville, Ga., in place of J. C. Nelson, retired.

IDAHO

Wesley H. Gross, American Falls, Idaho, in place of E. W. Cronkhite, retired.
 William J. Miller, Bonners Ferry, Idaho, in place of E. J. Doyle, retired.
 Delbert W. Taylor, Eagle, Idaho, in place of R. R. Fluaharty, retired.
 Inez A. Seagraves, Kingston, Idaho, in place of M. J. Perry, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Clare A. Lupton, Assumption, Ill., in place of H. W. Myers, deceased.
 Louise E. Schultz, Beecher, Ill., in place of Louise Sperling, retired.
 Richard J. Silverman, De Kalb, Ill., in place of D. A. Leifheit, retired.
 Harry J. Kribs, Glen Ellyn, Ill., in place of M. C. Palmer, deceased.
 Dartsis F. Harvey, Glenwood, Ill., in place of J. A. Blakemore, resigned.
 Harold J. Dehr, Hinsdale, Ill., in place of E. R. Kylen, resigned.
 Wayne B. Tatham, Industry, Ill., in place of C. P. Janes, retired.
 Thelma M. Comer, Joppa, Ill., in place of V. M. Lauderdale, resigned.
 Ina L. Thurlby, Kingston, Ill., in place of G. L. Campbell, retired.
 John R. Clarke, Mount Sterling, Ill., in place of G. R. Davis, retired.
 Joseph A. Gossett, Norris City, Ill., in place of W. S. Smith, retired.
 Charlotte J. Prentice, Pawpaw, Ill., in place of W. A. Woods, retired.

Arthur F. Dirks, Petersburg, Ill., in place of S. L. Shaw, resigned.

John Craig Templeton, Pinckneyville, Ill., in place of T. A. Denton, transferred.

Oscar C. Hudson, Princeton, Ill., in place of H. B. Brown, retired.

Joe M. Stoddard, Ramsey, Ill., in place of O. W. Hinton, removed.

Ralph E. Wright, Rockton, Ill., in place of N. J. Lovelace, retired.

Irene F. Hitzeman, Roselle, Ill., in place of A. M. Smith, resigned.

William C. Miller, Seymour, Ill., in place of W. H. Richards, retired.

Allen D. Crist, Stonington, Ill., in place of O. F. Young, retired.

Lester Lippincott, Sullivan, Ill., in place of G. C. Miller, retired.

William E. Halvey, Techny, Ill., in place of F. P. Campbell, resigned.

Melvin J. Lowery, Tolono, Ill., in place of C. E. Harden, transferred.

Paul H. Eberle, Wonder Lake, Ill., in place of Arthur Hay, removed.

INDIANA

Leland F. Hess, Brook, Ind., in place of R. A. Conn, retired.

W. Lehr Wilder, St. Joe, Ind., in place of M. E. Storer, retired.

IOWA

Delbert C. Harken, Ackley, Iowa, in place of M. J. E. Kachelhoffer, retired.

Barbara E. Sommers, Andrew, Iowa, in place of Q. J. March, retired.

Donald L. Wilson, Colo, Iowa, in place of Frances O'Donnell, retired.

David H. Crenshaw, Des Moines, Iowa, in place of E. M. Johnson, removed.

Charles W. Fry, Earlham, Iowa, in place of O. L. Jones, transferred.

Robert L. Curtis, Greene, Iowa, in place of Clarence Starkweather, Jr., removed.

Ewing E. Shiffer, Grimes, Iowa, in place of H. M. Meneough, retired.

Carl T. Ehen, Harcourt, Iowa, in place of C. A. Forslund, resigned.

Don P. Sanchez, Martinsburg, Iowa, in place of L. F. Mikesell, retired.

William C. Messinger, Menlo, Iowa, in place of G. R. Streepy, retired.

Jewel E. Campbell, Ollie, Iowa, in place of C. W. Campbell, deceased.

James F. Cooper, Onawa, Iowa, in place of C. W. Beigel, resigned.

Arthur L. Kastman, Paullina, Iowa, in place of J. H. Clayton, deceased.

Phyllis J. Davis, St. Charles, Iowa, in place of R. E. Lathrum, transferred.

Donald L. Morse, Sheldon, Iowa, in place of A. B. Dougherty, retired.

Lyle C. Smith, Wauke, Iowa, in place of L. M. Davis, retired.

Donald E. Christensen, West Bend, Iowa, in place of G. W. Montag, retired.

KANSAS

Mary F. Findley, Coyville, Kans., in place of J. P. Hollis, transferred.

Oswald K. Klassen, Elbing, Kans., in place of H. B. Schmidt, retired.

Bruce R. Corrick, Esbon, Kans., in place of Q. L. Ault, transferred.

George P. Shaw, Kanopolis, Kans., in place of L. M. Herrington, deceased.

Lauren E. Daetwiler, Ramona, Kans., in place of J. H. Anderson, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Earl G. Cothran, Eddyville, Ky., in place of N. G. Woodson, retired.

James S. Hinton, Jr., Flemingsburg, Ky., in place of Gilbert Adams, retired.

Earl Burris, Liberty, Ky., in place of C. L. Sharp, retired.

Smith C. Ledford, Paint Lick, Ky., in place of K. L. Walker, retired.

Arlie C. Money, Taylorsville, Ky., in place of J. R. Harris, retired.

Pernie B. Middleton, Verda, Ky., in place of Carl Jones, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Thelma M. Bodoin, Broussard, La., in place of T. L. Ducrest, Jr., transferred.

Trellis Black, Farmerville, La., in place of T. E. Albritton, transferred.

Alice H. McWilliams, Princeton, La., in place of F. B. Farmer, resigned.

Jacqueline F. Dunn, Westlake, La., in place of W. H. Prejean, resigned.

MAINE

John B. Tschamler, Augusta, Maine, in place of H. E. Weeks, retired.

Edward L. Larrabee, Bath, Maine, in place of E. N. Hartnett, retired.

Mina C. Kent, Beals, Maine, in place of S. O. Carver, retired.

Eugene P. Duran, East Corinth, Maine, in place of G. L. Hawes, retired.

Florence P. Pendleton, Islesboro, Maine, in place of H. D. Pendleton, retired.

Virginia V. Morton, North New Portland, Maine, in place of E. E. Kennison, retired.

William A. Frizzle, Ocean Park, Maine, in place of J. H. Clark, removed.

Earl A. Fraser, Rangeley, Maine, in place of O. C. Brackett, retired.

Philip G. Lewis, Rumford, Maine, in place of M. B. Manson, deceased.

Margaret M. Given, South Harpswell, Maine, in place of A. L. Douglass, resigned.

Albert A. Ayotte, Strong, Maine, in place of A. D. Richards, retired.

MARYLAND

Agnes L. Matthews, Hughesville, Md., in place of J. H. Bowling, retired.

Lee Munshour, Thurmont, Md., in place of E. T. Kelbough, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Herbert A. Thurber, Bedford, Mass., in place of H. F. Davis, deceased.

Jack B. Jordan, West Barnstable, Mass., in place of I. I. Peltonen, resigned.

Ralph M. Clark, West Townsend, Mass., in place of H. F. Tenney, retired.

MICHIGAN

R. Don Pretty, Allen Park, Mich. Office established September 1, 1957.

Menzo A. Chapman, Blanchard, Mich., in place of A. A. Jones, transferred.

Roy O. Poth, Brown City, Mich., in place of F. F. Getz, resigned.

Verla V. Wolfgang, Dansville, Mich., in place of Bennett Taylor, retired.

Stanley L. Schook, East Detroit, Mich., in place of O. A. Kern, deceased.

Robert William Fagan, Holly, Mich., in place of B. E. Jones, deceased.

Edwin L. Gillespie, Jr., Jonesville, Mich., in place of B. A. Dobson, retired.

Walter A. Goodwin, Montrose, Mich., in place of E. S. G. Huber, resigned.

George W. Austin, Romulus, Mich., in place of Anthony McGinnis, deceased.

Bonnie L. Smith, St. Helen, Mich., in place of Elsie Grover, retired.

Ralph W. Kanaar, Swartz Creek, Mich., in place of S. D. Wade, retired.

MINNESOTA

Bernice A. Bottemiller, Bertha, Minn., in place of M. E. Alden, retired.

Jacob W. Kangas, Chisholm, Minn., in place of C. J. Auble, retired.

Ruth A. Campbell, Ellendale, Minn., in place of C. R. Campbell, retired.

Paul H. Hiller, Good Thunder, Minn., in place of C. E. Young, retired.

Eugene J. Grady, Hoyt Lakes, Minn. Office established February 16, 1955.

Carlton L. Anderson, Ironton, Minn., in place of R. J. Mayheu, retired.

J. Shirley Cole, Kenyon, Minn., in place of O. M. Goodfellow, retired.

Sylvester H. Prigge, Mazeppa, Minn., in place of H. M. Stull, retired.

Harry E. Maki, Menahga, Minn., in place of A. P. Nunn, retired.

Harry A. Smith, Mound, Minn., in place of R. E. O'Donnell, deceased.

Everett M. Vitata, Mountain Iron, Minn., in place of H. H. Schur, resigned.

Conrad J. Christle, Royalton, Minn., in place of H. L. Fisher, transferred.

Roland S. Sorvig, Winger, Minn., in place of S. M. Anderson, transferred.

Earle Henry Welty, Winona, Minn., in place of C. B. Erwin, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Arlie A. Ramsey, Clarksdale, Miss., in place of S. I. Still, retired.

Harry O'Cain, Durant, Miss., in place of M. T. Williams, deceased.

Herbert M. Herman, Mayersville, Miss., in place of C. S. Elliott, retired.

Lola Lee Crawford, Meadville, Miss., in place of A. R. Moore, retired.

Edward L. Filgo, Shannon, Miss., in place of Effie Abernathy, retired.

William R. Basden, Sherman, Miss., in place of J. L. L. Beasley, removed.

Dee L. Doty, Vaughan, Miss., in place of R. C. Hinson, transferred.

Paul L. Parker, Water Valley, Miss., in place of A. K. Mauldin, retired.

MISSOURI

Harold M. Wood, Campbell, Mo., in place of M. B. Rice, retired.

MONTANA

James M. Stout, Ballantine, Mont., in place of E. F. Boschert, retired.

Arla M. Bullock, Basin, Mont., in place of T. B. Hopkins, retired.

Dale A. Wetzel, Broadview, Mont., in place of E. M. Evenson, retired.

Donald A. Kleppel, Circle, Mont., in place of E. T. Kirchner, deceased.

Olaf Pederson, Huntley, Mont., in place of L. E. Osness, retired.

NEBRASKA

James R. Fleming, Cedar Bluffs, Nebr., in place of W. F. Hund, retired.

Earl A. Christenson, Craig, Nebr., in place of M. E. McDonald, retired.

Allen D. Irish, Genoa, Nebr., in place of R. W. Bruce, transferred.

John W. Robson, Gordon, Nebr., in place of R. F. Nelson, transferred.

James S. Harrison, Morrill, Nebr., in place of E. G. Quick, retired.

Paul R. Wenzl, Steinauer, Nebr., in place of C. A. Conradt, retired.

Joseph M. Schaaf, Superior, Nebr., in place of S. E. Tabor, retired.

NEVADA

Wilford E. Dunfield, Carson City, Nev., in place of E. J. Folsom, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Marjorie A. Kimball, South Danville, N.H., in place of M. M. Heath, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Robert C. Roy, Branchville, N.J., in place of E. M. Davenport, retired.

William S. Weise, Dumont, N.J., in place of J. L. A. Gorman, retired.

Harry L. Goble, Jr., Great Meadows, N.J., in place of E. J. Wojcik, resigned.

Natalie F. Steele, Highland Lakes, N. J., in place of G. M. Lane, resigned.

Josephine A. Latimer, Laurelton, N.J., in place of E. J. McGann, retired.

Francis A. Riopel, Marlboro, N.J., in place of M. K. Collins, deceased.

Warren W. Fredericks, Sparta, N.J., in place of F. J. Kays, retired.

Daniel Dietz, Stanhope, N.J., in place of L. P. Kays, retired.

Robert M. Dunsmore, Summit, N.J., in place of T. F. VanDyke, deceased.

Merrill M. Tucker, Teaneck, N.J., in place of J. F. Carroll, removed.

Spartaco Pavesi, Tenafly, N.J., in place of F. V. Carter, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Virginia L. Alexander, Farmington, N. Mex., in place of L. H. Moore, retired.
Hattie J. Whitley, Quemado, N. Mex., in place of H. K. Shaw, resigned.
Leon F. Dryden, Ruidoso, N. Mex., in place of O. J. Hull, retired.

NEW YORK

Edna M. Beach, Cottekill, N.Y., in place of Ida Pietrobelli, retired.
Leon V. Jordan, Lyons Falls, N.Y., in place of Rosabelle Harris, retired.
George A. Cole, Northport, N.Y., in place of J. F. Hubert, resigned.
Howard B. Stickney, Prattsburg, N.Y., in place of G. L. Patch, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

John H. Lynch, Mill Spring, N.C., in place of A. F. Briscoe, retired.
James C. Dial, Pembroke, N.C., in place of J. R. Lowry, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Albert Maier, Ashley, N. Dak., in place of M. B. Johnson, retired.

OHIO

Clifford J. Haglock, Dover, Ohio, in place of D. W. Gerber, retired.
Lloyd Gardner, Dundee, Ohio, in place of D. T. Johnson, retired.
Gene H. Ward, Farmersville, Ohio, in place of A. M. Bell, resigned.
William A. Jordan, Fayetteville, Ohio, in place of C. F. Roberts, transferred.
Harold T. Deselms, Freeport, Ohio, in place of K. E. Caldwell, transferred.
Clarence A. Emley, Germantown, Ohio, in place of C. N. Emrick, retired.
Ernest W. Jones, Glouster, Ohio, in place of D. P. Mooney, retired.
Fredrick W. Scheiderer, Marysville, Ohio, in place of H. C. Doellinger, retired.
Marvin O. Crabtree, Morral, Ohio, in place of Guy Miller, retired.
C. Emil Sidle, Nashport, Ohio, in place of W. A. Braller, retired.
Leo C. Blackburn, Portsmouth, Ohio, in place of F. E. Smith, resigned.
Florence M. Hazen, Sharon Center, Ohio, in place of Alice Johnson, retired.
Gordon R. Lanker, Toledo, Ohio, in place of W. P. Kilcorse, deceased.
Russell H. Miller, Yellow Springs, Ohio, in place of H. J. Grote, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Della I. Harlan, Big Cabin, Okla., in place of J. T. Haney, Jr., transferred.
Henry A. Hewett, Durant, Okla., in place of G. V. Duncan, transferred.
Howard E. Barkley, Forgan, Okla., in place of W. J. Lundy, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harold C. Stiffler, Boalsburg, Pa., in place of G. E. Rishel, deceased.
Harold H. Allshouse, Brookville, Pa., in place of H. F. Aiken, retired.
William I. Wolfinger, Chalfont, Pa., in place of E. C. Wonder, retired.
Emil F. Balocco, Chester, Pa., in place of F. L. Stringfellow, retired.
Marion G. Vail, Chester Springs, Pa., in place of J. A. Vail, deceased.
Henry L. Bomberger, Elm, Pa., in place of J. M. Bomberger, retired.
Robert L. Graham, Grand Valley, Pa., in place of C. E. Ongley, retired.
John F. Wolf, Hatfield, Pa., in place of E. N. Zepp, retired.
Vincent B. Segeleon, Leetsdale, Pa., in place of Fred Schneider, deceased.
Richard C. Rader, Littitz, Pa., in place of R. E. Pfautz, retired.
Diantha E. Webster, Mainesburg, Pa., in place of G. E. Stauffer, retired.
F. Ruth Horst, Neffsville, Pa., in place of G. P. Kratzert, retired.

Esther M. Moore, Rockhill Furnace, Pa., in place of M. E. Byers, deceased.
Berton R. Rearick, Rural Valley, Pa., in place of H. O. Boyer, retired.
Douglas A. Portzline, Selinsgrove, Pa., in place of E. G. Aucker, retired.
Russell A. Rosengrant, Wyalusing, Pa., in place of J. G. Keeler, retired.
Abel S. Landes, Jr., Wycombe, Pa., in place of A. S. Landes, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Robert S. Hirst, Ashaway, R.I., in place of J. E. Murray, deceased.
Henry K. Mook, Charlestown, R.I., in place of G. W. Short, resigned.
Donald C. Shemick, North Scituate, R.I., in place of E. L. Clark, retired.
Reginald L. Campbell, Tiverton, R.I., in place of C. S. Holding, removed.
Richard J. Vitullo, Warren, R.I., in place of Fred Beauchaine, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Carl E. Burkett, Cayce, S.C., in place of Helen Van Keuren, retired.
Herbert H. Crosland, Jr., York, S.C., in place of G. C. Cartwright, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Melvin H. Weisner, Orient, S. Dak., in place of M. C. Matter, removed.

TENNESSEE

Allie Louise W. Anderson, Charlotte, Tenn., in place of H. B. Crow, removed.
Lloyd Dodson, Doyle, Tenn., in place of Etoile Johnson, deceased.
Carmon C. Bowlin, Dresden, Tenn., in place of W. H. Pritchett, retired.
Basil Hubert Nunley, Riceville, Tenn., in place of W. H. Higginbotham, retired.
Joseph E. Hollingsworth, Whiteville, Tenn., in place of Lois Caruthers, retired.

TEXAS

Jasper L. Ellison, Abernathy, Tex., in place of W. A. Richter, resigned.
Frank R. Summers, Alief, Tex., in place of C. M. Curry, retired.
John Clarence Stockton, Alvord, Tex., in place of W. E. Howell, transferred.
Earl F. Stubblefield, Bogata, Tex., in place of W. G. King, retired.
Sidney E. Chandler, Bowie, Tex., in place of H. L. Turns, retired.
James R. Flowers, Chico, Tex., in place of W. M. Mead, removed.
Horatio George Littlefair, Cleburne, Tex., in place of D. M. Pegues, retired.
Sam Stowers, Denison, Tex., in place of J. R. Brown, retired.
John D. Zahn, Farwell, Tex., in place of N. N. Lokey, resigned.
Rex L. Alexander, Jayton, Tex., in place of W. E. Wade, transferred.
J. Austin Rigney, Keller, Tex., in place of Alex Jones, retired.
Robert R. Joyner, Ladonia, Tex., in place of Carl Little, retired.
Mary K. Fridel, Mont Belvieu, Tex., in place of L. N. Tyer, deceased.
Issac J. Newman, Moody, Tex., in place of B. W. Newman, transferred.
James M. Cottle, Moran, Tex., in place of A. J. Dennis, transferred.
Ralph R. Richardson, Pecan Gap, Tex., in place of U. B. Walker, retired.
Vera F. Thomas, Point Comfort, Tex. Office established January 1, 1955.
Dixie L. Shaw, Port Bolivar, Tex., in place of I. G. Bouse, retired.
Velma F. Link, Presidio, Tex., in place of A. W. Valentine, resigned.
Helen M. St. John, Progreso, Tex., in place of N. A. Shull, retired.
William H. Brown, Red Oak, Tex., in place of V. G. Evans, retired.
Grady V. Harris, Troup, Tex., in place of G. W. Dear, transferred.
Clarence E. McFarland, Whitesboro, Tex., in place of Harry Reast, retired.

UTAH

Vernald W. Johns, Garland, Utah, in place of M. L. Nielson, deceased.
Michael Kolovich, Jr., Hiawatha, Utah, in place of E. C. Bowen, retired.
Bliss R. Packard, Springville, Utah, in place of J. E. Bird, retired.

VERMONT

Esther L. Sweatt, Craftsbury Common, Vt., in place of B. W. Farrar, retired.

WASHINGTON

Gordon E. Carr, Colville, Wash., in place of C. F. Lee, removed.
Sidney A. Morton, Longview, Wash., in place of C. L. Byers, retired.
Monty Fraser, Othello, Wash., in place of B. H. Barton, retired.
Allen H. Grant, Tracyton, Wash., in place of E. E. Riddell, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Amos L. Whittington, Buffalo, W. Va., in place of E. K. Beitz, resigned.
Maurice B. Morrison, Charlton Heights, W. Va., in place of M. S. Robinson, resigned.
Nettie L. Hurd, Craigs ville, W. Va., in place of S. B. Herold, retired.
Donna M. Harmon, Griffithsville, W. Va., in place of B. R. Osborne, resigned.
Charles F. Parker, Madsville, W. Va., in place of J. C. Garlow, deceased.
Erva Winston Cooper, Milton, W. Va., in place of D. J. Blackwood, retired.
Harold R. Wiles, Tunnelton, W. Va., in place of J. F. Graham, retired.
Robert N. Ailen, Union, W. Va., in place of L. L. Spangler, retired.

WISCONSIN

Ellsworth L. Thompson, Black River Falls, Wis., in place of P. W. Dickey, retired.
Clifford John Stuber, Cochrane, Wis., in place of E. F. Keller, transferred.
Floyd R. Dixon, Elkhart Lake, Wis., in place of E. C. Loos, resigned.
John R. Sargent, Gratiot, Wis., in place of J. A. Brannan, retired.
Kenneth R. Jacobs, Knapp, Wis., in place of J. D. Purvis, transferred.
Theodore R. King, Mazomanie, Wis., in place of L. E. Dye, deceased.
Daniel H. Hutchison, Ontario, Wis., in place of C. I. Nixon, retired.
Stephen D. Angelo, Redgranite, Wis., in place of F. W. Ocain, removed.
Howard T. Rose, Tomahawk, Wis., in place of A. O. Ball, retired.
Roger K. Erickson, Twin Lakes, Wis., in place of B. C. Schippers, retired.

WYOMING

Elizabeth L. Moore, Fort Washakie, Wyo., in place of C. W. Markley, retired.
Hazel M. Bennion, Meeteetse, Wyo., in place of A. T. Frans, retired.
Marguerite A. Brazier, Yoder, Wyo., in place of C. V. Malone, transferred.

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 13th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:
Mason Sears, of Massachusetts.
Benjamin Gerig, of Maryland.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

George N. Sundquist, of Wisconsin, to be Collector of Customs for Customs Collection District No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn., to fill an existing vacancy.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Myron D. Crocker, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of California, vice Gilbert H. Jertberg, elevated.
Fred Kunzel, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of California, vice Jacob Weinberger, retired.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Harry W. Hultgren, Jr., of Connecticut, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Connecticut for the term of 4 years, vice Simon S. Cohen, resigned.

Robert S. Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years, vice B. Hayden Crawford, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Edwin W. Rawlings, 95A, (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code.

Lt. Gen. Samuel E. Anderson, 92A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank of general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 16, 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the countries indicated:

Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, to Cuba.

Philip K. Crowe, of Maryland, to the Union of South Africa.

Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon, to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

William C. Trimble, of Maryland, to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the country indicated:

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Republic, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Father John Kidykas, S.J., Lithuanian Jesuit Fathers' House, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, Father of infinite love, Father of all wisdom and orderliness, Father of all life and happiness, I humbly pray Thee to bless this House of Representatives, charged by Thee and by the people with the promotion of order, peace, and happiness. May this blessing of Thine include a large share of Thy divine wisdom, of Thy merciful justice, and of Thy just love, which alone can enable them to cooperate with Thee in promoting Thy kingdom of truth and life, Thy kingdom of sanctity and grace, Thy kingdom of justice, love, and peace, and so to insure our Nation's true and lasting welfare.

And since Thou didst command us to love also our neighbor, so, Father of all oppressed and suffering, I entreat Thee to move the hearts and wills of each one here present to search and to find ways and means for bringing freedom and lib-

erty to nations and peoples oppressed by a ruthless enemy of all that is holy, truly human and just, and which is constantly threatening the remaining free nations with subversion and subjugation.

In behalf of those doomed, as it seems, to perish in that godless slavery, today I recommend to Thy mercy in a special way, and to the sympathetic help of this noble body the people of Lithuania. Grant O Lord, that this Congress may never abandon that small nation to extinction by Thine own bitter enemies, but rather that it may prove to be the good Samaritan, protecting the natural rights to life, liberty, and happiness, even of the weakest of nations, so that, restored to its freedom, the Lithuanian people may again join the family of free nations as grateful witness of Thy merciful help and powerful victory over the forces of evil, and to rejoice in Thy glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 12, 1959, was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

FEBRUARY 13, 1959.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 712(a)(2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 I have appointed the following members of the Banking and Currency Committee to be members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production: Hon. PAUL BROWN, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, Hon. ALBERT RAINS, Hon. GORDON L. McDONOUGH, Hon. EDGAR W. HESTAND.

With kind regards, I am,
Very sincerely,

BRENT SPENCE.

GROUND BREAKING FOR EXTENSION OF THE EAST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce to the Members, so that they will be on notice, that the ground breaking for the extension of the east front of the Capitol will take place on Monday, February 23, at 11 o'clock a.m.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JANUARY 21, 1959.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having become the ranking majority member of the Committee on Armed Services I find that I do not have adequate time to devote to that position and continue to serve on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Therefore, I hereby resign as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve on that most important committee.

Sincerely,

PAUL J. KILDAY,
Member of Congress.

Without objection the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, United States Code, section 2251, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during whatever general debate may be carried on in the House this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, February 23, 1959, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LITHUANIA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, while commemorating the 41st anniversary of the restoration of independence to the Republic of Lithuania after World War I, it appears fitting to keep in mind the circumstances in which Lithuania lost its independence and became one of the colonies of the Soviet empire.

It seems also particularly fitting to review briefly Soviet Russia's action in the case of Lithuania at the time when pressure is developing for negotiating with Soviet Russia new agreements and new treaties regarding Germany.

The story of the annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union is a story of broken treaties, broken agreements, and