

pose. There is a specific provision in the proposed amendment that such statement may not be used in the Tax Court as proof of the facts or conclusions stated therein but may be used as proof of the reason for such determination. The proposed amendment would also require the Board to make available for inspection by the contractor all data relating to the renegotiation proceeding and to supply the contractor, upon request, with copies of any part thereof which may be requested by the contractor. All of this is designed to give more attention to the basic principles of fair play to the end that the contractor may be fully apprised of the basis for any determination alleging excessive profits.

EXEMPTION OF STANDARD COMMERCIAL ARTICLES

H.R. 5123 in section 4 proposes an addition clarifying one of the criteria in the definition of a standard commercial class of articles.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF TAX COURT DECISIONS IN RENEGOTIATION CASES

Section 5 permit appeals from Tax Court decisions in renegotiation cases to the same extent as other tax cases. It also removes any presumption of correctness in the determination of the Board from which an appeal is being taken. The act now provides that a proceeding before the Tax Court is a proceeding de novo. In such a proceeding

the contractor and the Board should have equal status with respect to the controversy since the Board's determinations are not made in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act. It is not a true de novo proceeding if the Board's findings are entitled to a presumption of correctness. The proposed amendment is designed to eliminate the possibility of such an interpretation of the present act.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

Section 114 of the act now provides for a report to the Congress by the Renegotiation Board. The report contains no information with regard to the specific determinations of the Board in individual cases. As a consequence, the Congress, the public, and the adversaries before the Board are unaware of inconsistencies which may develop in the administration of the act resulting in unfairness and discrimination regardless of an innocent motive. There should be no objection to exposing findings of the Board to the light of day. The requirements of the proposed amendment simply provide that certain information already made available by the Board to the specific contractor involved be made public in its report to the Congress in all cases where the renegotiable business of a contractor exceeded \$20 million in the year in question. I believe the public is

entitled to know, where these vast sums of Government money are involved, how the Board has interpreted this law which is designed to eliminate excessive or windfall profits. The consolidated statistics that are submitted under the present law do not permit me or the public to learn how the Board is exercising its broad discretionary powers. It would seem to be a help to all—the Renegotiation Board, the Congress, procuring services, the public, and the companies who are receiving such large amounts of Government money—to open these actions to the light of day. Not only will this information be of interest to the Congress and the public but it will be in such form as to assure its use in Tax Court proceedings involving renegotiation determinations.

CONCLUSIONS

The amendments proposed by H.R. 5123 are designed to accomplish a greater degree of due process than is now the case and to surround the Board with the same safeguards against unreasonableness, discrimination, and abuse that apply to other administrative agencies with the power and authority similar to that conferred by the Renegotiation Act. Their adoption will tend to bring about stability in the defense industry to the advantage of the Government, the public, the defense industry, and its employees.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 1959

(Legislative day of Monday, March 9, 1959)

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. William Gowland, president of Luton College for Industrial Evangelism and chaplain of Luton Industrial Mission and Community Center, Luton, England, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for this new day with all of its possibilities for glorifying Thy Holy Name. We ask that in all our concerns we may seek Thy will.

We bring before Thy throne this day all those who represent the people of this great Nation. As we thank Thee for all the rich heritage of the past, we pray that our hopes and aspirations in this day and generation shall be according to Thy Holy will.

Teach us how to promote true righteousness, freedom, and justice throughout the whole world, and to face with courage and true insight those principalities and powers of darkness which would bring disaster to the whole of Thy family. Save us from holding lightly and defending halfheartedly the basic beliefs of all free peoples. Recalling the cost to our forefathers in their struggle for liberty and freedom from tyranny, grant that our sacrifices shall be no less than theirs.

All this we ask in Thy Holy Name and only for Thy sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 9, 1959, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS—LIMITATION OF DEBATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business, and that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was

authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] be granted a leave of absence for today and the remainder of the week. He is on official business with the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee in California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW — LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make that request for this reason: There are 98 Members of the Senate. The Senate has one of the most dedicated and efficient staffs I have ever worked with. When business is pending, we like to consider it thoroughly and get action upon it.

We all wish to be as accommodating as possible to individual Senators and to the employees of the Senate. We do not wish to have sessions 6 days a week, if that can be avoided, because we find that a part of our senatorial duties is to keep

in touch with our constituents throughout the Nation, and in order to do so we must return to our States at frequent intervals.

I have received numerous requests that no bills be scheduled for a vote on Thursday, Friday, or Saturday of this week. Of course, I could not comply with such requests, because if every time a Senator asked me not to schedule a vote I complied the Senate would never vote.

Our policy will be to try to accommodate Senators as much as possible, without making any commitments with respect to votes. It would be very difficult to obtain a vote in the Senate on Monday. Tuesday will be St. Patrick's Day, and a substantial number of Senators have engagements out of the city.

The Senate would probably be in session later than usual tomorrow evening were it not for the fact that there will be congressional night at the Press Club. We wish to be understanding in that connection, too.

Tomorrow there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses, which will consume some time. It is our plan and hope before this weekend to dispose of three pieces of legislation now before the Senate. Printed hearings, reports, and bills are available for all Senators to read and study. We may not be able to get action on these measures. It will depend upon how long Senators desire to talk. I have no desire to curtail discussion. One Senator told me only Thursday at the policy committee meeting that he anticipated that the consideration of a certain bill would require 4 or 5 days. Yesterday it was reported that no speakers desired to discuss the bill at any such length. So we must adjust our plans accordingly.

It is our intention to hold the Senate in session until late this evening, and to consider bills in this order:

The unfinished business, which is the space bill. To be followed by the draft bill, which will be presented by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. That will be followed by the Hawaiian statehood bill. I expect quorum calls and yea-and-nay votes during the day. I should like to have the attachés of the Senate locate any absent Senators, and keep themselves informed as to where they are, so that there will be no unusual delay, and so that 75 Senators will not be kept waiting for 2 to reach the Chamber. There will be a yea-and-nay vote on the space bill, and a yea-and-nay vote on the draft bill, as well as on the Hawaiian statehood bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, beginning with new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

T. Graydon Upton, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and

Henry J. Heinz II, of Pennsylvania, to be representative to the 14th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Elmer F. Bennett, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of the Interior;

George W. Abbott, of Nebraska, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior; and

Edward Elliott Johnston, of Hawaii, to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar, beginning with new reports.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that nominations in the Air Force be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that nominations in the Navy be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOSE MARIA LEMUS, OF EL SALVADOR, BEFORE JOINT MEETING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce for the information of Senators that President Jose Maria Lemus, of El Salvador, will address a joint meeting of Congress tomorrow at 12:30 o'clock p.m.

I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Chair to declare a recess tomorrow at approximately 12:15 o'clock p.m., subject to the call of the Chair, and that Senators assemble and proceed to the Chamber of the other body.

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1348. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 1349. A bill for the relief of Song Song Tai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1350. A bill to provide for the registration of finance companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1351. A bill to authorize assistance under the Small Business Act of 1953 to certain small-business concerns displaced as a result of urban renewal activities under the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1352. A bill to authorize enrolled members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to acquire trust interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request):

S. 1353. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of a motor carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of another engaged therein;

S. 1354. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of an air carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of another engaged therein; and

S. 1355. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of a water carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in

such business or acquiring control of or an interest in another so engaged; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. (See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. MORTON, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 1356. A bill to amend the act authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Federal locks and dams in order to increase a certain authorization in such act relating to dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1357. A bill to extend the copyright provisions of title 17 of the United States Code to musical compositions produced without the use of a conventional system of notations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1358. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes; and

S. 1359. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Montezuma Castle National Monument, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

S. 1360. A bill to authorize Dunn Center Special School District No. 29, North Dakota, to apply and receive payments for certain fiscal years under the provisions of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, providing financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1361. A bill for the relief of Henrique Ferreira Das Neves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1362. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 1363. A bill providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 1364. A bill to amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to take possession of the naval oil shale reserves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

S. 1365. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) (by request):

S. 1366. A bill for the relief of Laura Irene de Courten, Candida Rommel, Selina Rommel, and Nikolaus Rommel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1367. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S.J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May of each year as Senior Citizens Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study and report on the U.S. telecommunication resource with special attention to the radio spectrum; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HARTKE submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) relating to priority in temporary employment of persons in taking the 1960 census, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills which would remove the restrictions now imposed by Federal statute upon the entry of American railroads into water, motor, and air transportation.

I am introducing these bills specifically at the request of the railroad industry. By this means the railroad industry will be afforded an opportunity to present to the Congress the various arguments and circumstances which it believes make it necessary and appropriate for the railroads to be freed of these restrictions.

Furthermore, at hearings incident to these bills, other transportation industries will be given an opportunity to present their views also. Introduction of this proposed legislation does not indicate any preconceived conclusion on my part. It is essential, in my opinion, however, that the American railroads be given this opportunity to express their views on the basis of specific legislative proposals without delay.

I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum prepared by the railroad industry describing the purposes of these bills

be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. BUTLER (by request), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 1353. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of a motor carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of another engaged therein;

S. 1354. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of an air carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of another engaged therein; and

S. 1355. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of a water carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of or an interest in another so engaged.

The memorandum presented by Mr. BUTLER is as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON TRANSPORT DIVERSIFICATION

Under existing law, as it has been interpreted by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, special restrictions have been imposed upon the entry of railroads into motor and water transportation and upon the entry of any surface carriers into air transportation. These special restrictions grow out of certain language found in various sections of the Interstate Commerce Act and the Civil Aeronautics Act and are in addition to the general restrictions of those two acts that no one may begin new carrier operations, or acquire control of existing carriers, by motor or water without the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission or by air without the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

As a result of the special restrictions referred to: (1) Except where unusual circumstances prevail, permission to railroads or railroad affiliates to operate as motor carriers has been generally restricted to service that is auxiliary or supplemental to train service; that is, in general, to transportation by truck of the rail traffic of the railroad, at railroad rates and on railroad bills of lading, to and from only such points as are located on the rail line of the railroad and with either a requirement for prior or subsequent movement by rail or a key-point condition (movement only between certain specified key points on the railroad); (2) surface carriers, including railroads, and their affiliates have been almost totally excluded from air operations; and (3) railroads were compelled years ago to cease water carrier operations on the Great Lakes, and have been deterred from instituting operations on other inland waterways or from reinstituting various coastwise ocean operations conducted by them prior to World War II.

The evolution of these restrictive policies which, especially in the case of motor and air operations, have come about almost entirely by reason of administrative interpretation and construction of the statutes, rather than because of the specific terms of the statutes themselves, is briefly reviewed in the appendixes accompanying this memorandum.

It would be in the public interest to permit railroads and their affiliates to enter into, or acquire existing rights to engage in, motor, water, or air transportation on the same basis as any nonrailroad operator.

In the first place, the shipping public would benefit from transport diversification. Greater freedom for the railroads to engage in other forms of transport would make it possible to do away with much unnecessary duplication of facilities, and would result in improved service and lower cost, to the ultimate advantage of the shipper. If the management of one form of transportation also managed other forms, a shipper could arrange through one manager for the complete service he needed and be directed to the most efficient and most economical means of handling his particular traffic either by one mode or a combination of modes.

Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that the railroads are admittedly the backbone of our transportation system. If they are to remain progressive and be given opportunity to regain their financial health, in the interest of the preservation of a strong national transportation system for the benefit of the economy as a whole as well as for the national defense, they should be allowed to diversify their operations just as other businesses do. In industry generally, diversification has been demonstrated to be sound economic practice. Diversification for the railroads means making use of technological developments in other fields of transportation. Special restrictions in this regard, applicable to the railroads but not to others, should be wiped out.

Aside from the obvious benefits that could be expected to flow from transport diversification as such, removal of the special restrictions upon railroad use of other forms of transportation would enable the railroads to share in the use of facilities furnished their truck, water, and air competitors through tremendous public subsidies to which the railroads, as important taxpayers, contribute. As it is, the railroads not only must provide their own comparable facilities out of their own pockets but, as large taxpayers, must share heavily in the cost of expensive projects vitally benefiting competing transportation agencies. It is only fair that this indefensible situation be ameliorated.

What is sought by the railroads in the way of freedom to engage in other forms of transportation is not in the nature of a one-way street, but is intended to be equally applicable to the right of each of the several forms of transport to engage in other forms. It is proposed that the Interstate Commerce Act and the Civil Aeronautics Act be so amended as to make it clear that none of the several forms of transportation when seeking to engage in another form is to be subjected to special standards or limitations or restrictions merely by reason of the circumstance that it is a different form.

It should be understood that even with removal of the special restrictions the railroads, like any other applicant, would still have to prove to the satisfaction of the regulatory authorities that their entry into another transportation field is required by public convenience and necessity or is consistent with the public interest as the circumstances may require. In such cases, whether a new entry or an acquisition of existing facilities were to be involved, the regulatory agency would consider the competitive effect upon existing carriers in the field.

APPENDIX A

MOTOR CARRIER OPERATIONS

In the early days of motor carrier operation and before its regulation, the Interstate

Commerce Commission conducted two independent investigations of the situation. In the first, motorbus and motortruck operation (140 ICC 685 (1928)), the Commission found that certain railroads were already making use of motor transport in their operations, and recommended that the railroads should be authorized to engage in interstate commerce by motor vehicles on the public highways subject to existing provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. In the second investigation, coordination of motor transportation (182 ICC 263 (1932)), the Commission directed its attention to the particular question of the use of motor transport by other transportation agencies. After an extensive study the Commission found that there had already been a great deal of diversion of highway traffic from the railroads to the motor carriers and concluded with the recommendation "that railroads, whether steam or electric, and water carriers, should be specifically authorized to engage in transportation of both persons and property by motor vehicles in interstate commerce over the public highways." Thus, prior to enactment of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 the Interstate Commerce Commission was of the view that railroads should be allowed to diversify their operations into other forms of transportation.

The Motor Carrier Act of 1935 did not follow the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission that railroads should be specifically authorized to engage in interstate motor transport.

In section 206 it did provide for so-called grandfather rights so that any carrier already engaged in motortruck operation could be issued a certificate to continue its operation without further proof of public convenience and necessity.

Section 207, pertaining to the issuance of certificates for new motor carrier operations, did not then nor does it now make any distinction whatsoever as to what type of carrier the applicant may be. It merely required and still requires that there be a finding that the applicant is fit, willing, and able properly to perform the service proposed, and that the proposed service is, or will be, required by the present or future public convenience and necessity.

In section 213 pertaining to authority for consolidation, merger, acquisition and control of an existing motor carrier, however, it was provided that if the applicant for control or merger of an existing motor carrier was a carrier other than a motor carrier, "the Commission shall not enter such an order unless it finds that the transaction will promote the public interest by enabling such carrier to use service by motor vehicle to public advantage in its operations and will not unduly restrain competition."

It will be noted that the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 as originally enacted did not single out the railroad industry for specific discriminatory limitations in this respect, but made the same conditions applicable to other carriers as well. By the Transportation Act of 1940 section 213 of the Motor Carrier Act was repealed but its substance was carried into section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, with one important change: It was provided by the 1940 Act that only in cases where a railroad is the applicant for control or merger of a motor carrier will the limitations apply. Section 5(2)(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act provides that in the case of any railroad acquisition of an existing motor carrier the Interstate Commerce Commission must determine that the proposed control or ownership of the motor carrier by the "railroad" will enable such [rail] carrier to use service by motor vehicle to public advantage in its operations and will not unduly restrain competition."

It should be noted, too, that neither the provisions of the act of 1935, imposing special limitations on other forms of carriers entering into the motor carrier field nor the superseding provisions of section 5(2)(b) of the present act, imposing those limitations on railroads alone, specifically indicate or require in terms that the present type of restrictions (to be shown later) be imposed practically as a matter of routine as conditions for approval of railroad control or acquisition of a motor carrier. It remained for interpretation or construction by the administrative agency to accomplish that effect.

The first proceeding in which the Commission dealt with the question of acquisition of control of motor transportation operations by a railroad or a railroad controlled subsidiary was *Pennsylvania Truck Lines, Inc., Control-Barker*, 1 M.C.C. 101, 5 M.C.C. 9, in which an affiliate of the Pennsylvania Railroad sought authority to acquire control over Barker Motor Freight. Although the railroad's professed intention in acquiring the operating rights of the motor carrier was to facilitate the establishment of a coordinated truck and rail service in Ohio similar to that already furnished in its eastern territory, it did not propose to abandon or dispose of those portions of the acquired motor operations which would not necessarily contribute to coordinated truck-rail service. On the contrary, it maintained that its greater financial resources would permit it to give improved and more frequent motor service over all the routes previously operated by Barker, including those not adjacent to its rail lines. Division 5 of the Commission, however, after first finding that some of Barker's route could indeed be used by the railroad to public advantage, indicated disapproval of any proposal by railroads "to go into the kinds of truck service which were not auxiliary and supplementary to their railroad operations." In a later report, 5 M.C.C. 9, the Commission's position and intent were clarified and restated as follows: "Approved operations are those which are auxiliary and supplemental to train service. Except as hereinafter indicated, nonapproved operations are those which otherwise compete with the railroad itself, those which compete with an established motor carrier, or which invade to a substantial degree a territory already adequately served by another rail carrier."

Thus, in this initial decision on the question, the Commission established the general principle that railroads would only be permitted to make use of motor transport to the limited extent that such was auxiliary or supplemental to rail service and would not be permitted to compete generally with established motor carriers. Motor carriers were thus given absolute protection from general competition by railroads by use of motor transport and the principle of competition as between various forms of transportation, which has subsequently proved to be both inefficient and ruinous, was established as the controlling principle in the transportation industry.

The statutory restrictions upon which the Commission relied in the Barker case were those in section 213 of the act pertaining to acquisition by purchase or merger of existing motor carrier rights. The Barker case was, of course, such an acquisition. This same policy, however, was early carried over as controlling also in the disposition of applications by railroads or their affiliates for new certificated motor carrier rights under section 207, which does not specifically contain any such restrictions for acquisition of rights by other agencies of transportation. In *Kansas City Southern Transport Company, Inc., Common Carrier Application*, (10 M.C.C. 221, 28 M.C.C. 5), a rail affiliate sought new motor common carrier rights over certain routes which it represented would be

auxiliary to and supplementary to its rail service and coordinated therewith. However, it asked to move some shipments entirely by truck. Division 5 of the Commission applied the Barker case principle and made the authorizations subject to the five following conditions which, with one later modification, have grown to be standard and customary in cases of this kind.

1. The service to be performed shall be limited to service which is auxiliary to, or supplemental of, rail service.

2. No motor service shall be rendered to or from any point not a station on a rail line of the railroad.

3. Shipments to be transported shall be limited to those on a through bill of lading, including a prior or subsequent movement by rail.

4. All contractual arrangements between the applicant motor carrier and the parent railroad shall be reported to the Commission and shall be subject to revision.

5. The motor service shall be subject to such further specific conditions as the Commission in the future may find it necessary to impose, in order to insure that it will remain auxiliary and supplemental to the rail service.

This decision was rendered on November 12, 1938, and from that date to the early part of 1940 it was followed consistently and substantially identical restrictions were imposed in disposing of numerous railroad applications for motor carrier operating authorities.

In 1941, on reconsideration in the same proceeding, the entire Commission substituted a different requirement for condition No. 3, which required a prior or subsequent movement by rail. In the case *Kansas City Southern Transport Company, Common Carrier Application*, 28 M.C.C. 5, a new type of condition was substituted; namely, a so-called key point condition. This permitted the movement of some shipments entirely by motor, but only between local way points on the railroad, and then only provided that such shipments did not move by motor between any two usual break bulk key points. The remaining conditions were left unchanged.

With rare exceptions confined to very unusual circumstances these restrictions, including either a prior or subsequent movement by rail or a key point restriction, have been uniformly imposed alike upon later railroad applications for both acquisition of existing and for new motor carrier rights.

The result of these restrictions has been to limit railroad or railroad affiliate operation of motor transport entirely to that which is auxiliary and supplementary to railroad operation, and prevents any general motor competition whatever with existing motor carriers. This policy of restriction that has been practiced by the Interstate Commerce Commission does not per se protect the inherent advantages of the mode of transportation by motor vehicle, but rather protects the business of the motor carriers engaging in that form of transportation. The Commission has limited the effective use of motor transport solely to motor carriers as such and has forbidden it to be used by other forms of transportation companies where the inherent advantages of such transport might fit in well with the operations of such company.

If the matter had not been already determined to the contrary, the railroads could point out that there is nothing in the statement of policy in the Transportation Act of 1940, nor in the express provisions of section 5(2), the successor to section 213 in the original Motor Carrier Act of 1935, which requires that railroad operation of motor equipment on the public highway be limited to that which is merely auxiliary or supple-

mental to rail service. The national transportation policy expressed in the act of 1940 refers simply to the public interest and the preservation of the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation. The railroads submit that it would be in the public interest, and it would further promote the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation, if the railroads were permitted to offer a diversified transportation product to the public as it would strengthen all functions of the transportation company and put it in a better economic position to offer all services to the public.

Furthermore, the only direct statutory restrictions on railroads and their affiliates are those contained in section 5, applying to acquisition of existing motor carrier rights by merger, purchase, or otherwise. There is nothing expressed in sections 206 and 207, concerning applications for new motor carrier authority, which necessitates discrimination against railroads and affiliates in the granting of such authority, and it is only through the Commission's interpretation of the law that they are imposed.

As stated heretofore, the Commission has, in some cases, held that where special circumstances are present, a rail affiliated applicant can obtain unrestricted motor carrier authority. In the absence of such special circumstances, the Commission has not issued unrestricted motor carrier rights to rail affiliates. It has been the Commission's view that a railroad applicant for authority to operate as a common carrier by motor vehicle, although required by statutes to do no more than prove as any other applicant that the service is required by public convenience and necessity, nevertheless has a special burden by reason of the fact that it simply is a railroad. The Commission has used the words of the national transportation policy to carry over the language from section 5 of the act into section 207, and this requires railroads in certification cases to show circumstances negating any disadvantage to the public because the applicant is a railroad. This policy of the Commission was approved by the Supreme Court in *U.S. v. Rock Island M. Transit Company* (340 U.S. 419, 427-428).

The Commission's policy of granting rail affiliates unrestricted motor carrier rights in situations where special circumstances exist has been given legal sanction by the Supreme Court in *American Trucking Associations v. U.S.*, 355 U.S. 141 (1957). The net effect of the decision, however, is not only to limit the area in which a rail affiliate can engage in unrestricted motor carrier operations but also to constitute a straitjacket for the railroads rather than an avenue permitting further motor operation. In the case, the Rock Island Motor Transit, a subsidiary of the Rock Island Railroad, had authority from the Interstate Commerce Commission to operate interstate motor carrier service between certain points in Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska, subject to restrictions designed to limit the service to that which was auxiliary to or supplemental of the Rock Island's rail operations (keypoint restrictions, forbidding transport to stations not on the rail lines), and filed an application for a certificate under section 207 to serve without the restrictions several of the communities under restriction. The authority was granted in part by the Commission when it was found that the applicant was willing to provide services which other trucking companies would not provide. The Court stated that the rigid requirement of section 5(2)(b) of the act applicable to acquisition cases applied also to proceedings for new certificates under section 207 and that the auxiliary or supplemental conditions applied unless the special circumstances were present, as they were in the

instant case. The case seems to approve only those unrestricted motor operations by a rail affiliate in situations where trucking companies do not want the traffic.

APPENDIX B

AIR CARRIER OPERATIONS

There are two provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act¹ that must be considered in any discussion of the performance of air carriage by surface transportation forms. One is section 401, providing that no air (common) carrier may operate in air transportation without a certificate issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board upon a finding that the transportation proposed is required by public convenience and necessity. Section 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act gives the CAB control over the consolidation of two or more air carriers and over transactions in the nature of consolidations, mergers, acquisitions and the like between air and surface carriers or their affiliates.

Proposed consolidations of air carriers are required to be approved unless the CAB finds that they would not be consistent with the public interest. This standard is also applicable where unification of air and surface carriers is involved, but in transactions where a surface carrier is the applicant the following additional requirement of section 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act must be met:

"That if the applicant is a carrier other than an air carrier, or a person controlled by a carrier other than an air carrier or affiliated therewith within the meaning of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, such applicant shall for the purposes of this section be considered an air carrier and the authority shall not enter such an order of approval unless it finds that the transaction proposed will promote the public interest by enabling such carrier other than an air carrier to use aircraft to public advantage in its operation and will not restrain competition."

There has been very little common ownership as between railroads and other surface carriers on the one hand and air carriers on the other. Before the Civil Aeronautics Act became law in 1938, a substantial interest in a New England air carrier was held by certain railroads, but the CAB early indicated that it would probably not look with favor on any increase in the railroads' control of this air carrier or on expansion of the air carrier's operations so long as it remained railroad-controlled (*Railroad Control of Northeast Airlines*, 4 C.A.B. 379 (1943)). Subsequently the railroads involved sold their holdings. Furthermore, when subsidiaries of two other railroads made application for authority to operate as common air carriers, those applications were denied (see Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics, *Historical Development of Transport Coordination and Integration in the United States* (1950), p. 177).

The philosophy of the Civil Aeronautics Board is perhaps best expressed in certain cases relating to efforts of overseas steamship operators to participate in foreign air service. The language used in these cases is at least indicative of the Board's attitude toward any future cases involving common

¹ The discussion in this appendix is couched in terms of secs. 401 and 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act. Actually, these two sections were repealed by Public Law 85-726, August 23, 1958; but they were reenacted as secs 401 and 408 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. Administration of these two sections still rests with the Civil Aeronautics Board.

ownership in respect of air carriers and surface carriers engaged in domestic transportation.

The first line of decisions involved an attempt by American Export Lines, an ocean steamship company, to organize and then control an air carrier subsidiary in order to engage in foreign air transportation. The Board denied the application of the steamship company to control the air line because, it said, the requirements of section 408 (above quoted) were not met. The Board went on to say that section 408 applies not only when a surface carrier organizes a subsidiary to engage in air transportation but also when a surface carrier seeks to enter the field of air transportation directly by obtaining new operating rights under section 401 (certification) of the act.

At the request of several steamship companies the CAB later reconsidered its view that the provisions of section 408 apply in certificate proceedings (e.g., *North Atlantic Route*, 6 C.A.B. 319 (1945)). The conclusion of the Board, based on a different interpretation of the statute and the congressional intent, amounted to a reversal of its previous holding in the American Export case, since it was found that compliance with the restrictive requirements of section 408 could not properly be held a condition to the granting of air carrier operating rights to a surface carrier.

Importantly, however, the majority of the CAB indicated that the fact that an applicant was a surface carrier would nevertheless necessarily be weighed in reaching a rounded judgment on the question of fitness, willingness, and ability to engage in air transportation.

APPENDIX C

WATER CARRIER OPERATIONS

Under the Panama Canal Act of 1912 (now section 5(14-16) of the Interstate Commerce Act), restrictions are imposed on the ability of railroads to engage in water transportation whenever the water transportation in question does or may compete with the rail carrier itself. Where water transportation that is competitive with a rail carrier is carried on through the Panama Canal, the railroad is absolutely prohibited from having interest in the water carrier.¹ Where the water transportation is carried on elsewhere, a railroad may, even where the water service does or may compete with its own rail service, be allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission to engage in water operations if it can be shown that this will not prevent such service "from being operated in the interest of the public and with advantage to the convenience and commerce of the people, and that it will not exclude, prevent, or reduce competition on the route by water under consideration."

As a result of this legislation and the refusal of the Interstate Commerce Commission, apparently as a matter of continuing policy, to find very much control of water carriers by railroads to be in the public interest, many railroad-water carrier relationships (principally on the Great Lakes) had to be dissolved; and in the view of many the Panama Canal Act has been and continues to be a rather effective bar to any new large-scale railroad participation in domestic water transportation.

¹ The railroads do not seek repeal of the specific and absolute prohibition as to the transportation through the Panama Canal.

INCREASE OF AUTHORIZATION FOR THE RESTORATION OF LOCK AND DAM NO. 3, BIG SANDY RIVER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, for myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would increase the authorization of the Corps of Engineers for the restoration of lock and dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River at Louisa, Ky., and Fort Gay, W. Va., from \$50,000 to \$90,000.

This restoration and authorization of \$50,000 was approved in 1956 by Public Law 966 of the 84th Congress. Subsequently it has been ascertained that the information upon which the \$50,000 figure was based was not obtained by the usual study of the Corps of Engineers, but was furnished as an estimate. It has now been determined by the Corps of Engineers that more than \$90,000 is required for the project.

The local communities are willing and able to provide necessary rights of way and to maintain the lock and dam, as required in the original legislation. Their financial circumstances are such, however, that they are unable to contribute more to the restoration costs.

Of great importance, I think, is the fact that the Congress intended in its original action to authorize an adequate sum of money to complete satisfactorily the restoration of the dam. I believe, therefore, that we have the obligation to adjust the authorization to the correct and detailed estimate of cost. The bill which we are introducing today undertakes to do that by increasing to \$100,000 the amount that is authorized for the lock and dam No. 3 project. The benefits to the two communities in providing a year-round water supply and recreational benefits, as contemplated in the original legislation, require prompt and favorable action.

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

The bill (S. 1356) to amend the act authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Federal locks and dams in order to increase a certain authorization in such act relating to dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River, Ky., introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I, too, am a cosponsor of the proposed amendment, and would like to speak in support of it.

I want to stress that the myriad of benefits to the Big Sandy Valley, which my colleague has outlined, was the original objective of the 84th Congress when, in the passage of Public Law 996, it provided a sum of \$50,000 for the restoration of Dam No. 3. This restoration might already have been carried out if it had not been for the fact that a subsequent reevaluation of the project has

shown that the original appropriation was inadequate.

The original cost estimate of \$50,000 was incorporated into the measure on the assumption that the dam might be restored as a lock-type structure. Since that time, however, it has been decided that this method of restoration would be ill-advised, due to the deterioration of the dam. It is now suggested that a cutoff wall be built across the lock chamber, and that other rebuilding be carried out at a cost of nearly \$100,000.

Therefore, Mr. President, you see that the proposed amendment now before us is not a new project in itself, but merely a rectification of an inaccuracy in the previous act. By approving this amendment, we will allow the original intention of the portion of Public Law 996 applying to Dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River to be brought to fruition.

Therefore, I, too, express my wholehearted endorsement of this proposed amendment, and respectfully invite my colleagues in this body to join in its support.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have today joined with the senior Senator from Kentucky in cosponsorship of an amendment to the act authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Federal locks and dams, in order to increase a certain authorization to provide for the restoration of dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River between West Virginia and Kentucky, and I wish to make a short statement in support of the amendment.

Dam No. 3, between the cities of Louisa, Ky., and Fort Gay, W. Va., is virtually useless in its present state. It is on the Government's obsolete list and is not used for navigation purposes. It merely sits in the Big Sandy River untended, with the unchecked stream coursing through it.

However, if the proposed restoration which is provided by this amendment could be carried out, dam No. 3 would again be of great benefit to the residents of the area. A large, beautiful reservoir of water would be created to enhance the region. It would assure the surrounding cities of an adequate water supply. It would serve as an attractive recreation spot. It would make possible the establishment of industries dependent upon water resources. It would contribute to flood control in the Big Sandy Valley. And it would bring to the area the many other advantages of a developed and controlled watercourse.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge and recommend the prompt passage of this measure which would bring such benefits to the people of this border region of West Virginia and Kentucky.

PROMOTION AND CONSERVATION OF COAL RELATING TO COAL RESEARCH THROUGH CONTRACTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am one of the several cosponsors of Senate bill 49, introduced by the Senator from

Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to establish a Coal Research and Development Commission in order to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in this country. The program which would be authorized by that bill is an important one. I hope, and have reason to believe, that it will receive serious consideration by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

In order that our committee may consider a somewhat different approach to the same problem, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a research program through the existing staff of the Bureau of Mines, by contract, or otherwise. This bill is a companion measure to one offered in the other body on January 26 by my good friend Representative Saylor, of Pennsylvania, H.R. 3375.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in full 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. 1362) to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines shall—

(1) develop through research, new and more efficient methods of mining, preparing and utilizing coal;

(2) contract for, sponsor, cosponsor, and promote the coordination of, research with recognized interested groups, including but not limited to, coal trade associations, coal research associations, educational institutions, and agencies of States and political subdivisions of States;

(3) establish technical advisory committees composed of recognized experts in various aspects of coal research to assist him in the examination, evaluation, of research progress on all research proposals and contracts and to ensure the avoidance of duplication of research; and

(4) cooperate to the fullest extent possible with other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Federal Government and with State governments, and with all other interested agencies, governmental and nongovernmental.

Sec. 2. Research authorized by this act may be conducted wherever suitable personnel and facilities are available.

Sec. 3. No research shall be carried out, contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this act, unless all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such research shall be available to the general public. Whenever in the estimation of the Secretary of the Interior the purposes of this act would be furthered through the use of patented processes or equipment, the

Secretary is authorized to enter into such agreements as he deems necessary for the acquisition or use of such patents on reasonable terms and conditions.

Sec. 4. (a) It is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended, not to exceed \$20,000,000 to be used to carry out the purposes of this act for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1960, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the appointment of a third district judge for our State. The need for another judge is critical; the backlog of cases which continues to mount because of this void is appalling. And there is no slackening of this caseload in sight.

Our citizens are forced to wait endlessly between the time a case is filed and the time it is heard in court. Oftentimes, in Colorado, our people are forced to await their day in court for as long as 3 or 4 years.

Even in comparison with the national picture, the situation in Colorado stands out as singularly critical. The average time from filing to disposition of civil cases in Colorado is 21 months, compared with the national average of 14. Forty-six percent of the trials during recent years had to be conducted by visiting judges. This means that half of Colorado's judicial business in Federal courts was handled by visiting judges. The problem is compounded when we realize the time these good men had to take from their own areas in order to lend a hand in our State.

Mr. President, an injured claimant whose earning power has been terminated can run into terribly hard times without compensation when the decision is delayed for years as so often happens now. I know that my colleagues agree with me wholeheartedly that justice delayed is no justice at all and may even amount to injustice.

The appointment of a third judge in Colorado has long been a recognized necessity. It was recommended by the Judicial Conference in March 1955, and again a year later. We no longer can delay. It is our responsibility to provide this needed help. Congress no longer can turn its back on our people.

Mr. President, Colorado is one of the Nation's fastest growing States. We are forced to drop further and further behind in our efforts to give fair play to those of our citizens who seek recognition in the Federal courts. What a pathetic commentary on our Federal judicial system.

I ask that this bill receive the speedy attention of my colleagues so that the citizens of Colorado will no longer be denied the full advantage of our great system of justice, an advantage to which they are fully entitled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1363) providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Colorado, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the District of Colorado. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the District of Colorado, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

| Districts | Judges |
|-----------------|--------|
| "Colorado....." | 3 |

ELIGIBILITY OF WELFARE AND RECREATION AGENCIES FOR FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies.

Under the present law, such surplus property can go only to medical institutions, health centers, schools, colleges, and related organizations. The proposed bill would broaden eligibility to include agencies such as the Salvation Army, Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., Travelers Aid, and other similar organizations.

The bill grows out of recommendations drawn up by a national welfare assembly committee, which included members drawn from American Foundation for the Blind, Child Welfare League of America, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Council on Social Work Education, Girl Scouts, National Council of Churches of Christ in America, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, National Jewish Welfare Board, National Recreational Association, Salvation Army, United Community Funds and Councils, Young Men's Christian Association, and Young Women's Christian Association. In addition, the following organizations have expressed their interest in this subject: American Hearing Society, Board of Hospitals and Homes of the Methodist Church, National Catholic Community Service, and United HIAS Service.

My proposal contains carefully formulated language to insure that only tax-supported or tax-exempt welfare or recreation agencies would be eligible for this property. Also, a tax exempt voluntary agency would have to have a license from a State standard-setting agency, or receive funds through a State or local community fund, or be affiliated with or a part of a national standard-setting organization.

The present law, which limits eligibility for surplus Government property to educational and health organizations, should be expanded to include worthy welfare and recreational agencies. These include settlement houses, homes for the aged, youth centers, character building agencies, and adoption centers.

These agencies are doing a magnificent job of helping our young people, our aged, and many of our needy citizens. They need and can make good use of surplus property in their work.

Since the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare cooperated with the National Welfare Assembly Committee in drawing up the agreement out of which this bill grew, the bill deserves wide support and should be acted upon as soon as possible.

We should endeavor to help these worthy organizations in every possible way, for through them we will all be building a better America.

Mr. President, there was a great deal of interest evidenced in the proposed legislation in the last session of Congress, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the *RECORD*, and lie on the table for a period of 1 week, in order to give other Members the opportunity to cosponsor it if they desire to do so.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the *RECORD*, and lie on the desk for 1 week, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 1365) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. WILEY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, 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 paragraph (1) of subsection (j) of section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C., sec. 484), is amended by inserting immediately after "or for research for any such purpose" the following: "or for utilization by welfare or recreation agencies".

Sec. 2. Paragraph (3) of such subsection (j) is amended—

(1) by inserting immediately after "or for research for any such purpose" the following: "or for utilization by welfare or recreation agencies";

(2) by striking out "and (B)" and inserting "(B)"; and

(3) by inserting immediately after "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" the following: "and (C) welfare or recreation agencies".

Sec. 3. Paragraph (2) of subsection (k) of such section 203 is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (D);

(2) by striking out "law," in subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "law; or"; and

(3) by inserting immediately after such subparagraph (E) the following:

"(F) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the case of property transferred pursuant to this act to welfare or recreation agencies—".

Sec. 4. Such section 203 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(p) As used in this section, the term 'welfare or recreation agencies' means tax-supported or tax-exempt welfare or recreation agencies which serve people in institutions and in groups, but in the case of any such agency which is a tax-exempt voluntary agency, includes only an agency which meets at least one of the following criteria—

"(1) such agency is licensed by a State standard-setting agency;

"(2) such agency receives funds through a State or local community fund or similar federated fund-raising body; or

"(3) such agency is affiliated with, or is a part of, a national standard-setting organization."

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "COAST GUARD"

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

The bill (S. 1367) to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

MARCH 4, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To amend title 14, United States Code, entitled 'Coast Guard,' to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft."

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide basic legislative authority similar

to that possessed by the Navy in title 10, U.S.C. 7223, to authorize the Coast Guard to furnish necessary fuel, supplies, and services to vessels and watercraft that (1) are unable to procure the necessary supplies or services at their present location; and (2) are unable to proceed to the nearest port where they may be obtained without endangering the safety of the vessel or watercraft, the health and comfort of its personnel, or the safety of the property aboard.

The proposed legislation is not designed to impair or change the traditional giving of assistance and comfort by the Coast Guard to those found in distress whose pressing condition warrants immediate succor. It is intended rather to allow a reimbursement of costs to the Government in those cases where furnishing of a material or service is in the nature of a humanitarian gesture.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Very truly yours,

A. GILMORE FLUES,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the month of May every year as Senior Citizens Month during which appropriate ceremonies and activities will be held in recognition of the contribution and capabilities of the growing number of citizens age 60 and over in the United States.

Slowly but surely, the attitude of our Nation toward its more than 21 million senior citizens past 60 is itself coming of age. No longer in our mind's eye do we automatically exile the aging to a quiet and unproductive retirement. We cannot afford to, for the advances of medical science resulting in a lengthening life span for all of us indicate that by 1980, nearly 35 million Americans—15 percent of our total population—will be 60 years or over. It is highly probable that this vast human resource of experienced and trained manpower at many levels of business and industry will constitute an indispensable element in the U.S. economy which must expand tremendously to keep pace with the needs of its own population and the demands of world markets.

However, if our senior citizens are to have an opportunity to play their role to the full—if we are to erase the old habit of thinking of them in the past, rather than in the present and future tense—I believe we should direct national attention to the problems confronting the aging as well as their contributions, their needs as well as their capabilities. Therefore, I am introducing this joint resolution which asks the President to proclaim May each year as Senior Citizens Month.

In the next two decades, the proportion of our population past 60 will increase more than 65 percent. This

means that all of us must be made aware now of the need to initiate and support legislation and promote programs aimed at preventing discrimination because of age in employment—only a handful of States presently have such a law on their books—and of equal importance providing special housing for older people including those who have retired and often live on sharply reduced incomes. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports that less than 5 percent of the housing problems of the aged have actually been met so far by existing State and Federal efforts.

However, some progress has been made in the area of broadened social security for the aged which was passed by Congress last year, although further steps need to be taken. In 1957 the Center for Aging Research in the National Institutes of Health was established, marking a real step forward.

The appropriate ceremonies and activities to be held by States and localities in celebration of Senior Citizens Month should also focus on the tremendous desire of our aging to expand their horizons, to train for new tasks and to cultivate fresh interests. Nearly 3 million Americans past the age of 50 are attending adult education courses, including more than 50,000 Americans over 75 years of age. Their deep interest in courses in civic and public affairs, general education, trade courses, and classes offering business, technical, and agricultural training reflect the healthy, vigorous outlook of the great majority of our senior citizens who wish to continue developing their manual skills and mental capacity to benefit themselves, their families, and their Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 75) to provide for the designation of the month of May of each year as Senior Citizens Month, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMISSION TO STUDY TELECOMMUNICATION RESOURCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a commission to study and report on the United States telecommunication resource with special attention to the radio spectrum. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, relating to the proposed legislation.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 76) to establish a commission to study and report on the United States telecommuni-

cation resource with special attention to the radio spectrum, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF CIVIL AND
DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The President, in his letter of March 3, 1959, recommended that the Congress establish a five-member commission on telecommunication to conduct a thorough and comprehensive study of certain problem areas of telecommunication management and allocation of radio frequencies which could not be examined by the Special Advisory Committee in the time available.

I believe that the President's purpose could be accomplished by the establishment of the recommended commission with the duty to conduct a thorough and comprehensive study of:

1. The role of the Federal Government in the management of the U.S. telecommunication resource.

2. The administrative organization for discharging the Government's responsibilities, with particular reference to the division of responsibility under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with a view to determining what changes, if any, should be made in the existing administrative organizations or statutes to improve the management of that resource.

3. The existing methods and procedures for allocating (apportioning) radio frequencies and bands of radio frequencies as between Federal Government and non-Federal Government users, with a view to determining what changes, if any, should be made to insure, insofar as practicable, the allocated frequencies may be utilized to the maximum degree possible, and to facilitate planning to take advantage of technological change in achieving maximum return from the use of the radio spectrum.

4. The existing national table of radio frequency allocations with respect to the apportionment of the various parts of the radio frequency spectrum as between Government and non-Government users, with a view to determining whether the current division of the spectrum serves the national interest to an appropriate degree and whether any frequency space (and if so, how much of such space) may, in the public interest, be reallocated to other uses.

The commission should be required to submit to the President for transmission to Congress within 12 months after the appointment and qualification of its members a report of the results of the study, together with such recommendations as the Commission may deem desirable and applicable. There is attached for your consideration a draft joint resolution designed to accomplish the foregoing.

I am addressing a similar letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

LEO A. HOEGH.

PRIORITY IN TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS IN TAKING 1960 CENSUS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the time is once again approaching when we

must make preparations for taking a national census. Never before, Mr. President, has this Nation approached a decennial census task with so many unemployed, or so many people receiving social security benefits.

Mr. President, this is the responsibility of the executive branch to plan and execute the census. Those who do the actual interviewing and counting of heads throughout this great Nation are usually chosen because of certain political loyalties.

However, Mr. President, it is my observation that unemployment and social security coverage know no political bounds. In these trying days of making ends meet on a limited income we must take every possible step to make available employment opportunities to those persons receiving such incomes.

It is for this reason then, Mr. President, that I submit a concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the President take such action as is necessary to cause the Bureau of the Census to give priority to the recipients of social security when selecting individuals for temporary employment in connection with taking the 1960 census.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President take such action as may be necessary to cause the Bureau of the Census, in selecting individuals for temporary employment in connection with the taking of the 1960 census, to give priority, insofar as may be practicable without jeopardizing any priority that disabled veterans or others may now enjoy with respect to obtaining such employment, to applicants for such employment who are recipients of insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; except that such priority shall not be accorded to such applicants in areas determined by the Secretary of Labor to be surplus-labor areas.

THE TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 9, 1959, the names of Senators PASTORE and HARTKE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1323) to authorize temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing unemployment compensation laws, and for individuals who were employed in noncovered employment, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA (for himself and other Senators) on March 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. HUMPHREY:

Address entitled "The Need To Know," delivered by him at the national debate banquet held at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., on February 13, 1959.

By Mr. ENGLE:

Statement by him before Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on proposals for Federal aid to education.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

Editorial entitled "Can TALMADGE Bail Out U.S. Farm Program?" and letter from him to the Wall Street Journal published on February 26, 1959.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF OGDEN ROGERS REID TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY TO ISRAEL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate today received the nomination of Ogden Rogers Reid, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Israel, vice Edward B. Lawson.

In accordance with the committee rule, the pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1096) to authorize appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a very brief statement to make at this time. I am obliged to be absent from the Chamber for a time, and for that reason I make the statement now.

First of all, I should like to commend the very able, distinguished, and dedicated Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the members of his subcommittee, who will very shortly present the bill in all its details. The members of the subcommittee are the very gracious and intelligent lady from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the very able Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the very able Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the very able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DOBB], and the very able Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

This subcommittee, ably assisted by its professional staff member, Max Lehrer, has done a thorough and expeditious job in handling the NASA supplemental authorization bill for 1959. All the pertinent facts were developed during the committee's hearings and the important highlights are set forth clearly in the committee report.

In introducing this bill, the senior Senator from New Hampshire and I were anxious to see that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was provided with necessary supplemental authorization for fiscal year 1959. To assure that there would be no delay in the program due to any lack of funds, the 1959 requirements were separated from the requirements for 1960. The speed and thoroughness with which the committee has done the job is therefore most gratifying.

In considering the authorizations requested for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, there was complete agreement on the part of all members of the committee that we must be guided by only one standard—and that is to take whatever action is necessary in the national interest.

If that meant adding money, we were prepared to do so. If we could find places to economize, we were also prepared to do so.

The end result of the committee's consideration has been to recommend the authorization of supplemental appropriations for 1959 totaling \$48,354,000. That is the exact amount requested.

This does not mean that the committee has simply rubber stamped the administration's request. The record of the detailed hearings and the comprehensive committee report amply demonstrate the thoroughness with which this supplemental request has been handled.

It was the considered judgment of the committee that the justifications presented for the 1959 supplemental authorization were sound and well supported.

Furthermore, while there are a number of problem areas that must be explored in connection with the 1960 program, the committee believes that the items covered by the 1959 supplemental authorization can be approved now with assurance that they will fit in with the program ultimately approved for 1960.

We may be sure that the Senator from Mississippi and his subcommittee will examine the 1960 NASA authorization request with the same completeness and dispatch with which they handled the 1959 bill. Before they complete their action, we hope they will have the benefit of the findings of the new subcommittee, headed by the junior Senator from Missouri, which we have appointed to look into Governmental Organization for Space Activities.

Mr. President, the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee has considered this bill with the widespread viewpoint of being as prudent as possible, yet providing fully for all essential requirements. This bill meets that test. That was the recommendation of the subcommittee, and the subcommittee's recommendation was approved by each member of the full committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee recommends that the bill be given favorable consideration, as reported. I shall await with great interest the details of the report to be presented by

the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 4282) to supplement and modify the act of May 24, 1828 (6 Stat. 383, ch. CXII), insofar as it relates to the corporate powers of the Sisters of the Visitation, of Georgetown in the District of Columbia, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 4282) to supplement and modify the act of May 24, 1828 (6 Stat. 383, ch. CXII), insofar as it relates to the corporate powers of the Sisters of the Visitation, of Georgetown in the District of Columbia, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUTHORIZATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1959

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which is S. 1096.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1096) to authorize appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, S. 1096 is the first bill which has been reported to the Senate concerning legislation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which was created only last July 29. The hearings on the bill marked the first appearance before Congress of Dr. T. Keith Glennan and his able staff directly concerning proposed legislation for their Administration.

At the subcommittee hearing, there were present Dr. T. Keith Glennan, who is the Administrator; and also Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, the Deputy Administrator of NASA. Dr. Dryden was formerly Administrator of the NACA. Also present were Dr. Abe Silverstein, Director of

Space Flight Development; Mr. Edgar M. Cortright, chief of the advanced technology program; Dr. Homer E. Newell, Jr., Assistant Director for Space Sciences; Mr. DeMarquis D. Wyatt, Technical Assistant to the Director of Space Flight Development; and Mr. Ira H. Abbott, Assistant Director of Research—Aerodynamics and Flight Mechanics. I mention them by name because this is a new agency, and the presentations these gentlemen have made constitute their first presentation of proposed legislation. They have been organized as a staff and an administration for only a few months. We were very greatly and most favorably impressed with their ability, their dedication, and their very fine knowledge of the subject matter. The pioneer work they are doing seems to be well handled.

Mr. President, Senate bill 1096, which now is being considered by the Senate, authorizes supplemental appropriations totaling \$48,354,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1959. Copies of the hearings, together with a detailed committee report, are on the desks of Senators. I propose to cover the highlights of the bill, for the record.

Mr. President, the record of the hearings, which includes the testimony given in this case, sheds very interesting light upon this little known subject. I refer particularly to the Appendix, beginning on page 135 of the hearings, which includes remarkable photographic reproductions of a number of exhibits with reference to space flight, illustrations of a man placed in the instrument, reproductions of weather satellite pictures, and related matter. I think these will be of special interest to the Members of Congress and to the general public.

At this time I should like to state that the bill and the report were unanimously recommended by the subcommittee on which it is my privilege to serve as chairman. The bill and report have also been approved unanimously by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. So there are no real differences of opinion concerning the authorization covered by the bill.

In considering the bill, the committee addressed itself to three questions: First, are the projects sound and essential?; second, are the amounts requested enough to do the job?; third, are these amounts requested excessive at this time?

Before proceeding, it should be made clear that the bill covers only the supplemental requirements of NASA for the current fiscal year. While the bill incorporates the exact amounts requested by the Administration, the bill is not in the form originally requested. In January, the Administrator of NASA, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, submitted a draft authorization bill covering both the fiscal year 1959 and the fiscal year 1960, and requested its introduction. In view of the need for thorough examination and careful consideration of the overall space program proposed for the fiscal year 1960, and of

the \$485,300,000 requested for NASA for its part of that overall program, it was clear that combining the supplemental request for the fiscal year 1959 with the authorization for the fiscal year 1960 would involve needless delay for the former.

To assure expeditious provision of additional authorizations required for present needs, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences separated its consideration of NASA needs for 1959 from its requirements for 1960. On behalf of the committee, Senators JOHNSON and BRIDGES introduced Senate bill 1096, which covers NASA's supplemental needs for 1959; and it is on this bill that the committee has held its hearings.

Mr. President, I may point out that under present law, and for another year, all authorizations for NASA, not only for new construction, but also all authorizations, including those for salaries and expenses and research and development, have to come before the Senate.

As shown on page 1 of the committee report, the total authorization of \$48,354,000 breaks down into three major categories, as follows:

| | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Salaries and expenses..... | \$3,354,000 |
| Research and development..... | 20,750,000 |
| Construction and equipment..... | 24,250,000 |

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The \$3,354,000 supplemental item for salaries and expenses is required to cover the cost of salary increases enacted last year, but for which no funds were requested by the executive branch. This is essentially a mathematical computation, and involves no policy issue.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The \$20,750,000 supplemental for research and development is earmarked entirely for the manned space-flight program, known as project Mercury. These funds are needed in order to permit rapid progress to be made in developing our capability to put man into space.

At the present time, most of our research in the space field involves the development of incredibly complex devices to perform the complicated tasks necessary for the mastery of space. The capabilities and complexity of many of these devices stagger the imagination. Nevertheless, no machine devised can substitute for the analytical and decision-making abilities of the human mind. All our scientists are in agreement that space exploration and exploitation will require the participation of human beings, in order to cope with unanticipated problems and provide the flexibility of action that is beyond the capabilities of machines.

For this reason, we are engaged in an aggressive program to develop our capabilities for manned space flight. The 1959 budget for NASA already contains some \$37,660,000 for project Mercury. The \$20,750,000 additional authorization in this bill will increase the 1959 program to \$58,400,000. The budget request for 1960 for project Mercury is \$70 mil-

lion; and Dr. Glennan, the Administrator of NASA, has testified:

Before we have completed this first U.S. effort to put man into space, the bill will have exceeded \$200 million.

It is clear that the development of capabilities for space flight will be an expensive proposition; and Dr. Glennan is to be commended for his candor in putting the facts before us. However, even the reference to a \$200 million cost for completing the first U.S. effort to put man into space does not tell the full story.

If project Mercury is successful—and it is essential that it be successful—we can soon expect to be spending billions of dollars a year on various types of space vehicles, unless there is a drastic change in the world situation.

We must make no mistake about this: Space flight is of the highest importance and of the highest practicality. Very properly, NASA is stressing the peaceful, scientific aspects of space flight, of which project Mercury is the first major step.

Even more significant, however, are the military potentialities of successful space flight.

At the present time, our national security is primarily dependent upon our nuclear deterrents. With every passing day, we are placing more and more reliance on ballistic missiles. Of course, Soviet Russia has been doing the same thing. At best, we can hope that this will result in a nuclear standoff.

Consider, however, what would happen if any adversary outstripped the United States in the development of manned space vehicles that could deliver nuclear weapons. The effect on our security could be disastrous. For this reason, we must continue to press forward with the development of manned space vehicles.

On page 2 of the report will be found a breakdown of the \$20,750,000 requested for project Mercury in 1959. Four million dollars of this is for the design, engineering, and early construction phases of a program involving the delivery of 12 satellite capsule systems.

On page 146 of the hearings on the pending bill will be found a picture of just what a capsule system is.

Sixteen million dollars is for four Redstone and four Atlas boosters, which will be used for short-range test and qualification flights. Two hundred thousand dollars is for data acquisition and handling equipment, \$500,000 is for simulators and other training equipment, and \$50,000 is for miscellaneous research and development costs.

CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

The third principal segment covered by the bill is for \$24,250,000 for construction and equipment. As shown on page 2 of the report, this, in turn, consists of three major items: \$9,000,000 is for expansion and relocation of facilities at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, Calif.; \$12,050,000 will provide for the expansion of tracking facilities needed to cover the satellites and space

vehicles to be flown during the next 12 to 18 months; \$3,200,000 will cover the cost of additional propulsion development facilities needed for the development and test of the 1-million-pound-thrust, single-chamber rocket engine.

Since the committee report and the hearings cover the individual items covered by these amounts in considerable detail, I will not attempt to go into them at this time. I will, however, touch upon a few of the additional highlights. For example, page 3 of the report gives a breakdown of the \$9 million required for relocation and expansion of the facilities at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and the individual line items covered by these amounts are listed on pages 35 through 37 of the report. The committee went into this in some detail, and the hearings developed the fact that this expansion was necessary to permit the outstanding work being done at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory to continue.

This is another story, Mr. President, of very small beginnings of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at the site in Pasadena, leading to a greatly expanding program and new developments. Now, in connection with the present need, the laboratory must be expanded, the grounds must be enlarged, and additional buildings must be constructed.

The \$12,050,000 for tracking facilities is discussed on pages 3, 4, and 5 of the report. A summary of the amounts requested is shown on page 5 and the specific line items are listed on page 37 of the report.

Mr. President, with reference to many of our warning systems, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am familiar, at least to a degree, with the very expensive installations that are necessary for the different systems, with the possibility of duplication as between those programs and other programs, and the possibility of duplication in the new programs for the development of satellite and space vehicles. We are certainly trying to avoid the duplication of systems or the duplication of expenditures.

The additional tracking facilities will involve nine new tracking sites. Only two of these are in the continental United States, while the remaining sites are planned to be located in Alaska, Newfoundland, Europe, Australia, South Africa, Hawaii, and Bermuda. Senators will all be interested to know that it is hoped to locate these new stations either on existing United States property or on leased land, so that no new land purchases will be involved. Each of the tracking stations will require an area of some 30 to 50 acres for initial installation, plus an additional 30 to 50 acres to allow for possible future expansion. However, these stations will not require many people to operate them. Present plans call for the employment of an average of 20 to 25 persons at each of these tracking stations.

Even though the number of personnel seems small—and it is hoped it will be kept small—it illustrates the ever-increasing need of money to operate our present military systems, in which more

and more areas of development, more and more instruments, and more and more manpower, are required. Our concern is not so much the initial cost of the project, which is large, as will be the cost of operations in years to come.

On pages 5 through 10, the committee report devotes considerable space to the \$3,200,000 requested for propulsion development facilities required for the 1 million pound thrust engine—a highly important part of our entire space program.

Simply stated, the committee encountered what appears to be some confusion in the assignment of funding responsibility between the various governmental agencies involved in the space program. In view of the urgent need for providing funds for these development facilities now, the committee has not attempted to resolve the basic problems involved, since considerable time will be required to do so. The committee is satisfied, however, that an appropriate interim solution has been effected, and intends to review the situation in considerable detail in connection with consideration of the 1960 authorization request.

While the committee did not examine the 1960 NASA program in any detail, it did consider it sufficiently to assure that the items and amounts recommended for 1959 were necessary and were consistent with the overall program planned for 1960. Needless to say, the space program involves many uncertainties, and any estimates of timing and costs in this area are subject to some variation.

Mr. President, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration did not come into being in time for it to have available the usual number of weeks and months which are considered necessary, as a minimum, to give an agency an opportunity to prepare its budget properly.

However, we believe the hearings demonstrate that the program presented for 1959 is sound and well conceived, and that the cost estimates are as reliable as is to be expected in a program of this sort.

As indicated at the outset of my remarks, the committee was concerned with three questions: First, are these sound and essential projects; second, are the amounts requested enough to do the job; and, third, are the amounts requested excessive at this time?

The testimony given to the subcommittee leaves no doubt about the essentiality of the items covered by this supplemental authorization bill.

With respect to the adequacy of funds, Dr. Glennan, the Administrator of NASA, has stated categorically that the supplemental authorization bill provides the amounts needed to do the job and that he could see no additional funding requirements for fiscal year 1959.

With respect to the need for the funds, the committee examined the programs in some detail and could find no basis for either reducing or deferring any of the amounts requested.

DUPLICATION

We are all aware of the waste and unnecessary expenditure of funds that has arisen from unnecessary duplication in the military missile programs. We must not permit these same mistakes to be made in the new missile programs. To meet this situation, the chairman of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, the distinguished majority leader, has appointed a Subcommittee on Governmental Organization for Space Activities, under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri. The findings of this subcommittee will be very helpful in acting on the authorizations for fiscal year 1960.

In considering the 1959 supplemental authorizations, the committee was concerned about any possible duplication with the military departments with respect to any of the items covered by the supplemental request. Accordingly, this was gone into in considerable detail in the subcommittee hearings. In addition, to assure that there would be no possible misunderstanding in this matter, a letter was sent to the Secretary of Defense and each of the service Secretaries, asking them to examine the record and to inform the committee whether they agreed with the NASA witnesses that there was no such duplication. The Secretary of Defense and each of the military departments affirmed that no such duplication existed. These letters appear on pages 25 through 27 of the report, and a number of significant excerpts from the hearings are shown on pages 13 to 18 of the report. I mention this in some detail because I believe this information will be helpful in answering letters from the public expressing their valid concern about possible duplication in this field.

VALUE OF SPACE PROGRAM

In view of the large prospective costs involved in the space program—involving the expenditure of billions of dollars per year within the next few years—we must obviously consider whether such expenditures are justified. I have already mentioned, in connection with project Mercury, one overriding aspect of the potential military significance of space vehicles. It is important to note that there are also important nonmilitary advantages that may result from the space program. Direct advantages, involving demonstrable benefits involving hundreds of millions and perhaps billions of dollars, can be expected from the application of space technology to such areas as meteorology, communications, and navigation. Satellites may also play an important role in the detection of high altitude nuclear explosions, thus making a vital contribution to our national security. In order to provide material that might be useful in answering public questions on this matter, the report contains, on pages 20 through 24, a number of excerpts from the testimony before the subcommittee concerning the value of the space program.

Mr. President, we emphasize this at this point because it is a new program, and there needs to be a further dissemination of knowledge and information as to the practical aspects and practical values, military as well as nonmilitary.

For example, there is this statement by Dr. Glennan quoted on page 21 of the report:

The cost of our space programs will continue, year after year, and it will increase, year by year.

I couldn't begin to say precisely what the payoffs will be, or how soon they will be realized. We expect that in the relatively near future satellites will be widely used in meteorology—witness this Vanguard II cloud cover experiment—and in worldwide communications.

Experts in those fields have estimated that the value of such advances will be counted in the billions of dollars.

On that same page of the report, there is quoted the following statement by Dr. Glennan:

The things that we expect to find in those areas, which thus far have been identified as possibly to be of use commercially or in a military sense, such as the weather forecasting business, many people have estimated that these would pay many times over the cost of the programs on which we are embarking.

Communications the same way. It may, indeed, be some way, the only way, in which we will be able to handle communications in the future may be through satellite channels.

The return in general scientific information is never possible of pricing, but throughout the time that we have been pursuing scientific investigations of this sort, we have always found that there was a payoff at some point along the line.

The Vanguard II satellite which was launched on February 17 was the first of a series of satellite experiments designed to obtain truly worldwide weather observations. I should like to read a portion of the testimony given to the subcommittee by Mr. Edgar Cortright in this planned use of satellites. This appears on pages 60 and 61 of the subcommittee hearings:

Now the reason the earth satellite will be so beneficial to meteorology, we feel, is twofold: One, it enables us for the first time to get truly worldwide weather observations, and secondly, by virtue of its position above the earth's atmosphere, the satellite will make possible measurements which have never been possible before.

Now, some of these measurements are indicated in the first chart here. They include, most obviously, observations of the clouds over the earth's surface. From these observations we hope to be able to determine the extent of cloud coverage, the types of clouds, their layers, thicknesses, heights above the earth, and that sort of thing.

And then we would hope to be able to measure precipitation, associated with the clouds, and the location of the thunderstorms under the blanket of clouds by the electrical disturbances resulting from lightning flashes.

Another set of measurements would be directed to the determination of temperatures of the stratosphere, tropopause, cloud tops, and surface of the earth. I think it is interesting to point out here that we feel ocean currents may be tracked by surface temperatures, and these are related to weather, in general.

There is also hope of being able to determine some of the constituents of the atmosphere, and their distribution, such as water vapor, ozone, and carbon dioxide.

Then there is a whole set of experiments which can be related to what is frequently referred to as the heat budget of the earth. This is essentially the local imbalance between incoming solar radiation, reflected solar radiation, and outgoing radiation from the atmosphere and the earth.

Now, all of these measurements are detected by radiation sensing devices such as television cameras, radar, photocells, and thermistor bolometers.

There has been one practical demonstration of this utility.

A photograph was obtained from a rocket a hundred miles over White Sands, and in the outer region of the photograph was a rather severe cyclonic disturbance building up over the gulf coast of Texas. Now, interestingly enough, the Weather Bureau stations in the area were not able to detect this disturbance, and yet the high altitude photograph shows it very clearly. This disturbance did develop into a severe one causing considerable damage from heavy rainfall.

It is obvious that improved knowledge of weather conditions will be important from the viewpoint of increasing the comfort and safety of the American people. Perhaps not as obvious is the fact that it will provide definite benefits which can be measured in dollars and cents, particularly in the field of agriculture.

Before concluding, Mr. President, I should like to invite my colleagues' attention to the fact that the hearings contain a series of striking pictures and illustrations of a number of significant elements of the space program. This is contained in an appendix to the hearings which starts on page 135. Many of these pictures have not been published previously and will be of considerable interest to the public, as well as to the members of this body.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to express my appreciation to the other members of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

I think every single one of the members of the subcommittee was present at each of the hearings, except for a part of one of the hearings when one Member had to be away. Every member was present at the markup of the bill, as I recall; and every member except one, who was unavoidably detained, was present for the full committee consideration of the bill. I especially appreciate their fine attitudes and their wonderful help in grasping this subject, in writing up the bill, and in presenting it to the full committee and presenting it today to the Senate.

Mr. President, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences recommends the bill be given favorable consideration, as reported.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has made his usual able and comprehensive presentation of the pending bill. I see no need, therefore, to go into any further detail on this matter.

I do want to say that I am in complete accord with the remarks of the chairman, and join with the other members of the committee in recommending approval of the bill as presented to the Senate.

The committee has made a rather painstaking review of the items covered in the supplemental authorization, and concluded that the programs which were presented merited the wholehearted support of the Congress and the American people. We must be frank to say, however, that it is impossible for any individual to state categorically that each and every item is of equal soundness and that each and every cost estimate is correct.

We are all keenly aware of the rapid progress and change which are occurring in all areas of technology today. In no field is the rapid change more pronounced than in the area of space activities.

As is customary in hearings of this sort, the witnesses from NASA were sworn in at the beginning of their testimony. Dr. Homer E. Newell, the Assistant Director for Space Sciences of NASA, prefaced his testimony with these remarks:

Now when we first came in here you asked all of us to swear to tell you the truth. One of the difficulties in this discussion is going to be that we do not always know the truth.

Obviously when we are dealing in a field in which even the most competent scientists cannot be sure of what the facts are, the individual members of the committee have no basis for interposing technical judgments of their own. We can, however, judge the competence of the witnesses appearing before us, and examine the rationale and methodology underlying the estimates their programs presented to us. This we have done.

I am sure I speak for the committee as a whole when I say that we were encouraged and impressed by the ability and the candor of Dr. Glennan, Dr. Dryden, Dr. Silverstein, and the other witnesses appearing before our committee. We believe that the program which has been presented is logical and has been prepared carefully. The witnesses have indicated that they recognize the need for getting the maximum return from every dollar spent on this program.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, we on the NASA authorization subcommittee feel that we are very fortunate indeed in having the distinguished Senator from Mississippi as chairman of our subcommittee. What I say today will be brief, and to the point, I hope.

At the outset I wish to express my complete agreement with the remarks made by the Senator from Mississippi. Also, I listened with great interest and with complete agreement to the remarks

of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

On our authorization subcommittee, as well as in the full Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, of course politics cuts no figure whatever. We are all trying to render real and needed service to our country in this grim period of international anarchy.

The bill involves a total of \$48,354,000. However, this is only a downpayment on a program that will inevitably grow in size, cost and importance in the years ahead.

The Senator from Mississippi has stated that in the not-too-distant future we may expect to be spending billions of dollars a year for space activities. This is certainly a sobering thought.

What the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Maine have had to say certainly furnishes a subject for sober thought on the part of all of us, as well as on the part of the American people as a whole.

In the very short time that it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the Space Committee, I have been asked a number of times: "Why spend money on space activities when there are so many important things to do here in the United States?" I may have asked the same question myself at the outset.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi has already mentioned a number of the military and nonmilitary applications of satellites and other space vehicles. Informed estimates have been made that the increased knowledge about the weather that may be obtained through meteorological satellites may result in ultimate savings of billions of dollars—not millions, but billions. Similarly, any price tag put on the potential value of communications satellites at this time would probably be far too small.

Despite some of the obvious benefits from the space program that we can see now, I do not believe we can consider the problem on this narrow basis. In this connection, I should like to quote from a colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and Dr. Dryden, which appears on pages 53 and 54 of the hearings:

Senator CANNON. Doctor, yesterday you heard me ask Dr. Glennan about the value of this program in view of the fact that the American public is going to be very vitally concerned with having approximately a billion dollars a year spent on a space program.

Dr. DRYDEN. Yes, Senator.

Senator CANNON. In view of budgetary problems at the present, I would like to have you state your views as to the value of this program, compared to its cost, in our overall budget picture today.

Dr. DRYDEN. Yes, sir.

I think I mentioned that the situation is a little bit like determining the value of the airplane at the time of the Wright brothers. We have the utmost confidence, based on the past, if nothing more, that man is going to be in space, and useful things to do in space; that we must begin to study the problems associated with that.

This project, in my mind, will advance the general technology of space at a faster rate than almost anything else that I can think of.

If you do not have such an integrating project, what you get engaged in is a lot of

research in various directions but not concentrated on accomplishing a mission, and we found in the X-15, for example, that this enabled a much greater integration and advance in the technology of high-speed flight than you could get by all sorts of general research.

Now, basic research is necessary, but this must be followed by research directed toward a mission to work out the applied research and the development problems, and this, I think, is one of the great returns which will come.

A secondary result of all of this work already reflected rather widely throughout our industrial structure or the developments in materials, devices, fabricating methods which come because this is at the forefront of our technology. The most difficult jobs that you could possibly think of.

Take the rapid development of transistorized and miniaturized equipment. To do these early satellites you have to make those developments.

Now as a byproduct, this has given you hearing aids that are in your spectacles. I do not mean to imply the space program has done this. The electronics program which was certainly stimulated by our missile program in this direction, has brought you such devices, and very small radios and all the rest of it.

The things developed in our ballistic missile program and space program have a tremendous influence in directions that you would not think of at the start.

Now, from a purely practical point of view, as I mentioned in the beginning, I do not think you could go to a banker and sell him on security and prove to him that you know just how he is going to get his money back. But again I say, if you look back at the airplane you could not have proved, in fact I mention that as a result of the lack of faith in our own country, the airplane was taken abroad and developed in other countries, and we entered the First World War without an airplane of our own and we had to buy them from other countries.

Now, you couldn't prove at that time the industry that you see today. No one looking at the wire and wood over here in the Smithsonian could contemplate, it is amazing now, that in 50 years you have gone from that to the big bombers, to the jet transports that we see today.

I think there is every confidence that space is going the same way. I don't know how fast; how fast depends on how much money you put into it.

I think Dr. Glennan made this point: that if it were not for the competitive aspect of the situation, perhaps it wouldn't go this fast, it wouldn't put this much money into it, but you would go in this direction, and if we don't someone else is.

Of course I refer directly to the Soviet Union. I emphasize Dr. Dryden's last few words: "If we don't, someone else is." This is really the heart of the problem. This program will be increasingly costly—but it would be even more costly to us as a Nation if we failed to devote our resources, skill, and determination to the new and vital dimension of space.

In short, we have no other alternative but to pursue this program with all the energy at our command. Since this is so, we must also assure that costly duplication is avoided, so that every dollar invested in the program brings us a full dollar's return.

Obviously we must promote and accelerate our space program so that we shall not lag behind.

In spite of the obvious benefits from the space program apparent to all, I

suggest we should not consider the problem on a narrow basis.

Our military potential is only one of a variety of elements upon which the safety of this Nation and its people depends.

Today, in our efforts to halt the aggression of the Soviet Union and of Soviet expansion throughout the world, we find ourselves engaged in a tremendous struggle for the minds of mankind.

More than half of the people of this world live in abject poverty and in ignorance.

Every night more than half of the world's people go to bed hungry.

To such hundreds of millions of people we should demonstrate that our way of life and our system of government is the way of liberty and peace in this troubled world.

This is an age of challenge. This Nation must be in the forefront of all the nations of the world in fields of science.

We take a forward step by today voting in the affirmative and passing this bill. In fact, we have no alternative but to pursue this program with all the energy at our command.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I very heartily concur with the report of the committee on the NASA authorization bill and with the explanation of the committee's action set forth so lucidly by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I consider it a privilege to be associated with him and the other members of the subcommittee in dealing with this important field.

I do not intend to discuss further the various specific items covered by the \$48,354,000 authorized by this bill, since they have already been covered fully and adequately. I would like to comment briefly, however, on one particular matter that I believe will be of interest to the Members of this body.

The \$9 million authorized for relocation and expansion of the Jet Propulsion Laboratories at Pasadena, Calif., includes \$375,000 for the acquisition of approximately 68 acres of land. The committee hearings developed the fact that 7 acres of this land is proposed to be acquired at a cost of \$75,000 in order to prevent it from being used for commercial or housing purposes when a current lease expires on July 1, 1959. This is the last parcel of land contiguous to the site of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory that could be used for future expansion.

This proposed transaction raised in the committee's mind the question of the future role of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. Certainly we did not want to be in the position of investing \$9 million at this site now, only to find in a few years that the Laboratory could no longer function because of its inability to expand further, so that it would then be necessary to scrap our investment and rebuild at a new site.

The committee has been assured that this will not be the case. With these land acquisitions, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory will be able to continue its outstanding work in the years ahead.

There will be certain experiments, particularly those involving hazardous types of fuels, which will not be able to be carried out at the site of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. However, the 1960 program for NASA includes provision for a new propulsion development facility, remote from urban areas, which will be used for research involving toxic high energy propellants. Even though such experiments will be carried out at this new, and as yet undetermined, location, the NASA expects to continue important work at the present site of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory for many years to come.

I very heartily concur in the report presented by the able chairman of the subcommittee and urge immediate action on the bill.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, my remarks will be brief, since the basic considerations involved in the bill before us have already been presented fully and clearly by the very able chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and by the succeeding speakers.

To a very large extent, I believe that the unanimity with which the subcommittee has spoken and given its approval to the bill is an expression of confidence in our chairman.

As a member of the subcommittee that considered and unanimously approved S. 1096, I should like to express my support of this measure and join in the remarks that have been made by the other members of the committee.

The unanimous committee vote in favor of the NASA supplemental authorization bill was an expression of Senate determination to give our scientists all the help we can give them as they struggle with the problems of outer space technology.

We are not scientists. We have no yardstick by which to measure the needs of this unprecedented program. But we do know of the fearful responsibility which rests upon the staff of NASA. And we know the men of NASA. We have had a chance to observe them and to talk with them, and to hear their testimony. I believe I speak for all members of the subcommittee when I say that they have inspired confidence in us. They have our confidence in their ability and their dedication.

Our space program, as has been suggested, is an indispensable element in our national survival in this awesome era, when one technological development might well spell freedom or slavery for this planet.

But, more than that, we dimly see the broad vistas of peaceful progress that conquest and exploration of outer space open before us.

We all want to help this program in every way possible.

Mention has already been made of the committee's concern about possible duplication in space activities. This is something that cannot be stressed too strongly. While we must invest the amounts that are necessary to pursue these important space programs, we cannot afford the luxury of waste and duplication.

Because of the doubts as to whether the various space programs are organized properly to avoid costly duplication, the distinguished majority leader has created a new Subcommittee on Governmental Organization for Space Activities to study and review this problem area. I consider it a privilege to serve on this new subcommittee.

Dr. Wernher von Braun pointed out in a recent hearing that it is time to be rethinking our national philosophy as regards space exploration. Up to now, space exploration has been a sort of by-product of our ballistic missiles programs. We have now reached the point where the space program must be set up on its own feet with an organization and appropriations equal to its great task.

But reorganization lies in the future. Right now we can best help by giving to the men of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration an expression of our confidence and our encouragement, and by voting the money which this agency needs for the next few months.

I join with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the chairman of our subcommittee, and my other distinguished colleagues, in urging the passage of this measure.

TRAGIC CONDITIONS OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the matter about which I rise to speak is one of crucial importance to our Nation, and one which, although often brought to the attention of Congress, I feel needs to be raised again and again until it is eventually resolved.

I refer to the tragic and disgraceful economic conditions which have settled upon America's regions of chronic unemployment.

On last Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, I returned to my State of West Virginia in order to hold public hearings, as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, on aid-to-depressed-areas legislation. For 3 days, from morning until late evening, the subcommittee viewed a grim and disheartening picture of the suffering which has come to once-prosperous coal-mining areas, glass producing cities, agricultural counties, and other portions of the State. Even though the desperation of the unemployed has long been known to me, I came away more appalled than ever that such senseless and purposeless hardship could be allowed to exist in our booming, thriving Nation.

In the course of the hearings, the evidence of the painful dilemma of economic desperation was repeated again and again. The bleak story was told and retold of how thousands of strong-bodied men who are able to work and eager to work are being forced to stand idle and watch themselves and their families sink deeper into terrible destitution.

Although this disheartening situation exists in many scattered regions of the United States today, I should like to pre-

sent just the West Virginia picture, as it was exhibited to me at the hearings.

I may say, Mr. President, that I was fortunate in having attending with me at the hearings the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who is a cosponsor of S. 722, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and cosponsored by 37 additional Senators. I was very much pleased that the senior Senator from West Virginia could attend the hearings for the 2 full days. He participated in the questioning of the witnesses and made statements concerning the proposed legislation. I am confident that he will verify the conditions which I am about to reveal.

Government officials testified that an estimated 89,700 West Virginians have lost their jobs and have been unable to find new work. This means that 13.6 percent of West Virginia's working men and women—or more than one person out of every eight—is without a means of livelihood. Of this large number, a total of 53,331 men and women are now receiving small unemployment benefits of one sort or another under various programs, while the rest—who have exhausted their benefits or could not qualify for them in the first place—are receiving nothing at all. This high rate of unemployment, coupled with a serious degree of only part-time employment in many of the industries, has had agonizing, far-reaching effects which have touched many corners of the State's way of life. Welfare officials testified that a total of 278,000 West Virginians are receiving surplus Government foods in an effort to stave off hunger, even though these commodities provide only a fraction of the minimum nutritional needs. Business officials testified that retail sales have slumped considerably—as much as 35 percent in some items in some cities—causing the pinch of declining profits to be felt by many, and causing hundreds of smaller business establishments to go under. Law enforcement authorities testified that lawlessness and theft of food and clothing are growing in the seriously affected areas. Welfare officials said doctors are finding rickets among children; and other diseases long thought to have been eradicated are making their reappearance. One welfare worker reported that in many instances the fathers of families had deserted the families, in order that the wives and children would become eligible for welfare support under the State public assistance program. One sheriff testified that many men in his county are turning to moonshining as a means of earning a meager income. Throughout the State, witnesses said, time and again, that the blight which has come to their respective communities is as critical as that during the terrible depression of the 1930's. Even some cases of actual starvation were reported.

Mr. President, this is nearly a life or death matter in those stricken, helpless communities. It is a matter of children going hungry to school in the morning, and then finding that the school hot-lunch program has been canceled because

too few youngsters are able to pay for it. It is a matter of conscientious, hard-working couples who have spent much of their lives paying for a home suddenly seeing that home lost to them. It is a matter of families watching their automobiles, appliances, and furniture being repossessed or sold in a desperate effort to obtain money for day-to-day necessities.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that it is imperative that bold steps—both emergency and long range—be carried through to alleviate these evil conditions, before the damage now being felt is imparted to coming generations.

On the basis of those hearings, it is my belief that this grave menace must be attacked from two fronts. First we must concentrate on emergency measures to sustain the unfortunate persons who are caught in the jaws of unemployment. Second, we must work for long-range measures that will provide a healthy rebuilding in the economic sore spots, and will prevent future recurrences of hardship. This will give us a one-two approach to the problem, allowing us to aid the stricken areas now, and giving them a chance for better conditions in the future.

Among the emergency measures now before us which I feel are desperately needed by the regions of hardship are the following:

First, an extension of the Government's temporary unemployment compensation program. This vital program, which presently is saving hundreds of thousands of American families from serious hunger, is due to expire March 31, just 3 weeks from today. My senior colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I have joined with other Senators in cosponsoring proposed legislation which will permit a continuation of this very vital legislation.

Mr. President, if the Congress allows this most necessary relief effort to lapse, it will stifle the hopes of these families, and perhaps will prolong the economic recession in their regions.

Second, I believe that the emergency foods bill which my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I, together with 24 other Senators, have introduced, is a badly needed emergency measure. The 278,000 West Virginians to whom I referred earlier are only a portion of the 5.2 million Americans who are dependent upon Government surplus commodities; and these commodities provide only a meager fraction of the nutritional needs for even the lowest standards of health. By permitting the purchase of additional, more varied, foods to supplement the diets of these people, we shall be insuring that they and their children will not fall victim to the infirmities of the impoverished, backward countries of the world.

Third, another emergency measure that is sorely needed is one for a public works program that will create jobs for the idle men in our depressed areas. If we can put them to work on projects to serve their fellow citizens, we shall not only utilize for good ends their now unused abilities, but we shall also make it

possible for them to support their families without the stultifying onus of receiving free handouts.

These are some of the temporary, emergency steps that may be taken, Mr. President. On a long-range, lasting basis, however, it is my belief—and I am sure that my senior colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] joins me in this—that the salvation of our Nation's depressed areas must lie in area redevelopment legislation such as that now being considered by the Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization.

It is evident that the immediate need for this type of legislation is recognized throughout Congress, judging by the large number of bills for area redevelopment which have been introduced. But it is my belief that only the most forceful and far-reaching of the measures is adequate to deal with the tremendous task at hand. Thus it is that I have given my support and cosponsorship to the most ambitious of the bills—that produced by the genius and insight of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I believe that, if our areas of economic blight are ever to be restored to health, it must be done through a bold program which will bring in new industries and new jobs and will stimulate private initiative and private enterprise in the depressed areas, as only the Douglas bill is equipped to do.

It is interesting to note that, among the learned leaders of my State who were given opportunity to study the various area-redevelopment proposals which have been made, virtually all of them—and I speak of the Governor of West Virginia, the director of the department of employment security, the director of the department of public assistance, and the many other government officials of West Virginia—gave unanimous endorsement to the Douglas bill in their testimony before the hearings in West Virginia last week. These men, who live with this problem every day, evinced nearly unanimous belief that only the strongest and most energetic program would be capable of meeting the needs of a region that has suffered economic atrophy due to a long-term decline in employment.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to reemphasize that the need is so great in our Nation's areas of chronic unemployment that it can be met only by a forceful program of both emergency and long-range measures. All these steps, and perhaps many others, must be taken without delay if America is to aid her citizens who have fallen victim to unemployment, and who have been allowed to languish all too long in their plight.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will my esteemed colleague from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to yield to the senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, if I were to indulge in a pleasantry, it would not be appropriate. Sometimes, when reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and finding that a Senator has spoken well

of another, one is inclined to feel that such a remark falls in the category of courtesy or easy compliment. But I assure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that last week it was my privilege and my responsibility to associate myself with the able junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He conducted the hearings to which he has made reference in the course of his remarks here today—remarks not only of clarity, but also of the utmost challenge.

Mr. President, the urgency of this problem cannot be disregarded. Earlier, in this Chamber, we heard the statement of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], who spoke about the starvation or near starvation of millions of people throughout the earth.

Let me say—with no attempt to overdramatize the seriousness of the situation—that in the valleys and on the hill-sides of our State of West Virginia, people are desperately in need of food.

My colleague [Mr. BYRD] will recall the testimony of Sheriff Howard Chambers of Mingo County. His language was forthright as he told of the plight of the people in that area. He indicated to us that 41 percent of the population of that county is wholly dependent upon surplus food commodities—provided free of charge by the Federal Government—in order to maintain a bare existence.

I congratulate my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on bringing to the attention of the Senate the acuteness of this situation.

Mr. President, the pitiful plight of these West Virginians and the dire distress in which they find themselves are matters which my colleague well understands.

I am sure that if he desires to take the time to do so—although, under the allotment of time we have today for debate on this subject, the time is running out—my colleague could appropriately state that he was reared in an area of mining production, where coal has been the basic industry. I am sure that the conditions of the 1930's are being matched and even exceeded by the more critical conditions in 1959.

Would my colleague care to comment about the present problem, as compared with that in the 1930's, in that section of West Virginia with which he has been closely associated?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from West Virginia for his contribution.

In answer to his suggestion that I comment on the conditions which exist today, as compared with those of almost 30 years ago, at a time when the Federal Government quickly instituted programs to absorb the unemployment and to put people to work and to spare the suffering millions from continued penury, poverty, and want, I wish only to say that I grew up in the home of a coal miner. I came to know early in life what it is to do without the everyday necessities. I knew what it was, in those days, to wear tennis shoes in the snow, and to see Christmas come and go without a stick of candy in the house.

Somehow or other, there did not seem to exist in those blighted communities,

at that time in our Nation's history, the desperation, the feeling of frustration, that we find today in West Virginia.

I think I can truthfully say, Mr. President, that in West Virginia today there are communities and people who have sunk to a lower position, insofar as the standard of living is concerned, than they ever endured in those days of the early 1930's.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that we cannot readily assess the disastrous and the permanent effects which these conditions will have upon our people. They contribute to a lowering of the morale, to a lowering of morality, and to a lowering of the mentality of the next generation.

We are concerned today because the Russians are seizing the lead in the scientific race. Yet here in our own country children are going to school hungry. And I would only ask this question: What can a child's mind concentrate upon when his stomach is empty, and when he remembers that his baby brother or baby sister at home is hungry, that his father is out of work, or that his father has even deserted the family in order that the family can qualify under the State program for public assistance? What is this doing to the next generation? How can our children learn the rudiments of science, how can they memorize the multiplication table, what care they about Gresham's law or Boyle's law, or what interest have they in Newton's theory of gravitation when they are hungry and ill-clothed?

I am grateful for the opportunity I have been given to go into these communities with the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, joined by my colleague, the Senator from West Virginia, to talk to these people, and to give them an opportunity to give their testimony in behalf of this vitally needed legislation.

I can assure you, Mr. President, that this will not be the last time this subject will be called to the attention of the Congress. I know that my senior colleague will join me in continuing from day to day to bring this matter to the attention of the Congress and to the attention of the people of the United States—yea, to the attention of those leaders in this administration upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility to make it possible for upstanding, loyal, patriotic citizens to live, and to live well and comfortably, and to work and to enjoy the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has indicated that it will be not only our desire, but, sir, it will be our purpose to rise in this body, almost on a daily schedule, and bring to the attention of our colleagues, and the country as well, the scope of this matter.

I again indicate that I associate myself with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in this factual presentation.

I do not want to seem to detract from what my colleague has so well said; but, Senator BYRD, you saw last week the pinched faces of little children in West

Virginia, and you realize that many children were in school without hot lunches. You know too, that hunger was the uninvited guest at tens of thousands of tables in West Virginia.

When we find these conditions existing today, it augurs well for this body to think carefully and constructively about the challenging words which have been spoken today by the junior Senator from West Virginia.

I assure my colleague [Mr. BYRD] that I join with him vigorously in bringing to fruition, I hope with the assistance of our colleagues, a measure such as you have discussed today, in which you are a leader for its passage—the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1096) to authorize appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I, as the acting majority leader, will now ask for a quorum call, with the hope that at its conclusion we may have the yeas and nay votes on the pending measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi will yield now for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. On the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am very sorry I was unable to be present to hear what the Senator from Mississippi had to say; but, as I understand, when the original bill was enacted there was a provision placed in it whereby there would have to be an authorization each year for the operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. STENNIS. An authorization each year; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us why that was necessary?

Mr. STENNIS. The provision was enacted in a supplemental appropriation bill. Public Law 85-766 has this paragraph:

No appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for any period prior to June 30, 1960, unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress.

As the Senator from Mississippi recalls, that provision was put in the law as a part of an agreement with the House. The amount to be appropriated last year was in disagreement. There was also disagreement on the provision of the Senate bill which required specific authorization for all appropriations to be made to the administration. It was suggested, as a part of an agreement by the conferees on a figure, that there would be

no further appropriation, except by express authorization, until June 30, 1960.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senate insisted on that provision; is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The Senate bill provided that all appropriations must be specifically authorized while the House bill contained no such requirement. It was agreed to compromise to require specific authorizations through June 30, 1960. This would permit ample time for further review of the desirability of making this authorization requirement a permanent one.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the hope that after 1960 a general authorization will be made for this agency, except for construction, which would be specifically authorized, so that it will be in the same category as any other arm of the armed services?

Mr. STENNIS. We are glad to have the Senator's interest shown. The entire matter will be taken up in the 1960 authorization bill. The committee expects to consider that very point.

Mr. President, before I suggest the absence of a quorum, may we have the third reading of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on the question of final passage of the bill I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. STENNIS. We have promised other Senators that if they would not speak we would have a vote.

Mr. BUSH. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Alken | Fulbright | Morton |
| Allott | Goldwater | Moss |
| Anderson | Gore | Mundt |
| Bartlett | Green | Murray |
| Beall | Gruening | Muskie |
| Bennett | Hart | Neuberger |
| Bible | Hartke | O'Mahoney |
| Bridges | Hayden | Pastore |
| Bush | Hickenlooper | Prouty |
| Butler | Hill | Proxmire |
| Byrd, Va. | Holland | Randolph |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Hruska | Robertson |
| Cannon | Humphrey | Russell |
| Capehart | Jackson | Saltonstall |
| Carlson | Javits | Schoeppel |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Scott |
| Case, S. Dak. | Johnston, S.C. | Smathers |
| Chavez | Keating | Smith |
| Church | Kennedy | Sparkman |
| Cooper | Kuchel | Stennis |
| Cotton | Langer | Symington |
| Curtis | Lausche | Talmadge |
| Dirksen | Long | Thurmond |
| Dodd | McCarthy | Wiley |
| Douglas | McClellan | Williams, N.J. |
| Dworshak | McGee | Williams, Del. |
| Eastland | McNamara | Yarborough |
| Ellender | Magnuson | Young, N. Dak. |
| Engle | Mansfield | Young, Ohio |
| Ervin | Monroney | |
| Frear | Morse | |

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator Joseph F. Guffey of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—91

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|-------------|
| Alken | Eastland | Lausche |
| Allott | Ellender | Long |
| Anderson | Engle | McCarthy |
| Bartlett | Ervin | McClellan |
| Beall | Frear | McGee |
| Bennett | Fulbright | McNamara |
| Bible | Goldwater | Magnuson |
| Bridges | Gore | Mansfield |
| Bush | Green | Monroney |
| Butler | Gruening | Morse |
| Byrd, Va. | Hart | Morton |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Hartke | Moss |
| Cannon | Hayden | Mundt |
| Capehart | Hickenlooper | Murray |
| Carlson | Hill | Muskie |
| Carroll | Holland | Neuberger |
| Case, S. Dak. | Hruska | O'Mahoney |
| Chavez | Humphrey | Pastore |
| Church | Jackson | Prouty |
| Cooper | Javits | Proxmire |
| Cotton | Johnson, Tex. | Randolph |
| Curtis | Johnston, S.C. | Robertson |
| Dirksen | Keating | Russell |
| Dodd | Kennedy | Saltonstall |
| Douglas | Kuchel | Schoeppel |
| Dworshak | Langer | Scott |

Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington

Talmadge
Thurmond
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.

Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—7

Case, N.J.
Clark
Hennings

Jordan
Kefauver
Kerr

Martin

So the bill (S. 1096) was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is unavoidably absent from the session today. Therefore, he could not be recorded when the vote was taken on Senate bill 1096, the bill to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. However, if he had been present, he certainly would have supported the bill; and I should like to have that fact noted for the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 89, H.R. 2260, the draft extension bill.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strength of the Armed Forces, and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. Section 203 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1959" wherever such date appears therein and inserting "July 1, 1963" in lieu thereof.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce for the information of the Senate that several Senators desire to make statements. Then the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, will give an explanation of the bill. There will then be further discussion of the draft bill. The committee feels that a vote can be had on the bill this afternoon. There will be a quorum call before the vote.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at the conclusion of action on the draft bill, it is planned to start the discussion of the Hawaiian statehood bill.

INFLATION, THE NATION'S NO. 1 PROBLEM

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, for a few years after the end of World War II, the demands of the American market were so great that it was possible to raise costs and prices and still sell all the products our industry could produce.

Today, it is becoming increasingly clear that foreign competition is not only invading our overseas markets but is becoming an increasingly important factor in our domestic markets.

President Eisenhower in his Economic Report said:

It is not the function of Government in our society to establish the terms of contracts between labor and management; yet it must be recognized that the public has a vital interest in these agreements. Increases in money wages and other compensation not justified by the productivity performance of the economy are inevitably inflationary. They impose severe hardships on those whose incomes are not enlarged. They jeopardize the capacity of the economy to create jobs for the expanding labor force. They endanger present jobs by limiting markets at home and impairing our capacity to compete in markets abroad. In short, they are, in the end, self-defeating.

Self-discipline and restraint are essential if agreements consistent with a reasonable stability of prices are to be reached within the framework of the free competitive institutions on which we rely heavily for the improvement of our material welfare. If the desired results cannot be achieved under our arrangements for determining wages and prices, the alternatives are either inflation, which would damage our economy and work hardships on millions of Americans, or controls, which are alien to our traditional way of life and which would be an obstacle to the Nation's economic growth and improvement.

In these statements when the President refers to productivity, he is referring to the productivity of the economy as a whole and not to the productivity of any particular firm or industry.

I have been greatly disturbed that in recent weeks many labor leaders have urged wage increases which they state would generate purchasing power for other industries. In effect, they suggest that we attempt to raise ourselves by our bootstraps.

More and more we are face to face with the fact that our price and wage structure is becoming less competitive in terms of world markets. Before this year is over the steel industry will once again negotiate a new contract with its employees.

Mr. President, two editorials from the magazine American Metal Market are worthy of the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From American Metal Market, Jan. 28, 1959]

FRUSTRATING AND DISTURBING

There is something utterly frustrating and disturbing about the reaction in the highest echelons of organized labor to the President's economic message. With racketeers ensconced in high labor offices openly defying public indignation and arrogantly

daring the Congress to do its damndest, and with demands for stratospheric wages and for basic hours that constitute little less than subsidized idleness, running almost rampant, one might have hoped for a different response to the President's urgent recommendations, from the more respected officials of the labor movement. The integrity of these latter officials is deservedly undisputed, but the irresponsibility of their criticism strongly suggests that the country may have more to fear from their sophistry than from the palpably unsavory elements who almost unfailingly overreach themselves.

All during the postwar years the country has heard business admonished on prices with as much or greater severity than labor has been urged to be temperate in its demands. In fact, the usual pattern has been for our highest officials to plead with business and labor to be moderate—after labor has exacted concessions from business. This appearance of impartiality has inevitably misled millions to blame business alone for price increases. Among this unsuspecting multitude, labor has escaped even contributory responsibility for price increase, because labor has already got theirs before officialdom in Washington has expressed its concern, whereas the price increases forced by cost increases have followed the appeals.

A conspicuous example of a congressional contribution to this deceptive practice was the hearings held last spring in anticipation of steel price increases after last July 1. The investigators carefully ignored the scheduled substantial wage increase that was automatically to go into effect on that date, pursuant to the agreement of July-August, 1956. They also piously refused to consider the possible effects of the already-demanded wage increases in the automobile industry (which had not by then been granted) and which, if denied, would have deprived the industry of justification for the price increases of last fall that followed the ultimate granting of the uninvestigated wage demands.

This seeming immunity of labor to accountability for the effect of higher wage costs on the national economy would appear to have led the leaders of the labor movement to expect continuing exemption from official comment in advance of their obtaining current demands. Restrained as the President's admonition was, it has been bitterly resented, not only because it would obviously forestall the additional demands on industry that are clearly in the making, but because, at long last and for once, the President has sought to brake the inflation at its source, before the spiral is launched.

There will be virtually no one, outside the small circle of labor leaders and the advocates of some constant inflation, to dispute the fact that, in the effort to stop the corrosion of the dollar and the destruction of savings, "leaders of labor have a particularly critical role to play, in view of the great power lodged in their hands." Nor is it to be doubted by any impartial observer, that "the terms of agreements . . . will have a critical bearing . . . in attaining . . . economic growth with stable prices." Nor will any informed person be likely to dispute the assertion that "increases . . . not justified by the productivity performance of the economy are inevitably inflationary."

Yet the leadership of our most powerful unions declares that stable prices mean "stagnation and perhaps depression" and that the unions' drives for wage increases will go forward. Mr. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers, has publicly appealed to the automobile industry to support his forthcoming demands, so as to provide his membership with \$1 billion to buy automobiles. Yet, if the past is any guide to

the future, Mr. McDonald will hold that the steel industry will have no excuse to raise prices if it raises wages by \$1 billion. One marvels at the mental process which can conceive of an industry supplying another with \$1 billion of undiluted purchasing power without first having to earn it. Obviously, the application of this logic, by which wages would be arbitrarily raised in industry after industry to provide purchasing power for the goods of other industries, would soon reduce the value of the dollar to that of trading stamps.

In its arrogance, labor leadership has come to the stage where it preempts the right to tell management and industry to augment productivity by whatever margin is needed to compensate for the demands it chooses to impose from year to year. It not only assumes the capacity of management to accomplish this miracle, but it takes for granted labor's exclusive right to all the fruits of increased productivity (in practice it demands even more), and denies the right of management, of ownership, and of consumers to any share in the greater abundance brought about by the greater efficiency of industry, in which greater efficiency labor, per se, plays so infinitesimal a part in a modern plant. If this is not a very clear indication of the great power lodged in the hands of labor leadership, there is no explaining it. And it is frustrating and disturbing that this great power should be exercised with such irresponsibility, in defiance of all known methods for operating a solvent economy, by those from whom the public have a right to expect enlightened and responsible leadership.

[From American Metal Market, Feb. 27, 1959]

THAT BILLION DOLLAR BUNDLE

The contract between the steel industry and the 1¼ million employees marshaled under the banners of the United Steel Workers still has another 4 months to run. In these changeable times, it would be hazardous, this far in advance, to attempt to say just what the issues will have proved to be when the contract is extended. But it is certain that the billion dollar bundle will loom large in the negotiations, because Mr. McDonald and his associates have deliberately put it on the line already.

In costly and widely distributed full-page newspaper advertisements, the USW has been propagandizing other industries, the ranks of labor, and the general public to support its demand for this additional purchasing power from the steel industry. They have painted alluring pictures of what they would do with this new income, buying automobiles, building new homes, buying groceries, patronizing moving picture houses and generally administering a blood transfusion to the U.S. economy. There will, unfortunately, be many who will think it a good idea—and not necessarily only those who would benefit directly. But, of course, as has already been asked, if this is a sound idea, why should Mr. McDonald and his partners want to keep it to themselves? Isn't this being a bit selfish? Why shouldn't all of us workers get in on this so-simply created prosperity? Why not, as the chairman of the United States Steel Corp. asked the other day, cut everybody in, take care of all 65 million gainfully employed workers on the same basis, and create not \$1 billion of new money, but \$52 billion so all might enjoy the good times?

These are questions well worth asking. It would be a mighty good idea if they were asked of every Tom, Dick, and Harry that thinks the picaresque \$1 billion proposition is a good idea. Possibly, in that way, some of the effects of this proposal might be brought home to those who still think that it is, and should be, only necessary for labor to demand in order to receive. It cannot be ex-

pected that those who swallow the specious arguments behind the demand will be impressed with orthodox refutations, based on the time-proven economic principles which have confirmed again and again, since time immemorial, that you can't get something for nothing. But there are a couple of other relevant points that we would like to bring up at this time.

The first is to ask, just what have the steelworkers done to justify an increase of \$1 billion a year in wages and benefits? Isn't that a fair question? Or has money become so inconsequential that a group leader is entitled to ask for a handout of any figure that first comes into his head—particularly if it has a litting sound to the ear, like a billion dollars? When he has done so, are we not to anticipate that the next step—possibly following a diffident hesitation by industry, instead of yielding with alacrity—will be to accuse industry of endangering industrial peace by being unreasonable? Where have we seen such tactics worked by others in a different field of negotiation? They are identical with the practices of another group also having power that is much too great for their own good, in international affairs. Time was, of course, that most people felt they had to perform some useful service to justify better recognition. Is this billion dollar bundle not suggestive of the idea that industry is no longer built up and conducted with some consideration for those who have directed and financed an operation, but that it exists primarily to meet the demands—whatever they may be—of those who control the working staff? Have we arrived at this concept of what industry really is?

Secondly, Mr. McDonald and his friends are not looking for any token or symbolic advantages. They want something substantial—something that will buy automobiles, build houses and provide their members with genuine purchasing power. Although one would never think it to be the case from U.S.W. propaganda, this implies that the steel industry has this additional \$1 billion current purchasing power available for distribution—for the asking. Now it so happens that automobiles are made mostly of steel and that, in order to get what it takes to make the cars Mr. McDonald says his boys will buy, the automobile makers will have to come to the steel mills for supplies (just as the steel mills have to go to the coal mines, the iron mines, the limestone quarries, the railroads and many other sources for raw materials to make steel).

The question naturally arises as to whether, after providing Mr. McDonald's boys with \$1 billion in new money, the steel mills are to supply steel to the auto companies at old prices, so that the boys will not find a higher cost of steel reflected in the price they pay for all those new cars? Or does he expect the steel companies to get the \$1 billion from the auto companies, without having them include the higher steel cost in the price of the cars the boys buy?

If it is one case or the other, what he is asking is that his boys be given the billion dollars, at the expense of others. That is, if he sincerely believes that the \$1 billion (or the \$52 billion, if all the workers are counted in) can be magically produced from the ether without impairing the purchasing power of everybody's dollar and without ultimately bankrupting industry. We are quite confident that everyone knows that every one of the U.S.W. leaders knows better.

LIBERALIZING "EXTRA EARNINGS" ALLOWANCES FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, I should like to discuss a problem which

is confronting a growing number of our people—that is, our senior citizens. Particularly, I am speaking of those folks receiving benefits under the social security program.

Today, there are over 12½ million people eligible for benefits under this program. During 1959, it is estimated that these folks will receive payments of about \$10 billion. In Wisconsin, over 281,000 persons are now receiving benefits.

For the future, it is estimated that 9 out of 10 of the Nation's workers—who are now contributing to social security—will be able to look to this program to help meet the needs of their retirement.

A big question is: Will it be adequate? Too, is it being kept up to date?

We recall that during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, these folks under social security were granted a 7 percent increase in benefits.

At the time, I felt—and still feel—that the increase was indeed very modest in view of the increased costs of living.

Consequently, I believe that a continuous effort must be made to improve the program.

Now, I should like to comment on a particular provision of the program which I believe should be liberalized to enable our maturing folks to better meet their economic needs. Specifically, I refer to the unrealistic limitation on extra earnings—now restricted to \$1,200 annually—which folks can earn in addition to social security benefits.

Unfortunately, this limitation obstructs—and often prevents—our aging folks from supplementing their social security benefits to the degree that might otherwise be attainable.

We recognize, of course, that it is not always easy for folks, 65 or over, to find a job. When work is available, however, I believe it is absolutely unrealistic and undesirable to unwisely restrict their earnings and, as a consequence, their ability to improve their standards of living.

Today, the costs of food, rent, clothing, and other necessities of living are high, very high. To many of our folks in the upper-age brackets, prices are just out of reach of their often too-low incomes.

The liberalization of the limitation—from the present \$1,200 to at least \$1,800 annually, for example—would enable many of our maturing folks to maintain better standards of living.

This action—in keeping with our spirit of encouraging individual initiative—would be in the best interests, not only of our senior citizens, but also of the Nation.

During the 85th Congress, I introduced proposed legislation to have the limitation lifted to \$1,800 annually. At that time, I was pleased to note widespread support for the measure, both in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the country. For example the National Federation of Independent Business, by poll, learned that 81 percent of its 100,000 independent business and professional members were in favor of my proposal.

Currently, there are a number of bills before the Finance Committee in the Senate, and before the Ways and Means Committee in the House to allow increased earnings. We recognize of course that the House Committee will need to take initial action on these legislative proposals.

I would hope, however, that at the earliest opportunity Congress will take action to liberalize the limitation for folks on social security.

From time to time, I receive messages for contributions stressing the need for liberalization of this social security limitation.

I ask unanimous consent to have two of these communications printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MILWAUKEE, WIS., January 4, 1959.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I take the privilege of writing to you about the limited earnings of people receiving social security pension.

First, because of age limits and other reasons, we are forced to give up our jobs. Many of us like to work, and rightly so. It is better for mental, physical, and spiritual welfare. Under existing conditions it is difficult to hold a job for the simple reason that many times we cannot put in the time that is required on the job.

Because of these circumstances many people are made unhappy. After all, it is better for those who desire to do so, to carry on. That is the way God intended it to be.

May I urge you, therefore, to make every effort to increase the amount of yearly earnings for the people receiving social security pension.

Thanking you in advance,
Sincerely,

SUN PRAIRIE, WIS.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: I hope you lawmakers will do something this session to change the social security law so I can earn all I am able to and still collect my social security payments.

This year I will be 70 and this means 2 more years of \$1,200 net under the present law, before I can earn enough to keep up with inflated prices.

Surely many of our elder citizens must feel the way I do about this. It works a hardship on me, as I work on a commission job, and could make enough to get along in good shape if I were allowed to do so.

With kindest regards,
Yours truly,

THE REMOVAL OF CHEESE FROM THE LIST OF PRICE-SUPPORTED COMMODITIES

MR. WILEY. Mr. President, I received today from the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association a copy of a letter which was addressed to the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, which I now read:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Statistical reports from your Department showing cheese production, consumption, cold storage stocks, and Government purchases under the price support program for the past year, show ample justification for the removal of

cheeses from the list of price-supported commodities, and we so recommend.

Until such action is taken, we urge you to continue the present support price of cheese after April 1, 1959.

This recommendation is by order of our board of directors.

Respectfully submitted,
GEO. L. MOONEY,
Executive Secretary.

At the bottom of the letter is written:

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The above copy is self explanatory. We hope you agree with us, and will promptly use your office to effectuate the recommendations of our directors. In haste and
Very sincerely,

GEO. L. MOONEY.

On receipt of this letter I called Secretary Benson's office and read the letter to his secretary. Mr. Benson was busy in consultation. The secretary stated that she would take the matter up at once with the Secretary of Agriculture and that very definitely in the near future I would hear what was the Secretary's reaction to the letter.

INVENTORY OF DELINQUENT FEDERAL TAXES

MR. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I shall incorporate in the RECORD the fifth annual report of the inventory on delinquent Federal taxes.

Five years ago upon my request the Treasury Department initiated an annual inventory of all types of delinquent taxes as of the end of each year, with this inventory broken down as to districts and types of tax delinquencies.

The 1958 report will be incorporated in the RECORD along with a statistical breakdown showing the percentage change in total tax delinquencies and in employment tax delinquencies for each of the 65 districts.

A comparison of this 5-year report gives a clear picture of the trend of these delinquencies with special emphasis upon those districts which are showing good progress in collections as well as pointing out those districts in which collections were poor.

The total amount of delinquent taxes has declined for the 3d successive year, with this year's decline being from \$1,504,709,000 to \$1,375,737,000, or 8.6 percent. This compares with a 7-percent decline last year. Employment taxes—social security and income taxes withheld by employers from their employees—which last year showed a 7.6-percent increase, declined 12.5 percent this year, or from \$300,678,000 to \$263,186,000. The employment tax collection was assisted this year by the enactment of a law providing additional penalties on employers refusing to forward to the Treasury Department these taxes which were withheld from the employees' pay envelopes.

The Treasury Department in submitting this report has recognized the need for additional effort to reduce these delinquent accounts; however, they very properly in their letter take credit for improvements in many of the former

troublesome areas. For instance, in last year's report I was critical of the Chicago office, which had shown a 56.9-percent increase in employment tax delinquencies and a 27.3-percent increase in total tax delinquencies. Those increases came on top of substantial increases in the 2 preceding years, and the Treasury Department was requested to give special attention to that area. As a result, their report this year shows a substantial improvement, which will be mentioned later in this statement.

Offices in which major changes have occurred in the amount of delinquencies during the past year are as follows:

In Augusta, Maine, the total tax delinquencies were reduced 22.7 percent although employment tax delinquencies were increased 8.3 percent.

Burlington, Vt., is still a troublesome spot. Employment tax delinquencies for the 3d consecutive year showed a substantial increase. In 1956 the increase was 38.6 percent; in 1957, 17.4 percent; and in 1958, 36.4 percent. In 1958 their total tax delinquencies increased 67.1 percent. This office should be given special attention by the Department.

Albany, N.Y., shows a reduction of 26.5 percent in total tax delinquencies and a reduction in employment tax delinquencies of 4.9 percent.

Brooklyn, N.Y., shows a decline in both employment tax delinquencies and total tax delinquencies of 12.5 percent and 27.6 percent respectively.

Buffalo, N.Y., likewise shows a decline in both categories, with a reduction in employment tax delinquencies of 13.5 percent and a reduction in total tax delinquencies of 20.9 percent.

Lower Manhattan, N.Y., shows a 25.8 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 5.5 percent reduction in total delinquencies.

Baltimore, Md., has turned in an excellent report, with a 21.4 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 28.7 percent reduction in total accounts.

In Camden, N.J., the employment tax delinquencies have risen for the fourth consecutive year, with this year's increase being 16.8 percent. I reemphasize that these employment taxes are, in effect, trust funds. They represent cash which has been withheld by the employers from the pay envelopes of the employees; and there can be no justification for allowing a diversion of these funds to the use of the employer. Employment tax delinquencies in the Camden office have doubled within the past 5-year period, while at the same time the total tax delinquencies have increased nearly 50 percent. This trend of continuous increases in the Camden office should be checked.

Newark, N.J., has a good report. This office has reduced the employment tax delinquencies for the fourth consecutive year, and the total tax delinquencies have been reduced from \$92,962,952 in 1954 to \$44,825,000 in 1958. These reductions represent a 22.6 percent decline in employment tax delinquencies and a 19.5 percent reduction in total delinquencies.

The Philadelphia office, of which I was critical a few years ago, also has a good report. It has reduced the employment tax delinquencies from \$15,700,488 in 1954 to \$8,944,000 in 1958, with last year's reduction being 13.3 percent. During the same 5-year period total tax delinquencies have dropped from \$63,450,420 in 1954 to \$42,563,000 in 1958.

The Pittsburgh, Pa., office, which last year showed a commendable drop in both employment tax and total delinquencies, has this year reversed that trend, and reports a 27.5 percent increase in delinquent employment taxes and a 10.8 percent increase in total delinquencies.

Scranton, Pa., last year showed a reduction of 22.2 percent in employment tax delinquencies, and a 23.3 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies.

Wilmington, Del., reduced the total delinquent accounts last year by 13.5 percent, and showed the total tax delinquencies to be at an all-time low for the past 5 years, having brought the figure down from \$22,009,168 in 1954 to \$3,296,000 in 1958. However, it reports a 27.6 percent increase in employment tax delinquencies, bringing that item to an all-time high for the past 5 years.

Cincinnati, Ohio, shows a reduction of 22.8 percent in employment tax delinquencies, and a 5.3 percent reduction in total delinquencies. It should be noted that the total tax delinquencies in this office have dropped for the fourth consecutive year, or from \$15,128,835 to \$9,681,000.

Cleveland, Ohio, has a good report. It shows a 34.5-percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies, against a 20.1-percent reduction in total accounts. Cleveland, too, has a good 5-year report, both in the reduction of employment tax delinquencies and in the reduction of total delinquencies—from \$5,272,650 in 1954, to \$3,794,000 in 1958; and from \$42,963,755 in 1954, to \$29,076,000 in 1958, respectively.

The office at Columbus, Ohio, however, needs the Department's attention. For 4 consecutive years the employment tax delinquencies have risen from \$594,431 in 1954 to \$1,087,000 in 1958, with last year's increase being 23.8 percent. During the same 5-year period the total tax delinquencies in that office have increased from \$6,652,735 to \$10,244,000, with last year's increase being 12.8 percent.

Indianapolis, Ind., shows reductions of 14.1 percent in employment tax delinquencies and a reduction of 25.4 percent in total delinquent taxes.

Louisville, Ky., shows a 19-percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 23-percent reduction in total delinquent accounts.

Parkersburg, W. Va., shows a 3.6-percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 21.7-percent reduction in total delinquencies. This office has reduced total delinquent accounts from \$12,931,609 in 1954 to \$5,372,000 in 1958, which is very commendable.

Richmond, Va., likewise has turned in a good report. Last year it reduced em-

ployment tax delinquencies another 14.8 percent and total tax delinquencies 21.4 percent. This brings the 5-year total of delinquent accounts in that office from \$20,986,659 down to \$12,333,000.

Toledo, Ohio, reduced its employment tax delinquencies by 21 percent, and shows a reduction of 25.4 percent in total delinquent accounts.

Greensboro, N.C., is another office which has turned in a good report. In 1958 the delinquent employment accounts were reduced 32.8 percent, while the total delinquent accounts were brought down another 14.5 percent. In the past 5 years the total of all delinquent taxes in that office has been reduced from \$26,395,319 to \$12,716,000, while during the same period delinquent employment taxes have been reduced from \$2,016,360 to \$1,359,000.

Jackson, Miss., shows a 24.6-percent increase in delinquent employment taxes for 1958, but a 19-percent reduction in the total amount of all delinquent accounts.

Nashville, Tenn., shows a reduction in both categories, with a 23.3-percent reduction in delinquent employment taxes and a 25.3-percent reduction in total delinquent accounts.

The Chicago, Ill., office, which last year was subjected to special criticism for having shown alarming increases in its accounts, does show a reduction this year. It has reduced employment tax delinquencies by 29.7 percent and total accounts by 21.9 percent. This is good progress; however, it should be noted that in that office the total of their employment tax delinquencies is still \$22,996,000, as compared with \$12,802,486 5 years ago. At the same time, even with this year's reduction in the total delinquent accounts, the outstanding balance still shows nearly a 50-percent increase over the 1954 total. The Department in its report points out that it has given this office their special attention, and the office certainly shows progress; but it still needs watching. These accounts should continue their downward trend.

Springfield, Ill., has shown a commendable reduction both in employment tax delinquencies and in total delinquent taxes, with reductions of 31.3 percent and 24.5 percent, respectively.

Aberdeen, S. Dak., reports sizable reductions in both categories, with a 20.8 percent reduction being shown in employment tax delinquencies and a 30.2 percent reduction in the total of its delinquent accounts.

Employment tax delinquencies in Cheyenne, Wyo., have increased 28.8 percent, thus erasing last year's decline and bringing these accounts to a 5-year high for that office. At the same time it reports a 4.7 percent increase in the total of all delinquent accounts.

Des Moines, Iowa, has brought its total of all delinquent accounts down to less than half of what they were 5 years ago, or from \$9,737,729 to \$4,564,000, with this year's reduction being 39 percent. Employment tax delinquencies in this office, however, have not done so well, for

while they do show a 10.2 percent reduction for last year, they are still higher than they were 5 years ago.

In Fargo, N. Dak., employment tax delinquencies have increased 30.1 percent, bringing them close to a 5-year high. The total of all delinquent accounts was reduced by 5.1 percent.

Omaha, Nebr., while showing a 1.5 percent increase in overall delinquencies, still has a good report. Its total delinquent accounts in the past 5 years have been reduced from \$4,180,447 in 1954 to \$2,770,000 in 1958. During the past 12 months it has reduced their employment tax delinquencies by 54.4 percent, bringing this item to a 5-year low, or from \$548,945 in 1954 to \$267,000 in 1958.

Dallas, Tex., shows a reduction of 32.1 percent in employment tax delinquencies and a reduction of 17.3 percent in total tax delinquencies.

Little Rock, Ark., reports a tremendous increase in total tax delinquencies, being 181.1 percent above the 1957 figure, or from \$2,465,000 to \$6,930,000 in 1958. In fairness to this office, it should be pointed out that the big increase is in its inactive accounts, which are the accounts on which collection has been deferred pending the outcome of court decisions, audit examinations, or other contingent actions. This does not mean that the substantial increase should not be given attention. The office did report for 1958 a 23.5 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies.

Boise, Idaho, reported a 23 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 2.9 percent reduction in total outstanding accounts.

Honolulu, T.H., reduced its employment tax delinquencies by 21.5 percent and its total tax delinquencies by 12.4 percent. This is the fourth consecutive reduction in the total of outstanding delinquent accounts for the Honolulu office.

Seattle, Wash., reported 17.8 percent reduction in delinquent employment taxes, and a 15.3 percent reduction in total delinquent accounts.

Puerto Rico, which has been a troublesome area from the standpoint of tax collections, does report a reduction in both employment tax delinquencies and total tax delinquencies. These reductions are 22.6 percent and 17.8 percent, respectively.

Under international operations, which is a category started in 1956, representing the delinquent accounts of taxpayers abroad and out of the reach of the respective offices, jumped 139.8 percent, or from \$17,443,000 to \$41,823,000. The Treasury Department explains this enormous increase as being the result of having had the district offices transfer to this division the delinquent accounts of all taxpayers known to be out of the country and out of the reach of those offices. While this explains the increase in the international operations category, it could also offset some of the reported reductions in the various district offices.

In conclusion, while it is pleasant to note that the amount of total delin-

quent accounts has declined approximately \$240 million from the total of 5 years ago, these accounts are still too high. Also, the employment tax reduction of 12.5 percent this year, while being a trend in the right direction, nevertheless is still \$9 million higher than 5 years ago.

It must be remembered that when speaking of employment tax delinquencies, we are speaking of income and social security taxes which have been withheld by the employer from the pay envelopes of his employees. They are in effect trust funds, and under no circumstances should they ever be considered as belonging to the employer or as representing funds which he can divert to his own use.

I am glad to report last year's progress of the Treasury Department in reducing these outstanding accounts, and again express my appreciation to them for their cooperation in furnishing statistics for this report.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report submitted by the Treasury Department under date of March 2, 1959, along with my own statistical breakdown of the 5-year report of the various offices, together with a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1959.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In answer to your request of January 22, 1959, we are enclosing a tabulation pertaining to the inventory of taxpayer delinquent accounts. The tabulation shows a breakdown of the total number of delinquent accounts by income, employment, and other taxes as of December 31, 1958, and December 31, 1957. Data relating to total number and amount of inactive accounts are also provided.

The overall picture in the taxpayer delinquent accounts area shows that a great deal has been accomplished in the past year. During 1958 the number of delinquent accounts was reduced from 1,554,876 to 1,280,642, a reduction of 18 percent, and their dollar value was decreased from \$1,505 million to \$1,376 million, a reduction of 8.6 percent. Each of the tax groups, income, employment, and other, shows a decline in inventory both as to number and dollar value. Confining ourselves to dollars, the percentage reductions were 6.7 percent in income, 12.5 percent in employment, and 15.3 percent in all other classes of tax. We feel that this general overall improvement is particularly noteworthy in view of the adverse economic conditions prevailing in certain areas during 1958.

These improvements were widespread, with nearly all offices accomplishing a percentage reduction in dollar amounts outstanding. Looking first at the total closing inventories of each office as compared to a year ago, we find that 46 of our 65 offices have reported gains, the highest being a 39.0 percent reduction. The employment tax area, in which you have expressed a particular interest in the past, reflects an even brighter picture, with 50 of our 65 offices contributing in varying degrees to the overall reduction of 12.5 percent. The greatest district office reduction was 54.4 percent.

Also, particularly gratifying is that substantially all of the offices about which you expressed concern a year ago are among those which made material gains in the reduction of dollar amounts outstanding. For example Chicago's overall inventory went from \$154.1 million to \$120.3 million, a reduction of 21.9 percent. Its employment tax inventory declined from \$32.7 million to \$23 million, a 29.7 percent gain.

The offices reflecting higher dollar inventories are for the most part the smaller offices, although a few of the larger offices are among those which lost ground during the year. In this connection, it is pertinent to mention that percentage increases, and in some instances even relatively high percentage increases, can be due to normal fluctuations. Further, it can and will happen that one or two large accounts going into a delinquent status late in the year can distort the picture when endeavoring to evaluate the performance of a particular office. Conversely, high percentage declines in inventories are often reflected solely as a result of normal fluctuations or the closing of one or two particularly large accounts. Individual office inventories also rise or decline, depending upon the economic conditions in the area. It is for this reason that we normally prefer to look at the inventories from a regional or national point of view. Incidentally, the increase of 139.8 percent in the International Operations Division is the result of our having had the district offices transfer to this division the delinquent accounts of taxpayers known to be abroad and out of their reach.

The additional table which follows contains a summary as of December 31, 1957, and 1958, of the taxpayer delinquent accounts broken down as to those in an active and an inactive status. As we have previously advised you, inactive accounts are those on which collection action has been deferred pending the outcome of court decisions, audit examinations or other contingent actions. It is to be noted that there is a reduction in the number and dollar value of both active and inactive account inventories as of December 31, 1958.

| | Active | Inactive | Total |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Amount (thousands): | | | |
| Dec. 31, 1957..... | \$944,256 | \$560,453 | \$1,504,709 |
| Dec. 31, 1958..... | 868,509 | 507,228 | 1,375,737 |
| Change from Dec. 31, 1957 to 1958..... | -75,747 | -53,225 | -128,972 |
| Number: | | | |
| Dec. 31, 1957..... | 1,395,035 | 150,841 | 1,545,876 |
| Dec. 31, 1958..... | 1,122,137 | 158,505 | 1,280,642 |
| Change from Dec. 31, 1957 to 1958..... | -272,898 | -1,336 | -274,234 |

In previous years we found it necessary to give you a separate accounting of taxpayer delinquent accounts which had not been issued. This year our offices are current in the issuance of their delinquent accounts with the result that the enclosed table includes all accounts which had reached a delinquent status as of December 31, 1958.

Even though we feel that we have substantially improved our position in the delinquent accounts area, we do not want to leave you with the impression that we are complacent about this situation. We are keenly aware of the necessity of reducing our inventories to the lowest possible level. You may be assured that we will continue to exert every effort toward that end.

Sincerely yours,

DANA LATHAM,
Commissioner.

Enclosure.

Inventory of taxpayer delinquent accounts, December 1958 and 1957

| Region and district | Tax groups ¹ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Inactive | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|---------|-----------------------------|---------|--------|--------|-----------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------|---------|-----------------------------|---------|
| | Income | | | | Employment | | | | Other | | | | Total | | | | Number | | Amount (thou- sand dollars) | |
| | Number | | Amount (thou- sand dollars) | | Number | | Amount (thou- sand dollars) | | Number | | Amount (thou- sand dollars) | | Number | | Amount (thou- sand dollars) | | | | | |
| | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | | |
| National total..... | 898,232 | 1,112,989 | 1,005,270 | 1,077,348 | 329,457 | 377,253 | 263,186 | 300,678 | 52,953 | 64,634 | 107,280 | 126,683 | 1,280,642 | 1,554,876 | 1,375,737 | 1,504,709 | 158,505 | 159,841 | 507,228 | 560,453 |
| Atlanta..... | 78,113 | 87,299 | 69,536 | 76,318 | 31,264 | 33,845 | 18,274 | 19,453 | 6,511 | 8,354 | 13,212 | 15,785 | 115,888 | 129,498 | 101,022 | 111,556 | 11,693 | 14,896 | 41,929 | 46,536 |
| Boston..... | 51,316 | 53,920 | 36,952 | 33,821 | 19,159 | 18,842 | 15,427 | 15,398 | 2,752 | 2,353 | 3,040 | 2,594 | 73,227 | 75,115 | 55,418 | 51,812 | 7,884 | 9,667 | 22,684 | 21,820 |
| Chicago..... | 159,966 | 236,227 | 143,220 | 167,148 | 50,324 | 64,000 | 41,528 | 52,424 | 7,360 | 10,350 | 18,408 | 27,289 | 217,650 | 310,577 | 203,155 | 246,861 | 60,109 | 23,860 | 91,143 | 72,202 |
| Cincinnati..... | 83,411 | 108,497 | 69,532 | 85,975 | 21,971 | 26,082 | 13,939 | 17,424 | 4,332 | 5,618 | 10,382 | 10,873 | 109,714 | 140,197 | 93,854 | 114,272 | 11,835 | 16,963 | 45,803 | 59,069 |
| Dallas..... | 54,630 | 65,539 | 40,797 | 39,298 | 21,344 | 26,774 | 12,081 | 14,496 | 3,614 | 5,167 | 5,453 | 6,825 | 79,588 | 97,480 | 58,331 | 60,619 | 6,981 | 8,809 | 23,395 | 19,186 |
| New York City..... | 178,824 | 207,733 | 315,809 | 344,500 | 83,089 | 98,360 | 75,873 | 85,056 | 10,721 | 12,477 | 23,141 | 27,110 | 272,634 | 318,570 | 414,823 | 456,666 | 19,539 | 25,233 | 107,181 | 147,516 |
| Omaha..... | 43,535 | 46,095 | 40,764 | 44,833 | 18,922 | 18,072 | 9,836 | 10,527 | 3,596 | 3,357 | 5,337 | 4,684 | 66,053 | 67,524 | 55,938 | 60,044 | 8,645 | 11,867 | 28,018 | 32,176 |
| Philadelphia..... | 109,989 | 144,770 | 101,299 | 122,095 | 34,994 | 40,922 | 37,010 | 42,158 | 6,493 | 8,314 | 16,689 | 18,388 | 151,476 | 194,006 | 154,999 | 182,642 | 12,438 | 23,830 | 64,163 | 78,264 |
| San Francisco..... | 130,354 | 150,798 | 146,459 | 146,509 | 46,523 | 48,472 | 38,807 | 43,298 | 7,447 | 8,593 | 11,106 | 12,987 | 184,324 | 207,863 | 196,373 | 202,794 | 19,061 | 24,276 | 82,603 | 83,251 |
| Atlanta region: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Atlanta..... | 16,578 | 18,054 | 9,696 | 12,479 | 5,981 | 5,864 | 3,948 | 3,829 | 1,316 | 1,410 | 1,744 | 2,664 | 23,875 | 25,328 | 15,388 | 18,972 | 2,219 | 2,900 | 6,778 | 6,253 |
| Birmingham..... | 9,529 | 10,871 | 10,130 | 11,011 | 3,653 | 3,826 | 1,735 | 1,772 | 948 | 1,289 | 5,201 | 6,106 | 14,130 | 15,986 | 17,066 | 18,889 | 1,948 | 2,614 | 10,865 | 13,044 |
| Columbia..... | 8,056 | 9,201 | 3,032 | 2,924 | 2,773 | 2,938 | 1,064 | 948 | 744 | 1,200 | 375 | 590 | 11,573 | 13,339 | 4,471 | 4,462 | 805 | 1,570 | 1,118 | 1,300 |
| Greensboro..... | 10,576 | 11,279 | 10,631 | 11,989 | 4,186 | 4,922 | 1,359 | 2,023 | 944 | 1,397 | 727 | 860 | 15,705 | 17,598 | 12,716 | 14,872 | 1,492 | 2,463 | 7,132 | 8,702 |
| Jackson..... | 3,845 | 5,042 | 1,845 | 1,830 | 1,774 | 1,634 | 852 | 684 | 380 | 553 | 214 | 461 | 5,999 | 7,229 | 2,411 | 2,975 | 569 | 530 | 824 | 901 |
| Jacksonville..... | 22,038 | 23,650 | 27,469 | 26,902 | 10,375 | 11,447 | 8,029 | 8,519 | 1,525 | 1,673 | 4,417 | 3,850 | 33,938 | 36,770 | 39,915 | 39,272 | 3,351 | 3,059 | 11,796 | 12,912 |
| Nashville..... | 7,491 | 9,202 | 7,233 | 9,182 | 2,522 | 3,214 | 1,287 | 1,679 | 654 | 832 | 533 | 1,254 | 10,667 | 13,248 | 9,053 | 12,115 | 1,309 | 1,700 | 3,417 | 3,424 |
| Boston region: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Augusta..... | 2,539 | 2,566 | 915 | 1,421 | 1,176 | 1,185 | 588 | 543 | 271 | 276 | 66 | 68 | 3,986 | 4,027 | 1,569 | 2,032 | 3,521 | 478 | 458 | 241 |
| Boston..... | 24,426 | 26,336 | 23,950 | 20,400 | 9,372 | 8,826 | 8,456 | 8,597 | 1,194 | 1,077 | 1,701 | 1,258 | 34,992 | 36,239 | 34,107 | 30,255 | 989 | 6,191 | 15,567 | 14,054 |
| Burlington..... | 1,516 | 1,271 | 516 | 339 | 762 | 510 | 322 | 236 | 236 | 155 | 171 | 29 | 2,514 | 1,936 | 1,009 | 604 | 195 | 176 | 306 | 85 |
| Hartford..... | 16,643 | 17,485 | 9,219 | 9,358 | 4,836 | 5,156 | 4,370 | 4,317 | 643 | 547 | 813 | 897 | 22,122 | 23,188 | 14,402 | 14,572 | 1,925 | 1,443 | 4,848 | 5,617 |
| Portsmouth..... | 1,897 | 1,703 | 499 | 529 | 779 | 718 | 307 | 347 | 109 | 135 | 105 | 142 | 2,785 | 2,556 | 911 | 1,018 | 382 | 358 | 335 | 298 |
| Providence..... | 4,295 | 4,559 | 1,853 | 1,774 | 2,234 | 2,447 | 1,383 | 1,358 | 299 | 163 | 186 | 199 | 6,828 | 7,169 | 3,421 | 3,331 | 872 | 1,021 | 1,170 | 1,526 |
| Chicago region: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Chicago..... | 92,515 | 139,568 | 84,047 | 105,805 | 25,352 | 35,678 | 22,996 | 32,068 | 4,205 | 5,550 | 13,280 | 15,582 | 122,072 | 180,796 | 120,323 | 154,085 | 46,508 | 13,234 | 56,006 | 35,326 |
| Detroit..... | 55,011 | 72,433 | 45,355 | 48,832 | 18,337 | 20,538 | 14,121 | 15,168 | 2,095 | 2,578 | 2,812 | 4,370 | 75,443 | 95,549 | 62,288 | 68,399 | 8,441 | 4,095 | 26,185 | 25,926 |
| Milwaukee..... | 6,910 | 12,457 | 9,442 | 6,566 | 4,608 | 4,529 | 3,033 | 2,551 | 547 | 1,417 | 942 | 5,847 | 12,065 | 18,403 | 13,418 | 14,964 | 3,431 | 3,706 | 6,732 | 7,715 |
| Springfield..... | 5,530 | 11,769 | 4,376 | 5,945 | 2,027 | 3,255 | 1,378 | 2,007 | 513 | 805 | 1,373 | 1,491 | 8,070 | 15,829 | 7,126 | 9,442 | 1,729 | 2,825 | 2,220 | 3,235 |
| Cincinnati region: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cincinnati..... | 13,440 | 21,104 | 6,573 | 6,773 | 2,764 | 3,349 | 1,529 | 1,980 | 335 | 542 | 1,579 | 1,474 | 16,539 | 24,995 | 9,681 | 10,228 | 1,187 | 1,790 | 4,404 | 2,910 |
| Cleveland..... | 19,412 | 28,727 | 23,435 | 29,104 | 5,951 | 7,431 | 3,794 | 5,788 | 843 | 1,473 | 1,479 | 1,479 | 26,206 | 37,631 | 29,076 | 36,371 | 2,380 | 4,337 | 9,807 | 19,747 |
| Columbus..... | 10,892 | 11,281 | 8,575 | 7,505 | 1,714 | 1,625 | 1,087 | 878 | 310 | 311 | 582 | 697 | 12,916 | 13,217 | 10,244 | 9,079 | 842 | 820 | 5,747 | 5,764 |
| Indianapolis..... | 11,010 | 14,295 | 10,548 | 15,579 | 3,594 | 4,667 | 2,907 | 3,386 | 907 | 990 | 2,942 | 3,028 | 15,511 | 19,952 | 16,397 | 21,993 | 2,249 | 3,051 | 10,591 | 12,522 |
| Louisville..... | 6,324 | 7,984 | 5,413 | 7,071 | 1,696 | 2,468 | 1,117 | 1,380 | 705 | 915 | 1,848 | 2,425 | 8,725 | 11,367 | 8,378 | 10,876 | 2,333 | 2,571 | 5,878 | 6,138 |
| Parkersburg..... | 5,597 | 4,840 | 3,930 | 5,374 | 1,769 | 1,574 | 1,077 | 1,117 | 428 | 463 | 366 | 369 | 7,794 | 6,877 | 5,372 | 6,860 | 843 | 1,130 | 2,514 | 3,600 |
| Richmond..... | 11,456 | 15,051 | 9,482 | 12,242 | 3,502 | 3,988 | 1,929 | 2,263 | 616 | 791 | 921 | 1,182 | 15,574 | 19,830 | 12,333 | 15,687 | 1,491 | 2,636 | 6,266 | 7,766 |
| Toledo..... | 5,280 | 5,215 | 1,577 | 2,328 | 981 | 980 | 500 | 633 | 188 | 133 | 297 | 220 | 6,449 | 6,328 | 2,373 | 3,180 | 510 | 628 | 597 | 622 |
| Dallas region: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Albuquerque..... | 3,756 | 4,088 | 2,037 | 2,317 | 2,077 | 2,378 | 1,075 | 1,192 | 252 | 311 | 120 | 426 | 6,085 | 6,777 | 3,233 | 3,935 | 698 | 807 | 710 | 1,031 |
| Austin..... | 14,368 | 16,638 | 8,157 | 8,993 | 4,445 | 5,664 | 2,797 | 3,336 | 624 | 1,049 | 1,292 | 2,056 | 19,437 | 23,351 | 12,246 | 14,386 | 1,568 | 2,344 | 4,019 | 4,092 |
| Dallas..... | 17,123 | 20,908 | 12,841 | 15,005 | 5,530 | 8,225 | 3,225 | 4,750 | 967 | 1,393 | 2,155 | 2,267 | 23,620 | 30,526 | 18,221 | 22,022 | 1,546 | 1,971 | 7,187 | 6,903 |
| Little Rock..... | 2,876 | 3,685 | 6,293 | 1,391 | 975 | 1,209 | 374 | 489 | 264 | 444 | 262 | 615 | 4,115 | 5,338 | 6,930 | 2,465 | 814 | 904 | 5,580 | 883 |
| New Orleans..... | 9,876 | 10,838 | 5,884 | 6,790 | 4,342 | 4,300 | 2,420 | 2,489 | 533 | 713 | 945 | 902 | 14,751 | 15,851 | 9,249 | 10,182 | 946 | 1,082 | 2,738 | 4,108 |
| Oklahoma City..... | 6,631 | 9,382 | 5,584 | 4,832 | 3,975 | 4,998 | 2,189 | 2,239 | 974 | 1,257 | 679 | 557 | 11,580 | 15,637 | 8,452 | 7,629 | 1,409 | 1,701 | 3,162 | 2,169 |
| New York City region: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Albany..... | 8,629 | 10,930 | 5,018 | 7,976 | 3,177 | 3,960 | 3,200 | 3,366 | 607 | 708 | 770 | 881 | 13,413 | 15,598 | 8,988 | 12,223 | 1,278 | 1,668 | 3,162 | 4,279 |
| Brooklyn..... | 51,836 | 70,027 | 64,425 | 93,159 | 28,275 | 35,112 | 21,773 | 24,882 | 3,062 | 3,680 | 4,578 | 7,349 | 85,173 | 108,819 | 90,776 | 125,382 | 5,502 | 7,870 | 11,176 | 17,232 |
| Buffalo..... | 12,400 | 13,541 | 5,642 | 7,990 | 4,031 | 4,836 | 2,969 | 3,436 | 590 | 807 | 1,563 | 1,443 | 17,021 | 19,184 | 10,174 | 12,869 | 1,164 | 1,665 | 3,203 | 5,032 |
| Lower Manhattan..... | 15,146 | 17,461 | 97,304 | 101,012 | 13,497 | 17,690 | 13,688 | 18,495 | 1,917 | 1,902 | 6,298 | 4,671 | 30,560 | 36,963 | 117,290 | 124,178 | 4,529 | 4,328 | 47,417 | 71,737 |
| Syracuse..... | 8,388 | 11,263 | 2,804 | 3,011 | 2,974 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Inventory of taxpayer delinquent accounts, December 1958 and 1957—Continued

| Region and district | Tax groups | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Inactive | | | |
|--|------------|--------|-----------------------------|--------|------------|--------|-----------------------------|--------|--------|-------|-----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|-----------------------------|--------|----------|--------|-----------------------------|--------|
| | Income | | | | Employment | | | | Other | | | | Total | | | | Number | | Amount (thou- sand dollars) | |
| | Number | | Amount (thou- sand dollars) | | Number | | Amount (thou- sand dollars) | | Number | | Amount (thou- sand dollars) | | Number | | Amount (thou- sand dollars) | | | | | |
| | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | 1958 | 1957 | | |
| Philadelphia region: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baltimore..... | 25,302 | 36,164 | 19,778 | 29,444 | 5,965 | 7,246 | 4,010 | 5,100 | 1,202 | 1,572 | 1,916 | 1,526 | 32,469 | 44,982 | 25,705 | 36,069 | 1,549 | 3,853 | 9,704 | 17,325 |
| Camden..... | 10,730 | 13,595 | 9,805 | 9,867 | 4,379 | 4,876 | 4,194 | 3,590 | 1,078 | 905 | 1,040 | 1,424 | 16,187 | 19,376 | 15,040 | 14,881 | 981 | 2,549 | 1,479 | 3,015 |
| Newark..... | 23,649 | 38,431 | 28,056 | 33,561 | 10,929 | 14,575 | 13,291 | 17,170 | 1,470 | 2,716 | 3,478 | 4,936 | 36,048 | 55,722 | 44,825 | 55,667 | 3,383 | 7,208 | 17,754 | 19,409 |
| Philadelphia..... | 22,830 | 32,945 | 25,432 | 29,099 | 5,816 | 7,564 | 8,944 | 10,317 | 1,206 | 1,745 | 8,187 | 9,038 | 29,852 | 42,254 | 42,563 | 48,455 | 3,527 | 6,422 | 24,609 | 24,536 |
| Pittsburgh..... | 20,862 | 16,308 | 11,795 | 11,063 | 5,976 | 4,592 | 4,569 | 3,583 | 983 | 859 | 1,011 | 1,037 | 27,821 | 21,759 | 17,374 | 15,683 | 2,003 | 2,446 | 5,364 | 6,439 |
| Scranton..... | 3,313 | 3,165 | 4,389 | 5,806 | 1,598 | 1,547 | 1,655 | 2,127 | 482 | 384 | 153 | 142 | 5,393 | 5,096 | 6,196 | 8,075 | 743 | 957 | 3,068 | 5,433 |
| Wilmington..... | 3,303 | 4,162 | 2,045 | 3,254 | 331 | 522 | 347 | 272 | 72 | 133 | 904 | 286 | 3,706 | 4,817 | 3,296 | 3,811 | 252 | 395 | 2,185 | 2,108 |
| San Francisco region: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Boise..... | 1,812 | 2,406 | 1,552 | 1,504 | 760 | 842 | 395 | 513 | 240 | 311 | 266 | 263 | 2,812 | 3,559 | 2,213 | 2,280 | 390 | 422 | 1,273 | 787 |
| Helena..... | 2,318 | 2,793 | 1,228 | 1,214 | 1,040 | 1,122 | 550 | 624 | 214 | 221 | 246 | 209 | 3,572 | 4,136 | 2,024 | 2,047 | 269 | 361 | 269 | 478 |
| Honolulu..... | 2,330 | 2,827 | 1,961 | 1,963 | 989 | 1,095 | 606 | 772 | 129 | 179 | 320 | 562 | 3,448 | 4,101 | 2,887 | 3,297 | 468 | 686 | 1,361 | 1,246 |
| Los Angeles..... | 59,388 | 66,415 | 60,510 | 50,469 | 19,895 | 19,853 | 18,723 | 20,762 | 2,400 | 2,746 | 4,678 | 5,448 | 81,683 | 89,014 | 83,911 | 76,679 | 9,195 | 13,466 | 25,040 | 21,296 |
| Phoenix..... | 4,070 | 4,397 | 2,721 | 2,836 | 1,961 | 2,039 | 1,288 | 1,396 | 187 | 324 | 267 | 221 | 6,218 | 6,760 | 4,276 | 4,452 | 485 | 514 | 812 | 887 |
| Portland..... | 6,542 | 7,203 | 10,756 | 10,506 | 2,410 | 2,554 | 1,766 | 2,073 | 544 | 538 | 356 | 559 | 9,496 | 10,295 | 12,879 | 13,139 | 1,383 | 1,375 | 3,478 | 5,121 |
| Reno..... | 2,258 | 2,584 | 5,124 | 4,447 | 717 | 928 | 1,174 | 1,393 | 177 | 227 | 506 | 484 | 3,152 | 3,739 | 6,804 | 6,324 | 349 | 313 | 3,767 | 4,153 |
| Salt Lake City..... | 3,025 | 3,094 | 3,134 | 2,915 | 1,344 | 1,527 | 807 | 861 | 203 | 257 | 142 | 130 | 4,572 | 4,878 | 4,084 | 3,906 | 520 | 567 | 1,772 | 1,688 |
| San Francisco..... | 36,143 | 44,635 | 51,157 | 61,292 | 12,169 | 12,797 | 9,562 | 10,119 | 2,635 | 3,009 | 3,115 | 3,370 | 50,947 | 60,441 | 63,834 | 74,781 | 4,231 | 4,778 | 40,188 | 41,919 |
| Seattle..... | 12,468 | 14,444 | 8,317 | 9,353 | 5,238 | 5,715 | 3,935 | 4,786 | 718 | 781 | 1,209 | 1,741 | 18,424 | 20,940 | 13,462 | 15,890 | 1,771 | 1,794 | 4,642 | 5,676 |
| International Operations Division..... | 8,094 | 12,111 | 40,903 | 16,852 | 1,867 | 1,884 | 410 | 444 | 127 | 51 | 510 | 147 | 10,088 | 14,046 | 41,823 | 17,443 | 320 | 440 | 310 | 433 |
| Puerto Rico..... | 835 | 916 | 283 | 316 | 1,612 | 1,755 | 290 | 375 | 4 | 3 | 21 | 30 | 2,451 | 2,674 | 593 | 721 | 320 | 440 | 310 | 433 |
| All other..... | 7,259 | 11,195 | 40,620 | 16,535 | 255 | 129 | 120 | 69 | 123 | 48 | 489 | 117 | 7,637 | 11,372 | 41,230 | 16,722 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |

NOTE.—Owing to rounding, components do not always add to totals.

Delinquent taxes

| District | Employment tax | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | Total taxes | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | District | Employment tax | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | Total taxes | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------|--|-------------|----------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--|-------------|-----------------|--|
| | Number | Amount | | Number | Amount | | | Number | Amount | | Number | Amount | |
| Augusta, Maine: | | | | | | | Philadelphia, Pa. (1st): | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 1,145 | \$665,410.01 | | 3,478 | \$2,582,660.00 | | 1954 | 18,014 | \$15,700,488.83 | | 95,824 | \$63,450,420.00 | |
| 1955 | 1,119 | 489,363.35 | -26.4 | 3,018 | 1,915,961.28 | -25.8 | 1955 | 17,918 | 17,060,134.24 | +8.6 | 87,594 | 74,744,336.73 | +17.7 |
| 1956 | 1,138 | 543,000.00 | +11.0 | 3,582 | 1,489,000.00 | -22.2 | 1956 | 11,923 | 12,342,000.00 | -27.6 | 55,994 | 66,115,000.00 | -11.5 |
| 1957 | 1,185 | 543,000.00 | | 4,027 | 2,032,000.00 | +36.4 | 1957 | 7,564 | 10,317,000.00 | -16.4 | 42,254 | 48,455,000.00 | -26.7 |
| 1958 | 1,176 | 588,000.00 | +8.3 | 3,986 | 1,509,000.00 | -22.7 | 1958 | 5,816 | 8,944,000.00 | -13.3 | 29,852 | 42,563,000.00 | -12.2 |
| Boston, Mass.: | | | | | | | Pittsburgh, Pa. (23d): | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 15,058 | 11,226,932.85 | | 57,082 | 41,306,294.00 | | 1954 | 4,880 | 3,800,921.84 | | 40,973 | 28,955,774.00 | |
| 1955 | 11,122 | 10,000,411.94 | -10.9 | 39,723 | 37,835,356.26 | -8.4 | 1955 | 6,651 | 5,079,938.43 | +33.6 | 34,891 | 30,144,327.73 | +4.1 |
| 1956 | 9,477 | 9,632,000.00 | -3.6 | 36,337 | 36,896,000.00 | -2.4 | 1956 | 5,251 | 4,858,000.00 | -4.5 | 28,534 | 23,103,000.00 | -23.3 |
| 1957 | 8,226 | 8,597,000.00 | -10.7 | 36,239 | 30,255,000.00 | -17.9 | 1957 | 4,592 | 3,583,000.00 | -26.2 | 21,759 | 15,683,000.00 | -32.1 |
| 1958 | 9,372 | 8,456,000.00 | -1.7 | 34,992 | 34,107,000.00 | +12.7 | 1958 | 5,976 | 4,569,000.00 | +27.5 | 27,821 | 17,374,000.00 | +10.8 |
| Burlington, Vt.: | | | | | | | Scranton, Pa. (12th): | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 619 | 241,083.40 | | 1,424 | 644,129.00 | | 1954 | 2,134 | 2,345,338.27 | | 9,414 | 7,948,754.00 | |
| 1955 | 441 | 145,096.27 | -39.8 | 1,245 | 409,970.49 | -36.3 | 1955 | 1,743 | 2,324,223.08 | -8.8 | 6,659 | 7,233,268.19 | -9.0 |
| 1956 | 421 | 201,000.00 | +38.6 | 1,714 | 685,000.00 | +67.0 | 1956 | 1,397 | 2,220,000.00 | -4.4 | 4,975 | 6,516,000.00 | -9.9 |
| 1957 | 510 | 236,000.00 | +17.4 | 1,936 | 604,000.00 | -11.8 | 1957 | 1,547 | 2,127,000.00 | -4.1 | 5,096 | 8,075,000.00 | +23.9 |
| 1958 | 762 | 322,000.00 | +36.4 | 2,514 | 1,009,000.00 | +67.1 | 1958 | 1,598 | 1,655,000.00 | -22.2 | 5,393 | 6,196,000.00 | -23.3 |
| Hartford, Conn.: | | | | | | | Wilmington, Del.: | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 4,232 | 2,831,137.07 | | 22,554 | 15,271,158.00 | | 1954 | 571 | 303,208.25 | | 5,460 | 22,009,168.00 | |
| 1955 | 5,079 | 3,298,977.26 | +16.5 | 21,219 | 15,348,135.93 | +5.5 | 1955 | 683 | 327,924.93 | +8.2 | 4,586 | 3,639,928.73 | -83.4 |
| 1956 | 4,079 | 3,202,000.00 | -2.9 | 21,783 | 11,445,000.00 | -25.4 | 1956 | 621 | 301,000.00 | -8.2 | 5,522 | 3,722,000.00 | +2.2 |
| 1957 | 5,156 | 4,317,000.00 | +34.8 | 23,188 | 14,572,000.00 | +27.3 | 1957 | 522 | 272,000.00 | -9.6 | 4,817 | 3,811,000.00 | +2.3 |
| 1958 | 4,836 | 4,370,000.00 | +1.2 | 22,122 | 14,402,000.00 | -1.2 | 1958 | 331 | 347,000.00 | +27.6 | 3,706 | 3,296,000.00 | -13.5 |
| Portsmouth, N.H.: | | | | | | | Cincinnati, Ohio (1st): | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 1,017 | 460,773.21 | | 2,854 | 3,252,731.00 | | 1954 | 3,431 | 1,784,096.72 | | 26,545 | 15,128,835.00 | |
| 1955 | 840 | 310,676.22 | -32.5 | 2,347 | 2,179,031.04 | -33.0 | 1955 | 3,630 | 1,947,441.26 | +9.1 | 24,423 | 12,685,909.21 | -16.1 |
| 1956 | 829 | 315,000.00 | +1.2 | 3,144 | 1,948,000.00 | -10.6 | 1956 | 3,060 | 1,801,000.00 | -7.4 | 22,534 | 11,410,000.00 | -10.0 |
| 1957 | 718 | 347,000.00 | +10.1 | 2,556 | 1,018,000.00 | -49.7 | 1957 | 3,349 | 1,980,000.00 | +9.9 | 24,995 | 10,228,000.00 | -10.3 |
| 1958 | 779 | 307,000.00 | -11.5 | 2,785 | 911,000.00 | -10.5 | 1958 | 2,764 | 1,529,000.00 | -22.8 | 16,539 | 9,681,000.00 | -5.3 |
| Providence, R.I.: | | | | | | | Cleveland, Ohio (18th): | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 1,847 | 1,204,162.49 | | 8,060 | 7,389,895.00 | | 1954 | 7,958 | 5,272,650.40 | | 49,841 | 42,963,755.00 | |
| 1955 | 1,259 | 894,222.10 | -25.7 | 5,985 | 7,173,805.25 | -2.9 | 1955 | 8,720 | 5,523,283.73 | +4.7 | 46,546 | 35,547,838.73 | -17.4 |
| 1956 | 1,874 | 1,254,000.00 | +40.2 | 7,329 | 6,041,000.00 | -15.7 | 1956 | 8,219 | 5,024,000.00 | +7.2 | 39,521 | 42,590,000.00 | +19.8 |
| 1957 | 2,447 | 1,358,000.00 | +8.2 | 7,169 | 3,331,000.00 | -44.8 | 1957 | 7,431 | 5,988,000.00 | -2.2 | 37,631 | 36,371,000.00 | -14.6 |
| 1958 | 2,234 | 1,383,000.00 | +1.8 | 6,828 | 3,421,000.00 | +2.7 | 1958 | 5,951 | 3,794,000.00 | -34.5 | 26,206 | 29,076,000.00 | -20.1 |
| Albany, N.Y. (14th): | | | | | | | Columbus, Ohio (11th): | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 4,679 | 3,559,687.55 | | 13,822 | 15,061,055.00 | | 1954 | 1,207 | 594,431.23 | | 13,054 | 6,652,735.00 | |
| 1955 | 4,770 | 3,454,402.53 | -2.9 | 14,246 | 11,274,930.84 | -25.1 | 1955 | 1,290 | 657,347.06 | +10.6 | 11,010 | 6,624,801.15 | -4.4 |
| 1956 | 3,818 | 3,368,000.00 | -2.4 | 14,296 | 11,242,000.00 | -1.1 | 1956 | 1,517 | 845,000.00 | +28.6 | 12,340 | 9,972,000.00 | +50.5 |
| 1957 | 3,960 | 3,366,000.00 | 0 | 15,598 | 12,223,000.00 | +9.7 | 1957 | 1,625 | 878,000.00 | +3.9 | 13,217 | 9,079,000.00 | -8.9 |
| 1958 | 4,177 | 3,200,000.00 | -4.9 | 13,413 | 8,988,000.00 | -26.5 | 1958 | 1,714 | 1,087,000.00 | +23.8 | 12,916 | 10,244,000.00 | +12.8 |
| Brooklyn, N.Y. (1st): | | | | | | | Indianapolis, Ind.: | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 28,903 | 18,534,016.93 | | 88,274 | 106,522,490.00 | | 1954 | 3,420 | 2,477,333.39 | | 23,475 | 19,133,272.00 | |
| 1955 | 37,452 | 24,523,884.76 | +32.3 | 100,932 | 133,339,786.92 | +25.1 | 1955 | 4,767 | 2,633,720.13 | +19.2 | 22,273 | 20,760,250.92 | +8.5 |
| 1956 | 33,648 | 23,624,000.00 | -3.6 | 105,604 | 129,428,000.00 | -2.9 | 1956 | 3,959 | 3,120,000.00 | +5.6 | 20,007 | 20,574,000.00 | -8.8 |
| 1957 | 35,112 | 24,882,000.00 | +5.3 | 108,819 | 125,382,000.00 | -3.1 | 1957 | 4,667 | 3,386,000.00 | +8.5 | 19,952 | 21,963,000.00 | +6.8 |
| 1958 | 28,275 | 21,773,000.00 | -12.5 | 83,173 | 90,776,000.00 | -27.6 | 1958 | 3,594 | 2,907,000.00 | -14.1 | 15,511 | 16,397,000.00 | -25.4 |
| Buffalo, N.Y. (28th): | | | | | | | Louisville, Ky.: | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 4,064 | 2,351,768.77 | | 21,869 | 12,368,574.00 | | 1954 | 2,019 | 1,035,518.05 | | 12,161 | 11,834,161.00 | |
| 1955 | 4,756 | 2,916,655.39 | +24.0 | 18,203 | 12,058,317.23 | -2.5 | 1955 | 2,934 | 1,228,281.32 | +18.5 | 12,963 | 13,172,969.14 | +11.3 |
| 1956 | 4,141 | 2,778,000.00 | -4.7 | 20,172 | 12,309,000.00 | +2.0 | 1956 | 2,457 | 1,343,000.00 | +9.3 | 12,331 | 12,630,000.00 | -1.8 |
| 1957 | 4,836 | 3,436,000.00 | +23.6 | 19,184 | 12,869,000.00 | +4.4 | 1957 | 2,468 | 1,380,000.00 | +2.7 | 11,367 | 10,876,000.00 | -15.8 |
| 1958 | 4,031 | 2,969,000.00 | -13.5 | 17,021 | 10,174,000.00 | -20.9 | 1958 | 1,696 | 1,117,000.00 | -19.0 | 8,725 | 8,378,000.00 | -23.0 |
| Lower Manhattan, N.Y. (2d): | | | | | | | Parkersburg, West Va.: | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 22,636 | 17,622,534.10 | | 48,155 | 171,309,518.00 | | 1954 | 3,221 | 1,952,988.54 | | 15,917 | 12,931,609.00 | |
| 1955 | 25,952 | 20,573,162.41 | +16.7 | 53,341 | 169,476,849.31 | -1.3 | 1955 | 2,257 | 1,376,158.66 | -29.5 | 11,094 | 10,627,103.44 | -17.8 |
| 1956 | 19,669 | 21,087,000.00 | +2.4 | 44,725 | 153,697,000.00 | -9.3 | 1956 | 1,533 | 1,064,000.00 | -22.6 | 8,357 | 9,032,000.00 | -15.0 |
| 1957 | 17,600 | 18,495,000.00 | -12.2 | 36,963 | 124,178,000.00 | -19.2 | 1957 | 1,574 | 1,117,000.00 | +4.9 | 6,877 | 6,890,000.00 | -24.0 |
| 1958 | 13,497 | 13,689,000.00 | -25.8 | 30,560 | 117,290,000.00 | -5.5 | 1958 | 1,769 | 1,077,000.00 | -3.6 | 7,944 | 5,372,000.00 | -21.7 |
| Syracuse, N.Y. (21st): | | | | | | | Richmond, Va.: | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 3,046 | 1,552,242.81 | | 12,486 | 5,650,017.00 | | 1954 | 4,692 | 2,239,122.31 | | 32,611 | 20,986,659.00 | |
| 1955 | 2,565 | 1,664,304.71 | +7.2 | 9,308 | 5,395,848.85 | -4.4 | 1955 | 5,147 | 2,663,135.29 | +18.9 | 29,332 | 21,881,829.41 | +4.2 |
| 1956 | 3,341 | 2,019,000.00 | +21.3 | 13,955 | 6,443,000.00 | +19.4 | 1956 | 4,118 | 2,420,000.00 | -9.1 | 26,199 | 23,932,000.00 | +9.3 |
| 1957 | 4,593 | 2,411,000.00 | +19.4 | 16,618 | 5,921,000.00 | -8.1 | 1957 | 3,988 | 2,263,000.00 | -6.4 | 19,830 | 15,687,000.00 | -34.4 |
| 1958 | 2,974 | 2,044,000.00 | -15.2 | 11,859 | 5,415,000.00 | -8.5 | 1958 | 3,502 | 1,929,000.00 | -14.8 | 15,574 | 12,333,000.00 | -21.4 |
| Upper Manhattan, N.Y. (3d): | | | | | | | Toledo, Ohio (10th): | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 24,420 | 26,447,055.62 | | 67,328 | 158,538,468.00 | | 1954 | 929 | 392,720.71 | | 6,072 | 3,317,067.00 | |

Delinquent taxes—Continued

| District | Employment tax | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | Total taxes | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | District | Employment tax | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | Total taxes | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|--|-------------|-----------------|--|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|--|-------------|----------------|--|--|
| | Number | Amount | | Number | Amount | | | Number | Amount | | Number | Amount | | |
| Greensboro—Con. | | | | | | | St. Paul, Minn.: | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 4,922 | \$2,023,000.00 | +3.3 | 17,598 | \$14,872,000.00 | -33.0 | 1954 | 3,096 | \$1,929,020.99 | ----- | 10,916 | \$9,725,868.00 | ----- | |
| 1958 | 4,186 | 1,359,000.00 | -32.8 | 15,706 | 12,716,000.00 | -14.5 | 1955 | 3,110 | 2,093,897.27 | +8.5 | 9,616 | 9,270,700.41 | -4.6 | |
| Jackson, Miss.: | | | | | | | 1956 | 3,590 | 2,546,000.00 | +21.5 | 12,035 | 11,203,000.00 | +20.8 | |
| 1954 | 1,500 | 636,230.21 | ----- | 5,563 | 4,717,712.00 | ----- | 1957 | 3,830 | 2,711,000.00 | +6.4 | 12,512 | 13,600,000.00 | +21.3 | |
| 1955 | 1,526 | 596,553.02 | -6.1 | 5,231 | 2,957,931.29 | -37.3 | 1958 | 3,969 | 2,494,000.00 | -8.0 | 11,474 | 12,139,000.00 | -10.7 | |
| 1956 | 1,321 | 656,000.00 | +9.8 | 5,371 | 2,744,000.00 | -7.2 | Wichita, Kans.: | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 1,634 | 684,000.00 | +4.2 | 7,229 | 2,975,000.00 | +8.4 | 1954 | 2,405 | 939,301.24 | ----- | 10,542 | 7,316,879.00 | ----- | |
| 1958 | 1,774 | 852,000.00 | +24.6 | 5,999 | 2,411,000.00 | -19.0 | 1955 | 2,912 | 1,018,508.27 | +8.5 | 10,279 | 6,757,858.90 | -7.6 | |
| Jacksonville, Fla.: | | | | | | | 1956 | 2,300 | 1,269,000.00 | +24.5 | 9,038 | 8,047,000.00 | +19.0 | |
| 1954 | 8,451 | 4,686,224.83 | ----- | 31,020 | 47,883,435.00 | ----- | 1957 | 2,294 | 1,299,000.00 | +2.3 | 7,703 | 7,084,000.00 | -11.9 | |
| 1955 | 8,239 | 4,996,151.87 | +6.6 | 30,918 | 49,361,697.11 | +3.0 | 1958 | 2,298 | 1,104,000.00 | -15.0 | 7,044 | 6,621,000.00 | -6.5 | |
| 1956 | 10,203 | 6,562,000.00 | +31.3 | 36,962 | 41,546,000.00 | -15.8 | Albuquerque, N. Mex.: | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 11,447 | 8,519,000.00 | +29.8 | 36,770 | 39,272,000.00 | -5.4 | 1954 | 1,911 | 741,103.41 | ----- | 5,491 | 2,824,810.00 | ----- | |
| 1958 | 10,375 | 8,029,000.00 | -5.8 | 33,938 | 39,915,000.00 | +1.6 | 1955 | 1,994 | 853,894.55 | +15.2 | 5,078 | 2,960,729.62 | +4.8 | |
| Nashville, Tenn.: | | | | | | | 1956 | 1,957 | 1,062,000.00 | +24.3 | 5,888 | 3,026,000.00 | +32.5 | |
| 1954 | 3,721 | 1,775,100.45 | ----- | 15,763 | 12,463,047.00 | ----- | 1957 | 2,378 | 1,192,000.00 | +12.2 | 6,777 | 3,935,000.00 | +2 | |
| 1955 | 3,181 | 1,601,697.63 | -9.7 | 12,971 | 13,220,012.32 | +6.0 | 1958 | 2,077 | 1,075,000.00 | -9.8 | 6,085 | 3,233,000.00 | -17.8 | |
| 1956 | 3,100 | 1,587,000.00 | -9 | 13,320 | 11,457,000.00 | -13.3 | Austin, Tex. (1st): | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 3,214 | 1,679,000.00 | +5.7 | 13,248 | 12,115,000.00 | +5.7 | 1954 | 5,609 | 3,021,818.39 | ----- | 22,355 | 20,202,903.00 | ----- | |
| 1958 | 2,522 | 1,287,000.00 | -23.3 | 10,667 | 9,053,000.00 | -25.3 | 1955 | 6,580 | 2,702,774.57 | +10.5 | 18,391 | 12,754,005.75 | -36.8 | |
| Chicago, Ill. (1st): | | | | | | | 1956 | 5,283 | 3,080,000.00 | +13.9 | 19,534 | 15,230,000.00 | +19.4 | |
| 1954 | 21,439 | 12,802,486.63 | ----- | 136,532 | 81,650,860.00 | ----- | 1957 | 5,664 | 3,396,000.00 | +8.3 | 23,351 | 14,386,000.00 | -5.5 | |
| 1955 | 22,891 | 15,915,033.71 | +24.3 | 119,822 | 87,843,509.34 | +7.5 | 1958 | 4,445 | 2,797,000.00 | -16.2 | 19,437 | 12,466,000.00 | -14.9 | |
| 1956 | 24,597 | 20,829,000.00 | +30.8 | 143,457 | 120,971,000.00 | +37.7 | Dallas, Tex. (2d): | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 35,678 | 32,698,000.00 | +56.9 | 180,796 | 154,085,000.00 | +27.3 | 1954 | 9,311 | 5,077,118.14 | ----- | 31,244 | 23,748,778.00 | ----- | |
| 1958 | 25,352 | 22,996,000.00 | -29.7 | 122,072 | 120,323,000.00 | -21.9 | 1955 | 6,816 | 3,608,220.71 | -28.9 | 22,420 | 16,337,067.48 | -31.2 | |
| Detroit, Mich.: | | | | | | | 1956 | 6,158 | 3,642,000.00 | +9 | 25,793 | 20,826,000.00 | +27.4 | |
| 1954 | 11,891 | 7,782,350.72 | ----- | 68,809 | 44,787,225.00 | ----- | 1957 | 8,225 | 4,750,000.00 | +30.4 | 30,526 | 22,022,000.00 | +5.7 | |
| 1955 | 16,325 | 10,808,182.55 | +38.8 | 81,569 | 68,904,225.44 | +53.8 | 1958 | 5,530 | 3,225,000.00 | -32.1 | 23,620 | 18,221,000.00 | -17.3 | |
| 1956 | 16,871 | 13,328,000.00 | +23.3 | 93,782 | 70,964,000.00 | +2.9 | Little Rock, Ark.: | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 20,538 | 15,168,000.00 | +13.8 | 95,549 | 68,369,000.00 | -3.6 | 1954 | 1,801 | 462,058.04 | ----- | 5,431 | 2,315,863.00 | ----- | |
| 1958 | 18,337 | 14,121,000.00 | -6.9 | 75,443 | 62,288,000.00 | -8.9 | 1955 | 1,259 | 319,961.69 | -30.7 | 4,182 | 2,108,438.18 | -8.9 | |
| Milwaukee, Wis.: | | | | | | | 1956 | 1,179 | 453,000.00 | +41.5 | 4,781 | 2,355,000.00 | +11.7 | |
| 1954 | 3,759 | 1,704,809.43 | ----- | 16,962 | 16,592,839.00 | ----- | 1957 | 1,209 | 489,000.00 | +7.9 | 5,338 | 2,465,000.00 | +4.6 | |
| 1955 | 3,781 | 2,087,500.52 | +22.4 | 14,322 | 16,279,604.79 | -1.8 | 1958 | 975 | 374,000.00 | -23.5 | 4,115 | 6,930,000.00 | +181.1 | |
| 1956 | 4,534 | 2,314,000.00 | +10.8 | 14,936 | 13,455,000.00 | -17.3 | New Orleans, La.: | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 4,529 | 2,551,000.00 | +10.2 | 18,403 | 14,994,000.00 | +11.2 | 1954 | 4,566 | 1,948,046.72 | ----- | 19,566 | 17,472,965.00 | ----- | |
| 1958 | 4,608 | 3,033,000.00 | +18.9 | 12,065 | 13,418,000.00 | -10.3 | 1955 | 4,261 | 2,260,578.68 | +16.0 | 14,225 | 13,613,589.17 | -22.0 | |
| Springfield, Ill. (8th): | | | | | | | 1956 | 4,097 | 2,214,000.00 | -2.0 | 15,298 | 11,536,000.00 | -15.2 | |
| 1954 | 4,563 | 1,903,972.63 | ----- | 19,192 | 9,101,127.00 | ----- | 1957 | 4,300 | 2,489,000.00 | +12.4 | 15,851 | 10,182,000.00 | -11.7 | |
| 1955 | 3,381 | 1,627,535.26 | -14.4 | 12,885 | 8,723,856.07 | -4.1 | 1958 | 4,342 | 2,420,000.00 | -2.8 | 14,751 | 9,249,000.00 | -9.2 | |
| 1956 | 3,374 | 2,171,000.00 | +33.3 | 15,117 | 8,526,000.00 | -2.2 | Oklahoma City, Okla.: | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 3,255 | 2,007,000.00 | -7.5 | 15,829 | 9,442,000.00 | +10.7 | 1954 | 3,311 | 1,790,406.03 | ----- | 9,994 | 9,043,216.00 | ----- | |
| 1958 | 2,027 | 1,378,000.00 | -31.3 | 8,070 | 7,126,000.00 | -24.5 | 1955 | 3,123 | 1,825,878.19 | +2.0 | 9,455 | 9,421,064.41 | +4.1 | |
| Aberdeen, S. Dak.: | | | | | | | 1956 | 3,764 | 2,167,000.00 | +18.6 | 12,886 | 8,737,000.00 | -7.2 | |
| 1954 | 734 | 282,200.82 | ----- | 3,092 | 1,255,504.00 | ----- | 1957 | 4,998 | 2,399,000.00 | +3.3 | 15,637 | 7,629,000.00 | -12.6 | |
| 1955 | 604 | 248,973.89 | -11.7 | 2,488 | 1,013,977.06 | +28.5 | 1958 | 3,975 | 2,189,000.00 | -2.2 | 11,580 | 8,452,000.00 | +10.8 | |
| 1956 | 823 | 248,000.00 | -4 | 2,048 | 1,441,000.00 | -10.7 | Boise, Idaho: | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 788 | 264,000.00 | +6.4 | 2,844 | 1,301,000.00 | -3.5 | 1954 | 1,050 | 470,289.14 | ----- | 3,115 | 2,083,834.00 | ----- | |
| 1958 | 515 | 209,000.00 | -20.8 | 1,865 | 971,000.00 | -30.2 | 1955 | 1,099 | 472,819.51 | +6 | 2,949 | 1,988,294.11 | -4.6 | |
| Cheyenne, Wyo.: | | | | | | | 1956 | 860 | 411,000.00 | -13.1 | 3,211 | 2,155,000.00 | +8.4 | |
| 1954 | 688 | 248,463.42 | ----- | 2,445 | 1,629,689.00 | ----- | 1957 | 842 | 513,000.00 | +24.8 | 3,559 | 2,280,000.00 | +5.8 | |
| 1955 | 727 | 256,547.69 | +3.6 | 2,215 | 1,344,230.40 | -17.5 | 1958 | 760 | 395,000.00 | -23.0 | 2,812 | 2,213,000.00 | -2.9 | |
| 1956 | 639 | 264,000.00 | +2.7 | 2,126 | 1,077,000.00 | -19.8 | Helena, Mont.: | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 490 | 205,000.00 | -22.3 | 2,013 | 1,266,000.00 | +17.5 | 1954 | 1,064 | 436,666.55 | ----- | 3,214 | 2,863,290.00 | ----- | |
| 1958 | 616 | 264,000.00 | +28.8 | 2,305 | 1,326,000.00 | +4.7 | 1955 | 831 | 333,265.41 | -23.7 | 2,912 | 2,575,503.61 | -10.0 | |
| Denver, Colo.: | | | | | | | 1956 | 1,035 | 527,000.00 | +58.2 | 3,299 | 1,799,000.00 | -30.1 | |
| 1954 | 2,754 | 1,319,176.85 | ----- | 9,888 | 7,552,576.00 | ----- | 1957 | 1,122 | 624,000.00 | +18.4 | 4,136 | 2,047,000.00 | +13.7 | |
| 1955 | 3,056 | 1,642,399.55 | +24.4 | 9,748 | 7,960,670.88 | +5.4 | 1958 | 1,040 | 550,000.00 | -11.9 | 3,572 | 2,024,000.00 | -1.1 | |
| 1956 | 2,483 | 1,402,000.00 | -14.6 | 10,236 | 8,142,000.00 | +2.2 | Honolulu, T.H.: | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 2,346 | 1,475,000.00 | +5.2 | 10,336 | 7,163,000.00 | -12.0 | 1954 | 1,338 | 898,188.84 | ----- | 4,682 | 4,620,939.00 | ----- | |
| 1958 | 2,917 | 1,586,000.00 | +7.5 | 10,946 | 7,938,000.00 | +10.8 | 1955 | 1,196 | 876,086.14 | -2.4 | 3,835 | 4,345,619.31 | -5.9 | |
| Des Moines, Iowa: | | | | | | | 1956 | 1,047 | 668,000.00 | -23.7 | 3,800 | 3,929,000.00 | -9.5 | |
| 1954 | 1,781 | 770,935.98 | ----- | 5,810 | 9,737,729.00 | ----- | 1957 | 1,095 | 772,000.00 | +15.5 | 4,101 | 3,297,000.00 | -16.0 | |
| 1955 | 1,596 | 749,072.00 | -2.8 | 5,207 | 8,200,182.84 | -15.7 | 1958 | 989 | 606,000.00 | -21.5 | 3,448 | 2,887,000.00 | -12.4 | |
| 1956 | 1,989 | 989,000.00 | +32.0 | 6,729 | 9,118,000.00 | +11.1 | Los Angeles, Calif. (6th): | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 2,069 | 947,000.00 | -4.2 | 6,351 | 7,480,000.00 | -17.9 | 1954 | 16,989 | 13,396,011.75 | ----- | 86,76, | | | |

Delinquent taxes—Continued

| District | Employment tax | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | Total taxes | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | District | Employment tax | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | Total taxes | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year |
|------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--|-------------|----------------|--|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|--|-------------|-----------------|--|
| | Number | Amount | | Number | Amount | | | Number | Amount | | Number | Amount | |
| Salt Lake City—Con. | | | | | | | Seattle, Wash.—Con. | | | | | | |
| 1956 | 1,374 | \$778,000.00 | -3.8 | 4,505 | \$3,771,000.00 | +5.8 | 1956 | 5,937 | \$5,687,000.00 | +5.1 | 20,852 | \$16,441,000.00 | -10.0 |
| 1957 | 1,527 | 861,000.00 | +10.6 | 4,878 | 3,906,000.00 | +3.5 | 1957 | 5,715 | 4,786,000.00 | -15.8 | 20,940 | 15,890,000.00 | -3.3 |
| 1958 | 1,344 | 807,000.00 | -6.3 | 4,572 | 4,084,000.00 | +4.6 | 1958 | 5,238 | 3,935,000.00 | -17.8 | 18,424 | 13,462,000.00 | -15.3 |
| San Francisco, Calif. (1st): | | | | | | | Puerto Rico: | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 17,616 | 10,597,430.98 | | 85,750 | 66,858,096.00 | | 1954 | 1,530 | 147,286.62 | | 2,020 | 273,843.00 | |
| 1955 | 17,509 | 11,951,569.42 | +12.7 | 73,245 | 88,983,217.30 | +33.0 | 1955 | 1,853 | 252,580.38 | +72.1 | 3,249 | 622,244.65 | +127.4 |
| 1956 | 11,473 | 9,214,000.00 | -22.9 | 61,138 | 77,550,000.00 | -12.8 | 1956 | 1,307 | 296,000.00 | +17.1 | 2,509 | 624,000.00 | +2 |
| 1957 | 12,797 | 10,119,000.00 | +9.8 | 60,441 | 74,781,000.00 | -3.5 | 1957 | 1,755 | 375,000.00 | +26.6 | 2,674 | 721,000.00 | +15.5 |
| 1958 | 12,169 | 9,562,000.00 | -5.5 | 50,947 | 63,834,000.00 | -14.6 | 1958 | 1,612 | 290,000.00 | -22.6 | 2,451 | 593,000.00 | -17.8 |
| Seattle, Wash.: | | | | | | | International operations: | | | | | | |
| 1954 | 5,932 | 4,324,875.05 | | 27,707 | 19,804,003.00 | | 1956 | 1,504 | 442,000.00 | | 14,321 | 17,328,000.00 | |
| 1955 | 6,417 | 5,409,549.97 | +25.0 | 22,634 | 18,285,409.85 | -8.1 | 1957 | 1,884 | 444,000.00 | +4 | 14,046 | 17,443,000.00 | +6 |
| | | | | | | | 1958 | 1,867 | 410,000.00 | -7.7 | 10,088 | 41,823,000.00 | +139.8 |

¹ Puerto Rico figures are included in international operations for 1956, 1957, and 1958.

² Result of district offices' transferring to this division delinquent accounts of taxpayers known to be abroad and out of reach.

TOTALS

| Year | Employment tax | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | Total tax | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | Year | Employment tax | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year | Total tax | | Percent increase or decrease over preceding year |
|------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------|--------------------|--|------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------|--------------------|--|
| | Number | Amount | | Number | Amount | | | Number | Amount | | Number | Amount | |
| 1954 | 390,398 | \$254,062,301.79 | | 1,725,474 | \$1,614,494,287.00 | | 1957 | 377,253 | \$300,678,000.00 | +7.6 | 1,554,876 | \$1,504,700,000.00 | -7.0 |
| 1955 | 399,269 | 284,803,237.04 | +12.0 | 1,596,615 | 1,646,383,973.95 | +1.9 | 1958 | 329,457 | 263,186,000.00 | -12.5 | 1,280,642 | 1,375,737,000.00 | -8.6 |
| 1956 | 356,748 | 279,183,000.00 | -1.9 | 1,560,685 | 1,619,629,000.00 | -1.6 | | | | | | | |

FISCAL POLICY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in view of the great debate over our Nation's fiscal policy, and whether there should be in effect a hard money or tight money-unemployment policy, or whether there should be in effect a soft money-high employment policy, I believe Senators will find an article which was published in last Sunday's New York Times magazine, entitled, "Argument for Creeping Inflation," both stimulative and informative.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may appear in the body of the RECORD.

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

ARGUMENT FOR CREEPING INFLATION

(By Sumner H. Slichter)

The principal economic issue dividing the American people today is the issue of growth of the economy vs. stability of the price level. Mr. Eisenhower has declared that a stable price level is an indispensable condition for achieving vigorous and continuing economic growth and has placed strong emphasis on the prevention of inflation in his state of the Union message, his budget message, and his economic report.

His critics accuse him of discouraging growth in order to stabilize the price level. The AFL-CIO economic policy committee has charged that Mr. Eisenhower's program is a sure-fire prescription for stagnation. The Joint Congressional Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, is about to start hearings on the problem of reconciling full employment, an adequate rate of growth, and price stability.

Is it true, as Mr. Eisenhower says, that there is no conflict between vigorous economic growth and a stable price level? Or

must permanent inflation be accepted as a necessary condition to maximum growth? And if maximum growth entails creeping inflation, what will be the consequences for the economy? Will the United States price itself out of world markets? Will confidence in the dollar be undermined and will there be a disastrous flight from the dollar with creeping inflation developing into a gallop? Will creeping inflation produce great suffering among recipients of fixed incomes? Or are the consequences of creeping inflation greatly exaggerated?

The recent inflation in the United States has been caused by a mixture of strong demand for goods and a strong upward push of costs, but the principal reason the price level has increased and slow inflation must be expected to continue more or less indefinitely is the strong tendency for labor costs to rise faster than output per man-hour. During the past 10 years, for example, hourly compensation of employees in private industry outside agriculture has risen more than twice as fast as output per man-hour.

The unions explain this by asserting that wages were simply chasing prices up, but the facts refute the claims of the union spokesmen. In every one of the past 10 years the percentage rise in the hourly compensation of workers exceeded the percentage rise in the consumer price index. Furthermore, in 9 out of the past 10 years, the rise in hourly compensation of workers exceeded the rise in the wholesale prices of finished goods. Wages were not chasing prices up; on the contrary, prices were chasing wages, and were falling behind each year.

The tendency for wages to outrun output per man-hour is bound to occur in an economy of private enterprise and powerful trade unions whenever the demand for goods is strong—that is, whenever the conditions are favorable for rapid growth. Wages could be prevented from outrunning output per man-hour if the bargaining power of unions were weakened and the bargaining power of em-

ployers strengthened by the maintenance of a fairly high rate of unemployment.

Some members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, some members of the Council of Economic Advisers, and some private economists have proposed that tight credit policies be used to create the amount of unemployment necessary to keep wages from rising faster than productivity and to keep the price level steady. The amount of unemployment needed would vary with the phase of the business cycle, the vigor of foreign competition and the year-to-year fluctuation in the size of crops, but recent experience indicates that an unemployment rate of 5 to 8 percent would be required.

Fostering unemployment in order to keep wages from outrunning productivity, however, would mean retarding the growth of the economy. Hence the conflict between maximum growth and stable prices is real—the community must decide which it prefers. There is little doubt which way the decision will go because the loss to the community from a retarded rate of growth would increase at a compound rate and would soon become intolerably burdensome. Suppose that the economy, which is capable of increasing its productive capacity at the rate of 4 percent a year, were held to a growth of only 2 percent a year in order to keep the price level steady. At the end of 10 years the economy would have a productive capacity more than 26 percentage points less than it would have had at the greater rate of growth.

What about the longrun effects of creeping inflation? Would not creeping inflation bring frequent recessions, so that in the longrun more real growth would be achieved under a stable price level? There is no doubt that rapid growth entails the risk of recession, but the occasional recessions that accompany a high rate of growth need not be severe. Much progress has been made in building up resistance of the economy to contraction. The recession of 1958 illustrates

this progress. The drop in business investment and the liquidation of inventories were moderately severe, but personal income and retail sales remained remarkably steady. As a result, the recession was both mild and short. In view of the growing capacity of the economy to resist contraction, one must reject the view that a stable price level is a necessary condition to the maximum rate of growth.

Are not changes possible in our institutions, policies, or business practices that would enable us to avoid creeping inflation and at the same time realize our maximum growth potential? There are many changes that would diminish the tendency for prices to rise, but none of them would assure that unions would not push up wages faster than industry could raise output per man-hour in the strong sellers' markets that would characterize a rapidly growing economy.

The possibility of price and wage controls may be dismissed, partly because the people would not tolerate controls in time of peace and partly because controls are easily evaded by changing the quality of goods and by introducing substitute goods. Strong public hostility to excessive union wage claims will have some effect on wages, but not much. Union members expect their officers to get all that they can for the members and would displace officers whom they suspected of failing to represent them faithfully. Union members, however, are not immune to public opinion, and strong public hostility to excessive demands will tend to weaken by a small amount the upward pressure of unions on wages.

What about the possibility of curbing the power of the trade unions by organization on the part of employers, by depriving unions of some of their present privileges and immunities, or by imposing new restrictions on unions? More organization among employers would help, but too much should not be expected from it. The employers are organized for dealing with unions in the steel industry, the coal industry, the railroad industry, and at the local level in many of the building trades, but in none of these industries have employers been able to prevent wages from outrunning output per man-hour.

Depriving unions of some of their present extraordinary privileges, such as the use of coercive picketing to force people to join or the conscription of neutrals in labor disputes, would remove some glaring injustices, but would have little effect upon the bargaining power of most unions. Breaking up some of the large unions, as has been suggested by George Romney and others, would have consequences that are hard to predict. Unions would lose some of their present ability to support strikes by some members while other members work and pay special assessments into a strike fund. Nevertheless, the new unions might drive hard bargains. There would be rivalries among them and each would have a strong desire to make a good showing.

Thus, if there were three or four unions in the automobile industry, each might feel a strong urge to make a better settlement than any of the others. Hence, breaking up the unions might increase their militancy and make reasonable settlements with them more difficult.

But whatever the possible results of the breaking up of unions, that step is not going to be taken. The American workers want their unions, and any effort to destroy or seriously weaken organized labor would cause the workers to rally to the support of the unions and make them stronger and more aggressive than ever.

The most promising methods of checking the tendency of rising labor costs to push up prices are new methods of management that enlist the ingenuity and imagination of the men at the machines and

benches in reducing the ratio of labor costs to income from sales. Experience in more than a score of plants shows that amazing things begin to happen when workers share in a plant-wide bonus, based upon their success in narrowing the ratio of labor costs to income from sales, and are given good opportunities to discuss their ideas regularly with management. The common interest that everyone in the plant has in reducing labor costs produces an almost startling degree of teamwork and cooperation.

The new methods of management were introduced a few years ago by the late Joseph Scanlon, and his work is being carried out by his followers. But a generation or more will probably be required to spread the new methods throughout industry and adapt them to enterprises of various sizes and kinds. Eventually American industry will drastically modify its methods of handling labor and draw on the great capacity of rank and file workers to contribute to improvements in technology.

The new methods of management may or may not be adequate to prevent wages from outrunning productivity, but they hold more promise for checking rising labor costs than any device that has yet been developed.

If a generation or so will be required for new methods of management to check the rise in labor costs, what will happen in the meantime? Fears that the United States will be priced out of world markets are far-fetched. Prices in most other important industrial countries have been rising in recent years even faster than in the United States. Between 1950 and 1957, for example, the increase in the index of wholesale prices in Britain was more than twice as large as in the United States. In Sweden and Norway it was more than three times as large, in France almost three times as large, in West Germany almost twice as large, in Austria four times as large.

No one knows, of course, whether prices in other industrial countries will continue to rise faster than in the United States. Since the principal industrial countries are in competition with one another and since they all are more or less subject to the same influences (such as powerful trade unions and an insistent popular demand for social services that precludes important reductions in taxes), all of the industrial countries are likely to experience about the same movement of the price level.

The competitive position of the United States is very strong, especially in manufacturing. This is indicated by the fact that our exports of finished manufactures are nearly three times as large as our imports. But if important industrial countries were to succeed in underselling us on a broad scale, that would not be a calamity for us. On the contrary, it would help us check inflation by stiffening the resistance of American employers to union demands and by encouraging employers to cut prices.

Also ill-founded are fears that creeping inflation will precipitate a flight from the dollar and that creeping inflation will sooner or later become a gallop. Every country in Europe has had creeping inflation during the past 10 years. The idea has become pretty well accepted that a continued drop in the purchasing power of money is to be expected. And yet in virtually all countries the rise in prices between 1953 and 1957 was considerably less than in the period 1948 to 1953.

As for a general flight from the dollar, the practical question arises: "Where is the money to go?" Other currencies have limited attractiveness because almost any country one might name has economic and political problems as formidable as those confronting the United States. Flight into commodities is not satisfactory because the future price of each commodity depends upon specific market conditions (supply, demand, competition of substitutes) far more

than on what happens to the general price level. Some shifting of investment is bound to occur and already has occurred, but the process tends to limit itself.

For example, if the price level is expected to rise 2 percent a year, a good bond yielding nominally 5 percent has a true yield of 3 percent. Such a bond may be as attractive as a stock that has been bid up so that it yields only 2.5 percent.

Our conclusion is that there is no immediate prospect that conflict can be avoided in advanced industrial countries between the desire for the maximum possible economic growth on the one hand and a stable price level on the other hand. This conflict is created by the rise of the relatively new institution of collective bargaining which is too well established and produces too many important benefits to be disturbed simply because it produces creeping inflation.

But the prospect that we shall be living under creeping inflation does call for various commonsense adaptations and adjustments. Efforts should be made to speed the adoption of new methods of management that automatically reward workers for helping reduce the ratio of labor costs to sales income. Pension plans, including the Federal old-age and survivors insurance plan, should be adapted to creeping inflation. This means that they should either be fitted with escalator clauses or revised every now and then to compensate for the rise in the price level.

People should review their investment policies and should not hold long-term bonds or other long-term fixed-income investments unless the yield is sufficient to compensate them for the probable annual loss in purchasing power. Long-term wage contracts should contain escalator clauses. But, in general, people should realize that living under creeping inflation in the future will not be essentially different from living under creeping inflation in the past—in fact, prices will probably rise considerably less in the next 10 years than in the past 10.

Most important of all, people should realize that the alternative to creeping inflation is a fairly substantial amount of chronic unemployment. The problems of creeping inflation are a small price to pay for avoiding the much greater problems of unemployment and a rate of growth that falls far short of our potential.

SPENDING AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the effect of the two major bills as passed by the Senate thus far in the current session of Congress would be to provide for back door expenditure of \$3.3 billion before the first appropriation bill is even reported from the House Appropriations Committee.

The housing bill, as passed by the Senate, would completely by-pass the appropriation process by authorizing \$575 million in expenditures from public debt receipts, and circumvent effective appropriation control over \$2,250 million in contract authorizations. Likewise the airport bill, passed by the Senate, would provide \$465 million in contract authorizations.

And as HHFA Commissioner Norman Mason has pointed out, the public housing provision in the housing bill virtually commits future appropriations running into multi-millions of dollars in Federal contributions to projects under this program. Federal contributions to public housing projects in existence are now running at a rate of more than \$100 million annually, and increasing every year, and to date they have totaled ap-

proximately \$0.5 billion, exclusive of loans.

These two bills, as passed by the Senate, exclusive of further commitments such as those for public housing, represent an increase of \$1.3 billion over administration requests for new spending authorization.

No one can foretell at this date what the effect of these bills would be on expenditures in the coming and subsequent fiscal years, but this type of fiscal legislation outside of annual appropriation

control makes a shambles of orderly efforts to keep the budget in balance.

Assuming enactment of the Senate housing bill, \$11.9 billion would be available for expenditure in Federal housing programs, including \$9 billion in unexpended balances remaining in prior authorizations. Assuming enactment of the Senate airport bill, \$610 million would be available for expenditure in the airport program, including \$145 million in unexpended balances remaining in prior authorizations.

In addition to the \$2.8 billion in new cash spending authorizations outside of effective appropriation control, the housing bill as passed by the Senate would further commit public credit for the insurance of private housing mortgages by a total of \$10 billion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point tables showing the status of these bills to date.

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

TABLE 1.—Federal credit and money available for housing and related programs under pending bills as compared with administration requests

[In thousands]

| | Authority to insure and guarantee | | | Authority to expend from public debt receipts | | | Contract authority and other authority to appropriate | | | Total | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612 | Passed by Senate, S. 57 | House committee, H.R. 2357 | Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612 | Passed by Senate, S. 57 | House committee, H.R. 2357 | Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612 | Passed by Senate, S. 57 | House committee, H.R. 2357 | Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612 | Passed by Senate, S. 57 | House committee, H.R. 2357 |
| Federal Housing Administration: Authority to insure mortgages: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal year 1959..... | \$6,000,000 | \$5,000,000 | \$6,000,000 | | | | | | | \$6,000,000 | \$5,000,000 | \$6,000,000 |
| Fiscal year 1960..... | (1) | 5,000,000 | 4,000,000 | | | | | | | (1) | 5,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| Subtotal..... | 6,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | | | | | | | 6,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 |
| Urban renewal: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Authority to enter into contracts with local public agencies: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital grants: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal year 1959..... | | | | | | | 200,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 | 200,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 |
| Fiscal year 1960..... | | | | | | | 250,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 | 250,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 |
| Fiscal year 1961..... | | | | | | | 250,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 | 250,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 |
| Fiscal year 1962..... | | | | | | | 250,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 | 250,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 |
| Fiscal year 1963..... | | | | | | | 250,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 | 250,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 |
| Fiscal year 1964..... | | | | | | | 200,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 | 200,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 |
| Fiscal year 1965..... | | | | | | | 200,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 | 200,000 | 350,000 | 500,000 |
| Additional, determination of Administrator with President's approval..... | | | | | | | | 150,000 | | | 150,000 | |
| Subtotal..... | | | | | | | 1,550,000 | 2,250,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,550,000 | 2,250,000 | 1,500,000 |
| Loans to local public agencies for advance land acquisition and rehabilitation..... | | | | | (2) | | | | | | (2) | |
| Loans for urban renewal..... | | | | (2) | | (2) | | | | (2) | | (2) |
| Urban planning grants for small communities..... | | | | | | | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Subtotal, urban renewal..... | | | | | | | 1,560,000 | 2,260,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,560,000 | 2,260,000 | 1,510,000 |
| Loans for rental housing and related facilities for the elderly..... | | | | | | | | | 100,000 | | | 100,000 |
| College housing: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Loans for college housing..... | | | | 200,000 | 300,000 | 400,000 | | | | 200,000 | 300,000 | 400,000 |
| Loans for construction and rehabilitation of facilities, etc.:..... | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Loan guarantee program..... | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Direct loan program..... | | | | | 125,000 | | | | | | 125,000 | |
| Subtotal, college housing..... | | | | 200,000 | 425,000 | 400,000 | | | | 200,000 | 425,000 | 400,000 |
| Farm housing research: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal year 1960..... | | | | | | | | 75 | 50 | | 75 | 50 |
| Fiscal year 1961..... | | | | | | | | 75 | 50 | | 75 | 50 |
| Fiscal year 1962..... | | | | | | | | 75 | 50 | | 75 | 50 |
| Subtotal, farm housing research..... | | | | | | | | 225 | 100 | | 225 | 100 |
| Veterans' Administration: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Direct loans to veterans..... | | | | | 150,000 | (4) | | | | | 150,000 | (4) |
| City planning scholarships and fellowships: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal year 1960..... | | | | | | | | 500 | | | 500 | |
| Fiscal year 1961..... | | | | | | | | 500 | | | 500 | |
| Fiscal year 1962..... | | | | | | | | 500 | | | 500 | |
| Subtotal..... | | | | | | | | 1,500 | | | 1,500 | |

¹ After fiscal year 1959 authorization would be open end.

² Includes \$100,000,000 to reestablish President's reserve.

³ Authority could exceed \$1,000,000,000 by any amount at President's discretion.

⁴ An additional \$300,000,000 passed by House in H.R. 2256.

TABLE 1.—Federal credit and money available for housing and related programs under pending bills as compared with administration requests—Continued

[In thousands]

| | Authority to insure and guarantee | | | Authority to expend from public debt receipts | | | Contract authority and other authority to appropriate | | | Total | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612 | Passed by Senate, S. 57 | House committee, H.R. 2357 | Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612 | Passed by Senate, S. 57 | House committee, H.R. 2357 | Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612 | Passed by Senate, S. 57 | House committee, H.R. 2357 | Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612 | Passed by Senate, S. 57 | House committee, H.R. 2357 |
| Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Service Act of 1951: Hospital construction: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal year 1959..... | | | | | | | | \$7,500 | \$7,500 | | \$7,500 | \$7,500 |
| Fiscal year 1960..... | | | | | | | | 7,500 | 7,500 | | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| Subtotal..... | | | | | | | | 15,000 | 15,000 | | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Federal National Mortgage Association: Special assistance functions: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fiscal year 1959..... | | | | | | \$25,000 | | | | | | 25,000 |
| Fiscal year 1960..... | | | | | | 50,000 | | | | | | 50,000 |
| Subtotal..... | | | | | | 75,000 | | | | | | 75,000 |
| Grand total..... | \$6,000,000 | \$10,000,000 | \$10,000,000 | \$200,000 | \$575,000 | 475,000 | \$1,560,000 | 2,276,725 | 1,625,100 | \$7,760,000 | 12,851,725 | 12,100,100 |

TABLE 2.—Funds available for Federal airport programs under pending bills as compared with administration request

| Fiscal year | Administration request S. 674 | Passed by Senate, S. 1 | House committee, H.R. 1011 |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1960..... | \$65,000,000 | \$100,000,000 | \$63,000,000 |
| 1961..... | 55,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 83,000,000 |
| 1962..... | 45,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 78,000,000 |
| 1963..... | 35,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 73,000,000 |
| Discretionary fund..... | (1) | 65,000,000 | (2) |
| Total..... | 200,000,000 | 465,000,000 | 297,000,000 |

¹ Bill would authorize 50 percent of amounts for States to be transferred to a discretionary fund.

² Included in figures above as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| Fiscal year 1961..... | \$20,000,000 |
| Fiscal year 1962..... | 15,000,000 |
| Fiscal year 1963..... | 10,000,000 |
| Total..... | 45,000,000 |

THE NATION'S HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last month the National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., held its annual convention at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, here in Washington, on January 21 and 22. The luncheon address delivered at the convention on Thursday, January 22, concerns the question of the scope and adequacy of the Nation's highway programs. It was delivered by Dr. Robinson Newcomb, who has served as an economic consultant for several congressional committees, and as an economist in governmental agencies.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

HIGHWAY PROGRAM IS BIG, BUT IT'S NOT BIG ENOUGH

(Address by Dr. Robinson Newcomb presented at the annual convention luncheon of the National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., January 22, 1959, Hotel Statler-Hilton, Washington, D.C.)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the one thing about which I am fairly certain is that our highway program has to be bigger. Each of you has a simple one-line chart No.

1 in front of you. I hope this chart gives my story. I hope it tells all I want to say. If it does, any of you can leave this minute without missing anything, because you'll have the idea. This chart shows that in constant dollars, if there were such a thing, the economy has grown from 3 to 3½ percent year in and year out including the depression years—including the 30's. I believe—and most technicians in the field believe—that the economy in the future can grow at least this fast and very possibly slightly faster. The economic report the President issued last Tuesday goes into some detail in explaining why and how we've been able to reduce the likelihood of serious recessions in the future. So, if the economy has grown this fast with serious recessions, it certainly should grow this fast without them and very likely faster without them.

There's another simple reason why the economy should grow at this rate in the future. Unless we think our kids are dumber than their parents, we should expect them to progress as fast as our parents and as fast as we progressed. If your children are as smart as I think my children are, we "ain't" seen nothing yet. So, if you will agree with me that this country will grow in the future as least as fast as it grew in the past, may I pass on to the next point?

Traffic has to grow faster than business as a whole. If business as a whole grows 3½ percent per year, traffic has to grow faster—at least 4 or 5 percent per year. Advancing culture and the increasing complexity of civilization require a greater and greater interchange of materials and of services. The self-sufficient peasant may make cloth for his own needs, and provide most of the materials and labor for his own food and shelter. He may depend on others for very little more than salt and the simplest of tools. He needs little in the way of roads or other transportation. But, with the onset of specialization, one of the essentials of increasing productivity and rising standards, must come more transportation. A man who weaves more cloth than he uses tries to exchange it for food and other things that he needs. Roads or other means of transportation must be developed if he is to exchange his cloth for what he considers the necessities of life. Otherwise, he must go back to a pastoral or a hunting economy.

Specialization means exchange—exchange means traffic—and the type of mass traffic which has been growing most rapidly is highway traffic. And that highway traffic requires facilities in the form of better highways. Highway traffic for all except basic

commodities, such as coal, steel, timber, and grain, is proving the most efficient transport when all things, including time, are considered. So, if traffic as a whole grows faster than the economy, highway traffic particularly grows faster than the economy. Vehicles traveled twice as many miles over highways for each given value of business done in 1929 as they traveled for the same volume of business transactions in 1922. Or to put it differently, there were twice as many vehicle miles per dollar of business done in 1929 as there were for the same volume of business done in 1922. This is all, of course, in constant dollars.

The growth in business about which I have been talking, this chart you hold in your hands, represents an increase in real, not inflated, dollars. The highways, no matter how you look at it, have to be improved. The growth in highway traffic during the twenties followed the normal growth pattern of most healthy new industries. Traffic grew 11 percent per year compounded annually, more than did business during the twenties. And, traffic grew even during the depression in relation to the volume of business. From the peak of prosperity in 1929 to the depths of depression in 1933 traffic per volume of business done grew at an annual rate compounded at about 10 percent per year. That's almost as much during the recession as it grew in the prosperous years of the twenties. Even the depression did not stop the growth in relative highway use.

Here the story begins to get a little complicated, and if it's hard to follow, don't worry because the concept is basically the same one. If the economy continues to grow then highway traffic should grow somewhat more.

New industries tend to show a standard growth pattern. They tend to grow slowly at the onset, then the rate speeds up, then the rate of growth finally declines. But in any basic industry the rate of growth does not suddenly stop. As a new industry is replaced by an old one, as the railroads were replaced by highways, or canals were replaced by railroads, the rate of growth in these industries slowed down. But it didn't suddenly reverse itself. The growth of highway traffic did not follow this historic, yet basic economic pattern. The growth of highway traffic did not taper off as normally happens. It stopped abruptly. It shifted from a positive rate of growth of 10 percent per year even during the depression years to a sharp decline. Such a sharp reversal in trend from a high rate of growth to a nega-

tive rate is unusual. In no basic industry can I recollect this having occurred except in highways.

What happened is fairly obvious. Highway construction was fairly well maintained through 1931. Real expenditures on a constant dollar basis rose about 10 percent per year from 1921 to 1931. This according to the Bureau of Public Roads studies provided a capital investment in 1931 that was about 4.6 times as great as it was in 1921. As the highway traffic was about 4 times as great in 1931 as it was in 1921, highways were about as well equipped to carry the higher volume of traffic in 1931 as they had been equipped to carry the lower volume of traffic in 1921. But, highway construction stopped almost completely in 1932. Construction dropped over 10 percent in real terms from 1931 to 1932 and another 30 percent from 1931 to 1933. Highway capacity, as measured by depreciated investment, stopped rising at a rate which would permit highway traffic to grow as it should grow. Roads became congested. Hardening of traffic arteries appeared. When many roads were carrying capacity traffic, an increase in demand for traffic in normal times could move only by displacing existing traffic.

Chart No. 2 was prepared for me by the Bureau of Public Roads using Public Roads' data on investment in highways and on traffic. It is drawn as an index of inadequacy. If it is turned upside down, it becomes an index of adequacy. This chart shows that roads became more adequate from 1921 to 1930, that is, we built more capacity in 1921 to 1930 than we added to our traffic. So the roads were better and better able to handle traffic up until about 1932. But from then on adequacy dropped. Of course, the roads were able to handle the traffic during the war years because we held traffic down. At the end of the war, the roads were freed again and traffic was allowed to grow. The chart shows what happened. Adequacy, on the basis of 1939-40 equals 100, dropped to 61 in 1955. We haven't been building roads fast enough to keep up with traffic. That is why in part it takes you so long to get from your house to your work.

The next chart, No. 3, was also prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads. It shows annual expenditures on highways per vehicle mile traveled. This was determined using 1947 and 1949 construction dollars, calculated by the Department of Commerce. What was done was to divide the number of dollars spent each year, in constant terms as calculated by Commerce, by the number of vehicle miles as estimated by the Bureau of Public Roads. If we look at the figures for the beginning of the twenties we spent almost 1.2 cents for each mile traveled. In 1958 money, that would be about 1.9 cents. We spent this down through 1929 for each mile traveled. But during the early years of the Hoover regime expenditures on highways were increased. We sometimes forget that public and highway expenditures rose in 1930. They were higher in 1931 and in 1932 than they were in 1929. They continued to rise more than traffic during these years. We fixed up our roads fairly well through 1932, as you may remember from the index of adequacy or of inadequacy which we just saw. But in 1933 we checked our spending on roads. Outlays went down to something like six-tenths of a cent a mile or thereabouts by 1935. Then appropriations were increased again and public roads construction was revived. Expenditures rose to about nine-tenths of a cent per mile. Then they went down and with the war, to something like 0.2 to 0.3 cents. By 1955 we were back up to something like 0.6 and now they are something less than 0.7 compared to 1.2 cents in constant dollars in the 1920's. In spite of all we spent last year, we are still spending less per vehicle mile than we spent

even in 1933 and far less than we spent back in 1925-29.

Today's program seems big. You've been told many times it's a big program. But in relation to the size of the country and in relation to the volume of traffic, it isn't a big program. It's six-tenths as big a program as it was 20 years ago. We forget how big we are, we forget that this is a growing country, a country growing $\frac{3}{4}$ percent per year. If the country grows this fast, obviously its expenditures for utilities must grow to keep abreast. We don't get excited when the A.T. & T. issues another big bond issue and spends more money for lines or switchboards. We don't get excited when the Potomac Electric Power, or your local utility, spends more money to increase its capacity for generating electricity. The only time we worry about spending to improve public utilities is when we talk about something like public roads. Payment for this utility comes out of the public exchequer instead of the private pocketbook. You men won't sell your limestone to the road program unless the money is available to build this program which I hope you won't call a big program, but more or less a normal program. Nothing comes without some effort and it won't take an awful lot of effort on your part to get the appropriations through, I am sure, for this normal highway program.

If economy is to grow $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent per year, highway traffic will have to grow roughly 5 percent per year for the next decade. The heavy dotted line on top on the last chart, No. 4, indicates what traffic might have been had we continued to build highways and had we avoided the recession. The heavier dotted line on the right suggests what traffic may be if we continue to build adequate highways now. The rate of growth which may be necessary for economy growing at $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent to 4 percent a year would yield a traffic volume of about a trillion, two hundred billion miles by 1970.

I'm throwing this in because pretty soon we will have to learn to talk in terms of trillions. By 1970 a high employment volume of business, in 1958 dollars, would be something like \$750 million. But by 1985, maybe, it will be something like \$1 trillion. Now, most of us hope to be alive in 1980, so we will have to learn to talk in terms of trillions. We are approaching an era in which, in the highway field, we will have to talk in terms of trillions earlier than we do in the terms of the national economy. But we won't have a national economy of \$750 billion by 1970 unless we have highways which will permit traffic growth of a billion vehicle-miles and probably 1.2 billion by 1970. Those who would suggest that we hold back on highway expenditures are actually then suggesting that we should restrict the rate of growth of the economy. That would mean that we would not need highways to transport goods which the unemployed are not producing. If we permit the economy to grow and the unemployment to remain relatively low, we must provide the capacity to move the goods our higher rate of economy will create.

A calculation of the capacity required for the sort of traffic I have been discussing, suggests that something over \$8 billion per year would be needed for construction between now and 1965. About another \$4 billion might be needed for maintenance, debt service, police costs, and so on. This \$8 billion estimate may be compared with a construction outlay of approximately \$5,350,000,000, as estimated by the Department of Commerce for last year. This would suggest that during the next decade the average should be increased about 50 percent. The estimated outlay for 1959 is about \$6 billion, or an increase of over 10 percent. For the decade 1966 to 1975, construction expenditures needed may approach \$11 billion. That's double last year's expenditure. This would

suggest your sales then may be double what they are now.

Once we have provided adequate highways, the capacity needed may grow but little more than the economy as a whole—approximately 4 percent per year. In the meantime, let's not create unemployment in order to avoid the expense of creating highways.

INTERNATIONAL WAR ON DISEASE CHALLENGE TO U.S. LEADERSHIP

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few battles can be waged with gains for all participants assured: an exception is the fight against disease.

Today the United States has a dramatic opportunity to assume international leadership in the struggle to decrease human suffering. Our great resources of skill and technology have enabled us to perform modern medical miracles within this country. Sharing of these gains—and assimilation of the gains made by those of other nations—will free for useful endeavor millions of persons fated to live their lives as cripples or doomed to a premature death because of cures that now lie beyond medical understanding.

From 1937 through 1955 the death rate in the United States was reduced by 18 percent. In the 10-year period 1945 and 1955 alone, the rate declined 12 percent.

In the 17 years between 1937 and 1954, the life expectancy of U.S. citizens increased almost 10 years; 4.4 years were added in the period between 1944 and 1954 alone.

MORE THAN 3 MILLION LIVES SAVED

The 18 percent decline in the death rate represents a saving of over 3 million lives. If the 1937 death rate had prevailed from 1937 through 1955, this many more people would have died.

These statistics, compiled by the National Health Education Committee, Inc., from data available through the National Office of Vital Statistics, reveal the magnitude of medical research progress in the United States and the rewards in terms of human lives.

Estimates of the relief of nonfatal but crippling diseases in the United States indicate similar massive steps forward. Eighty percent of all epileptics now lead normal lives due to neurological research. Salk vaccine has drastically reduced the incidence of paralytic polio. Because of the discovery of certain antibiotics, a number of blinding eye diseases have virtually disappeared in the United States.

RESEARCH BENEFITS WORLDWIDE

Benefits of research have spread to other countries. Due to antibiotics, within 3 years the incidence of yaws in Haiti was reduced from 1 in 6 of the populace to 1 in 3,000—at a cost of 30 cents per capita. In some parts of the world two-thirds of the people have trachoma; the antibiotic aureomycin can provide dramatic improvement within a few days. From 1942 to 1949, Greece reduced the sickness rate from malaria to one-fortieth of the 1942 rate through use of DDT control measures.

These statistics indicate the value of medical research. In dry, dispassionate

terms, they show achievements won and argue for further effort.

Our scientists have made great progress in discovering the cause and cure of many illnesses. I have been proud to play a small part in this forward movement through our successful efforts, under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, Senator LISTER HILL, to secure increased appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, and other federally sponsored research activities. We have instituted public health programs which aid in implementing in other countries the knowledge gained by research. But we have not yet taken the ultimate step—inauguration of a worldwide war against disease.

HERBERT LEHMAN DESCRIBES CHALLENGE

Mr. President, recently a respected and eminent former Member of this body, Senator Herbert H. Lehman, delivered an address before the American Social Hygiene Association in New York City which vividly describes the challenge to the United States. I should like to read a portion of that speech to the Senate today. Senator Herbert Lehman said:

I would like to see the day, and soon, when the largest single item in our national research budget would be for study of the ways and means of saving rather than of destroying life.

Our Government does make appropriations for medical research, mostly through the National Institutes of Health. These appropriations are still far from enough. But the chief bottleneck, the principal shortage today is not of money but of trained research scientists and technicians.

There is a similar shortage in most countries where research is going on.

Yet at the same time, there is a great duplication of research effort, as between our country and others. The world supply of its most precious scientific resources—brains and skills—is being wastefully expended.

The exchange of medical research information between our country and other countries is tragically inadequate.

I have heard it said that if all the existing bits and pieces of information bearing on cancer to be found in the various laboratories of the world could be pooled, sifted and correlated, a major breakthrough with regard to this disease would be virtually assured.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of Senator Lehman's address dealing with international cooperation in medical research be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HERBERT H. LEHMAN BEFORE THE AMERICAN SOCIAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION

Let me present a specific program which could, I think, arouse the enthusiastic support of the American people and strike a deeply responsive note throughout the world. I suggest it as a path to peace. I refer to the desirability of an international cooperative attack on the problem of disease and disability—those common enemies of all mankind which recognize neither national boundaries nor national interests, but constitute, along with the threat of war, the chief menaces to the human race.

What a thrill would go through the ranks of mankind if our Government sent out a clarion call for an international crusade against these age-old enemies, and pledged the resources necessary to help organize such a crusade.

Of course, this alone would not solve the complex problems of our world relationships; nor dare we turn our back upon the efforts of Soviet communism to undermine the world's forces of freedom and spread its power throughout the earth. But I am convinced that in the breakneck race we are now running against the Soviet Union on a predominantly military course, it matters increasingly less to a growing number of the common people of mankind whether the Soviet Union or the United States is ahead; they feel that humanity is falling behind.

And so I suggest that we try to change the focus of the world's attention from some of the differences which divide us to some of the problems which unite us. Surely one of them is the problem of disease and disability.

Proposals pointing in this direction have already been made in the Congress, and, I am sure, elsewhere. President Eisenhower has made passing reference to it, and his brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, spoke of it before the World Health Assembly in Minneapolis early this summer.

I am told that the administration in Washington is even now giving consideration to an expansion of our Government's activities in international health cooperation. I do not know in what magnitude.

I take this occasion to urge that the various proposals pointing in the directions I have mentioned be given the widest possible public discussion with a view to their most comprehensive possible implementation.

I utter a sober warning that these undertakings must not be publicly presented as merely new propaganda weapons in the cold war. If so, they will fail in their purpose. They must be presented as a new departure in policy, part of an entirely different approach to the problem of peace and understanding in the world. But beyond that, the program of international cooperation in the war against disease must be viewed as valid for its own sake. It is.

I would like to see the day and soon, when the largest single item in our national research budget would be for study of the ways and means of saving rather than of destroying life.

Our Government does make appropriations for medical research, mostly through the National Institutes of Health. These appropriations are still far from enough. But the chief bottleneck, the principal shortage today is not of money but of trained research scientists and technicians.

There is a similar shortage in most countries where research is going on.

Yet at the same time, there is a great duplication of research effort, as between our country and others. The world supply of its most precious scientific resources—brains and skills—is being wastefully expended.

The exchange of medical research information between our country and other countries is tragically inadequate.

I have heard it said that if all the existing bits and pieces of information bearing on cancer to be found in the various laboratories of the world could be pooled, sifted and correlated, a major breakthrough with regard to this disease would be virtually assured.

For these and other reasons, leading medical scientists believe that the greatest single need in the field of research today is international cooperation and coordination in the training of skilled research workers, in the exchange of information, and, of course, in the actual conduct of research.

An international program is called for.

There is already in existence international machinery which could be utilized to help carry out such a program.

I mean the World Health Organization. This body has already worked miracles in helping to control such diseases as malaria and tuberculosis in many parts of the world.

It operates on a minuscule budget, \$13½ million annually, about half the budget of the New York City Health Department. Thus it has never been able to concern itself with basic medical research. Yet it could well function at the center of the international research program I have been discussing.

Our Government must greatly increase its financial contributions to the WHO to permit this organization to utilize its full potential in the world war against disease and disability.

But the need is not just for bigger appropriations. We need a comprehensive plan, and a governmental mechanism in the United States to help enlist and mobilize the scientific personnel and resources of our country for the great undertaking I have sketched.

A comprehensive proposal to meet precisely this need has been presented by Senator LISTER HILL, who is the Senate's leading and most effective fighter for medical research and for public welfare measures generally.

Senator HILL's plan would authorize an annual appropriation of \$50 million to effectuate the purposes I have described—to mobilize the health resources of America, and to stimulate their mobilization abroad—for a world crusade against disease and disability.

I do not have the time today to discuss the details of the Hill proposal. But I commend this measure to the sympathetic consideration of this organization and of every individual present here today.

I hope that Senator HILL's bill will be enacted by the next Congress. But as with all such proposals, this can only happen if public interest groups such as yours, and the public at large, mobilize their support behind this program.

I can think of no more stirring cause than this, and none more truly worthwhile. This project embraces the most primary concern of human beings. It can evoke a world enthusiasm based on the ancient and universal respect for the healer, who can make the blind see and the lame walk.

Undertakings of this sort hold the only promise I can see for the world to emerge from the present age of confusion and brink of catastrophe.

Being basically an optimist, I have great faith in the resources and indestructibility of the human spirit. I believe—because I must believe it—that far from being at the beginning of an age of darkness, we are actually near its end, and that a true renaissance of the free spirit of mankind shortly awaits us.

As part of this renaissance, I believe there will be a revival and renewal of the spirit of humanitarianism.

I believe that America will help lead the way in this historic development.

I have faith and I have hope. But the progress which we impatiently await will be made only if all of us join to help bring it about.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, despite significant victories in the field of medical research, tremendous challenges remain. Eighty-eight million Americans now living will die of heart diseases unless new treatments and cures are found. About 26 million will die from cancer. As former Senator Lehman points out, the key to the cause of cancer may now lie in a laboratory test tube in Japan, Poland, or Brazil. But this magnificent achievement might be delayed for years because scientists in

other nations—who might realize the implications of this information due to their own studies—lack the necessary means of communication to obtain these findings. The magnitude of the problem is indicated by the fact that many scientific investigators find it less expensive and time-consuming to conduct laboratory experiments anew than to search for previously reported data—even though such data are known to exist.

Mr. President, the outstanding political leader in the field of public health is the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. His effective leadership in the Senate has been a major element in the significant appropriation increases which we have been able to secure for the vital work of the National Institutes of Health. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has recognized the moral responsibility of the United States to launch an international crusade against disease by introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 41, a bill to establish the domestic machinery which will facilitate the international cooperation in medical research. Enactment of this resolution would further signify to the world, the United States desire for cooperation, not conflict. It would help prepare the way for an International Medical Year in which scientists, doctors, and technicians of all countries could combine to launch a global battle against disease. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this proposal, on which Senate hearings are now being held. I hope that it will receive speedy consideration by Congress.

REPORT LISTS ADVANTAGES FOR UNITED STATES

In the 85th Congress, the Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 99 urging the President to initiate action leading to U.S. participation in a world Health and Medical Research Year. This declaration of support by the Senate should receive the urgent consideration of the administration. I ask unanimous consent that part of the cogent Senate report on that resolution—which was prepared by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has so vigorously and effectively supported the International Medical Year concept in this country and abroad—be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

PURPOSE

Major health and medical progress has been achieved within recent years throughout the world, thanks to scientific discovery and other efforts. However, widespread disease and disability still beset the world, including particularly the underdeveloped areas.

The goal of these resolutions is, therefore, to encourage the acceleration and broadening of mankind's battle against its afflictions. One possible medium which would be studied by means of this resolution would be international participation in a Health and Medical Research Year, which might be comparable in some respects to the current successful International Geophysical Year.

The President of the United States would be invited to extend, principally through the World Health Organization, an invitation

to the nations of the world to designate representatives to meet and discuss the feasibility of such a Health and Medical Research Year, which might, if approved, occur at some indefinite time in the future. In addition, alternative methods would initially be explored, looking toward intensified international cooperation in the field of health.

BACKGROUND

In January of 1958, in his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower conveyed a recommendation for "works of peace," including an offer for a pooling of efforts with the Soviet Union "against the diseases that are the common enemy of all mortals—such as cancer and heart disease."

At the Eleventh World Health Assembly, held in Minneapolis in May-June 1958, a United States offer of \$300,000 was accepted for the purpose of exploring expanded health research efforts.

The Executive Board of the World Health Organization will be directing this study, one of the possible phases of which might be the question of a Health and Medical Research Year, as contemplated under these resolutions.

ADVANTAGES TO THE UNITED STATES

The United States has a long and honored record of advancing and exchanging scientific knowledge, among other ways, through the means of specially designed international scientific years. By means of the present resolutions, our Government would be maintaining the initiative in the forum of world opinion in advancing constructive programs for the alleviation of the health problems of mankind.

Experience under the International Geophysical Year demonstrates that there are impressive advantages in a universally designated period of intensified research and cooperation. Public recognition is heightened, governments are encouraged to optimum efforts, and barriers to the flow of scientific information tend to be relaxed.

Disease, of course, recognizes no national boundary line. Illness exacts a grim toll on all mankind—directly and indirectly.

No country is immune from the ravages of such scourges as heart disease, cancer, arthritis, rheumatic diseases, and neurological disorders, to name but a few common afflictions.

The findings from expanded research findings which might be stimulated by means of these resolutions would become available for the benefit of the population of the United States, as well as for all other peoples.

Coping with disease involves the complex processes of discovery, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation—to all of which tasks scientists, physicians, and other health workers of all nations can fruitfully contribute.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 3, 1959, the Senate approved a resolution presented by the Senator from Minnesota which will permit the Committee on Government Operations to continue its study of international activities of the executive branch in the field of medical research. This study has already yielded valuable information. During the coming year publication of further findings will provide guidelines for necessary congressional and executive action as we seek to insure fullest efficiency and coordination in international research efforts.

NEED DICTATES INTERNATIONAL CRUSADE

Mr. President, the war against disease is not an abstract principle for me. In August I underwent surgery for cancer. Only a few weeks ago I ended precautionary cobalt radiation treatments.

Medical research saved my life. Millions of persons live useful and productive lives today because of the efforts of dedicated researchers who successfully searched out the cause of death and disability—"those common enemies of all mankind which recognize neither national boundaries nor national interest, but constitute, along with the threat of war, the chief menaces to the human race."

Herbert H. Lehman said:

What a thrill would go through the ranks of mankind if our Government sent out a clarion call for an international crusade against these age-old enemies, and pledged the resources necessary to help organize such a crusade.

I can think of no more stirring cause than this, and none more truly worthwhile. This project embraces the most primary concern of human beings. It can evoke world enthusiasm based on the ancient and universal respect for the healer, who can make the blind see and the lame walk.

It is my hope that our Government will heed these words from a wise counselor and a great humanitarian.

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I wish to say I am pleased to observe present in the Chamber with us the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] who has been very persistent and effective as an advocate of international progress in the field of medicine. Today all too few studies and findings with respect to medical research are translated into other languages so that they can be shared by people in all countries. In addition, there are many backward nations which have great scientists and brilliant minds but lack the financial means to use the physical resources such as drugs and various elements in those countries, so that they can make the medical findings which would be possible if the programs could be supported financially.

I am pleased that the Senator from Minnesota has been present during the delivery of my address, so that he can share in what I have had to say and so that I can acclaim his leadership in this important field.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his very kind and gracious remarks.

One of the most thrilling experiences of my life took place last year in November or December, when under the terms of the Senate resolution to which the Senator from Oregon has referred, the resolution to look into medical research as conducted by the executive branch of the Government, I visited some nine nations to study the hospitals, laboratories, and pharmaceutical establishments in the field of health and medical research. It was an experience, I will say to the Senator from Oregon, that will live in my memory from now on.

I recall, for example, being in the Radium Institute in Paris, in the presence of a very great doctor, who is in the United States at this moment, Dr. Latterjet, an excellent scientist who

headed the Radium Institute. While I was there the seven Yugoslavs who were the victims of a nuclear plant explosion were brought in for treatment, and we were able to observe the importance of more progress in the field of what we might call radioactive medicine or medical treatment and medical research in the field of radioactivity. We know very little about that.

Other doctors to whom I talked were keenly concerned in the problems of air pollution.

I visited the children's hospital in Paris, where Dr. Minkowsky, an eminent specialist in children's diseases, took me through all the laboratories and all the experimental wards to show me what was going on, particularly with respect to the care of children born prematurely.

These were a few of my experiences, and I had some others at Oslo and Stockholm and the great Karolinska Institute in Finland, and the World Health Center in Geneva.

In Moscow we visited the Soviet Academy of Sciences and the great Cancer Institute, where we visited with the top specialists in the field of cancer research and cancer treatment. Dr. Blochman is one of the leading specialists in Russia, and has been the same in the United States, under the American Cancer Institute.

I want to say to the Senator that his support of this great endeavor currently being sponsored by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and others—the Senator from Oregon is a cosponsor—will be of inestimable value, because the Senator speaks not only with the mind of a great legislator but with a heart which is filled with experience in this field of medicine and knowledge of what medical research can provide for us.

I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, and I am very appreciative of the Senator's very generous comments relating to my activities.

MR. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, who should not belittle or deprecate his own role, because it is a very important role. I have often thought, particularly since my own serious illness, how much disease and health problems are the levelers which unite all mankind. We may disagree on ideologies, economic systems, politics, military problems, international borders or international frontiers, but all mankind—living in the United States, in the Soviet Union, in the British Empire, in France, in Italy, or in Turkey—is heir to the same ills.

I am sure the hearts of mankind everywhere have been stirred by the heroic fight for life of our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. I feel certain, whether people agree or disagree with his policies in the international field, they pray and hope for his recovery, and they are stirred by the valor and bravery with which he is facing his illness.

I should like to say further that it is my hope that when we pass the joint resolution of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], of which the Senator from

Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I are cosponsors, to further medical research internationally, perhaps we can dedicate the passage of that measure to the ultimate recovery of our distinguished Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear at the conclusion of these remarks an article which I prepared for the Progressive magazine, and which appeared in the October 1958 issue of that publication, together with editorials from the Eugene Register-Guard, the Arizona Star, and the New York Times endorsing an International Medical Year.

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

[From the Progressive, October 1958]

NEXT THE INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL YEAR

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

"The groundwork of all happiness is health."—Leigh Hunt, 1821.

I have a proposal which I believe might stir all mankind. We have just concluded the International Geophysical Year, during which the nations of the world spent some 18 months studying the earth and its environment. This ranged from outer space to caves and crevasses, from Antarctica to the steaming jungles of the Amazon and Congo. New mountains of ore were discovered, to say nothing of 40 percent more ice than anybody thought existed in the polar regions.

Now, what of an International Medical Year, to be held beginning early in 1961, under the auspices of the newly inaugurated President of the United States? This would afford time to prepare for the undertaking.

Such a project could mobilize all the world's skills, knowledge, and facilities for an all-out onslaught against heart disease, against the grim series of malignant diseases known as cancer, against malaria, against the blinding glaucoma which plagues the Orient, and against all the other sinister maladies that kill and torment members of the human race.

An International Medical Research and Health Year was proposed by Adlai E. Stevenson in an eloquent commencement address to the students of Michigan State University last June. The vast potential significance of this idea was brought home to me recently when I read the letter of a young American doctor, Thomas A. Dooley, treating natives in the swamps of Vietnam. He wrote that the effect of tender medical care on these forsaken people could be "Christlike in power and simplicity." The idea occurred to me again when I noticed that, during both 1956 and 1957, not more than 1 percent of our foreign-aid funds were used for health measures. Yet what could have a more favorable and enduring impact on our friends overseas than clinics to reduce the tragic rate of infant mortality, to cope with malaria, to eliminate the bacteria-nurtured diseases which snuff out so many young lives in Asia and Africa before even the age of 35 is reached?

Nor would an IMY—meaning International Medical Year—be without immense potential benefits to America itself. Despite our vaunted standard of living, the male residents of the United States have a shorter life expectancy than the males of no fewer than seven other countries—Holland, Great Britain, New Zealand, Israel, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. And, although Soviet medical education is quite a bit less thorough than ours, Russia today is producing four times as many doctors annually as we do: about 25,000 as compared with 6,000. Russia has 164 doctors for each 100,000 people

as contrasted with our 130 per each 100,000. And we in the United States cannot afford to ignore the increasing number of deaths in this country each year from cancer, climbing steadily from 211,000 in 1950 to 250,000 in 1957.

Furthermore, I believe the political climate is right in the United States for such a proposal as IMY. In a world racked by war and rumors of war, hopeful tidings often escape public notice. This is particularly true in the realm of politics, where Cassandra-like wailing can become an occupational disease.

Yet, I would confidently declare that one of the truly auspicious events of our era is the ever-increasing support of research on the frontiers of medical science by the U.S. Government. Indeed, it is little short of miraculous that Congress has been able to achieve this goal during a period when the executive branch of Government is headed by a President whose budget actually had discouraged such a program.

Perhaps this overwhelming challenge helps to explain my answer when people ask for my opinion of the outstanding legislative feats with which I have been associated. They expect me to enumerate spectacular bills such as statehood for Alaska, repeal of the Federal freight tax, or funds for the 1-million-kilowatt John Day Dam on the Columbia River. Instead, I reply:

"The vast increase in appropriations for medical research generally and cancer research in particular."

The efforts of the Government in this category center at the National Institutes of Health, in the green Maryland countryside near Bethesda. Research is carried on here by some of the Nation's most eminent medical scientists. I rejoice that some of us recently were able to secure congressional approval of adequate salaries for these gifted men and women. In addition, the National Institutes provide substantial grants to medical schools, clinics, private laboratories, hospitals, and other places throughout the 48 States where promising avenues of medical exploration have been opened.

Here is how Federal funds for the various separate divisions of the NIH have been progressively expanded in the 4 fiscal years since I came to the Senate:

| | 1955 | 1959 |
|-----------------------------|---------|---------|
| | Million | Million |
| Mental health..... | \$14.1 | \$52.4 |
| Heart..... | 16.6 | 45.6 |
| Cancer..... | 21.7 | 75.2 |
| Dental health..... | 1.9 | 7.4 |
| Arthritis..... | 8.2 | 31.2 |
| Allergy, etc..... | 6.1 | 24.0 |
| Neurology and blindness.... | 7.6 | 29.4 |

Shamefully enough, the budgets of the Eisenhower administration literally, on occasion, have recommended reductions in appropriations for the National Cancer Institute. But Senators who had seen such illustrious colleagues as Vandenberg, Taft, McMahon, and Neely die lingeringly of cancer, would not hold still for this kind of economy. They rallied behind the Nation's premier political figure in the field of public health, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, to make available for research into cancer, heart disease, and blindness at least a fraction of what we invest in armaments and other weapons of destruction.

This reveals why Senator HILL is my first choice to be American chairman of IMY. Few people outside the inner citadel of medical science are such symbols of concern for health as this southern liberal, who has served in Congress since 1923 and whose grandfather and father before him were eminent physicians. The author of the Hill-Burton Hospital Act and other medical legislation comes by his interest as a matter of rightful legacy. His father, Dr. Luther L. Hill, was the first American surgeon to perform a successful suture of the human heart.

He had studied in London under the great British scientist, Sir Joseph Lister, and this is how Dr. Hill's son received his name.

LISTER HILL works successfully with other people, for a humorous and kindly disposition affirms the sincerity of his solicitude for human suffering. He has rallied bipartisan support for his pioneering efforts in health legislation from such responsible Republicans as Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine. Another effective lieutenant is Mrs. Mary Lasker, the beautiful and wealthy founder of the National Health Education Committee, whose presence in Washington is almost invariable when Senator HILL and some of the rest of us are fighting for adequate funds to support the National Institutes of Health.

These citizens—and many others—could give vitality to America's participation in an International Medical Year. And IMY, originating in the United States, might help to instill in Americans a renewed appreciation for the wonders of medical research. I remember a day in the Senate, some months ago, when some of the lack of this appreciation was vividly impressed upon me.

I had recently passed the great Senate caucus room where a hearing was under way of the Senate Rackets Committee. The huge marble hall was crowded. At least two dozen reporters thronged the press tables. The klieg lights of television flooded the place. Radio microphones were placed at strategic intervals to catch every word. Some wretched racketeer from a strife-ridden labor union was on the witness stand, testifying reluctantly to his thefts from the union membership.

My wife and I had as our guests two nurses from the fine teaching hospital at the University of Oregon Medical School. We thought they would be interested in attending a hearing before Senator LISTER HILL's subcommittee on National Cancer Institute appropriations, in the basement of the Capitol Building. The witnesses were two of America's foremost doctors, Sidney Farber, of the Children's Cancer Research Foundation, and Isador Ravdin, of the American College of Surgeons and University of Pennsylvania. Quietly, they talked of a possible breakthrough employing chemotherapy as a method of treating cancer, and of the fact that viruses might be the etiological agent for cancer in human beings. They described the direction which cancer research ought to follow during the years directly ahead.

In that room, besides four or five of us from the Senate, were our two Oregon nurse guests and Mrs. Mary Lasker and a few of her personal friends. There was not one newspaper reporter, not one TV camera, no microphones, no flash bulletins, no communication to the public from the green felt table where Drs. Ravdin and Farber were somberly testifying.

I thought of the past panoply of communication which has been brought to bear on a labor racketeer's testimony upstairs. And I thought, too, of the 250,000 Americans who had died agonizingly of cancer in 1957, and of the hundreds of helpless child patients under Dr. Farber's care for leukemia, the deadly cancer of the blood. It seemed to me, in this moment, that an International Medical Year, centering in our own country where skills exist so abundantly in the realm of medicine, might help to achieve many purposes. One of these could be a greater talent for separating the things of lasting value from those of only transitory importance.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Dec. 21, 1958]

NOW AN INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL YEAR?

The International Geophysical Year, which lasted 18 months, ends December 31. Now

the proposal is made by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER that another year be proclaimed. He calls for an International Medical Year to begin in 1961. The idea of stimulating medical research is appealing. But it pays, also, to examine the nature of such years. What may they accomplish that might not be accomplished otherwise—or that might take much longer?

The Geophysical Year was a profitable one. Among the worthwhile scientific achievements were the lofting of the first and succeeding sputniks (and those were remarkable scientific feats regardless of their political ramifications), extensive navigation under the polar ice, discovery of a new mountain range on the Pacific floor, new ideas about the real character of the Antarctic continent, and many discoveries about weather. Some of these discoveries undoubtedly would have been made even if there had been no IGY.

Where the IGY did help was in focusing public attention on fields that often fail to make headlines. It is likely that some money was pried loose for geophysical research. Some of this money might not have been forthcoming had not the year been proclaimed. In this respect the IGY was a promotional scheme, not greatly different from cheese week, book week, fire prevention week, education week, newspaper week, and a hundred other weeks that are more or less celebrated annually.

The IGY has been a success because it had the widespread support of the world's scientists, the only men who could make it work. Before an International Medical Year, or IMY, could be organized, we should have to be assured of the support of the medical research people and of many of the practicing physicians. And they're skittish about promotions. It's one thing for a scientist to take active part in a program conceived by scientists. It is quite another to expect that a scientist will take part in a program that had its genesis in the mind of a political figure, even one so genuinely sympathetic to medical research as Senator NEUBERGER.

But it might be worth trying anyhow. As the Senator says, we in America should be enthusiastic about it. He points out that American men have a shorter life expectancy than men living in Holland, Great Britain, New Zealand, Israel, Norway, Sweden, or Denmark. This is so, despite the high standard of living that we brag about. And a mobilization of medical skills in an all-out assault on such diseases as cancer, heart disease, and mental illness would be made more feasible if the promotional force of an IMY were present to pry out the money such projects need. Supplies must be bought. Scientists must be freed of bread-and-butter jobs so that they can spend their time in research of a type that gives no assurance of money profit. New scientists must be trained. Hospitals and schools must be established and supported.

This newspaper, without using such a term for it, has long believed that the IMY approach is the right one. It has seemed wiser to work on the general problem of human health and fitness, concentrating as experts felt wise, than to spin our wheels by multiple appeals for specific illnesses, some of which are relatively minor in the whole medical picture. The Senator's idea, while it may have some bugs, appears to be worth serious consideration.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Nov. 17, 1958]

AN INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL YEAR

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, a narrow escapee from death by cancer, came up with an idea during his convalescence which he believes might stir all mankind. It is for an International Medical Year to start early in 1961, in the same pattern as the vastly

successful International Geophysical Year now in its closing weeks.

In his proposal, NEUBERGER points out that "despite our vaunted standard of living, the male residents of the United States have a shorter life expectancy than the males of no fewer than seven other countries—Holland, Great Britain, New Zealand, Israel, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark."

He points out that setting the IMY for 1961 would provide time to prepare for the undertaking. He adds:

"Such a project could mobilize all the world's skills, knowledge, and facilities for an all-out onslaught against heart disease, against the grim series of malignant diseases known as cancer, against malaria, against the blinding glaucoma which plagues the Orient, and against all other sinister maladies that kill and torment members of the human race."

It should be remembered that some of the great medicines of today have been known in other parts of the world for centuries, and that an IMY a generation ago might have effected the simple exchange of information which would have saved, for example, hundreds of thousands of hypertensives from eye hemorrhages, breakages of blood vessels elsewhere including in the kidneys and the brain, suffering and death. Mahatma Gandhi was chewing snake root daily for many years before doctors in the United States even knew it existed.

Research designed to whip some of the great killers has proceeded to the place where perhaps an International Medical Year might bring the climactic victory.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 8, 1958]

FOR A WORLD HEALTH YEAR

What may in the long run prove to be one of the most important actions of the present session of the General Assembly was taken last Friday. By a unanimous vote the Assembly invited the World Health Organization to carry out plans for the observation of an International Health and Medical Research Year, preferably in 1961.

The basis for this renewed effort would be primarily national, just as the World Health Organization works through regional and national groups with no attempt to supplant them. But the great aim is a better coordination of effort in some fields where international operation is imperative.

First of these, obviously, is the spread of existing knowledge in the field of fighting epidemic and endemic disease. The accomplishments of the World Health Organization in its first 10 years in the campaign against such scourges as malaria, tuberculosis, and yaws have been spectacular. An internationally supported health year should make it possible greatly to increase and accelerate these campaigns.

Of equal importance is a projected program for the coordination of research in these fields in both prevention and treatment. This is the point at which international cooperation is essential and at which immediate results can be obtained. Legislation to place the United States in the forefront of such a program will come up in our next Congress and it would be a logical part of this worldwide effort.

By far the largest possibility in this planning, however, is the opportunity to focus worldwide attention on the problems and how they can be solved. We still need to bring closer together the obscure village and the great laboratory. We still need to take to every part of the world the electrifying knowledge that if only we have the will and the imagination, these great battles can be won.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Dodd 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.)

NEW INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times of March 10, announcing a new international wheat agreement as approved by the United Nations Conference of Exporters and Importers, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article may be printed as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. This announced agreement is the culmination of some six weeks of hard and serious work by fifty nations in Geneva, Switzerland. I am pleased to note that it is expected that many more nations than were included in past agreements are expected to agree to this new pact. Among the expected new signatories are Great Britain, as an importer, and Italy and Mexico, joining the six major exporters—Canada, the United States, Australia, Argentina, Sweden, and France.

This international agreement on wheat is but one more example of the fine and constructive work which is being done through the medium of the United Nations. Although the headlines most often reflect crises and tragedy, it is well for us to keep a proper perspective and to realize that greater cooperation between nations is being made.

In the work of the United Nations lies the great hope for a just and lasting peace, and a world in which mankind may live in freedom and dignity and enjoy a decent standard of living.

EXHIBIT 1

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

NEW INTERNATIONAL WHEAT PACT DRAFTED BY U.N. BODY IN GENEVA

GENEVA, March 9.—A new international wheat agreement was approved here today by the United Nations Conference of Exporters and Importers. The Conference of 50 nations has been meeting in secret here for 6 weeks. The Conference will hold its last formal meeting tomorrow morning. Conference sources said that many more countries than previously would adhere to the new agreement. This would replace the existing agreement at the end of July.

The agreement establishes quotas and prices among its signatories.

Among the new signatories would be Britain, as an importer, and Italy and Mexico, joining the six major exporters—Canada,

the United States, Australia, Argentina, Sweden, and France.

The special working group that has been discussing the problem of maximum and minimum prices submitted its report today to the main Conference. The approval of this report was the Conference's last main task.

Conference sources said that the minimum price of \$1.50 Canadian (\$1.54) a bushel remained unchanged but there had been a slight reduction of the maximum price of \$2 Canadian (\$2.06) a bushel.

The main difference between the old and new agreements is that the new arrangement is based on consented percentages, while the old one was based on guaranteed quantities.

An annex to the agreement lays down the percentages of normal wheat transactions that importers will cover from exporters.

BRITISH APPROVAL SEEN

LONDON, March 9.—A spokesman for the Government said today there was every chance the Geneva Wheat Conference would end in a new international wheat agreement to which Britain could adhere.

Joseph Godber, parliamentary secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture, told this to the House of Commons in reply to a question.

VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY PRESIDENT JOSE MARIA LEMUS OF EL SALVADOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this week we in the United States are honored by having as a guest the distinguished President of El Salvador, Jose Maria Lemus.

President Lemus has been engaged in a most commendable program to raise the standard of living of the people of his fine democratic country. Under his leadership, programs have been undertaken to improve in particular rural housing, sanitation and education.

The people of El Salvador have reason to be proud of their country which is one of the most highly cultivated in the whole of Latin America. To President Lemus we extend a glad welcome and assurances to him and his people of our friendship.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an editorial from the New York Times of March 9, 1959, entitled "Visitor from El Salvador" be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

VISITOR FROM EL SALVADOR

The visit of President José Maria Lemus of El Salvador to the United States has some especially pleasant aspects. It gives us a chance to show that the head of the smallest nation in the Western Hemisphere is just as welcome as if he were president of one of the largest.

El Salvador is a democracy, politically quiet and financially sound, although hard hit by the fall in coffee prices. President Lemus said in San Salvador that he was coming here solely for the purpose of cementing the friendly relations between our two countries and not for a loan or a hand-out.

This is certainly true, but it does not mean that the United States should fail to encourage the ambitious Campesino program which President Lemus is trying to put into effect. The one socially bad feature of Salvadoran life is the enormous disparity between the few wealthy families and the great

mass of the people, who are very poor. The ruling class, to give it credit, has a social conscience. El Salvador is more than 90 percent mestizo, of mixed Spanish and Indian blood. The Government program aims primarily at rural housing, sanitation and education.

It is a long time since a Central American statesman came to the United States, and this, too, is a special reason to welcome President Lemus today.

FORTHCOMING WORLD YOUTH FESTIVAL IN VIENNA, AUSTRIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on August 24, 1957, I commented in the Senate about the Moscow World Youth Festival and the role that American youth played in it. This summer, a world youth festival will be held again, this time in Vienna, Austria. I would like to bring to the attention of the American people the significance of this gathering and the challenge which it presents.

This carnival-like meeting will be the seventh in a series of mass propaganda events sponsored since World War II by two of the most active and formidable Communist international front groups—the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students. The festivals are highly organized and controlled events which aim to provide a glorified picture of Soviet society and of Russian foreign policy, and conversely a distorted view of what Western society stands for. These gatherings also serve as an effective means of bolstering the prestige of the two sponsoring Communist-front groups, and thus strengthen their full-time program, pursued relentlessly in all areas of the globe, to win the allegiance of young people to the Soviet cause.

The representative and democratically elected student and youth groups throughout the free world, having learned through bitter experience of the nature of these festivals and their organizers, have determined to have no official connection whatsoever with the Vienna gathering. They fully realize the degree to which any type of official or representative recognition will be skillfully exploited to add to the prestige of the festival in the eyes of young people throughout the world. It is significant that all representative student and youth groups in Austria have vigorously protested and are opposed to the policy of their government in permitting the festival to be held for the first time in a non-Communist nation. Similar groups in this country, such as the U.S. National Student Association and the Young Adult Council, are avoiding all official connection with the festival.

But the fact cannot be overlooked that some 20,000 young people from all over the globe will be at the Vienna meeting. Many of these participants will be open-minded individuals who will be eager for, and can profit from, rational discussion and a genuine exchange of ideas. A large number, particularly those from Asia, Africa and Latin America, harbor a distorted view of America and of the American people because of their limited and often inaccurate knowledge of us, and I may add, because of the effec-

tiveness of Communist propaganda. Unless positive action is undertaken by informed young Americans, not only will an opportunity be lost for rectifying such misleading attitudes, but the environment of the festival and the nature of its activities will insure that such misconceptions become confirmed and more deeply etched.

Many Senators will recall that in a speech about the Moscow Festival several years ago, I commented on certain young Americans who had entered into extended public debate on disarmament and the Hungarian situation with Russians in Red Square. Although they realized that the festival was an instrument of Communist propaganda, these young people also saw the unusual and dramatic opportunity offered for presenting an honest picture of our society and point of view, and for rebutting Soviet propaganda.

The effectiveness of their courageous actions showed that we have little to fear from the participation in such festivals of informed, intelligent, and articulate young Americans who, in their individual capacity, are able to speak out in a candid, rational and persuasive manner. Unfortunately, this group of dedicated and patriotic Americans constituted only a handful of people at the Moscow Festival.

I differentiate between individual participation and any type of official participation by representative established student or young people's groups. As I have indicated in my remarks, the established young people's groups of our country are not associating themselves with this festival. They are keeping their record clean; but they are also aware of the challenge which the Communist-sponsored festival poses to free men and women everywhere.

The Vienna Festival now provides us with a challenge and an opportunity which must not be permitted to slip by—that of mingling freely and of exchanging ideas frankly with young people from all over the globe. The Moscow Festival provided Americans with the chance to make an impact on the indigenous population; the Vienna Festival, because of the freer atmosphere of the non-Communist host country, offers the opportunity of making significant contact with individuals from the vast uncommitted areas. I should add, on the other hand, that this opportunity can be lost, or even worse, turned to disaster unless careful thought and preparation is given to the manner in which young Americans should participate in the festival.

First of all, such participation should be by individuals in their personal capacity, making face-to-face contact. Past experience has demonstrated that participation in a representative capacity by persons active in non-Communist organizations, in academic institutions, or, indeed, in respected groups of any kind, is used for propaganda purposes by the festival sponsors and the worldwide Communist apparatus. To promote understanding, one need not appear in Vienna as a representative; nor is it essential to participate in all the official events of the festival. Real understand-

ing will flow from informal, unplanned, personal conversations and contacts among those at the festival, and such contacts in large measure will take place in coffeehouses and cafes, and wherever else young people gather to ask questions and to discuss the problems which trouble them. Americans in Vienna will encounter no difficulty in breaking the ice. Young people from other nations feel too deep a curiosity and concern about this Nation for any American to escape without many opportunities to exchange ideas and make friends.

Secondly, Americans at Vienna must be well informed about the character of the festival and its organizers. That is why I am making this address today, namely, that it may be a part of the Record of the Senate, and that young people in colleges and universities who might be interested in the Vienna Festival will at least have some idea of what it is all about and how they might guard themselves from any unfortunate participation under auspices which could be anything but helpful to them. They must be aware of the manner in which the festival will operate, and of the ways in which attempts will be made to exploit their presence and statements. They must fully understand that they are in the midst of the most heavily financed and the ranking propaganda show in the Soviet arsenal, and that pitfalls abound.

I am entering into the Record the comments of one of the participants at Moscow which, I think, tells a great deal about the nature of these events. Unfortunately, most Americans who have attended previous festivals have been uninformed, or even misinformed, about what they were becoming involved in.

In other words, I am trying to put up a warning sign and am trying to advise these fine young men and women as to some of the problems and pitfalls they might encounter. Because I believe that young Americans should be courageous and not be fearful, and because I believe they should join the issues and be willing to debate these points with young men and women from other parts of the world, I should like to say these words of encouragement to them on the one hand, and some words of prudent warning on the other.

Some of the organizers of the so-called American delegations have presented an incomplete and misleading picture of the festivals, and have thereby often served the purposes of Communist propaganda.

Third, and most important, Americans who decide to attend the festival must be well informed about all aspects of American society, and about our foreign and domestic policies. Queries concerning our educational system, our labor and social welfare programs, or our system of free enterprise, including our cooperatives and public ownership, and individual initiative, cannot be answered satisfactorily by vague generalizations. Neither can the widespread and genuine concern about racial discrimination, military pacts, disarmament, and nuclear testing be met constructively without a deep understanding of both the fundamental principles and facts which underlie our policies. Nothing constitutes a greater obstacle to improving interna-

tional understanding among individuals than the lack of relevant information—the failure to have at one's fingertips a sound and penetrating command of the facts. International understanding is not promoted merely by recourse to well-intentioned platitudes and sentimentalism.

Young Americans who are thoroughly informed on the matters which I have mentioned—and there will be many others—can make a positive contribution. However, unless they take the trouble and time to acquire such information, it would be better if they did not attend the gathering in Vienna. An exhibition of good faith, love, and understanding is not enough. I am confident that the young Americans who will attend any of the meetings will want to be prepared to engage in discussion with anyone who may be interested. I make this address today after consultation with a number of the fine young Americans who have encouraged me to speak out in the Senate so that their fellow students throughout the land will at least get some feeling of what is to be offered and what they will be confronted with at Vienna. For Americans, this festival cannot be viewed as just another opportunity to have a good time.

Assistance is available for those young Americans who wish to respond realistically and with determination to the challenge at Vienna. Several days ago, I learned that a number of young Americans experienced in international youth and student affairs, including some of those very people who performed so admirable a service at the Moscow Festival, have formed an organization to be known as the Independent Service for Information on the Vienna Youth Festival. Located in Cambridge, Mass., at 1430 Massachusetts Avenue, the Independent Service, with the cooperation of large numbers of national organizations, has undertaken to prepare the materials which are required to provide American participants in the Vienna meeting with an informed understanding of the festivals and of American policies and problems. The service plans to provide those Americans who have an interest in the festival, and who may wish to attend the meeting in their individual capacity, with a good deal of the essential background material.

I believe our Government owes a debt of gratitude to this voluntary organization of American students who are eager to help prepare fellow students who may wish to visit the festival for this important mission.

I am personally acquainted with some of the organizers of the Independent Service and believe them to be highly motivated and competent. It is my strong recommendation that all young Americans who are interested in learning more about the festival, or who are contemplating attending the gathering while traveling in Europe, contact the service for further information and assistance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a statement published by the Independent Service describing its objectives and program,

and excerpts from an article by Mr. George Abrams entitled "Talking With Russians" which appeared in the New Republic of October 14, 1957, and which tells a good deal about the character and activities of the Moscow Youth Festival.

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

EXHIBIT 1

INDEPENDENT SERVICE FOR INFORMATION ON THE VIENNA YOUTH FESTIVAL

WHY AN INFORMATION SERVICE?

The service has been organized for the purpose of providing American young people with objective data regarding the Communist-sponsored Seventh World Youth Festival to be held in Vienna next summer (July 26-August 4). In the past, knowledge of the nature and purpose of the festivals has been limited largely to information derived from a flood of misleading literature with which the Communist organizers have deluged American college campuses and youth organizations. Consequently, a number of Americans have attended past festivals without possessing a full understanding of these events and of the consequences flowing from participation. Furthermore, they have sometimes lacked the information necessary both to lessen the exploitation of their presence and their actions for propaganda purposes, and to correct the misconceptions and distortions of American society which have characterized such gatherings:

WHAT ARE THE WORLD YOUTH FESTIVALS?

Next summer's festival is the latest in a series of mass youth events organized since World War II by two leading Communist international youth fronts: The World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY) and the International Union of Students (IUS). Long discredited in the eyes of representative national student and youth bodies throughout the world, these front groups have used the festival as a principal weapon in their continuing propaganda program. Their activities are designed to further the objectives of Soviet policy and to gain adherents to the Soviet cause from among young people, particularly those in the underdeveloped areas.

This strategic aim is furthered by a variety of techniques employed at the festivals. These include utilizing the emotional environment of mass gatherings and promoting the uncritical acceptance of ambiguous and propagandistic slogans, such as the "solidarity of youth," "peace and friendship," "the horrors of nuclear war," etc. Likewise, the festival organizers have shown themselves capable of skillfully exploiting the views of uninformed participants and of asserting misleading claims as to the representative nature of individuals in attendance. By conducting a highly developed and centrally controlled program of activities, the organizers aim to present a selective and flattering view of Soviet cultural achievements and policies.

The festival's objective is to implant an impression of the strength and rectitude of the Soviet cause in the minds of the participants and those millions throughout the world to whom news of festival activities is communicated before, during, and after each gathering. Its organizers attempt to demonstrate that the Soviet system is superior morally, politically, economically, and culturally; and that world tensions are the product solely of the machinations of Western powers. In addition the festivals serve to further the pretension of the two sponsoring Communist-front groups that they are internationally representative and non-partisan in character. This in turn strengthens the prestige of their local affiliates.

The open propaganda aspect of the festivals has been toned down from the days of the Stalin era when explicit anti-Western sentiment was a primary feature. However, it is clear that the shift in tone at more recent festivals is no more than a change in format.

Judging from past experience, both the International Preparatory Committee (IPC), which has the immediate administrative responsibility for organizing the festival, and U.S. Festival Committee, which has been stimulated in this country by the IPC for the purpose of recruiting an American delegation, will shortly begin to distribute vast quantities of literature to American campuses and youth organizations. Material already circulated indicates that the festival will be depicted as a neutral and nonpolitical affair designed to further international fellowship and understanding by bringing together the youth of all countries in a spirit of good will. The organizers will attempt to imply that the 17,000 individuals they hope to attract to Vienna are representative leaders covering all areas of the world and every shade of political opinion in it.

A misleading and highly incomplete picture will be given of what goes on at a festival and of the motivations of its promoters. It may be regarded as certain that the festival promoters will not shed any light on such interesting questions as where the \$100 million spent on the 1957 Moscow festival really came from or the true nature and background of the IUS and WFDY.

The holding of the forthcoming festival in Vienna marks the first time that it will take place outside the Soviet bloc. Austrian Chancellor Raab has compared his government's policy in permitting the festival to be held in Vienna with the action of neutral Sweden in allowing a meeting of the World Peace Congress, a well-known international Communist front. Raab displayed a marked lack of enthusiasm when he stated that "fortunately, on occasions such as this, the Austrians show themselves sufficiently disciplined, capable of ignoring events they don't appreciate."

SHOULD ONE PARTICIPATE?

In a representative capacity

Each of the festivals has raised the question of participation for youth and student organizations throughout the world. In general, representative groups in the non-Communist countries have declined to send delegates because they felt that participation would be utilized to lend official prestige to a propaganda show, and thus would buttress the claims of the festival organizers to the universal representative character of the meeting. This strengthens not only the effectiveness of the festival but also the day-to-day activities of WFDY and the IUS.

This policy of nonparticipation has been adopted by U.S. student and youth groups such as the U.S. National Student Association and the Young Adult Council. Similar positions toward the festival have been taken by representative student and youth groups in many other countries. Of particular importance is the fact that the Austrian national union of students and the Austrian federation of youth groups both have strongly protested the festival being held in their country and have called on their counterpart groups in other parts of the world to enforce a boycott of representative organizations against the event.

The information service supports such a policy and urges that no American attend the festival in any representative or official capacity, even as the spokesman of a college or local community organization.

In an individual capacity

The information service expects that there are many intelligent and patriotic Americans who will wish to attend the Vienna meeting in an individual and nonrepresentative

capacity which would not lend the event any official prestige. Most will probably be interested in observing the various events and in making personal contact and exchanging views with the large number of young people from many areas of the world who will be present.

The organizers of the information service believe that such participation can be valuable only if the individuals attending are fully informed as to the nature and purpose of such a meeting so as to lessen the propaganda use of their presence and actions. The service further thinks that American participants should be prepared for the great interest and curiosity, both friendly and hostile, which will be expressed regarding our Nation and its policies. They should be equipped to effectively present a democratic viewpoint, dispel particular misconceptions of American society, and thus promote understanding with the participants drawn from over the globe.

Such well-informed individual participation requires considerable preparation. The problems confronting the world today and the aspects of American life in which young people overseas are most interested are complex. Similarly, objective material regarding the world youth festival is difficult to obtain. It is the purpose of the information service to facilitate the gathering together and distribution of such information.

HOW CAN THE INFORMATION HELP YOU?

The service is prepared to answer inquiries regarding the Vienna festival and to provide current information both to those who desire a greater understanding of such meetings and to those who may be seriously considering attending the festival.

Present plans call for the preparation of documented studies on the history and operation of past festivals and the character of their sponsors. Preparations of the Vienna gathering and the activities of its organizers will be continually analyzed and periodically reported.

In addition, the service will provide background data on U.S. and world affairs and indications on what may be expected in Vienna. Information on transportation and accommodations as well as other practical data as to means of participation in the festival will also be made available.

WHO ARE THE ORGANIZERS?

The Independent Service for Information on the Vienna Youth Festival has been organized by a number of students and recent university graduates in the Boston area. Most have had personal experience in national and international youth and student affairs, and several have had the opportunity of observing past festivals in operation. Many have held elected positions in representative U.S. student and youth groups, and some now hold elective campus posts. They have been joined in their work by interested young Americans in various parts of the country who recognize the important role played by young adults in world affairs today.

The service is now establishing contact with a large number of national youth and student organizations including educational, political, religious, academic, and social service groups. Among these groups are the Council on Student Travel, National Young Democrats, National Young Republicans, U.S. National Student Association, World University Service, and the Young Adult Council. Liaison has developed with a number of these groups who plan to utilize the facilities provided by the information service.

Attempts are being made to raise funds for the operations of the service, and some support has already been received from public spirited citizens in the Boston area. Further financial assistance from those in-

terested in furthering our activities would be welcomed.

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO?

If you have any questions concerning the Vienna Youth Festival or desire further information about it, please communicate with the service at its Cambridge offices. We will be pleased to place you on our mailing lists to receive items appropriate to your interest.

EXHIBIT 2

The attempt of the Russian Government to use the Youth Festival for propaganda turned out to be far more subtle than we had first anticipated. Past youth festivals had been very carefully calculated propaganda efforts against the West—and the United States in particular. In 1947 and 1949, the theme was antifascism; in 1951 and 1953 the festival passed resolutions condemning "United States aggression and germ warfare in Korea"; in 1955 at Warsaw, the pitch was peaceful coexistence. Peaceful coexistence was again the main theme of the Youth Festival this year. But resolutions were incidental to demonstrations of peace and friendship. Everywhere the delegates went thousands of Russians greeted them with flowers and gifts and apparently genuine affection.

It became obvious to us that the Russian Government was directing its greatest effort toward the African and colonial countries, and the Arab nations. For instance, many of the large Russian stores had set up display windows. The clothing dummies were always mixed white and Negro and carefully arranged in each window. Dummies of black-skinned children were used to display the best of Soviet youth wearing apparel, and display windows for the most expensive women's clothes all had at least one Negro dummy. One of the most spectacular displays in Moscow was of a giant magic carpet about 30 feet above one of Moscow's largest squares. On the magic carpet were three model children, arm in arm: a Negro child, a Caucasian child, and a child representing the yellow race.

The dark-skinned and the Arab delegates to the festival seemed to be given special treatment by the Russian crowds and officials. These delegates were deluged with flowers and gifts, and were carefully shepherded to numerous meetings along with other supposedly exploited people. Although every delegation was given the red-carpet treatment, the colonials found themselves living in somewhat better conditions. Instead of five to a room (in the American and British hostels), the Indians and Africans and Arabs were put in rooms with two or three people. Instead of cafeteria-type, self-service meals, the Russians gave the delegates of the uncommitted countries their own dining halls and waiters and candlelight service. The rooms of each of these delegations were equipped with telephones.

Most of the Indian delegates to whom I spoke saw through this preferential treatment. A good many of them laughed and joked over the whole thing and explained that I too could be better treated if I would only give up my American citizenship and become an Indian or an African. But undoubtedly all the Soviet efforts along this line were not in vain. It is pretty hard to forget the almost hysterical screaming of the Syrian and Egyptian delegations every time the opportunity came to praise Russia and the Russian leaders. Or the way the Arab delegates prostrated themselves before Khrushchev and the Presidium on the day of the opening ceremonies. The chant of "Syria and Russia, friendship forever," echoed throughout Moscow wherever the Syrian delegation went.

In many respects I was impressed with the careful, methodical planning and general organization of the Youth Festival activities. Thirty thousand young people from all over the world and all speaking different languages poured into Moscow. One hundred thousand youths were brought to Moscow from all parts of the Soviet Union. All of these people had to be housed, fed, transported around the city. Although there were a number of mixups and sometimes complete confusion, by and large, the Russians were able to run the whole production smoothly.

It might be worthwhile to note that the Russians were able to find top-rate interpreters for each language spoken by the festival delegates. Not one, but several. I asked some of the Russians whether it was difficult to find interpreters for some of the dialects and lesser known languages. The answer was no. "We make sure that we have enough people studying all the different languages to provide for our language needs whenever such things as the Youth Festival come up." "But suppose you have no students who want to study a particular dialect?" I asked. "We find them," came back the answer.

The food problem at the festival must have been immense. The Russians provided from three to five main courses for each meal. One course was always served for vegetarians. Arabs received food in line with their national eating habits; Chinese food was available, and so on down the line.

The problem of equitably providing tickets for the cultural performances during the festival was gigantic. Thirty thousand foreign youths and 100,000 young Russians were in Moscow all clamoring to be entertained. Thirty, forty or fifty theaters would be in operation in one night, and somehow each would be filled to capacity with festival delegates. Mistakes were made in the ticket allocations, but the big surprise was the apparent ease with which this difficult problem was handled.

Sometimes, however, the Soviet technical and organization competence fell down completely. The most serious example of this from the Russian point of view was the carefully ballyhooed evening demonstration on Hiroshima Day. The Russians were quite obviously planning to make their big propaganda push of the festival. "American mass murder" was one term being bandied about as the big rally drew near.

But the rally was a complete failure. The Russians made several crucial mistakes in its staging. For some reason they decided to make it a rally of only youth delegates to the festival. Cordons of police were set up to keep the Russian people out. This was a festival rally, they explained. The sudden shift from 10 days of howling masses of people to the comparatively few festival delegates put a real damper on festivities.

The total cost of the festival to the Russian Government has been estimated at anywhere from \$20 million to \$200 million. The most reliable figure seems to be somewhat in the neighborhood of \$125 million. The bulk of this money went into building construction, housing facilities, and food transportation, and entertainment. From all accounts in the Russian press since the Youth Festival, it seems pretty apparent that the Russian Government is having a good many qualms as to whether the money was well spent or not. Russian youth leaders have had to issue statements telling the young people of Russia to throw off the subversive ideas spread at the festival by non-Communist delegates, to ignore the lies spread by certain youth delegates, and to join together once again in their full support of the Communist Party and the Soviet leaders. Hitherto taboo subjects have found their way into the Soviet press, such as the defection of Howard Fast from the Communist Party and the contents of the United Nations Report on Hungary.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. HENRY L. J. MAY, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT OF NEW ZEALAND

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we have with us on the floor of the Senate a very distinguished visitor. At this time I present to the Senate Hon. Henry L. J. May, a Member of the Parliament of New Zealand. Mr. May is the chief government whip in the Parliament of New Zealand. He is chairman of the Parliament's local bills committee, and also a member of the Committee on External Affairs, which corresponds to our Foreign Relations Committee.

It is a pleasure to have Mr. May with us, and I am delighted to present him to the Senate at this time. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement prepared in the Office of International Labor Affairs of the Department of Labor containing a brief biography of our distinguished visitor.

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

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Henry L. J. May is visiting the United States as a participant in the foreign leader program of the International Educational Exchange Service of the Department of State. The Office of International Labor Affairs of the Department of Labor has been assigned responsibility for his program.

Mr. May is a Labor Party Member of Parliament, and has been for approximately 5 years. He is a member of the National Executive for the New Zealand Labor Party. Mr. May is president of the Wellington, Nelson, Westland, and Marlborough local bodies, other laborers, and related trades industrial union of workers. He has been a borough councillor and a member of a river and valley power board. He has been associated with the New Zealand railroads for approximately 18 years. Mr. May has also been very active in sports and belongs to a number of sporting clubs, such as rifle shooting, football, and tennis. He is a member of the National Geographic Society. Mr. May is chief government whip, chairman of the Parliament's local bills committee, and a member of the Committee on External Affairs. He has acted as chairman of some of the most important committees of the New Zealand labor conferences.

Mr. May is keenly interested in studying various aspects of U.S. Federal, State, and municipal government. He is particularly interested in all aspects of the political scene; for example, the methods used for running for office, and the organization and methods of Congress, especially the administration, functions, and authority of congressional committees. Because of his long association with administration of his borough, he would like to see as much as possible of American practices in traffic control, laws and codes, public transport, housing administration, soil conservation, irrigation, and fire department organization. As a member of Parliament representing the interests of his constituents and an industrial and manufacturing area that is growing fast, he would like to learn about something of union attitudes toward automation, the meatpacking industry, methods of attracting industry, and the peaceful uses of atomic energy. He would like to visit one or two automated plants.

As a framework to his particular purposes, Mr. May is generally interested in the recreational, cultural, social, political, and economic aspects of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, H.R. 2260, involves a 4-year extension of five separate authorities, all of which relate to the maintenance of the strength and health of the Armed Forces of the United States. I should like to discuss each one of the five authorities briefly; then I shall be glad to yield for questions concerning the bill.

REGULAR DRAFT

The first and perhaps the most important objective of the bill is to extend the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces. Unless extended this authority would expire on July 1 of this year. The pending bill contemplates a 4-year extension, until July 1, 1963.

Under the Universal Military Training and Service Act young men must register with their local boards at the age of 18, although they are not liable for induction until they reach the age of 18½. After registration these young men are classified by their local boards. Unless they are eligible for the various deferments and exemptions authorized under the basic law, the young men are classified I-A. Persons classified I-A are called in a sequence that results in the induction principally of nonfathers between the ages of 19 and 26. Draft calls presently are relatively low. Approximately 115,000 men will be inducted during the current fiscal year, and over the next 4 fiscal years annual inductions are estimated to average 90,000. The current average age at induction is about 22½, and over the next 4 years this average age probably will increase to 23.

Under existing conditions only the Army requires inductees, but the existence of the draft machinery operates as a powerful inducement to enlistments in the other Armed Forces.

More than 1,200,000 young men will reach the age of 18½ during each of the next 4 years. This fact coupled with the relatively low rate of inductions has caused some observers to believe that the manpower pool is excessive and that

many young men are reaching the age of 26 without having performed military service. A comprehensive study conducted by the Department of Defense and participated in by other Federal agencies having manpower responsibilities tends to counter such an impression. The results of this study, which are discussed in the committee report, show that only a negligible number of qualified nonfathers have avoided military service or are likely to avoid military service by 1963.

Although this result may seem paradoxical, it is understandable when one analyzes the manpower supply in any particular age group. It must be remembered that, in addition to the approximately 100,000 inductions, about 400,000 other young men enlist in one or another of the Armed Forces. Another large chunk of a year group is made up of fathers. Still another explanation is the high rate of rejection for failure to meet mental and physical qualifications. The current rejection rate for an age group as a whole is about 33 percent. Since many members of an age group voluntarily enter service, the rejection rate for the effective manpower pool is approximately 45 percent of all registrants.

Before giving the committee justification for extending the draft authority, I should like to discuss the other authorities included in the bill.

SELECTIVE CALLS FOR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

Despite some special inducements for physicians and dentists, the Department of Defense has been unable to recruit enough Regular doctors and dentists to meet the needs of the Armed Forces. For this reason, it is necessary to provide for the temporary service of a sufficient number of doctors and dentists to bridge the gap between the numbers of Regulars and the requirements of the Department.

Persons deferred under the Universal Military Training and Service Act remain liable for induction until they reach the age of 35. Since most physicians and dentists are deferred to continue their professional education, they incur a liability for induction until age 35.

Originally there was no authority to select persons for induction on the basis of their professional abilities or skills. When world conditions required the Government to summon increasing numbers of men to the colors, they could not be called from their homes and placed in the Armed Forces without being afforded adequate medical and dental care. The necessity for that care required that unusual steps be taken.

To permit such selective induction without also inducting unneeded persons, a 1957 act authorized the President to levy special calls for medical and dental officers and allied specialists. This law also provided authority for ordering physicians and dentists who were members of Reserve components to active duty for 24 months if they had not already served on active duty for at least 1 year.

The combination of authority for selective induction of physicians and den-

tists and the authority for ordering Reserve physicians and dentists to active duty has caused this special authority to operate by indirection. No inductions have been made under this authority because the physicians and dentists who are subject to it have accepted Reserve commissions and have been ordered to active duty as needed. The pending bill contemplates a 4-year extension of this special authority to induct physicians and dentists and to order Reserve physicians and dentists to active duty for 24 months.

Despite the fact that the strengths of the Regular medical and dental corps have increased in each of the three military departments, about 50 percent of all physicians and about 60 percent of all dentists on active duty on June 30, 1959, are noncareer officers. If this special authority is permitted to expire, it will unquestionably reduce to unacceptable levels the number of physicians and dentists on active duty.

DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT

Another feature of the bill is a proposed 4-year extension of the Dependents Assistance Act.

This act was approved in 1950, and had as its purpose the authorization of dependency allowances that were necessary under the peacetime structure of the Armed Forces.

The peacetime policy of the Armed Forces would not involve acceptance by persons with dependents of enlistments in the lower three pay grades and a part of the fourth. Since persons with dependents were not enlisted in these lower pay grades, there was no authorization to pay a quarters allowance to them. The partial mobilization, following hostilities in Korea, required the utilization on active duty of members of the lower pay grades, even though they had dependents. Consequently, the Congress in 1950 prescribed a system of quarters allowances for all enlisted grades. These allowances are graduated according to grade, and they are somewhat more liberal than the allowances provided under the permanent law, even for the persons who are entitled to quarters allowances under the permanent provisions of the Career Compensation Act. At a time when it is important to emphasize voluntary enlistments, it obviously is necessary to continue provisions for dependency allowances for all of the enlisted grades.

SUSPENSION OF STRENGTH LIMITATIONS

Another of the authorities contained in House bill 2260 would continue in effect a suspension of ceilings on the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces.

The permanent authorization of the Armed Forces total somewhat more than 2 millions persons, but less than the active duty strength of the Armed Forces today or at any time since 1950. These ceilings have been suspended since 1950; and I am sure that the necessity for continuing the suspension is apparent to everyone who has any familiarity with the conditions which exist today.

The Air Force furnishes a good illustration of the necessity for continuing

suspension of these ceilings. The permanent personnel authorization of the Air Force is 502,000. It is estimated that its strength on June 30 of this year will be about 850,000. Failure to continue this suspension would result in a loss of almost 350,000 members of the Air Force. Of course, Mr. President, such a condition as that is unthinkable.

For the period that the permanent limitations are suspended, a secondary ceiling of 5 million persons on the total personnel of the Armed Forces comes into play. This secondary limitation will be effective during the period of suspension of the permanent limitations involved in this bill. Of course, in the light of the present strength of our Military Establishment, that limitation is not likely to come into effect.

SPECIAL PAY FOR PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, AND VETERINARIANS

The committee has amended the bill by adding to it a legislative proposal by the Department of Defense that continues eligibility for special pay by physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty after July 1, 1959.

In an attempt to procure more physicians and dentists, and to make military medical compensation more competitive with civilian incomes by persons with similar experience, there has been in effect for several years a system of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians. The amount of this special pay is graduated in accordance with the length of service. Medical and dental officers with less than 2 years of active duty as such officers are eligible for special pay of \$100 a month. Those with more than 2, but less than 6, years of service are eligible for \$150. Those with more than 6, but less than 10, years of such service are eligible for \$200 a month. Those with more than 10 years may receive \$250 a month. Veterinarians are eligible for \$10 a month in special pay, irrespective of their length of service.

Physicians, dentists, and veterinarians already on active duty, or entering on active duty before July 1, 1959, would continue to receive this special pay, even if this amendment were not adopted. The amendment is offered to permit those officers in these categories who enter on active duty between July 1, 1959, and July 1, 1963, to be eligible for these special payments in the same manner and amount that officers already on active duty are now eligible.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE BILL

Mr. President, in 1948 we could not raise the strength of the Armed Forces to 2 million men without having a selective service or draft law in operation. Today, the active duty strength of the Armed Forces is more than 2,500,000. In today's troubled world we simply cannot risk a reduction in this strength that unquestionably would result if the authority to induct were not extended.

Of course, there is nothing sacrosanct about the 4-year period of extension. However, the last two extensions of this authority have been for 4 years; and I regret to say that I see nothing that would support a hope that we may dispense with the draft within the next 4

years. Since this is true, Mr. President, I believe that a shorter extension would only offer a false hope to some young men, and perhaps it would cause them to plan unrealistically for their future.

The committee has had some earnest suggestions from church groups that the draft should be stopped. While conceding their good faith, I confess that I am unable to understand their reasoning. The Communists admittedly are atheistic. In my opinion, failure to extend the draft would make this country most vulnerable to the onslaught of atheistic communism. Until the Communists demonstrate some of the same religious characteristics that we are urged to show by those who would suppress and stop the operation of the draft, I think that failure to extend the draft would tend to suppress a religious outlook, instead of strengthening such an outlook.

Nor have I been impressed by the argument that uncertainties about when a young man will enter the service are contributing to confusion of and delinquencies by our youth. Whatever the defects of the present system may be, and I would be the first to concede that there are defects in the system—it certainly offers a wide choice to the young men vulnerable for the draft. There are more than 30 ways in which a young man may discharge his military obligations to his country. There is a wide variety of choice of branch of service, as well as a choice as to whether the person will enlist in the Regular forces or in the Reserve forces, and also as to the length of his total service.

For young persons who desire to complete college before discharging their military obligations, this opportunity exists, since the average age of induction is now about 22½. For those who desire to discharge their obligation before attending college, this opportunity also exists. These persons may volunteer for induction, or they may enter one of the 6-month training programs. For those who are seriously disturbed about the uncertainty, I would suggest that they consider the wide variety of choices available to all young men who desire to discharge their military obligation to their country.

I also should like to disabuse some persons of an impression that military service is in some way degrading or that it tends to militarize our youth. The many millions of veterans in our society today completely refute these contentions. Anyone who has any apprehension that men who have served in the military forces are likely to produce a military dictatorship in this country have only to talk to those completing their military duties to find that, instead of giving him any such impression as that, he will find they are more devoted than ever to the idea of civilian control of our Military Establishment.

Mr. President, I would urge the responsible community, church, and civic leaders to emphasize the opportunity and privilege of participating in the defense of this country, instead of harping on the inconvenience and disadvantages of military service. This country cannot survive in today's troubled world

without determination and a willingness on the part of our people to make some sacrifice. I believe there is need for a renewed awareness that military service is necessary. Mr. President, I believe that in today's world, when all that we have and hold dear is threatened, there should be a feeling of pride in being able to render military service, instead of considering it as something to be avoided as if it were a disease or a plague.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the senior member of the Armed Services Committee on this side of the aisle, I want to join with the chairman of the committee in supporting the position of the committee in extending the Draft Act or the Selective Service Act for 4 years.

The committee has recommended that the bill be passed, with no amendments or changes in the present law, for 4 years. In other words, the committee has recommended the continuation of the Selective Service Act for 4 years.

The committee has recommended the continuation for 4 years of the provisions relating to doctors, dentists, and veterinarians, with increased salaries.

The committee has recommended the continuation for 4 years of the provision relating to dependents.

The committee has eliminated for 4 years the ceilings which may be placed on the size of the Armed Forces.

As the chairman of the committee has so well pointed out, we need the benefits and the provisions of this act in order to maintain the strength of our armed services. Many volunteers are obtained for service in our Armed Forces, but we must not deceive ourselves into believing that the Armed Forces would obtain all those volunteers if there were not in effect the provisions of the Selective Service Act.

Undoubtedly there will be questions asked of the chairman of the committee as to why the committee did not adopt a particular amendment or amendments which had been recommended. The difficulty with amending the Selective Service Act, as I see it, is that we could not tell what the effect would be if an amendment of the law were adopted, and that if the committee adopted one amendment, it might only be fair to adopt several more.

The committee decided that, as long as the act had been administered in a fairly satisfactory manner, it should be continued. Of course, the administration of the act has not been entirely satisfactory, because no compulsory law of that kind will ever be administered in an entirely satisfactory manner. We believed that there was involved a question of administration of the act rather than a need for a change in the law.

As General Hershey pointed out in his testimony, in his work as head of the Selective Service System there have been many administrative changes made since the original Selective Service Act was put into operation. Those changes have affected very considerably the responsibilities of the young men

who have gone into the military service, the time they would spend in the service, and many other matters. As General Hershey stated to the committee, if conditions change again, as they have changed from time to time, the law is sufficiently flexible so changes can be made in an administrative way.

I would say the chairman of the committee has stated accurately the general opinion among the committee members that the act should be extended for 4 years rather than 2 years, because there will be no change in conditions that we can foresee which would allow us to eliminate the law at the end of 2 years. So it was thought wiser to extend the law for 4 years rather than 2 years.

As the senior member of the committee on this side of the aisle, I join with the chairman of the committee in recommending and hoping that the Senate will pass the bill without amendment. In my opinion, that will be the fairest way to pass the bill and the fairest way that an act of this character can be administered. Any law which is compulsory as regards young men cannot, of course, be entirely fair to all of them, and it is not fair to all. However, it is the best we can do in the way of legislation, so long as a Selective Service Act is required.

I am happy to join the Senator from Georgia for the second time, since he and I have been working on the committee, in urging that the law be extended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is the ranking Republican member of the Armed Services Committee, and who, in those unfortunate periods when the Republican Party was in the majority, served as chairman of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At that time the Senator from Massachusetts was ably assisted by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am always glad to help the Senator from Massachusetts. If there has ever been any partisanship in this committee in either administration, I have not seen it.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Massachusetts has just stated, the pending measure contains no substantive change in the act which is now in effect, and no amendments to the act, as such, were considered by the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee considered some amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Georgia will remember that prior to his committee's consideration of the measure I spoke to him, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, in an effort to have him accept an amendment fixing the strength of the Army at not less than 900,000 men, which would retain the Army at its current strength and would not necessitate the closing of any Army installation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana did dis-

cuss that matter with me. He of course knows that the Senate had adopted a provision for 900,000 men in the Appropriations Act for the current fiscal year, and that there had been a difference of opinion between the legislative and the executive branch as to what the size of the Army should be. There had never before been substantive legislation fixing a definite floor on the strength of an armed force.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the distinguished Senator stated to me at the time of the discussion that that had never been done in the past, and he did not believe it was practical to amend the act at this time in order to fix a floor for the number of men in the Army. Therefore, upon learning of Senator RUSSELL's position on this matter, I saw no future in pursuing this tack.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has quoted me almost verbatim. I made that statement. I still think it would be unfortunate and an unwise thing to undertake to do so in the legislation now being considered. We are having enough difficulty at present in holding the Army at its present strength, without endangering the proposal by inviting a veto. The Army can still further shrink below its present size.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator stated, this entire problem was discussed before the Senate Committee on Appropriations last year, and the Committee on Appropriations went on record as stating that in its opinion, a 900,000-man Army, at least, was necessary for the protection of the country. Pursuant to that viewpoint, we provided sufficient funds to maintain a 900,000-man Army.

Mr. RUSSELL. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana is one of the senior members of the Committee on Appropriations, and one of the most active members of that committee. The Senator has correctly stated that the committee last year approved appropriations for an Army of 900,000 men. The Senate, as I recall, confirmed that act without any substantial discussion. The appropriations for an Army of 900,000 men were actually made.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, I believe the Senator will recall that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina presented an amendment to the bill to fix the Army at 900,000 men and the Senate subsequently adopted this amendment unanimously. However, when the matter was taken to conference, the House refused to accept the mandatory Army limit placed in the bill by the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The size of the Military Establishment in this country historically has been fixed in the appropriation bills rather than in other legislation. When the Armed Services Committee considers personnel strengths it usually establishes an authorization or a ceiling, which is based upon the testimony in the hearings before the committee. However, as between one man and the ceiling, whatever it may be, the number is fixed by the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from South Carolina did offer such an amendment,

which would have placed language in the law that the Active Army should be not less than 900,000, and the Senate approved the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. However, when the bill went to conference, the other body was adamant in opposition to the amendment. It so happens I was one of the conferees on the bill, and the House refused to accept the amendment, so the Senate was compelled to yield on that very wise provision.

However, the Senate did not abandon the position completely, because the committee on conference did state that the Army strength should be 900,000. It was the position of the other body that the matter had been handled historically in the conference report. Strong language was placed in the conference report, but that clear intent has been disregarded.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator and would like to point out that, specifically, the will of Congress has been disregarded by the President.

Does the Senator know of any manner in which now or in the near future we could present a measure which would compel the President, at least, to recognize that the Congress has something to say and to do about fixing a minimum size for the Army? Certainly, considering all the information which was presented for the Record yesterday by the distinguished majority leader and by others, there is an indication to me that under the Constitution the Congress has the power to raise and support armies. Considering the facts brought before us by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it strikes me that a powerful case has been made for a larger Army than has been ordered by the President. Yet we are confronted with this direct opposition to the wishes of Congress from the President. I wonder if the distinguished Senator will comment on this.

Mr. RUSSELL. I, of course, realize how keenly the Senator from Louisiana feels that the Army should be maintained at not less than 900,000 men, because I have heard him discuss the matter in the committee, as well as in the conferences he has held with me in my capacity as chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator, of course, knows this is not a new issue. There have been questions between the Congress and the executive branch of the Government for more than a century—for almost a century and a half—with respect to the appropriations which have been made by the Congress, when the Executive has not thought it wise or prudent to make the expenditures. Very frankly, I know of no recourse which the legislative branch of the Government has in such a situation as that, unless the situation is so bad that the Congress feels it is justified in resorting to the impeachment powers which are conferred on the legislative branch in the Constitution of the United States. Otherwise, we have no powers that would compel the President of the United States to spend any appropriations made for the Armed Forces.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, we realize impeachment is manifestly impossible. There is a difference now between Congress and the executive branch. I do not question the good faith of the Executive. I know the Congress is acting in good faith.

This is not a new question. Other Senators in other days have sought to devise ways and means to require an Executive to carry out the intent of Congress as to the expenditure of funds. So far as I am advised, none of them have ever succeeded.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am aware of what has happened in the past, I will say to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the President is willing to take the responsibility before the people of the country for refusing to spend the funds, it does not seem that much can be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have stated, I am aware of that, and that is why I discussed with my good friend from Georgia the possibility of getting something done by the Armed Services Committee which would compel the President to maintain an Army of 900,000 men.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we provided the money, action still would not be required, I will say. That would not strengthen what the Congress did last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was reassured by the statement of the distinguished Senator that no substantial change has been recommended in the existing law. Do I correctly understand that the provisions of the existing law provide that the Governors of the respective States shall name the Directors of Selective Service in their States and shall name the members of the local draft boards; and that those provisions are to continue?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator from Florida well knows that under the law the President appoints the State Directors on the recommendation of the Governors. The President appoints the local boards but on the recommendation of the Governors. That has been the case since the first Selective Service Act was passed, I believe in 1939. That system will be carried over in the extension, if the Congress sees fit to extend the law.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that is a very important part of the law, and I am sure the chairman of the committee agrees.

Mr. RUSSELL. I could not agree more. There have been injustices in regard to certain individual draft boards, but there has been a feeling on the part of all the young men in this Nation that their cases have been considered by neighbors in the community. I think that has had a beneficial effect. It is one of the things which dramatizes the difference between selective service as applied in a democracy such as ours and as applied in a military system such as obtained in Prussia, or in Germany. The question of passing upon deferments is taken to the grass roots, and the many

human elements enter into the question of when and how the military service is to be rendered. It is one of those things which cause me to believe there is no need to be worried about Prussianization or militarization of this country so long as we keep the program so close to the people.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I could not agree more heartily with the distinguished Senator than upon the last statement. I think the details which we have just discussed help to give the earmarks of democracy to selective service in a way which could not be accomplished otherwise.

I have one more question to ask the Senator on that subject. Will the discretionary powers of the local boards be affected or diminished in any way by the proposed extension?

Mr. RUSSELL. They are not touched at all by the proposed extension. Frankly, they very largely grew out of regulations under the law, rather than the law itself. This bill in no wise affects the present powers or discretion of the local boards. There is some variety in the application of the law. Some boards do not hesitate to draft young men who are married. Others give them deferment under the regulations. The discretionary powers represent an intangible, related to the community rather than to the hard and fast letter of the regulations.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. Speaking for one Senator—and I think I speak the sentiments of a great many others—I am happy that the responsibility in this vastly important matter in our Republic rests in hands so capable and so patriotic as those of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who speaks for Senators on this side of the aisle, and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] who speaks for Senators on the other side of the aisle. We know with what complete patriotism these questions are handled. We compliment those two distinguished Senators, as well as every other member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I would not like to have this occasion pass without saying that the committee is very fortunate in the caliber of its staff. It is not a large staff, but it is very able and efficient.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. First, let me join other Senators in paying my respects to the distinguished chairman of the committee. There is no person in Government service for whom I have greater admiration and respect.

I should like to ask the Senator a question on the subject of deferment and exemptions. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Georgia that it might be desirable to have a committee of Congress, or perhaps a joint committee,

enter into some study of this subject during the next 2 or 3 years, to see if there is some way by which we can bring about more of an organized pattern to insure that every young man performs some useful service, rather than having large numbers of qualified men escape service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator that the idea that a large number of qualified men escape service is not well founded. The President has raised the mental standards. Testimony before the committee was to the effect that not more than 1 in 10 qualified young men in this country have avoided military service. About 45 percent are not qualified, either for physical reasons or because their aptitude is not adequate to qualify them. However, about 9 out of 10 of those who are qualified have rendered military service to the country.

There have been inequities, and we have conducted a number of studies. The Senator from Louisiana is a former member of the committee. He was a very active and useful member of the committee. He will recall that a commission was appointed to deal with this subject. When it was first established it was presided over by former Senator Wadsworth, of New York, who was an expert in that field. Later General Sarnoff was Chairman of the Commission. It held lengthy hearings and filed a large number of reports and recommendations dealing with this subject.

Many commissions have studied this field. Of course, we have improved the machinery. It is much better than it was in the early stages. We learned as we went along.

We also discussed in the committee the desirability of having a subcommittee that would consider this question very closely, as well as the question of utilization of military manpower. It is always a difficult problem to determine the best utilization of the manpower we now have.

Mr. LONG. One point which occurs to the junior Senator from Louisiana is the fact that the people of this Nation are weak in the understanding of foreign languages. The Armed Forces have a good language school. However, I noticed, in visiting Russia, that that nation exempts certain young men from service in the armed forces in order to permit them to go to language schools. They concentrate on the study of languages, to the extent that large numbers of their people are trained to speak foreign languages very fluently. It seems to me that that is one area in which this Nation is not laying the proper stress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator that I hold the same opinion. However, at the present time the armed services have a better record with respect to teaching attachés the languages of other countries than has the State Department.

One can go to almost any country, including Finland, Russia, Sweden, and other countries which have difficult languages, and find that the Army attachés speak the various languages fluently, because they are given very rigid indoctrination in the language for 6 or 8 months. They may not be as fluent as

they might be, but they understand the language, and they can make themselves understood. I think the armed services are improving in that respect much faster than is the State Department.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is entirely correct. But, to offset some of the glaring weaknesses in the State Department, it seems to me that if the armed services could train a considerable number of their members to speak foreign languages, there would be a wider reservoir from which the State Department might draw subsequently.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree entirely. As a member of the Board of Visitors to various service academies, I have discussed that subject. There has been great improvement in the language courses available in the service schools, and in the schools operated by the services. If I were as well satisfied with the progress we are making in all other branches of the military service as I am with the teaching of languages to the men who are to serve as military attachés overseas, I would be much more optimistic. I believe the improvement has been most spectacular in the past 5 years.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With relation to the State Department, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I have joined for several years in trying to stimulate a greater degree of language study in the Foreign Service Institute of the State Department.

With relation to the armed services, I agree with what the chairman has said. In the service academies as much time is now devoted to the humanities as it is possible to give, when we consider all the science studies which must be pursued.

With relation to the men brought into the armed services, I believe I am correct in saying—although I am not sure of the accuracy of the statement—that there are opportunities for language studies in almost any place where a man may be situated, if he wishes to pursue such studies. It is on a voluntary basis.

The armed services are making an excellent record. The State Department can do better. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I express the hope that the Senator from Louisiana will support the bill of the Senator from Montana and myself.

Mr. LONG. It does seem to me that, in the national interest, something must be done toward providing better qualifications generally in the language field for our Foreign Service. Perhaps it might be well to consider at some time in the future means by which it would be possible to work out some kind of deferment or even exemption for those who are attempting to qualify themselves for the Foreign Service, so that we may have available persons in the diplomatic service, who, with their knowledge of foreign languages, will help avert war, if that is possible—and to help win it if we must fight it.

It seems to me that some kind of deferment or even exemption should be pro-

vided for persons who are willing to develop a knowledge of foreign languages.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is possible to do that under existing law. It is possible under existing law to give a deferment. A very liberal system of deferment is available for students in colleges who wish to study foreign languages, as well as many other courses, as long as they maintain certain grades and do a certain amount of work in those fields.

The Senator is undoubtedly correct that this is one of our great weaknesses in our battle to win the minds and hearts of men. The Russians have a tremendous advantage over us in that regard. He and I have traveled in Russia, and no doubt he has been amazed by the number of people in Russia, many of whom have never traveled outside their little home communities, who can speak a foreign language.

Mr. LONG. It is worse than amazing; it is distressing.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is certainly very impressive on the visitor. Russian children must study a foreign language, and must begin the study of a foreign language in what is the equivalent of our second, third, and fourth grades. That is when they must begin their study of a foreign language.

When I was in Russia, I was told that before World War II, the German language had been the favorite foreign language. Now, since the war, and since the expansion of their language courses, English has become the most popular language study in the Russian schools.

The Russians not only train people in a particular language, but also in the various dialects of a language. There is no place in the world, regardless of what its language or the dialect of the language may be, into which the Russians cannot send a qualified person who is capable of speaking that language and dialect, so that he can converse with those people. That is giving the Russians a tremendous advantage over our country. That situation certainly should be corrected, and I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator. I should now like to ask a question or two along the line of the questions asked by my senior colleague from Louisiana. I should like to ask first a question relating to the proposed cutback in the military strength, which, I believe, would amount to about 30,000 in the Army and about 20,000 in the Marine Corps.

Mr. RUSSELL. About 25,000 in the Marine Corps and 30,000 in the Army. That is what is proposed to be done at the moment, but I understand that consideration has been given to a larger cut.

Mr. LONG. Do I understand that under the proposed Army cutback, the Army would lose one full division? I understand that at the present time we have two divisions in the Far East and about five divisions in Europe. I also understand that we have divisions which are now training in this country, and that those divisions will rotate with the divisions in foreign areas when trained. However, I understand that that leaves only about two trained divisions in the United States as of now. I should like to

know if that is also the understanding of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. There will be one less division in the U.S. Army when the reduction is effectuated. I understand that the division will be taken from what is called the STRAC, the strategic reserve of the Army, which has been composed of four divisions. It would be reduced by one division if the reduction is made.

Mr. LONG. So far as I am able to determine, my impression at the moment is that if we look at the Reserves in this country which would be available to go to an area of disturbance, we would have only two or three divisions in this country which could be sent, let us say, to Europe, if trouble should break out there, or to Asia, or wherever trouble might arise, based upon our present reserves. Is that in accord with the Senator's understanding?

Mr. RUSSELL. I doubt that in this country we have more than two divisions which are fully trained and equipped and ready to go at the present time. A third division is somewhat less ready.

Mr. LONG. That is, in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. There may be another one. There are other divisions, but they are largely training cadres. I know of no divisions as such other than the two the Senator has in mind that would be ready to go.

Mr. LONG. The point I have in mind is that the proposed cutback in the Army strength may well mean, if it is made, a reduction of 30 or 50 percent of the actual available reserves which could be shifted to wherever trouble may arise.

Mr. RUSSELL. From within this country; yes.

Mr. LONG. That is my impression.

Mr. RUSSELL. At least 25 percent, I will say.

Mr. LONG. That is a very serious reduction in our ready reserve, which must back up our forces in position in the event trouble breaks out.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator well knows that Congress has consistently refused to put all of its congressional eggs into the massive retaliation basket or in the Strategic Air Command. We have supported the Strategic Air Command at a strength greater than requested in the budget. At the same time we have been apprehensive about the danger of a war less than total war breaking out. Such a development would require considerable ground forces. All I can do is try to imagine what a potential enemy would do, and I try to consider what I would do if I were in his place.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator shares my hope that the United States will not find itself in such a position that our only recourse will be to engage in an all-out thermonuclear war. In other words, if we run into trouble in Berlin or in the Middle East or in Korea, I would hope that we would not find ourselves in the position where our only course would be to engage in thermonuclear warfare.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would certainly hope so. I will give another illustration of what I have in mind. If the Russians

were to pull back 25 miles from around Berlin, and the East German forces were to undertake to blockade all the means of ingress and egress to and from Berlin, I do not know exactly how we could use nuclear weapons to resolve that difficulty. Would we attack the East Germans or would we attack the Russians, who had pulled back and had disengaged?

Somehow we would have to get into Berlin to feed the people or to rescue them or to relieve them. The principal way we could do that would be with our Army on the ground. I do not believe that nuclear superiority would function under that assumed situation any more than it did in Korea.

Mr. LONG. The Secretary of Defense appeared on a television program over the weekend, and he laid great stress on the fact that if trouble broke out in the world, we could rely on our allies, and that with their divisions, plus our divisions, we would have a considerable force in the area.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the Secretary of Defense suggest how long it would take France to get its army out of Algeria?

Mr. LONG. No; he did not dwell on that point at the time. However, if this Nation is to make a reduction of a full division in its Armed Forces, I wonder what the effect would be on the French, the West Germans, the Belgians, the Dutch, the English, and our other allies, who are in the affected area, and how we can expect them to maintain their forces in readiness.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has not mentioned what distresses me even more than that, and that is the effect it would have on the men in the Kremlin, particularly as to whether they will believe we are serious in our talk at a time when we are reducing our military forces. That is what concerns me most of all.

Mr. LONG. That very much concerns the junior Senator from Louisiana also. I wish to explore a matter of congressional policy with the Senator from Georgia. I doubt that he need look at the manual to answer this question. I am referring to article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which provides that Congress shall have the power to lay taxes, and so forth. I skip to the provision: "To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years; to provide and maintain a Navy." My interpretation of that constitutional provision is that Congress shall have the power to raise and support an Army and Navy in addition to its power over the purse strings, because in the beginning of the section reference is made to laying taxes to provide for the common defense. I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia interprets that section the way I do, namely, that it means that it is both the duty and the responsibility of Congress to raise and support an Army and a Navy.

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opinion there is no question that that is the responsibility of Congress. It is my belief that when the Founding Fathers were writing the Constitution, they intended to en-

trust to Congress the responsibility of determining the size of the Military Establishment. In the division of powers, they gave to the President of the United States the power of the Commander in Chief over whatever Army and Navy Congress raised. They divided the powers in that fashion, so that the Commander in Chief would not have complete control over the size of the Armed Forces, because they were opposed to a military regime in this country and to the complete seizure of power by one man.

I interpret the Constitution just as it is written. That Congress has the power to maintain a Military Establishment, to provide for it, and to provide for the means to establish the size of it. But it has not always worked out that way.

Mr. LONG. The last Congress appropriated money, and the committee report contained language indicating that the purpose of the money was to maintain a 900,000-man Army. I heard the Secretary of Defense explain his view of that matter on the television program on Sunday. He said he regarded it as a mere invitation to the Executive to provide more defense than the Executive cared to provide, in the event the Executive was so disposed.

It seems to me that if Congress should write into some particular bill—an appropriate one, I would hope—language requiring the Executive to maintain a certain sized Army or Navy, since Congress clearly has the duty to raise and support an Army and a Navy, I should imagine the Executive would perhaps recognize that it was more than an invitation, but was an actual matter of law which he was obliged to carry out.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should hope so; but there is nothing I know of anywhere which would require him to do so, unless he wanted to do it.

Mr. LONG. We cannot require the Executive to abide by a law, although he can be impeached. I hope the Senator will agree that it would be desirable, first, to try a legislative proposition to maintain the strength of the Army and the Marine Corps rather than seeking to impeach the President.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. Of course, the Senate cannot originate the impeachment. Even if the Senate were unanimous in believing that the President should be impeached, we could not initiate the action. The body on the other side of the Capitol would have to sit as a grand jury and prepare the indictment of impeachment.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to align myself with the statements made by the distinguished Senators from Louisiana relative to the intent of Congress, when that intent is made clearly known through the necessary language in appropriation bills. The impounding of funds by the executive branch is applicable both to Republican and Democratic administrations, because we all remember that before the Korean war, Congress voted for a 70-group Air Force. Then the President, Mr. Truman, and Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson im-

pounded the extra funds above those needed for a 48-group Air Force.

We know that 4 years ago, when the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] offered an amendment, which was agreed to, raising the appropriations for the Marine Corps by \$40 million, that money was impounded by the present administration, and the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, tried to spend that money in other ways, until the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, got wind of it and called Mr. Wilson before the committee. Since the administration did not plan to use the money for the Marine Corps, I think the money reverted to the general Treasury; did it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. A part of it did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The latest example is what Congress did last year in stating specifically that the National Guard should be maintained at a strength of, I believe, not to exceed 300,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was 400,000 in the National Guard and 300,000 in the Reserves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Army Reserves were to be maintained at 300,000; the Marine Corps at 200,000; and the Army at 900,000.

How is it that the intent of Congress, which I thought was clearly spelled out in those four categories was carried out only in the fields covering the Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserves, but not in the fields of the Marine Corps and the Army itself?

Mr. RUSSELL. In the case of the National Guard and the Reserves, the appropriation bill itself provided language that the numbers should be not less than those indicated by the Senator from Montana; whereas in the case of the Regular Army and the Marine Corps the money for the larger force was appropriated and the congressional intent was expressed in the committee report. That was the justification given by the Department of Defense for differentiating between the items.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I correct in stating that it is the intention of the Department of Defense this year, again, to request that the strength levels of the Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserves be cut?

Mr. RUSSELL. The budget for fiscal year 1960 contemplates reducing the strength of the Army Reserves and the National Guard. The reduced strength of the Active Army and the Marine Corps would be continued.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is this one way in which we can circumvent the impounding power of the executive branch of the Government: namely, to write into the appropriation bills, as was done for this fiscal year in the case of the Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserves, identical provisions for the Marine Corps and the Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. We can try, I may say to the Senator from Montana, but it still will not compel the President of the United States to spend the money if he decides he will not spend it. In this instance, the Department of Defense undertook to draw a distinction between the

forms of congressional action; but heretofore the numbers both of the Army Reserves and the National Guard, and of the Army and Marine Corps, as well, were determined by the amount of the appropriation for each organization. In this case, the Senate made a determination in the case of all four. We provided in the bill for an Army of 900,000; for 200,000 marines; for 400,00 in the National Guard; and for 3,000 in the Army Reserves.

When the bill went to conference, the other body refused absolutely to accept our proposal so far as the regular establishment was concerned, because they said the intent had always been carried in the committee report.

In order to get a bill, the Senate finally receded from its provision and placed the figure in the report. But we appropriated money for 900,000 in the Regular Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps, just as we did for the 400,000 in the National Guard and the 300,000 in the Army Reserves. But the Department of Defense saw fit to draw a distinction between them.

Of course, this year, if Congress in its wisdom considers this desirable, we can state in the appropriation bill the numbers for the Army, the Marine Corps, the National Guard, and the Reserves. We can say that each of these branches shall be maintained at a certain number or at not less than a certain number, and see then if the Department of Defense will accept the figures when they are set forth in the text of the bill any better than it did when the figures were contained in the committee report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Evidently the administration has its wind up on the matter of reducing forces. They did not put the Marine Corps and the Army cuts into effect at the time of the Lebanon crisis, did they?

Mr. RUSSELL. They had already announced them, but they delayed putting the cuts into effect when the Lebanon crisis arose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They did not do so at the time the crisis arose affecting the islands off the shore of the mainland of China last September and October, did they?

Mr. RUSSELL. They have not done so completely as yet.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But they are planning to make cuts just before the deadline on Berlin, May 27.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are reducing to the levels they desire.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did I understand the Senator from Georgia to say or indicate that in addition to the cuts in the Marine Corps and the Army, which are now going into effect, and which I think certainly are open to question, further cuts in these two outfits are in the offing?

Mr. RUSSELL. There has been no direct statement or request in the budget for any lower numbers. But at the time it was first decided to reduce the size of the Army by 30,000 in fiscal 1959, other studies were conducted looking to a still further reduction in fiscal 1960.

Although Congress appropriated funds for the full 900,000-member Army in fiscal 1959, the Department has not yet

reached the level of 870,000 which it sought for fiscal 1959, and no further reduction below 870,000 has been planned for 1960. So there has been no further reduction for 1960. But what I intended to say was that studies looking to even greater reductions than those being sought at the present time have been conducted. I do not say the decisions have been reached, but studies looking to even greater reductions have been conducted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But it is not true that orders have been issued to reduce the Marine Corps to 175,000 men and the Army to 850,000 men by June 30 of this year?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That means that, roughly, the total reduction will amount to 55,000, because I believe the marines are now approximately 185,000 in number.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the Army is around 900,000 at the present time. So the reduction by means of such orders will not be quite that large, because some reductions have been achieved by chips and whitestones, by not replacing losses.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, let us assume that the cut in the case of the Army would amount to 45,000 trained men. We realize that the Government has made a large investment in their training. We are discussing the Draft Act. How many men are drafted over the period of 1 year? Would the number be 110,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Between 100,000 and 120,000. Of course, that number will be reduced to approximately 90,000 in 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. But it seems to me that what we are doing is making it mandatory that by June 30 of this year at least 40,000 well-trained men, in whose training the Government has invested a great deal of money, will leave the Army and the Marine Corps.

Mr. RUSSELL. Reductions to that extent will be made. Of course, in any event there would have been a turnover, and some of them would have left the services. But undoubtedly there would then be that many less trained men in the military services.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And the Government, in this year of "the balanced budget," will suffer a subsequent loss, because the replacements which will have to be made will be made of new men who will have to be trained accordingly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot subscribe completely to that statement, because if the terms of service of 40,000 men have expired, that many men will be separated from the service, if they wish to be. But we would have 40,000 men to take their places, and thus we would incur the cost of training the 40,000 men who would replace the 40,000 who had been separated from the services.

But undoubtedly the total overall strength will be 40,000 men less on July 1, as the Senator from Montana has indicated. In fact, it will be nearer 50,000 men less.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At that time we shall have 14 divisions, I believe. Will all of them be combat ready?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; some of them will be training divisions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How many divisions will the Soviets have?

Mr. RUSSELL. We attribute approximately 175 divisions to the Soviet Union. However, I wish to say that the matter is not as simple as it would appear to be. Different countries have divisions of different sizes. In some countries, a division is 7,000 or 8,000 men; in other countries, a division is 12,000 or 14,000 men. But of course the Soviet Union divisions have overwhelming strength in ground forces, including tanks. Worst of all, our country, which has the greatest industrial establishment on earth, has not modernized its divisions properly. The Soviet ground forces are equipped with better weapons than our forces have today. Our forces have a great amount of obsolescent and obsolete equipment. That is one of the most alarming aspects of this entire situation—namely, the fact that we have not kept up with technological advances, in terms of supplying our men and our military forces with the very latest weapons.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How does the United States compare with the Soviet Union, in the case of submarines?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Soviets have three or four times as many submarines as the United States has. Our estimates attribute more than 400 submarines to the Soviet Union; and the United States has slightly more than 100.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How does the United States stand vis-a-vis the Soviet Union in the field of naval power, exclusive of submarines?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the United States has a far stronger navy, exclusive of submarines, than the Soviet Union has. Since the end of World War II, the Soviets have built quite a few fast 10,000-ton cruisers, and they have some other modern ships. But in overall naval strength, there is no question in my mind that our Navy is far superior to the Soviet Navy. Of course, the carrier strength of the U.S. Navy gives us a great advantage. So far as we know, the Soviets have no aircraft carriers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How does the United States compare with the Soviet Union, generally speaking, in the air?

Mr. RUSSELL. I can give the distinguished Senator from Montana my opinion, which is based on the hearings we have from time to time. I believe the Soviet Union has more airplanes than the United States has; but I think the United States has a much superior operating personnel, as compared to that of the Soviet Union; and I believe that our best planes, although very few in number, are better than the best of the Soviet planes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator from Georgia say that the relationship would constitute a standoff?

Mr. RUSSELL. Leaving out the area of missiles, and talking about the operational planes, I would say the United States is superior to the Soviet Union. I do not believe the Soviet long-range bomber command is anywhere near comparable to our Strategic Air Command.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I note that there is public information to the effect that at the present time, in the field of missile power, the United States has no ICBM's, and neither does the Soviet Union; that in the field of IRBM's, the United States has 10, and supposedly the Soviet Union has somewhere between 500 and 1,000. Those figures, which come from the public prints, indicate that the United States is in a very delicate position; and certainly that position is made more delicate by the approaching deadline of May 27, June 27, July 27, or next autumn, depending on whatever date Mr. Khrushchev wishes to use.

I am very much disturbed over the fact that our Army is being reduced in size. I am extremely disturbed over the fact that the Marine Corps, the only one of our services which has a floor under its strength, will not have enough men, under this year's budget, despite the expressed intent of Congress, to maintain three combat divisions and three air wings. I am sure the Senator from Georgia recognizes that situation, and also recognizes the consequent danger we are in.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have discussed it here on the floor and wherever else I could make myself heard. Whenever I have been invited to attend councils where the highest Government officials were present, I have expressed my unwillingness to see our Military Establishment weakened in any respect, in view of the situation which obtains today in the world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When I came to the floor, the Senator from Georgia stated, so I understood, that objections had been made by means of letters, and probably also by witnesses, to the extension of this law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to the opposition voiced to this measure, I take it that the committee intends to develop in our military forces a personnel strength which at least will in some way be able to cope with the threats that are facing us today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly we want to have the means of providing all the military strength which will be authorized by the Congress and approved by the executive branch of the Government. But certainly we could not do that without the enactment of this bill, because, in the first place, on July 1, in the absence of the enactment of this bill, the ceilings on all the armed forces would be just above 2 million men. So there would have to be a reduction of all above the 2 million men on the 1st of July; and 325,000 of those would come out of the Air Force.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If that were done, the number of personnel would be reduced from the present figure of how much to a new figure of how much?

Mr. RUSSELL. The overall number of 2½ million would be reduced to slightly more than 2 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, there would be a reduction of 500,000; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that the primary purpose of the committee members, in their consideration of this bill, was to preserve to the maximum degree the security of our country?

Mr. RUSSELL. If it were not necessary to preserve the security of the United States, in my opinion, and, I will say, in the unanimous opinion of the committee, this bill would not be before the Senate today, because no one is enthusiastic about any compulsion in the matter of military service in this land of ours, unless all that we hold dear is threatened.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that normally the wish and the desire of the committee would be to eliminate, insofar as possible, this universal draft law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Indeed, whenever the public safety would permit, we would like to see the compulsory element of it eliminated. There are members of the committee—including myself—who at times have believed in a system of universal military training. But I must say that the changes in weapons systems now have caused me to modify my feelings and views in that regard.

So far as the draft act is concerned, it is designed to enable this country to meet the emergencies of this hour and the threats of the cold war with the Soviet Union, in which we have been engaged over the past 12 or 14 years.

The draft ended at the conclusion of World War II, but in 1948, when the cold war began, we could not get into the armed services the number of men we needed, and we had to revive selective service. The act has been in effect since 1948.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would it be fair to interpret the mental attitude of the committee in this way? The committee is saying to the people of Ohio and the people of the Nation that, if it were possible, the committee would have gladly recommended a reduction in the number of persons needed to serve in the military forces; but, in the face of the threat facing us, the recommendations of the committee are an absolute minimum of the needs of the military services of the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. The position of the committee is that unless we have the manpower that this authority will provide, the security of the country and the freedom of its citizens will be gravely imperiled. It is the position of the committee that this authority to provide the manpower is necessary in order that the security of the country and the freedom of its people may survive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The questions I am about to ask may be somewhat personal, but I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia how long he has been a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. When I came to the Senate there were two committees re-

lating to the armed services, the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs. I became a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs in January 1933. I have been a member of the Committee on Armed Services and its predecessors for over 26 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Based on that experience of 26 years of service on those committees, the Senator from Georgia recommends, does he not, to the Members of the Senate and to the people of the country that, for the security of the country, the draft law which is now in effect should be extended?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do, unqualifiedly and unhesitatingly. In 1948, when the draft law was not in operation, we could not raise the 2 million men needed. There is no way to get the manpower to meet the present crisis without having the existing machinery of the Selective Service Act in effect.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was the recommendation of the committee unanimous?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was as to the extension of the authority to induct. One or two members of the committee thought the act should not be continued for more than 2 years, but the committee was unanimous in recommending that the act be continued.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to preface my questions by saying that a reading of the report and the recommendations of the committee leads me to the same conclusion the committee has reached. I think an extension of the draft law is a necessity which cannot be avoided. However, I should like to ask the Senator a few questions.

Last fall, when I was in my own State, I talked personally with thousands of young men, and to several hundred groups. One question constantly recurred. These young men had the attitude that they did not seek to avoid military service. However, they repeatedly came up with the thought that if they were drafted, they would go into the military service for 2 years. Perhaps some young men do not object to being drafted, which is all right, but the group I am talking about would rather enlist than go into the service through the Selective Service program.

They pointed out that if they enlisted, they would have to enlist for a 3-year or a 4-year period.

I notice, on page 4 of the report of the committee, under subsection (2), it reads:

Volunteers under the age 26, in the sequence of their volunteering for induction.

In other words, these young men would volunteer to the draft board, and they would still go through selective service. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the committee given any consideration or has it had any reason or cause to give consideration to the situation of young men who do not seek to avoid service, and yet, by volunteering their services, are subjected

to a 1- or 2-year period of longer training and service than those who are inducted under the Selective Service Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. If they serve more than 2 years, it means they have elected to go into the Navy or the Air Force. They can go into the Army for a 2-year period of service at the present time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Perhaps most of the young men to whom I talked wanted to go into the Navy or Air Force.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the young men choose to go into the Air Force, they will have to weigh whether they want to serve 4 years in the Air Force rather than 2 years in the Army. Many of them do. There is no trouble in obtaining volunteers in the Air Force. Some young men may prefer to serve 3 years in the Navy rather than 2 years in the Army. There are still others who get 6 months' training and then participate actively in the Reserve, in which they must perform 48 Reserve drills and 2 weeks of active duty for training annually. There are many different ways of performing military service. If the young man choose to go into the Air Force, they have to pay the price of serving 4 years.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the committee discussed this particular question?

Mr. RUSSELL. We have discussed this question for hours. Without attempting to make a disparagement as between the different branches of the service, I point out that there is required a greater degree of skill in the Air Force than is required in some of the other branches of the service. If a man were going into the Air Force, and were required to serve only 2 years, by the time he would be trained, he would then be lost to the service. In the infantry, if a young man is a strong boy, with good reflexes, and can carry a gun and learn how to use it, he can be trained in 4 months, and the Army will still obtain 20 months' service from him, even though he has to serve only 2 years.

More highly developed skills required in certain branches of the Army—in electronics, for example—that are just as demanding as are skills in the Air Force; but these positions should be filled by career personnel.

I must say there has been an increasing tendency—although I understand it, I deplore it—for young men to try to get out of having to march and sweat it out with a rifle on their shoulders. Some young men are willing to serve for a longer time in order to avoid having to do it. However, it must be pointed out that the foot soldier is an extremely important member of the armed services, and we must have him. In the last analysis, the man who has won every war from the time man carried sharp sticks to the day of modern weapons has been the foot soldier.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the Senator's own experience prompted his allegiance to the foot soldier?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was in the Navy.

Mr. ALLOTT. I may say for the young men, in whom I have a great deal of faith, that in the Air Force—

Mr. RUSSELL. The Air Force has no problem in obtaining enlistments. It

sometimes has more applicants than it can absorb. The Navy has more applicants than it can absorb. That is not where the difficulty is. The Army is the only branch which has to use the draft to fill its needs.

Mr. ALLOTT. The problem arises in filling the needs of the Army. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right. It is the only branch which today has to use the selective service to obtain its needed personnel.

Mr. ALLOTT. The reasons for the longer service with respect to the volunteers are, first, the greater amount of technical training required and, secondly, perhaps, the committee feeling that if a man is to have a right to select his branch of service then he should be willing to spend a longer period in service. Is that stating the matter fairly?

Mr. RUSSELL. That feeling undoubtedly enters into it. It has been completely justified by the facts, as stated.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to ask one other question on a subject which to me appears to be very shocking. On page 5 of the report, in the paragraph the third from the bottom of the page, it is stated:

The current rejection rate for an age group as a whole is about 33 percent. Since many members of an age group voluntarily enter service, the rejection rate for the effective manpower pool is approximately 45 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. That is a tremendously high percentage. I think I stated earlier that the services have raised mental qualifications since the end of World War II. A much higher degree of mental competence is required now.

To be perfectly frank about the matter, if we became involved in an all-out war we would have to lower the standards, and more young men would be available. We have heard a great deal of discussion over the past few weeks about the strength of our Armed Forces. The services want the strongest bodies and, above all, the most efficient minds they can get in those bodies, to make up for the disparity in numbers as between the men in service in our country and those in service in the Soviet Union.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then this percentage could not necessarily be interpreted in the same light with the inductions prior to World War II?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. ALLOTT. Or inductions prior to the Korean War, because of the raising of the physical and mental standards.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. This does not reflect any depreciation in the mental and physical qualities of our young manhood, but reflects instead an increase in standards.

Mr. ALLOTT. What this really means is that the services have set a goal of a certain number of men. In order to attain what is desired, the services have turned down approximately 45 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. ALLOTT. The services require certain standards.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is a fair statement. I was very reluctant to approve those higher qualifications, because in a sense they were a limitation on the equal distribution of services.

Mr. ALLOTT. Of the burden of service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of the burden of military service. The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, and all the ranking generals in the Army, were most insistent that since there was a reduction in personnel in the Army there was a requirement for the higher standards. The Army has been reduced from about 1½ million to 900,000 men, and in the light of that reduction these military men felt it was imperative that they have persons with higher mental capacity, because they could train those men much easier, and those men could do many more things and absorb training in a much shorter period of time.

In addition, this program has greatly mitigated the disciplinary problems of the Army. I first would not accept the relationship of the disciplinary problems to the somewhat lower intelligence quotients, but since we have authorized the President to raise the mental standards the Army has closed two of its disciplinary barracks. There has been that much reduction in the disciplinary problems of the Army.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is wonderful news. I think this is an area to which we have to pay some attention.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can assure the Senator it has been a matter of great concern to the members of the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure it has been. In this respect what we are really doing is not having a selective service in one sense; we are putting the burden of service only upon those who have the highest physical qualifications and the highest mental qualifications.

Mr. RUSSELL. I must confess there is a great measure of justification for the Senator's statement.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will bear witness to the fact that for two sessions I held up the proposed legislation to increase the standards because it looked to me as though it would be unfair to the young men who were more intelligent and stronger.

After all, standards are all a matter of degree. We had standards before. It was all a matter of degree as to how high we should raise the standards.

Our need for a strong military force was so great that I finally capitulated. We passed the bill last year. I must admit the program has produced results far beyond anything I anticipated at the time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me and permit an interruption at this time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, if the Senator from Colorado does not object.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the correct thing to say is that the program has increased the selectivity and reduced the universality.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We used to talk in terms of universal military

service, and now the emphasis is upon selectivity. The changing of the standards has entirely shifted the burden of responsibility.

Mr. RUSSELL. A number of things have contributed to that effect. The weapons of war have become more complex in the last 20 years. I think the complexity has increased in the last 20 years more than in the two centuries before that. Weapons are so complex today that I have almost despaired of being able to observe an ordinary military outfit operate one of the missile batteries. It requires a very high degree of training and a very considerable basic education simply to get the count-down handled exactly as it should be.

That is one reason I have not been too much frightened by the claims of Russian missile superiority. If the Russians have the missiles operational everywhere, they must be sadly depleting the faculties of their educational institutions. It takes almost a team of college professors to operate one of those missile batteries. If the Russians have the missiles operational everywhere, they have had to use many highly competent persons.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate very much the answers the Senator has given. I knew perhaps all of these things had been considered by the committee, but I think it is worthwhile to point out, as the Senator from South Dakota has indicated, that the emphasis has been changed, probably of necessity, from a selective service system of universality to a selective service system of selectivity.

Mr. RUSSELL. The standards have been changed from time to time. They were changed drastically from 1940, when we passed the first bill, to 1942.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. In 1940 the standards were about as high as they are today, but by 1942 if a man could walk, the services carried him off, gave him a gun, and put him in the armed services. We needed 14 million men. This has never been a universal program.

Mr. ALLOTT. I realize that.

Mr. RUSSELL. There has always been a degree of selectivity.

Mr. ALLOTT. I realize there has never been a time when the Army or the military forces were in that category completely.

I thank the Senator for answering my questions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to undertake to answer the Senator's questions.

Mr. KEATING. Would it be fair to say that in the committee the only substantial dispute regarding the bill was with relation to the length of time the draft should be extended?

Mr. RUSSELL. As a practical matter, I will say to the distinguished Senator from New York, no motion was made to change the 4-year provision. The committee was unanimous in agreement that it was necessary to extend the authority to induct. One or two members of the committee expressed the wish that the law might be extended for 2 years in-

stead of 4 years, but after full discussion there was no formal vote on that suggestion.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, it is my intention to support the extension of the draft law. I have been debating in my own mind, although my knowledge is much less extensive than the knowledge of members of the committee, whether the extension should be for 2 or 4 years.

Is it not a fact that if it were extended for 4 years, and the world situation should change, and the need for the draft should become less apparent during that period, the Congress at any time could end it, even if it were extended for 4 years?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only could the Congress end it, but the executive branch of the Government, if it did not need the men, could declare the draft inoperable at any time. Congress would not have to be in session. There could be a cessation of the draft at any time, if men were not needed in the Armed Forces. As pointed out by Assistant Secretary of Defense Finucane, who is in charge of manpower, it is a great clarification to the young men of the country to know that the draft will be in operation for 4 years. This will prevent them from building up false hopes and making their plans for the future based on the illusion that the draft may end, when we really do not see any hope of its ending.

Mr. KEATING. I think there is much merit in that position.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in connection with the point which the Senator from New York raised, there was a feeling on the part of several members of the committee that the draft was not operating perfectly, that there was some room for improvement, that the reserve liability was unequal, and that the values for dollars expended might be increased with longer terms of enlistment, rather than a period of 2 years.

I would not want the Senator from New York to think that the only question considered was whether the extension should be for 2 years or 4 years. In that connection, let me say that I intend to speak on some of these points, and also to discuss 2 amendments which were discussed within the committee. I shall offer one of them.

One of the amendments had to do with simplifying and clarifying the period and conditions of liability, both as to active duty service and as to the Reserve.

The second amendment had to do with the possible creation of a manpower commission for studying the manpower needs currently and making such recommendations as its studies might lead it to make.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the Senator from South Dakota share my feeling, which is apparently the feeling of the Senator from Georgia, that it would be wise to extend the draft for 4 years, because of the fact that either the Defense Department or the Congress could act

at any time, if it should be found that it was not needed?

Is it not better, at this crucial time, to err, if we err at all, on the side of too long an extension, rather than on the side of an extension which is not long enough?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Two or three arguments were made for the 4-year extension. The first was that the last time the draft was extended, it was extended for 4 years.

The second argument was that the 4-year extension would perhaps provide a great show of determination for our allies, even recognizing the fact that one of them, England, has indicated that she intends to discontinue conscript service in a year or two.

The argument which was cited as being most persuasive was that the 4-year extension would give to the young men who would be affected a certain sense of definiteness, and they would have the knowledge that the draft would be extended that much longer. All those arguments were mentioned as reasons for an extension of 4 years rather than 2.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it has been a great privilege for me as a freshman Member of the Senate and as a newcomer to the Armed Services Committee, to work under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, in the preparation of the legislation now proposed. I have been impressed by the unanimity of opinion among my colleagues on the committee regarding the necessity for extending the draft. Surely it is apparent that at the present hour there is no alternative to such an extension.

At the same time, Mr. President, I would be remiss in my obligations and in my responsibility as a Member of the Senate to promote the national security, if I did not rise now to voice certain doubts which I feel concerning the draft program.

Chiefly, my doubts are whether our present manpower policies are giving this country true security in the missile age—or the illusion of security only. Therefore, it is my hope that Senators will consider on a continuing basis our manpower policies so that if workable alternatives to the draft exist we will know that they exist, and will put them to work for the safety of America.

If the answer to our manpower need is universal military training, we must find this out and adopt some plan of universal service at once.

If it be a professional Military Establishment, increased in size and equipment, we should know that, too.

Perhaps there is a solution which would utilize in the fullest degree in the service of their country the talents and energies of thousands of young men not fit for, or not needed in, the Military Establishment.

If the answer is found to be the current selective service, that system should be continued. But in that event, it is the duty of Congress to look into the practicability of some of the improvements which suggest themselves.

One reason given by witnesses who appeared before the committee for an extension of the draft for 4 years is that

failure to extend it for that period of time would dishearten our allies. I am troubled by the implication, if it be a fact, that our alliance is so tenuous as to require us to maintain a static military manpower policy that may not be best calculated to shore up the security of the United States of America.

That there must be an extension now of selective service, should be or ought to be obvious. My personal preference after hearing much of the testimony given by the committee would have been for a 2-year instead of a 4-year extension. It was and is my thought that an extension for this shorter period would point up the necessity for proceeding with an overall study of military manpower utilization and our manpower needs. However, I realize that I am of the newest of the new, having entered the Senate and having gained a place on the Armed Services Committee only in January of this year. I have yielded to the accumulated experience and wisdom of my elders in service on the committee and I voted to report the 4-year extension and I shall vote for it on the floor. Notwithstanding, I believe I have a duty to perform in calling to the attention of the Senate my views relating to an imperative need for an honest-to-goodness, down-to-earth study of this big and vital subject. I cannot believe that the shorter extension would have frightened our allies. Indeed, is it not altogether likely that they will be far more concerned with the announced reductions which are to be made in our existing military organization? That is almost surely to be of grave concern to them as it is to me and to so many other Americans.

There must be on our part no hint of weakness or fear. The Russians must see in us a determined unity with which we face whatever may befall. But, in the face of so grave a military danger, it would be folly and negligent not to examine the manpower situation thoroughly in the light of current facts.

I raise these questions today because they suggest serious problems which, unattended, could undermine our security. Now I am no military strategist, but the overall impact of these questions seems to me to indicate an urgent need for a frank and full study by a congressional panel or an independent commission. I reserve the privilege of submitting at a later date a formal proposal for such a study.

The more I consider the question, the more advisable it seems to me to have the study carried out by a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, rather than an independent group not associated with the Senate.

During such an inquiry, no slightest delay for complexity would impede the continuation of the present system. And if the present system is found to be adequate, or no better alternative has been worked out, there need be no change and no delay in the implementation of the draft.

Let us think of the changes in the military situation which have occurred since the last time the draft was examined by the Congress—changes in warfare

perhaps more extensive than those that occurred in all the centuries of human history—sputniks and luniks and intercontinental missiles and missile-bearing submarine fleets; and soon man to be sent into the heavens, too. Can it be sensible to assume that in the midst of so vast a redoing, manpower procurement policies alone must remain static, unimproved, even unquestioned?

Surely it is now clear how directly our international posture is affected by our manpower policies. It is no slight to these policies nor on the men who have carried them out so faithfully. To suggest that these policies, too, need periodic reexamination. Perhaps the study for which I speak today would find that we need a larger Army and that the best way to get it is a larger draft call. This, too, the American people must know and, knowing, would gladly accept.

Indeed, we must know how our Reserve program is standing up under the new strains and needs, how our pentomic divisions are faring—how nearly ready we are, in short, for any type of onslaught. If we are anything less than ready, the degree of difference may be the measure of our demise. If anything is plain, it is that the situation is just that ominous.

In 1941, in the face of a grave military threat from abroad, at a time when the nature of warfare more certainly justified a draft program than does the nature of warfare in the missile age, and when the totalitarian threat was no less immediate, one vote in the House of Representatives saved the draft. That vote may well have been the margin of our survival in the dark days of 1942. Statesmanship in the House of Representatives in 1941 saved America. Statesmanship in the 86th Congress by Members of the U.S. Senate may again save America in the face of the grave military threat from abroad. That statesmanship requires us not merely to enact a draft extension, but also to commit ourselves to a careful reappraisal of our present manpower policies. In the context of new weapons, old answers are not adequate. Complex new weapons demand complex new skills and we ignore these demands at the peril of our existence.

Even if we have adequate missiles in our arsenals and adequate pentomic divisions on the charts, well-trained, highly motivated men remain the lifeblood of the whole structure. Missiles do not fire themselves. Atomic artillery do not maintain themselves. Technology does not advance or explain itself. Is it really inconceivable that the draft—so necessary to meet our manpower needs in 1940—may no longer be adequate to the needs of 1960?

It is in this spirit, Mr. President, that I now raise for the consideration of my colleagues in the months to come what I submit may well be life-and-death questions.

First. Is conscription a permanent feature of U.S. defense policy, according to present military plans?

Second. If conscription is likely to continue indefinitely, are major efforts being made now by the Defense Department to improve the Selective Service

System to eliminate such inequities and inefficiencies as may currently be a part of it?

Third. If conscription is not to continue indefinitely, what plans are being made now by the Defense Department to lessen our dependency on and eventually to eliminate conscription?

Fourth. Might now such a study of manpower policies have value in ascertaining such facts as our overall manpower requirements; the most effective way to retain trained men in service for longer periods of time; possible nonmilitary uses of men of draft age; the possibility of reducing the number of men constantly involved in training soldiers who do not intend to stay in the armed services, and so forth?

Fifth. Can men be trained in (a) 6 months, (b) 2 years to operate the more complex weapons of modern warfare?

Sixth. Is this training of much value to the Nation if men are separated soon after they become proficient in the use of such weapons?

Seventh. How many draftees receive continuing combat training after their initial 8 or 16 weeks?

Eighth. Are we training an adequate number of men to fight limited non-nuclear wars in which mass armies are engaged?

Ninth. If draftees are not trained to operate the complex instruments of modern warfare, can we risk using them in combat situations, even if nuclear weapons are not immediately involved?

Tenth. In a limited war in which nuclear weapons are used, would a mass army untrained in nuclear warfare be adequate to our needs?

Eleventh. In an all-out war decided by a nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union, would a large army or large reserve force, especially a reserve force derived from the 6-month program, be of great value to the United States?

Twelfth. In short, is the training received by 2-year draftees adequate for any kind of war, be it total, limited non-nuclear, or limited nuclear?

Thirteenth. Is it possible that the manpower needs produced by new weapons cannot be met adequately without a substantial increase in the number of men who stay in the service for a minimum of 4 years?

Fourteenth. Is the training that men are getting in the 6-month program or in the 10-week Air Force training program adequate for any kind of war?

Fifteenth. If the 6-month training program is not adequate to prepare men for combat and other military assignments, should the program be continued?

Sixteenth. If the 6-month training program is adequate, should we not put it on a universal basis, and couple it with incentives designed to keep the requisite number of men in the Armed Forces for minimum periods of 4 years?

Seventeenth. How effectively are the (a) 6-month, (b) 2-year selectees being integrated into Active Reserve units?

Eighteenth. Might an adequate Reserve program provide an acceptable substitute for a large standing army, a large

percentage of whose personnel are not prepared for nuclear combat?

Nineteenth. Is it not possible that the arbitrary limitation imposed on the size of our Armed Forces by budgetary considerations has handicapped international negotiations looking toward disarmament?

Twentieth. Is it not possible that actually a larger standing Army could be maintained at less cost by an improved incentive system?

Twenty-first. In fact, regardless of size, might not the replacement of conscription with a system of incentives designed to attract and keep a competent and motivated professional armed force save money and produce a better nuclear-age defense system?

Twenty-second. But if the size of the Army is to be limited, might it not be wise to speed the replacement of soldiers by civilians in noncombat positions?

Twenty-third. Could not many such noncombatant jobs be filled more economically and more efficiently by civilians?

Twenty-fourth. In the long run, might it not be wise to employ civilians even in certain technical positions, if some way cannot be devised to retain service personnel for considerable periods of time after their training has been completed?

Twenty-fifth. Does not the fact that almost three-quarters of all enlistees leave the service after their first hitch seriously limit the value of conscription in filling the manpower needs of the service?

Twenty-sixth. Might not the \$14,000-per-man cost of training and maintaining draftees, 96 percent of whom leave the Army after their 2 years, and of training the one-hitch enlistees, be adequate to provide the kinds of salaries and benefits necessary to maintain an adequate professional force?

Twenty-seventh. Is part of the problem of attracting and keeping bright technicians in the Armed Forces derived from the fact that personnel are subject to certain conditions left over from an earlier military tradition which do not comport with the type of mental and technical initiative now required of military personnel?

Twenty-eighth. Is a system under which some men serve their country involuntarily up to 8 years while others do not serve at all the fairest that can be devised?

Twenty-ninth. Is a system which continually occupies a large percentage of our military personnel in the basic training of transient recruits the most efficient use of manpower that can be devised?

Thirtieth. Is such a system an adequate alternative to a combat-ready fighting force with a low turnover and a high proficiency in the use of modern weapons?

Thirty-first. Does the confidence of our allies in American leadership require us to maintain a manpower policy that may no longer be adequate to our own security?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to my colleague from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to commend my colleague highly for his very thoughtful and comprehensive analysis of this question. It shows how well he has taken advantage of his relatively brief membership on the Committee on Armed Services. What he has presented to the Senate is a wonderful blueprint for study by the committee during the coming years.

Needless to say, like my colleague from Alaska, I feel in duty bound to support the bill which, after extensive hearings, has the recommendation and the stamp of approval of the Committee on Armed Services, headed by a Senator who, more than any other Member of the Senate, is experienced in this extremely important field. I was privileged a few weeks ago to attend a testimonial banquet in honor of Senator RUSSELL. I felt privileged to be there and to join with the large group of military and civilians in approval of the citation and the testimonial which was given to him for his magnificent contribution to national defense.

Certainly at this time there is need for the expert opinion by which the rest of us who are necessarily less familiar with this subject have to be guided; and I may say that we in Alaska have been peculiarly sensitive to the needs of national defense. We have lived through a period when there were no defense plans for that area.

I recall that 24 years ago testifying before a Military Affairs Committee of the House, the late great Billy Mitchell emphasized that the importance of Alaska strategically was something we could not afford to overlook. He said at that time: "He who holds Alaska holds the world." His wisdom on that subject was as much disregarded as was his wisdom concerning the importance of aircraft in war.

I have lived through the years when the sole efforts to get defenses for Alaska were confined to Alaskans. I recall how Senator BARTLETT's predecessor as Delegate from Alaska, in the House, Anthony J. Dimond, strove for years to get some defense measures for Alaska enacted. I recall his prophecies both on the floor of the House and in the committee that the Japanese would attack Alaska without warning. I have in my possession a letter written to him as late as 1937, by Gen. Malin Craig, who was then Chief of Staff of the Army, after Delegate Dimond had urged the establishment of an Air Force and Army post in Alaska, in which General Craig replied, that the idea was fantastic; that Alaska was so remote from any possible theaters of conflict that the idea of spending any money for defense there was ridiculous.

I recall that away back in 1904 the Navy sought to establish a naval base in the outer Aleutian Islands, on the Island of Kiska. Year after year the Navy Department presented a request for an appropriation so that that island could be fortified. But the navy which first occupied the Island of Kiska was not Uncle Sam's navy, but the navy of the Mikado. In consequence of the lack of understanding of Alaska's strategic importance and the consequent failure to provide for its defense, Alaska was the only part of America invaded and for a time held by the enemy.

I could continue almost indefinitely to give examples of how sensitive and how keenly aware we are of the importance of national defense and of Alaska's role in national defense. We Alaskans believe that an important part of Alaska's destiny is to serve as a bulwark of defense for the continent. I shall vote for this measure though with substantial doubts. I think my colleague is to be greatly commended for raising in categorical form as questions, some of the doubts which some of us have.

I myself would have preferred a 2-year extension. I listened to some of the arguments against that modification. I noted particularly the comment made by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I am sorry he is not in the Chamber now. He said that one reason why he did not favor a 2-year extension, but rather favored a 4-year extension, is that there would be no appreciable change in the situation during those 4 years. I assume he meant by that that there would be no appreciable change in our relations with the totalitarian power which now menaces the freedom and peace of the world.

But I call his attention to the fact that there may be one very fundamental change in 1960, namely, a change in the Executive power of the Nation. Therefore, I think the time may come, even though we shall have extended the act for 4 years, when we will want to revise this law together with our other defense measures, as was so ably discussed and criticized in the Senate yesterday, and to take a new look at our needs for national defense and the strengthening of our national security.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish, first, to express to the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] my appreciation for his very complimentary references to me.

I am delighted to have the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I particularly appreciate the fact that he brought an inquiring mind with him to the committee. At times we have dealt with these problems for so long that we have become somewhat set in our views and our opinions. So it is always well to have someone asking new questions and generating new thoughts in the committee.

I have been so much impressed by the capacity of the senior Senator from Alaska to serve on the Committee on Armed Services that I regard it as being of vital importance that he has been assigned to the Subcommittee on Military Preparedness, where he will have a great many opportunities to exercise this sense of questioning which is in his mind, and to undertake to get answers from the military authorities and the civilian officials of the country who are charged with the responsibility in this area.

I am glad he has asked the questions he has propounded. I think I could answer some of them, but I shall not undertake to do so now. I do not know

that I could answer all of them to his satisfaction, but I certainly welcome him on the committee and appreciate the fact that he has fallen right into the work. I know he will make many valuable contributions to our national defense and to eliminating some of the admitted inequities in our present system of service.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I know of no one anywhere who is more capable of answering my questions than is my able chairman. I join with my colleague from Alaska in praising the effective work for his Nation which the distinguished Senator from Georgia has performed throughout the years. I thought only this afternoon that it was rather remarkable that he stood here and answered, without reference to a book, a note, or a piece of paper, the many technical questions which were put to him during the consideration of the bill. It was really a remarkable demonstration, one which few persons anywhere could have accomplished. We owe him much, and we recognize the fact, with pleasure and with pride.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have listened with great pleasure and pride to the very able statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. I was privileged to know him when he served as a Delegate from Alaska in the other body. I am very happy that he sought membership on the Committee on Armed Services, where I have served ever since I entered the Senate.

I think the contribution which the senior Senator from Alaska has already made, in the thorough way in which he covered the subject and the diligent manner in which he attended the committee hearings, is something which will please all Members of the Senate. All of us who are members of the Committee on Armed Services are very fortunate to have the privilege of serving under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I do not think I have ever known a greater legislator, a man of more ability, or a wiser or better man. So when the senior Senator from Alaska sought membership on the Committee on Armed Services, I thought then that he would have an opportunity to render the type of service which he has demonstrated today he is capable of rendering.

I had a chance to visit his State in the early days of World War II, in 1942, and I was greatly impressed with the loyalty, the patriotism, and the dedication of the people who live in Alaska.

Mr. President, nothing has given me more pleasure than to observe the competence, the teamwork, and the patriotism of the two Senators who work side by side in representing the largest State in the Union.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am grateful to the distinguished majority leader. It is a privilege to serve under two such great leaders as the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Georgia.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska. I do not have the benefit of membership on the Committee on Armed Services, and I am not so familiar with this very difficult and delicate issue as he is. However, I share with him the view that the extension of the act should have been for 2 years only. I also have in common with him the opinion that there should be a very detailed, extensive, thorough, and painstaking review of our military manpower policies, particularly with respect to the draft.

Mr. President, I believe both suggestions which have been made by Delegate BARTLETT should be considered by the leadership. I should have said "Senator BARTLETT." I have known him affectionately and personally as Delegate BARTLETT for so long that I am afraid I have gotten into the habit of addressing him as "Delegate."

Mr. BARTLETT. I am used to it; I like it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is a very illustrious title.

I think both of the proposals made by the Senator from Alaska should be considered not only by the chairman and other members of the Committee on Armed Services, but also by the leadership of both the Senate and the House.

I think few Members of the Senate are as familiar with the policies of our Armed Services, as a result of long experience, as are the two Senators from Alaska. I had the privilege and the experience of serving in the Army in Alaska and the Yukon during World War II. At that time the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] was the Governor of Alaska; and the senior Senator from Alaska Mr. [BARTLETT] was, part of the time, Secretary of the Territory of Alaska, and then he succeeded the very eminent Anthony J. Dimond as the Delegate from Alaska. It was while they were the civilian officials in charge of the Territorial government of Alaska that, if I am not mistaken, Alaska became the only portion of the North American continent under the sovereignty of the United States to be invaded in well over a century of American history.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. So, for example, they have had experience with military policies which were not wise—because, if I am not mistaken, at the beginning of World War II, during which Alaska was invaded by the forces of Imperial Japan, the only guns in Alaska pointed toward our good ally, Canada, which fought side by side with us during that war. Furthermore, if I am not mistaken, at the beginning of World War II the only artillery in Alaska was at Chilkoot Barracks; and the guns were pointed, not toward Imperial Japan, which invaded Alaska, but toward the little border post of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police near Pleasant Camp, British Columbia, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. BARTLETT. The accuracy of the Senator's memory cannot be challenged and is greater, I am sure, than the accuracy of the guns he mentions.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I suppose the assumption was that in World War II our enemy would be Canada, rather than Japan.

So it is obvious that correct forecasts have not always come from the Pentagon or its predecessor.

I should like to mention one thing about the policies in connection with our military services that has disturbed me: I believe that many times we repeat mistakes which previously have been made in the course of our history. I remember that when I was in high school, the statement was made again and again, by many persons, "In the next war, both capital and men will be drafted; and no one will become a millionaire at the cost of blood, sacrifice, and suffering." If I heard that said once, I heard it said a hundred times. It was repeated on the Fourth of July, in conventions of the American Legion, conventions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in other conventions, and here in the Congress, and generally throughout the country.

But let us consider the situation which exists today: The Congress is considering an extension of the draft law. I will vote with some reluctance for that measure, as will the two able Senators from Alaska. But 2 weeks ago there appeared in the business section of the New York Times a very interesting article which pointed out that on the New York Stock Exchange many of the leading stocks were those of companies which were making missiles, jet plane fuels, electronic equipment for the Armed Forces, and all the other military items that our boys will have to use, perhaps in mortal combat. These stocks have had record rises.

Today we are spending annually on armaments more than we spent each year during the Korean war. Yet the excess-profits tax on the manufacturers of armaments, which was invoked during the Korean war, has been suspended.

Last week I introduced four tax bills. One was to restore the excess-profits tax. If we are going to vote for a 4-year extension of the draft, with all that this implies for the young men of this country, then I think the Senate and the House of Representatives—although of course such legislation must originate in the House of Representatives—certainly should study the imposition of some ceiling on the profits of those who will manufacture the jet planes, the tanks, the nuclear submarines, and the nuclear aircraft carriers in which some of our boys may unfortunately lose their lives or be maimed.

Recently, I noticed that the workhorse airplane of World War II—the B-17 Flying Fortress—was stated as costing \$188,000. The jet planes which have replaced it in the bombing field today cost approximately \$7 million. Just compare \$7 million with \$188,000. The largest submarines we had in World War II cost approximately \$8 million or \$10 million, whereas the nuclear-powered *Nautilus* cost approximately \$65 million.

If I am not mistaken—and I speak entirely from memory—the great aircraft carrier *Lexington*, of World War II, cost approximately \$90 million. We have on the drawingboards at this time aircraft carriers which will cost between \$350 million and \$400 million.

The other day I saw a statement by one of our leading military officials—and again I speak from memory—that a jet fighter plane costs the Government more than if it were made entirely from solid silver, at the prevailing market price of silver.

So I say that if we vote for an extension of the draft of the young men of the United States, certainly we should consider placing some ceiling on the profits of the manufacturers and industries who are making the weapons of war.

There has been a great deal of oratory about this matter, but there has been relatively little action in connection with it. I recognize that the distinguished chairman [Mr. RUSSELL] and the other members of the Armed Services Committee cannot do anything directly about it, any more than the rest of us can, because this subject comes within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

But I call the matter to the attention of the Senate because I believe it involves a moral issue of great proportions. It also involves an economic issue, because today the bulk of the \$77 billion budget, which is so controversial, goes for military weapons and military hardware of one kind or another. Under these circumstances, I believe we should restore the excess-profits tax on the manufacturers of the weapons of war. It certainly would help our taxpayers.

I wish to thank my good friend, the Senator from Alaska, for bearing with me and for being so sympathetic and indulgent with his time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement I have prepared on my views on the draft—which I am happy to say are similar to those of the Senator from Alaska—and an editorial entitled "A Look at the Draft," which was published on February 4 in the Washington Post, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

Critics of the draft have contended that it—

1. Creates a cloud of uncertainty which hangs over the heads of young men 18½ through 26 years of age, prohibiting them, in many cases, from making firm vocational, educational or matrimonial plans.

2. Causes inequities as between young men eligible for selective service. It is pointed out that there are approximately 2,200,000 1A's in the pool now and that about 1,200,000 youths reach the minimum draft age annually. In 1960, this figure is expected to reach 1,300,000. By 1965, it is predicted that it will be nearly 2 million. Some 660,000 persons enter the services each year; 180,000 are inductees. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch noted recently: "Thus, chances are excellent the vast majority of the class that attains military age will not

see service. This is not fair to those who are drafted or who volunteer."

3. Fails to provide the services with the type of personnel they require—persons with an aptitude for special training and who intend to make a career of the military—but instead encourages manpower waste, lowers troop morale, reduces leadership quality, and fosters complacency about the system.

I am not a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and do not have the background of service with that group which would enable me to assess confidently the validity of these claims. However, I have observed that many persons with a professional competence to analyze these questions have attested to the need to explore in depth our present military manpower policies. I believe that such an investigation would be highly beneficial. Although I intend to vote for the extension of the draft, because I believe that it would not be wise to repeal this law at such a crucial time in the affairs of our country unless a substitute is provided, I wish to state that I will support legislation which would establish a detailed and comprehensive study of military personnel procurement policies and alternatives to the draft; and if such a group should find that basic alterations are necessary or desirable, I will then urge their enactment.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1959]

A LOOK AT THE DRAFT

Before Congress automatically adopts a long-term extension of the military conscription law, it ought to take a careful and critical look at the way in which the draft has been operating. When draft calls take only a small fraction of the total number of eligible young men and the great majority avoid military service, a very serious question of fairness arises. John Graham notes in a study for the Fund for the Republic that "because of either disability or fatherhood, more than 60 percent of all non-prior servicemen" were being deferred in early 1957 and "there is no reason to believe the picture has changed since then, or will change in the future."

Actually, the Army is the only one of the military services using the draft. It calls approximately 8,000 a month, of whom fewer than 7,000 are inducted for the 2-year period. Some 90,000 young men each year take advantage of the plan for 6 months of active training and 5½ years of Reserve or National Guard service; and of course there are many thousands of others who volunteer for service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. All in all, however, the burdens and obligations are distributed very unequally among the 1.2 million young men who come of military age each year. Some have their education, career, or family plans disrupted while many others make no national sacrifice at all.

The House Armed Services Committee has reported a simple 4-year extension of the draft beyond June 30. There is something to be said for using such means to avoid harangue over new plans for additional deferments and special-interest concessions. But there is a great deal more to be said, in our opinion, for the approach of Representative WOLF, of Iowa. Mr. WOLF's bill would provide for a 2-year draft extension, but a concurrent resolution would require an intensive study by a joint congressional committee of military manpower procedures and alternative methods of meeting the needs.

This newspaper has long supported both the draft and the concept of national service. It does not share the views of those who feel that the country's youth is being stereotyped or "prussianized"; indeed, it believes that most young men benefit in one way or another from their military service.

But it recognizes also that there is now no chance of fulfillment of the universal military training plan which Congress approved 8 years ago. With the changing character of war, UMT probably has been outmoded; moreover, it would be extremely costly.

Now, the Army makes some compelling arguments, in which it is supported by the other services, that a draft law is necessary on the books whether or not it is fully utilized. A recent study shows that the Air Force and Navy benefit notably in the caliber of their volunteer enlistees because of the draft; and the Army obtains higher quality men than might otherwise be the case.

Furthermore, the contention that there will be no more Koreans is highly dubious. It is impossible to predict the exact needs of limited war. If the Reserves and National Guard are worth anything, their requirements cannot be overlooked. The assertion that higher rates of pay for the lower ranks would attract an all-volunteer force rather begs the question of national obligation. Does the United States really want to abandon the concept that each young man owes some service to his countrymen? What would be the effect of higher pay scales in the countries where American forces are stationed abroad? And what would be the result in NATO, which is having trouble maintaining its strength, of an American decision to end the draft?

Plainly such questions demand thoughtful consideration, and we think there is strong reason for Congress to extend the draft temporarily. But the country also needs to determine whether the draft is the best way of meeting the problem—and whether, alternatively, if there is value in the concept of national service, it ought to be expanded beyond military conscription to include an overseas technical service corps, a scientific corps, a civil defense corps, a conservation corps and the like. It is a delusion to think that there is an easy or even a wholly satisfactory answer. Surely, however, while Congress is attending to the immediate need, it ought to provide for conscientious, unemotional examination of the possibility of some less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance upon the draft.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his helpful contributions to the debate; and I commend him for his wise observations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota obtained the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to yield to the Senator from Maryland, for as long a time as he may need, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota may be recognized immediately following the statement of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I believe we should run the Senate one way or the other. If we are going to have a list of Senators to be recognized, we ought to abide by that list. If we are not going to have a list, Senators ought to be recognized as they address the Chair. I tried to be recognized for a half hour. I was not recognized. Then I was put on the list. Then the Chair did not use the list. The Senate should be run one way or the other.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Maryland is recognized and may proceed.

APPEASEMENT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, today we are reminded of one of the most disgraceful acts of appeasement in contemporary history. Some 20 years ago a tall, angular man in a bowler hat, carrying the familiar umbrella, returned to England from Munich proclaiming "peace in our time." Shortly thereafter the world erupted into World War II and the black umbrella became a universal symbol of submission to a power-crazed former corporal in the German Army who sought to Prussianize the earth.

The grave question we must face in this the year 1959 is: "Will history repeat itself?" Prime Minister Macmillan has just returned from conferences in Moscow with Nikita Khrushchev. And, although he was subject to snubs and insults from the Soviet chief of state, it would appear that, through fear, he is now preaching "disengagement" and "flexibility" in the solution of the Berlin problem. He is currently trying to sell this appeasement line to De Gaulle, and when he comes to the United States next week it is clear that he will try to get the President of the United States to buy it.

Now, Mr. President, please do not misunderstand me. I believe Mr. Macmillan is completely sincere in his endeavor to lessen the tensions which prevail between East and West on the subject of Berlin. But I also think it is vitally important that the initiative, so far as any negotiations are concerned, remain with this Nation. I respectfully submit that we must not make the same mistake a Briton by the name of Neville Chamberlain made two decades ago. The Berlin situation, if mishandled, could touch off the most hideous war in the history of civilization. It could, indeed, prove to be the end of civilization as we know it.

To prevent such a holocaust we must stand fast. To retreat on Berlin would be just as disastrous as was the retreat from Munich. Our President has called for no surrender, and it behooves every Senator, every Representative, and every American citizen, to align himself squarely behind him and back his stated position. He has left the door open for peaceful solution of the powder-laden Berlin issue, but he has stoutly refused to be browbeaten into submission to the ruthless Communists. The President's position is the right position. He will negotiate, but he will not surrender. He will not forsake principle in the face of saber-rattling and veiled threats. He will steadfastly respect the commitments made in good faith by this Nation. To do otherwise would be to sell the entire free world out to international communism.

Mr. Macmillan has arrogated to himself the right to speak, not only for Great Britain, but for these United States, and France, and the West German Republic, and all other countries allied with us to stem the Red tide. I do not believe that a man who has indicated his willingness to make concession after concession at the conference table is representative of either our point of view or the viewpoints of our other friends. The American people have every right to resent being spoken for by a man from another land. American taxpayers, after all, have been carrying that part of the world on their backs for some time.

It is only logical—yes, it is in the best interests of world peace—that Dwight David Eisenhower be recognized as the chief spokesman for the West. When the time comes to sit down and negotiate with the Russians, there will be no room for doubt as to where he stands. There is no such word as "retreat" in his vocabulary, and it is fortunate for the Western World that this is so.

Let us in the Congress, then, give him the unqualified support he richly deserves not only as President, but also as the world's most outstanding military leader. Let us resist with all our might suggestions, from whatever source, that smack of appeasement. Let us not be deceived by the innocuous words "disengagement" and "flexibility," for actually their definition is retreat. Indeed, Senators, retreat can spell disaster.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF COLORADO BLUE CROSS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I believe that the people throughout this country will be interested in the progress of Colorado's pioneering effort to establish a medical care program for our public assistance beneficiaries. The administration of this excellent plan has already attracted nationwide attention from health and welfare agencies. Our State welfare department utilized the Blue Cross administrative facilities and their participating hospital agreements to implement the plan.

I feel that their record is one which will interest my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the 21st annual report of the executive vice president, Thomas Tierney, be reprinted in the RECORD at this point, together with a letter from Mr. Tierney, so that Senators may more easily study it.

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

TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, COLORADO HOSPITAL SERVICE

The year 1958, which marked the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Colorado Blue Cross plan, was a year of significant plan progress and achievement. It is a privilege to report that progress and achievement to the people of the State of Colorado.

Continued public acceptance and approval of the Blue Cross philosophy of prepayment was evidenced by the increase of our membership to embrace a total of 616,715 residents of the State. Continued service to our 84 participating hospitals was apparent in our total payment of \$15,125,263

for hospital services—an increase of almost \$2½ million over the payments made in 1957.

From the standpoint of the staff, the outstanding event of the year was the occupation of our new office building. Despite the expansion of our services, and the additional personnel required in the administration of the State's medical care plan for pensioners and the Federal Government's hospital benefit program for service-men's dependents, the increased efficiency afforded by the new building made it possible for us to reduce our operating expense ratio to 4.7 percent of income; so that 95.3 percent of every dollar we received was returned to our members in the form of hospital payments or in additions to minimum required reserves for future hospitalization. The building is, in a very true sense, a tribute to the subscribing public, to the voluntary hospital system, and to the members of the medical profession who, through mutual cooperation and effort, have found in Blue Cross and its companion plan, Blue Shield, a reasonable and realistic method of financing the health requirements of the community.

It seems to have become a vogue in recent months to level criticism at the voluntary hospital system of America. While an objective analysis of the various articles which have appeared during the last year indicates that the alleged complaints have little relationship to the basic health care provided in modern hospitals, still the publication of such articles continues. Those of us who are privileged to work closely with the hospitals and with their administrative personnel know the complexities of modern hospital administration. Hospitals today are tremendous health centers to which sick persons go to secure all of the benefits of modern medical science, and from which they emerge restored to sound health and a productive role in the community. The costs are high, but the life-saving and health-restoring services are worth every cent involved. It seems only appropriate that we salute the hospitals whose services our members utilize, for their constant effort to make every facility which modern medical science devises available to all of the people at a price which they can afford.

To the hospitals of Colorado we pledge our continued support, and to the people of Colorado we pledge our continued effort to render an ever-expanding service.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS M. TIERNEY.

COLORADO BLUE CROSS,
COLORADO HOSPITAL SERVICE,
Denver, Colo., February 25, 1959.

Senator GORDON L. ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: For the past several years, it has been my pleasure to furnish you each year with a copy of our current annual report. You will find the report of our 1958 operations enclosed. Without question, the most significant development in the field of health care financing, not only locally but nationally, during the past year was the inaugural of Colorado's old-age pension medical care program. It has already attracted nationwide attention, and will undoubtedly be watched with great interest by health and welfare agencies throughout the country. We are very proud of the fact that the State welfare department saw fit to utilize our administrative facilities and our participating hospital agreements in the implementation of the plan and I think the record, to date, amply supports the wisdom of their judgment.

During the year 1958, we paid out the total sum of \$3,804,970.84 to the hospitals of Colorado for the care of 16,652 hospitalized pensioners. The total cost of our administration

of this hospital care program was approximately eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total hospital expense involved, and even this minimum expense was virtually erased entirely by our being able to refund to the State welfare department its proportional share of the adjustment amounts derived from our routine semiannual audits of the participating hospitals operating costs. Certainly Colorado has led the Nation in developing at least a partial solution to the ever-growing problem of providing basic health care for the constantly increasing number of old persons.

Over 700,000 persons in our State, including the old-age pensioners and the servicemen's dependents for whom we administer the Government's Medicare plan, now enjoy the benefits of Blue Cross membership. I suppose it is true that few businesses in the State have as many people directly interested in their operations as we do. Let me assure you that we are very vitally aware of the tremendous responsibility that such widespread public acceptance entails. If there is ever any occasion when you might have a question with regard to our organization or its administration, it will be a privilege for me to provide the answers for you.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. TIERNEY,
Executive Director.

AGITATION OF ANTI-U.S. RIOTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Red Student Agitators Seen Fomenting Anti-U.S. Riots," written by David Lawrence, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 4, 1959.

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

RED STUDENT AGITATORS SEEN FOMENTING ANTI-U.S. RIOTS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 3.—And now it's trouble in Bolivia. Yesterday it was in Cuba, and before that in other Latin-American countries where hostility against the United States was artificially intensified by the Communists.

Unfortunately, maneuvers of the Communists in the cold war are usually pooh-poohed by too many people in this country, despite bold propaganda operations that are obviously planned with care. When the anti-Nixon incidents occurred on the Vice President's tour of South America, it was conceded, of course, that an antagonism such as was manifested against the United States could readily have been brought into the open without the slightest stimulus by the Communists. But this was no reason to ignore the impetus given anti-American sentiment there or anywhere else in the world by the Communists.

It so happens that this week an article reporting an alleged remark by a minor American official was published in a magazine reaching Bolivia from the United States. The idea that a chance comment in a magazine, circulating a relatively small number of copies in that country, could produce a riot against the U.S. Embassy and cause the evacuation of its personnel is too fantastic to believe. Only an organized conspiracy by those malcontents with a desire to focus international attention on relations between the United States and an important South American country could have brought about the tragic episode.

CITES DEMANDS BY PANAMA

The other day in Congress, Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania,

declared that Communist influence is back of some of the demands being made by the Government of Panama for an extension of its territorial waters which would adversely affect American rights in the Canal Zone. He said:

"Those in charge of the Communist movement in Latin America, and especially in the Caribbean area, have undoubtedly focused their conspiratorial activities on the Panama Canal with the purpose of causing destruction of amicable relations between the United States and Panama, with complete liquidation of United States control over the Canal itself."

Nor is Communist activity confined to any one part of the globe. It is noticeable just now in Africa, where fuel is being added to the flames of nationalism. It is operative also in the Far East. A few days ago a United Press International dispatch dated Manila said:

"The Foreign Office warned yesterday it has received reports pointing to growing infiltration by Communists among the Philippine student population."

"Foreign Secretary Serrano conveyed the warning to Representative Lenardo Perez, chairman of the house committee on anti-Filipino activities, and told him to put his committee on alert."

REDS AMONG STUDENTS

The pattern of student infiltration is worldwide. In Latin America, in particular, many of the anti-American demonstrations have originated in the colleges. To plant young leaders who will use any provocation to work up passionate outbursts is a relatively easy device. It has been revealed in Cuba in the so-called youth movement. While the top officials there vehemently deny that the Communists have anything to do with the Fidel Castro regime, it is an open secret in Havana that the Communists are busy causing mischief wherever they can in the little Republic which is struggling to recover from the ill effects of the Batista dictatorship.

In the Middle East the Communist plotters have been more successful than anywhere else. Everyone who has watched the situation in Egypt is aware that the Communists have played an active part there in anti-Western demonstrations. The Nasser government, which at first welcomed such supporters, now is troubled by them. Iraq is an example of a successful conquest by the Communists of a country which until recently was one of America's staunchest friends.

Despite the denunciations of anything that even remotely resembles an intervention in their own domestic affairs, the Soviets are spending hundreds of millions of dollars fomenting internal trouble inside many of the countries sympathetic with the West.

In the United States, the effects of some of the insidious operations by Communists are more and more noticeable. Having won many a big battle in the courts through the aid of legal technicalities, the Communists have continued to plant their propaganda in important places and among groups which are gullible and naive, thus enlarging the scope of the Soviet propaganda drive.

Sooner or later the American people will come to realize that the Communists are succeeding in their infiltration of many countries and are dangerously impairing the relations between the United States and peoples in different parts of the world who normally would be very friendly to the people of this country. It's a significant type of fighting in what has been misnamed the cold war.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION SUBSIDIES

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at

this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Rural Electrification Subsidies," which was published in the March 1959, First National City Bank monthly letter on business and economic conditions.

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

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION SUBSIDIES

The controversy over President Eisenhower's plan to help balance the budget by eliminating the Federal interest rate subsidy to borrowers from the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) provides a compelling illustration of how hard it is to withdraw Federal assistance once people have become used to it. The President's proposal, made in his January budget message, was simply that "the present statutory interest rate of 2 percent for loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration be replaced by a rate which will cover the current cost to the Treasury of equivalent-term borrowing and other reasonable costs." The Treasury, which provides the funds which the REA lends, has recently been paying up to 4 percent to sell its securities.

The President's proposal immediately drew fire and in a speech before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, whose members borrow from the REA, he gave assurances that "this recommendation would not raise interest rates . . . on outstanding REA loans" and that it was not intended to be harmful in any way to rural electric cooperatives. Nevertheless, the association adopted resolutions asking Congress to protect the 2 percent rate on REA loans and calling for still more Government aid.

Congressional leaders gave warm support to the association's position. A New York Herald Tribune dispatch reported that Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON urged the Members to "fight with beer bottles" if necessary to keep their advantages. Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN said flatly: "If 2 percent interest is a subsidy, then I am for a subsidy for that." Explaining his stand, he added, "why not a little subsidy for the millions who, until a few years ago, were the underprivileged?"

The answer to Speaker RAYBURN's question was given by the President in his speech to the Rural Electric Cooperative Association. He pointed out that Government benefit programs are designed to insure that no group of citizens is unfairly handicapped. Once the handicap is overcome, justification for Federal assistance is no longer there.

THE REA'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The fact is that the Rural Electrification Administration has done its work so well that the underprivileged it was designed to serve are underprivileged no longer. The REA was set up in 1935 in the midst of the great depression to put up money for local cooperatives to finance rural electrification. At the time only 10.9 percent of the 6.8 million farms in the United States were receiving central-station electric service.

Today, 24 years later and after the provision of \$3.8 billion, REA electrification loans and a vast expansion of service by private utilities, most of the rural electrification job has been done. More than 95 percent of U.S. farms now have central electric service.

Recently REA has been enlarging on its original purpose of financing the distribution of power to rural consumers. Thus, loans to finance distribution and consumer facilities accounted for no more than 65 percent of the \$242 million REA electric loan total in fiscal '58. Financing generators for cooperatives, once rejected as a last resort by REA in favor of encouraging the purchase of private power, and construction of transmission lines took \$86 million in fiscal 1958.

With the growing emphasis on generating and transmission facilities has come a tendency of REA borrowers to compete with existing privately owned utilities for industrial and commercial customers. In the past 5 years the commercial and industrial business of all REA cooperatives has doubled. Three out of four new customers are nonfarm.

Meanwhile, under a 1949 congressional authorization, the REA has taken on the additional task of financing rural telephone service and through June 30, 1948, had made available \$478 million for this purpose.

Borrowings of the cooperatives regularly exceed repayments so that their financing has involved a continuing drain on the Treasury. The President would make available, in his fiscal 1960 budget proposals, \$268 million to increase loans to the electric cooperatives and \$104 million for new telephone loans, as well as \$9.6 million for REA administrative expenses. But, as stated earlier, he believes that the rate of interest paid should measure up to the Government's own cost of borrowing. Though the administration has recommended tightening up on tax treatment of cooperatives, the rural electric cooperatives do not at present contribute significantly to Federal tax revenues. Financing their needs represents a part of the staggering burden of farm subsidies.

Meanwhile, the rural electric cooperatives have become sizable businesses. As early as 1946, REA Administrator Claude Wickard cited as the most important development of the year the fact that REA borrowers have become well-established, stable, mature business enterprises:

"Locally owned and locally operated cooperative groups—which numbered 918 of the 996 REA borrowers as the year ended—exemplify the ability and determination of America's farm people to solve their own problems. Many of these cooperatives are the largest business enterprises in their communities."

The biggest growth has occurred in the postwar period. Net worth of REA electric borrowers increased sevenfold from 1947 to 1957, from \$63.6 million to \$436.9 million. Although more recent figures have not yet been published, their net worth is undoubtedly higher today. In comparison, the net worth of privately owned electric utility companies doubled.

It is hard to deny the President's conclusion that we have reached a point where REA is no longer an infant enterprise.

BREAKING FAITH?

A question of integrity was raised by Senator JOHN KENNEDY when he assured the representatives of the rural electric cooperatives that Congress would not go back on our word by raising the 2 percent interest rate on REA loans. It is always desirable to have emphasis on integrity in public as well as private affairs. The fact is that, in the original Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the intent of Congress was that "all such loans * * * shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of 10 or more years."

The tendency of beneficiaries of Government benefits to perpetuate their favored status is what creates suspicion of new Government programs, however meritorious. They tend to go on and on, and cost more and more, as long as the taxpayer will stand for it. The President has set out the proper approach: "Ideally, in a federally sponsored and financed undertaking, it should be possible for the Government to step progressively aside as they reach the stage of self-sufficiency which enables them to move forward under their own sound management, ownership and financing."

The President's objective in curbing subsidies and balancing the budget is to avoid

breaking faith with the American people in the most fundamental sense. As he put it to the Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

"Shall Government live within its means, shall our citizens, in a prosperous time, meet the cost of the service they desire of their Government?"

"Or is it to be our established policy to follow the ruinous route of free republics of the ages past, the route of deficit financing, of inflation, of taxes ever rising, until all initiative and self-reliant enterprise are destroyed?"

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if it will be agreeable to the majority leader to have the committee amendment acted on at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to add a new section, on page 2, beginning in line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, are there any further committee amendments? If not, I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only other amendment of the committee to be acted on is the amendment of the title.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, copies of my amendment have been placed on every desk. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Add at the end of the bill the following new section:

"COMMISSION ON MILITARY MANPOWER"

"SEC. — (a) There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the 'Commission on Military Manpower' (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Commission') whose function it shall be to carry out the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

"(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President within 60 days after the effective date of this Act. Four members of the Commission shall be appointed from civilian life and three from personnel of the Armed Forces serving on active duty. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission appointed from civilian life as Chairman.

"(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original ap-

pointment was made. Four members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(d) (1) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

"(2) Each member of the Commission who is an officer or employee of the United States shall receive no additional compensation for his services as a member of the Commission, but he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(e) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such personnel as it deems necessary to carry out its duties.

"(f) It shall be the function of the Commission to make a comprehensive study and investigation of—

"(1) the operation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the Reserve programs, and the programs of procurement of military personnel by the Armed Forces;

"(2) means and methods of improving utilization and assignment of personnel of the Armed Forces; and

"(3) alternatives to the system of induction of civilians for military training and service as a method of maintaining the required strength of the Armed Forces.

"(g) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government information, statistics, data, suggestions, and other matter for the purposes of this section; and each such department, agency, or independent establishment is authorized and directed to furnish any of the foregoing matter directly to the Commission upon request of the Chairman of the Commission.

"(h) The Commission may from time to time report to the President and shall, not later than January 31, 1961, submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall thereafter from time to time make such further reports and recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1963.

"(i) Expenditures of the Commission shall be defrayed out of funds appropriated to the Executive Office of the President."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the Senator will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will yield with that understanding.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota may yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, and that the Senator may not lose his right to the floor thereby.

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

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceed to call the roll.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the bill pending before the Senate deals with the lives of some 10 million men who are at present registrants under the Selective Service Act, and, prospectively, in the 4 years ahead, for which the act would be extended, would deal with another 4 million young men.

In addition, it deals with the life of the Nation, which is to be secured by the implementation of the act in our Military Establishment.

That the draft should be extended under the present world circumstances seems beyond practical dispute or debate. The act now on the statute books will expire the 1st of July 1959. I have heard no particular argument—within the committee, at least—proposing that it not be extended. There was some difference of opinion as to whether the extension should be for 2 years or 4 years, but the major question discussed within the committee, in our executive hearings, had to do with the operation of the draft.

It is my personal feeling that the operation of the draft law could be improved, that a better use could be made of our manpower, and that a fairer administration could be obtained. It is for those reasons that I have offered the amendment which is now pending.

My amendment would create a Presidential commission, to be paid for out of the funds of the President, for a study of our manpower needs and problems and the administration of the Selective Service Act.

The amendment provides as follows:

(f) It shall be the function of the Commission to make a comprehensive study and investigation of—

(1) the operation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the Reserve programs, and the programs of procurement of military personnel by the Armed Forces;

(2) means and methods of improving utilization and assignment of personnel of the Armed Forces; and

(3) alternatives to the system of induction of civilians for military training and service as a method of maintaining the required strength of the Armed Forces.

The Commission would consist of seven members, to be appointed by the President within 60 days after the effective date of the act. Four members would be appointed from civilian life, and three from personnel of the Armed Forces serving on active duty.

Also, there are the usual provisions with regard to the employment of stenographic help and clerical assistants.

It is difficult for me to understand why anyone should hesitate to support this kind of proposal. I do not claim originality for it. The language I have submitted actually was drafted at the request of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I have changed it only in one particular, I believe, namely, to give the Commis-

sion the power to report from time to time to the President, along with the requirement in the original draft that a final report be submitted by a specified date. The senior Senator from Massachusetts knows that I am offering the amendment, and I am doing so with his assent in that respect. Because of the consideration of the 2-year and 4-year angle, I believe, he decided, not to offer the amendment in committee, although he did present it there for discussion.

In consideration of the urgency of the amendment, I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to comments which have been made during the consideration of this subject in the other body and during the hearings before our committee.

When the House of Representatives voted the extension of the Draft Act, Mr. John T. Norris, staff reporter for the Washington Post and Times Herald, carried this paragraph in his report on the action:

There was some support within the Pentagon before its submission to Congress for changes in the draft law because the manpower pool is steadily mounting, but administration chiefs and congressional leaders decided a simple extension of the law was preferable to opening up the complex law to legislative changes that might prove more troublesome than present defects.

In the face of it, if it was recognized that there were defects in the operation of the present draft law, who should have the responsibility of trying to amend it or improve it? If we are to extend it for 4 years, what is the logic of saying that we will not consider improving it because the changes might prove more troublesome than present defects, unless we make some effort to determine how and in what manner the law might be improved?

I recognize that there has been some argument of urgency in connection with the extension of the act. It is true that the act does not expire until the 1st of July. However, the great powers of the world today are considering their strength in an important crisis. There is value in the logic that at this particular time we should make sure that we have the strength we might need. It is good logic to say that we want to reassure our allies in this present world crisis, that we are standing in a firm position, and that we propose to be in a position to carry out whatever decision may be made.

That logic, however, has led to this situation: A bill for the extension of the draft was considered in the House committee for only a very short time, reported to the House, and there passed after 1 or 2 days' consideration.

In the Senate we have the situation that we held 3 days of hearings last week. Yesterday the bill was presented before the committee in executive session for markup. At the time I understood that it would not be brought to the floor of the Senate before Wednesday. Today we learn by the radio and the press that, because of the Legislative Calendar, it was decided to bring up the bill today.

Obviously, under those conditions, Members of the Senate have not had an opportunity really to review the printed hearings, which became available only today, the day the bill was brought to the floor of the Senate. Reporters, the press, columnists, and the people of the country generally have had no opportunity to learn that the Senate Committee on Armed Services had reported the bill, and react in time to suggest to Members of the Senate whatever opinions they may have before the bill comes before the Senate for final consideration.

It seems to me that all those arguments point to the fact that, if there are defects, if there are imperfections in the present law, or in its administration or operation, we should guarantee that there will be an opportunity for study of the operation of the act, and that recommendations will be brought to the attention of the President and the Congress. That is what the pending amendment proposes.

I find the following in Time magazine for January 26, 1959:

The most valid criticism of the draft as now operated is that it is inequitable. Of the Nation's 2,200,000 physically fit men in the 18½-to-26-year-old bracket, only 120,000 get grabbed by the draft each year. Thousands of others volunteer, but the fact is that in the skimpy-quota peacetime era it requires little imagination to think up a reason to be deferred, e.g., as a student, a farmer, a scientist, or a hardship case. Thousands of 17- and 18-year-olds exercise their alternative right of fulfilling military obligations with 6 months of active duty and 7½ years of weekly drill and summer camp in the Reserves or National Guard.

If we stop to think about it, the very fact that a national news magazine can print such a statement as "the most valid criticism of the draft as now operated is that it is inequitable," raises the question as to what argument can be presented against trying to remove some of the inequities, in a bill which deals with the lives of more than 10 million young men? In the very critical age period between the ages of 19 and 26, or 18½ and 35, depending upon how one looks at the period of liability, what would be more proper than that we should attempt to remove the inequities?

The Washington Post and Times Herald, in its February 4 issue said:

Plainly such questions demand thoughtful consideration, and we think there is strong reason for Congress to extend the draft temporarily. But the country also needs to determine whether the draft is the best way of meeting the problem—and whether, alternatively, if there is value in the concept of national service, it ought to be expanded beyond military conscription to include an overseas technical service corps, a scientific corps, a civil defense corps, a conservation corps, and the like. It is a delusion to think that there is an easy or even a wholly satisfactory answer. Surely, however, while Congress is attending to the immediate need, it ought to provide for conscientious, unemotional examination of the possibility of some less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance upon the draft.

Again, Mr. President, I ask the question: If an editor of a nationally read newspaper can make such a proposal,

surely Congress ought to provide for a conscientious, unemotional examination of a possibly less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance on the draft as it is presently constituted.

The proposal I make would make sure that such an unemotional and objective study would be made of the problem, and the Commission appointed would be directed to present its recommendations and reports to Congress.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator has been a Member of Congress, either in the House or in the Senate, for some time. Is it not true that every time we are considering an extension of the draft act we are in a period of crisis?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true. It seems that the one produces the other, or the one occasions the other. I do not know which it is. We generally act under the compulsion of a critical situation.

Mr. MORTON. I realize that we must make some improvements. I realize, also, that we have made improvements in the past when the law was extended. As the Senator has so ably stated, certain defects are contained in the present act. I agree with the Senator that Congress should correct those inequities. It seems clear that Congress will not do that at this time; that it will not take the time to take such action now.

Therefore I believe the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota is an excellent amendment. If a group will objectively study the problem, I feel sure that a more equitable plan can be devised than the present one.

I agree we must extend the act. However, I believe also that it could be extended in a way so that we would not upset the lives of so many young people and the lives of so many young families. At the present time the draft act is a kind of Damocles sword hanging over the heads of many young men.

The Danes have a universal military training system. However, I understand that Denmark uses a system under which the option is left to the young man as to when he will perform his service. The young man knows he must serve. He is given the freedom of deciding whether he will serve before he goes to college or after he goes to college, before he gets married or after he gets married, before he goes to law school or after he goes to law school. He can plan his life, and the choice rests with him, even though he knows he must serve. There is no sword of Damocles hanging over his head.

I understand that the system works fairly well. I understand that Denmark gets the right number of men in the various age groups into its armed services. Of course, I do not know whether it would work effectively in this country. However, it seems to me that we could work out a more equitable way of getting the manpower we need. I admit that we need a draft, and that volunteers will not take care of the situation. I repeat, I believe that we should devise

a system which will not upset the lives of so many young men and the family life of so many young people. For that reason I believe the approach the Senator from South Dakota is taking is a good one.

It is clear that we should set up a commission to study the problem and that then Congress should set up a system of drafting manpower which will not completely disrupt the lives of so many of our people. I commend the Senator, and I intend to support him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Kentucky. The Senator has put his finger on what we seek to do. It is to provide a way in which someone can unemotionally and in good time study the problem and come up with a better way of taking care of the situation.

With regard to the observation he has made about the inequity of the service, I should like to call his attention to the fact that at the end of fiscal year 1958, June 30, 1958, there were 9 million registrants under 26 years of age.

Of that 9 million, about $4\frac{1}{4}$ million were in service or in the Active Reserve service or had obligated service. The remaining 4,750,000 were still without training. Many of the $4\frac{1}{4}$ million who were without training, or 2.93 million, were nonfathers. Therefore only 3 million of the 9 million registrants under 26 years of age, as of June 30, 1958, were nonfathers and were not sharing the burden of responsibility of universal service.

It seems to me that the point the Senator has made about the system used by the Danes is a good one. Under it everyone makes the same contribution, and the individual can fit the responsibility into his own plans for life. It is certainly something that should be considered by the Commission, if one is set up.

That the authorities who testified before the committee recognized the inequities is evidenced by the fact that the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in his questioning of General Harrison, made this statement:

So there are a great many inequities in the program. I think it is beyond the power of mortal man to eliminate all the inequities in a program of this magnitude, but it certainly is incumbent on us to do as much as we can to see that this responsibility for the defense of the United States is distributed as widely as possible and is evenly imposed as we can on the young manhood of this Nation.

I see the distinguished Senator from Georgia nodding his head. I am sure he believes that inequities should be eliminated to the extent it is humanly possible to do so.

The Senate and the country have heard about the Cordiner report. Mr. Ralph Cordiner, who headed that committee of study for 18 months, dealt with pay and matters of that sort related to the armed services, and he made the statement that we devoted 25 percent of all military effort to training men who do not stay in the service. He was concerned with the waste under the present system.

At another point he said that he had found antagonism and bitterness over the draft and that men were checking off the days until they got out of the service.

Another aspect of the problem was suggested by Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, executive director of the Scientific Manpower Commission. In his statement he told the committee that his organization was a private organization founded in 1953 by the major scientific groups of the Nation. The work of the Scientific Manpower Commission had been recognized many times for the great contribution it had made in the study of the need for agricultural scientists, astronomers, biologists, chemists, earth scientists, mathematicians, physicists, and psychologists practicing in the clinical and experimental fields.

Dr. Meyerhoff testified before our committee last week. He said that the power granted to the Selective Service System to induct the young men must be extended. He also stated:

We further believe a 4-year extension is to be preferred over a 2-year extension. We do urge, however, that H.R. 2260 be amended so as to broaden the powers of the Selective Service System and to enable it, by statutory provision, to select men with critically needed skills for assignment to civilian activities that are essential to the national welfare and security.

Then he continued in some detail by supporting his recommendation that the system be given authority for the assignment of personnel to essential selective activities.

At the time the committee was considering the bill, I attempted to design a program which would equalize the service somewhat and would clarify the responsibility of the young men who register. I wrapped that up in an amendment, on which we did not have an opportunity to get opinions from the Department of Defense in any detail. However, it was suggested that the amendment be referred to the Secretary of Defense for comment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment, which I had tentatively drafted, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person may be inducted into an armed force (other than as a physician, dentist, or allied specialist), or enlisted into an armed force, after the date of enactment of this act and before July 1, 1963, only under one of the following programs which the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized to provide:

(1) A critically skilled person may be enlisted for 10 years, the first 3 months of which shall be served on active duty for training and the remaining 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ years shall be served in the Standby Reserve.

(2) A person may be enlisted for 7 years, the first 6 months of which shall be served on active duty for training and the remaining 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ years shall be served by satisfactory participation in the Ready Reserve.

(3) A person may be inducted for 5 years, the first 2 years of which shall be served on active duty, the next 2 years shall be served by satisfactory participation in the Ready Reserve, and the last year shall be served in the Standby Reserve.

(4) A person may be enlisted for 5 years, the first 3 years of which shall be served on active duty, the next 1 year shall be served by satisfactory participation in the Ready Reserve, and the last year shall be served in the Standby Reserve.

(5) A person may be enlisted for 4 or more years of active duty and if he so serves for 4 or more years, he has no additional obligation to serve.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the amendment sought to establish a fair relationship between the active duty time and the Ready Reserve liability and the Standby Reserve liability for the registrants under the act. At present, I think the chairman said, there are 30 different ways in which a young man might discharge his responsibility under the present act. Those ways are confusing and overlapping.

The period of liability varies, depending on whether one takes 6 months of active duty training before he is 18½ years of age, or takes it after he is 18½. The liability varies from service to service. It may be that there should be some distinction among the different services. But it has seemed to me that it would improve the situation if there were certainty, definiteness, and a clear statement of the responsibility, so that a young man might choose with his eyes open, so to speak.

The particular proposal embodied in the amendment which I am not now offering, but which I have had printed in the RECORD, so that it might be studied, would create a class A, in which one might enlist for 3 months of active duty and then go into the Standby Reserve for the balance of the 10-year period, during which he would be available for assignment in a number of employments in the scientific or technological field.

Class B would be the group which would take 6 months of active duty and then go into the Ready Reserve for 6½ years. This is comparable to the program which the National Guard now has, but makes the period 7 years total rather than 8.

Class C would embrace a 2-year enlistment or a 2-year induction with a Ready Reserve liability of 2 years following the 2 years of active duty, and 1 year of standby, but would give assurance that at the end of 5 years, under those circumstances, the liability would have been discharged or liquidated.

Class D would provide for a 3-year enlistment with 1 year of Ready Reserve liability and 1 year of standby following that. That would reduce the Ready Reserve liability by 1 year, but it would get for the Government 1 additional year of active duty.

It should be pointed out that this is important because the first 5 or 6 months of service goes into training. Under a 2-year enlistment or 2 years of active duty, a man gets only 18 months of actual active duty. With a 3-year enlistment, he gets 29 or 30 months of actual active duty. The Defense Department estimated that a 3-year enlistee costs a total of \$17,474. Estimating 29 months of effective service, his average cost for an effective month is \$603. Whereas a 2-year inductee provides only 17 months of effective service,

CV—238

his average cost for an effective month being \$706. In other words, the 2-year inductee costs more than \$100 a month more for his actual service than does the 3-year enlistee. That means it costs something more than \$3,000 more to obtain the same period of effective service.

The amendment on that point would also provide that if one served 4 years of active duty, he would have no reserve liability either in the Standby or the Ready Reserve.

I hope that Senators who are interested in the total problem will note the

amendment as it appears in the RECORD and will compare it with the present service.

For that purpose, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table which was prepared by a staff member of the committee, I believe, and dated February 6, 1959, showing methods of fulfilling the military obligation, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Methods of fulfilling the military obligation

| Major programs now in use | Age | Minimum active duty | Ready Reserve participation ¹ | Total military service ² |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Selective service (voluntary or involuntary induction) | 18½ to 25 years.... | 2 years..... | 2 years..... | 6 years. |
| Enlistment in active forces: | 26 to 35 years.... | do..... | None..... | 2 years. |
| Army..... | 17 to 34 years.... | 3 years..... | 1 year..... | 6 years. |
| Navy..... | 17 to 31 years.... | 4 years..... | do..... | Do. |
| Air Force..... | 17 to 34 years.... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Marine Corps..... | 17 to 28 years.... | 3 years..... | 2 years..... | Do. |
| Coast Guard..... | 17 to 5 years.... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| 6 months' active-duty-for-training program: | | | | |
| Army National Guard and Army Reserve. | 17 to 18½ years.... | 6 months..... | 3 years..... | 8 years. |
| | 18½ to 25 years.... | do..... | 5½ years..... | 6 years. |
| | 26 to 35 years.... | do..... | 2½ years..... | 3 years. |
| Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve. | 17 to 18½ years.... | do..... | 7½ years..... | 8 years. |
| | 18½ to 25 years.... | do..... | 5½ years..... | 6 years. |
| Marine Corps..... | 17 to 18½ years.... | do..... | 4½ years..... | 8 years. |
| | 18½ to 25 years.... | do..... | 5½ years..... | 6 years. |
| Coast Guard..... | 17 to 18½ years.... | do..... | 7½ years..... | 8 years. |
| | 18½ to 21 years.... | do..... | 5½ years..... | 6 years. |
| Other Ready Reserve enlistment programs: | | | | |
| Air National Guard..... | 17 to 18½ years.... | 11 weeks..... | Until age 28..... | Until age 28. |
| | 18½ to 25 years.... | do..... | 5 years, 41 weeks..... | 6 years. |
| | 26 to 35 years.... | do..... | 2 years, 41 weeks..... | 3 years. |
| Army Reserve..... | 17 to 25 years.... | 2 years..... | 2 years..... | 6 years. |
| Naval Reserve..... | 17 to 31 years.... | do..... | 3 years..... | Do. |
| Marine Corps Reserve..... | 17 to 25 years.... | do..... | do..... | Do. |

¹ Participation in Ready Reserve training is mandatory for members of the Army's Reserve components at the present time. The other services encourage voluntary participation on the part of members who have served 2 or more years on active duty. Members who do not participate may be retained in the Ready Reserve for the full military obligation if needed.

² Those personnel 26 years of age or older at time of enlistment do not incur a military service obligation under the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, but do obligate themselves to serve for the period of time set forth in the enlistment contract.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, just at a glance, anyone can see how much more complex and confusing, and possibly discriminatory, the present plan is as compared with the more simplified plan.

I ask unanimous consent, also, that a statement which I have prepared on the operation of the Reserve Forces Act under administrative decisions may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Because of some administrative decisions since enactment of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, I believe it is possible that an inequitable situation has developed in connection with the length of Active Reserve participation required by persons in various categories of service. Certainly, there is a degree of indefiniteness about the Reserve participation and I suspect that it might be desirable to legislate more particularly into the Reserve program.

One of the objectives of the committee has been the creation of a trained Reserve composed largely of persons who have not fought in a war or served long periods on active duty. This objective was accentuated by the inequities of recalling veterans for duty after Korea because there simply were no other trained people to call.

The Reserve Forces Act of 1955, which initiated the 6-month training program,

offered the opportunity to create a Reserve of this type. When the committee approved that act, it was our understanding that the inductees who served 2 years on active duty would participate actively in the Reserve for 3 years and then have 1 additional year of vulnerability in the Standby Reserve, for a total obligation of 6 years. The persons who voluntarily entered the 6-month training program before reaching the age of 18½ were to participate actively in the Reserve for 7½ years. This longer Reserve participation period was in exchange for their shorter period of active duty for training.

A Selective Service ruling that any person participating satisfactorily in a Reserve unit would not be inducted, had the effect of opening the 6-month training program to persons over the age of 18½. To make a distinction between persons who entered the 6-month training program before they were draft liable, the Department of Defense adjusted the period of active participation required. Inductees had their period of active duty participation reduced to 2 years. Persons who entered the 6-month training program before reaching the age of 18½ had their period of Active Reserve participation reduced to 3 years. Persons who entered the 6-month training program after reaching the age of 18½ were required to participate actively in the Reserve for 5½ years.

After the 6-month training program was opened to persons over the age of 18½, the number of young men deciding to enter this program was substantial. The Department of Defense did not accept enlistments in the 6-month training program up to the full potential of the program. The fact that the

6-month training program has not been utilized to the maximum raises some questions about the fairness of requiring Active Reserve participation by the relatively few persons who are inducted into the Armed Forces.

This situation, coupled with the administrative adjustments of the period of Reserve participation, has introduced an element of uncertainty into the Reserve problem.

For this reason, I have prepared a draft bill that I had thought I might offer as an amendment to this bill. Because the several provisions of law bearing on this problem are somewhat complex and interrelated, I have decided to seek the views of the Department on my proposal before pressing for its adoption.

I am aware that the authority for the 6-month training program for persons under the age of 18½ will expire this year and that a bill to extend it is liable to be considered. Before the committee acts on this bill, I hope that we may have an opportunity to consider carefully the equities of the several Reserve and active service programs, and that we may be able to introduce a greater degree of certainty to them so that the young men who must make the choice can do so on a more informed basis.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I could have read the statement, but in the interest of saving the time of the Senate this afternoon I have placed it in the RECORD. I may say, frankly, that it is impressive because of the confused state of mind in which it leaves one after he has read it. As a result of administrative decisions, the operation of the present law is very uneven.

During the past year, I point out, when the change was made in qualifications, some 79,000 men were discharged from active duty because of the raising of the mental requirements. It is true that one or two disciplinary barracks have been closed because of the higher quality, mentally, of the men who are now being taken into the service. But it must be obvious that that represents a shifting of the burden of liability for service. Not all of the 79,000 men who were dropped would have gone into disciplinary barracks; in fact, they were not in disciplinary barracks when they were released. They were doing the chores to which they were assigned. But when we get to the point that half the men who are registrants can look forward to not being called, it must be obvious that many men who are qualified do not share the burden equally with those who actually are called.

A Defense Department official—I think it was Mr. Finucane—testified that by the time they reach the age of 26, 9 out of 10 of those considered fit will have served in some capacity, but that situation will change in the next year by reason of the greater number of men who are coming on. It will be about 8 out of 10 of those who are regarded as fit under the new standards. Under the present rejection standards more than half the men have no prospect of being called. They will be eliminated by the increased standards.

It seems to me there are at least six ways in which the present law is defective. First, it is inequitable in its call. Second, it is inequitable in the reserve liability. Third, there is a failure to insure the meeting of the needs for scientific and technological talent. Fourth,

there is a failure to get the most active duty service for the dollars spent, which could be had if there were longer periods of voluntary enlistment. Fifth, there is a waste in manpower by the use of men for jobs for which they are not employing their best talents. Sixth, there is an economic and social loss in the life of the individual himself.

I certainly agree with the statement of the chairman of the committee earlier this afternoon that it becomes an easy excuse to say that there is some moral delinquency or delinquency of youth which is perhaps charged to the operation of the draft law, but which ought not to be so charged. At the same time, I think that in some individual lives there may be created a recklessness in attitude because of the feeling: "Oh, well; I am going to be drafted shortly anyway." I think there may be a delay in making plans. There may be a delay in accepting jobs. Certainly there are young men today who cannot get jobs because when they go to a prospective employer, he asks them, "Where do you stand under the draft?" If a man is unable to give a firm answer the employer—particularly the employer of a small number of persons—cannot afford to take the liability of restoring a man to his job after he returns from the service, if he is to be taken away at just about the time he has learned his job. That is certainly an economic loss.

There is an effect upon the young man himself. While I would not charge, nor do I believe, that juvenile delinquency is primarily attributable to the draft law, I think that in the lives of some young men the attitude of recklessness or the devil-may-care attitude is created, which results in a lower moral standard or a lesser determination to accomplish something than would be the case if he felt he could plan his own life.

It is because there are at least those six areas in which there is an inequity or a loss to the Nation or a loss to the individual or a loss to society that I feel someone should be studying the manpower problem, taking a look at it prior to the time when the time arrives for renewal of the law on the floor of Congress. A commission should be created, as suggested in the pending amendment, which would report from time to time to the President, and ultimately present to the President its specific recommendations for improvement.

Let us not delude ourselves into believing that the country is unaware of the need for improvement of the Draft Act. There is a sort of hopelessness, a sort of feeling, "Well, there is nothing that I, individually, can do about it." I know that is expressed in some of the letters I receive. But other Members of the Senate must receive, as I do, letters which implore us to do something about this matter, letters which indicate that the people feel that we have a responsibility in connection with it.

Recognition that the act is not perfect at the present time was given even in the testimony of Lieutenant General Her-

shey, the Director of Selective Service. In the course of his prepared statement he said:

I feel uneasy over our manpower situation.

Mr. President, these statements by General Hershey were made in the course of the formal, prepared statement he presented to our committee. They were not made in response to questions. Instead, they were made in the course of his formal statement to the committee.

He also said:

Millions of our young men have been told they have little, if anything, to contribute to their Nation's defense—because of physical or mental conditions. Others, fewer in number, while deferred in the national interest, are not fitting themselves to meet the day when their lives and the Nation's survival may be at stake.

We are not doing all we should do in preparation against possible nuclear attack. Our training for civil defense lags. Our reserves must be made ready. Our need to do things in preparation is great. Many of them we are not doing.

Much needs to be done, but many are doing nothing. We cannot afford to waste our manpower. There are services vital to survival which do not require a man to wear a uniform. It will add immensely to our chances for survival if we find a way to induce our citizens to give those services, especially those who for various reasons cannot now make their contribution within the military forces.

Mr. President, I do not know how anyone could make a statement which I would endorse more than that one by General Hershey, nor could I offer a statement which would be better evidence of the need for a manpower study commission.

It seems to me that such a study by the proposed manpower commission is the least we can provide for. If we do not have the time that is needed—if we must consider a bill at hearings, one week, and must mark up the bill the next week, and the next day must bring up the bill on the floor of the Senate, before Members of the Senate who are not members of the committee can familiarize themselves with the testimony taken at the hearings—then the least we can do is establish a study commission on manpower, which will be charged with the responsibility of studying the operations of the act and the provisions of existing laws, and then coming forward with recommendations for the improvement of our handling of the most precious resource we have—namely, the young men of our country, upon whom we depend in time of crisis.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill to extend the draft, without any weakening amendments.

I believe that today our military posture is so weak, and the determination of the administration to put money savings ahead of adequate defense is so strong, that at this time the Congress must demonstrate very definitely how it feels in regard to the manpower problem. With each succeeding day the clock ticks off the minutes and brings nearer the end of the "count down" on meeting the Berlin crisis.

It is gratifying to be able to present a united front in our refusal to abandon West Berlin. I am sure that our allies are heartened by the unanimous voice of the leaders of Congress over our determination not to sacrifice this island of freedom to the Communists of East Berlin or of Moscow.

This month is the 20th anniversary of Hitler's repudiation of the agreement reached with Chamberlain at Munich. Hitler violated it and abrogated it in March 1939. No one in this country wants another Munich.

While we must be willing to negotiate at the foreign ministers level, or even at the summit, experience dictates that in dealing with the Communists, as in dealing with Hitler, the effectiveness of such talks depends, not on the strength of our arguments, but on the strength of our armaments.

It is far, far later than we think in preparing for this crisis. Precious weeks have been wasted, and millions of words have been spoken about our good intentions and our right to stay in Berlin under our treaties with the Russians. But intentions or treaty rights are not enough.

On Sunday, I listened with great interest to the "Meet the Press" program in which Defense Secretary McElroy was interviewed by an able panel of newspapermen. If the opinions voiced by the distinguished Secretary represent the thinking of this administration—the President, the Chiefs of Staff, and the civilian heads of the Department of Defense—then we are pursuing a policy of complacency that will weaken dangerously our hand in any negotiations, whether at the summit or elsewhere.

I was particularly surprised and disappointed to hear Secretary McElroy minimize the importance of having an adequate airlift instantly available, should an emergency result as Russia turns over to the East German Communist Government control of access to West Berlin.

If I correctly understood the plain import of his statement, then our present policy is to rely primarily upon the capabilities of the Strategic Air Command to deliver a hydrogen bomb as our answer to any resistance we might meet on the road to Berlin.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Missouri, who long has advocated an adequate airlift, and for months has been the champion of that effort.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able colleague from Oklahoma. As is known by all Members of the Senate, he is the authority in this body on civil aviation.

I am very much interested in his reference to the program of last Sunday, in which the Secretary of Defense participated. My impression was that, in effect, the Secretary enunciated a reversal, and a return to the theory of massive

retaliation, which was originated in January 1954, and later, to the best of my knowledge, was abandoned. Am I correct in my impression? Did the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma receive a similar impression?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; I was frightened and surprised to hear the Secretary of Defense imply that an end has come to our previous policy of trying, of attempting to confine any conflict to a limited war, and to use only conventional forces, if necessary, so as to make sure that world war III would not be triggered off. I believe such a change in policy to be very dangerous, indeed; and I thank my colleague, who apparently received the same impression that I did from the Secretary's interview. The clear implication was that the Secretary of Defense virtually rules out the concept of a limited conflict and the possible use of conventional forces, should the access road to Berlin be closed. Certainly that is the strong impression that I received.

As Mr. Reston, of the New York Times, so ably pointed out, that represents a reversal of our time-honored policy of trying to keep all conflicts in the limited war category and to use conventional forces, rather than all-out hydrogen warfare, with its catastrophic results. The only sane policy for the United States to follow is to prevent, rather than trigger, such a conflict.

I am alarmed by the growing evidence of the administration's neglect of our conventional ground forces, discussed so ably yesterday by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I submit that not only do we lack adequate forces to meet local emergencies, but we are not developing the airlift capability required to insure that we can rapidly and efficiently apply conventional forces at points of danger.

That is why the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], formerly the Secretary of the Air Force, not only has spoken eloquently, but also succeeded in having \$140 million added to the appropriations made last year—as a result of his recognition of this very grave deficiency in our airlift capabilities.

A flagrant example of the failure to appreciate the importance of our military airlift potential is the postponement of the tactical airlift exercises—which were to be conducted jointly by the Military Air Transport Service and the Army, this month—due to lack of operational and maintenance funds in the MATS budget.

Now I yield to my distinguished colleague from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, thanks to the very able chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL], who happens to be present on the floor, and the able chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, the majority leader, we did put in the last appropriation bill an item for \$140 million for airlift. That was done after extensive hearings, which my friend from Georgia will remember.

This administration, despite the possibility that something might happen,

as has happened now with regard to Berlin, not only did not spend one cent of that money, but, at least up until a few days ago, had no plans for spending it. I am sure that is what the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has reference to.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have. I think it is a shame that we have not developed a more adequate airlift with which to deliver forces at points of emergency. That aspect of defense has been completely disregarded, despite the determination of the very distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the distinguished Senator from Missouri. Now, in view of the neglect to spend the \$140 million to make plans to buy the airplanes we need, the cancellation of the exercise to test the airlift capability which was scheduled for March seems to me to be reaching a new low in defense planning.

This exercise was to test the combat capabilities of the Military Air Transport Service to reach a simulated area of combat with men and supplies at the earliest possible moment. The exercise also was to include the calling up without notice of the planes and crews of regularly scheduled airlines and other nonscheduled carriers to supplement the MATS airlift on a reserve basis.

I do not believe that MATS ever has had a chance to engage in such pre-training for its combat mission. I further doubt that MATS will be able to handle efficiently, on a D-day basis, the vast number of movements required without the practice provided by such tactical exercises.

The Air Reserve fleet, composed of dozens of planes listed by airlines, and their crews, has never undergone such exercises to determine whether they could be assembled and placed on the job under simulated mobilization conditions.

This exercise is as essential to training the MATS organization as it is for the Marine Corps to train in amphibious landings, or for the infantry to engage in war games.

The current cancellation also bears out my feeling that the genuine mission of MATS, and its combat capabilities, has been subordinated to the job of running the world's largest airline to the neglect of its combat readiness. Actual training, under simulated emergency conditions, is necessary if MATS is to be ready for the herculean task that would be thrust upon it if a limited war should break out in some distant part of the world.

When I asked questions as to what it would cost, I was told it would run as high as \$1 million. I pointed out that the planes are available, as are the crews and the pilots, in the MATS fleet. I pointed out everything is available except the scheduling of the exercises. I was told MATS could not afford it because it would require MATS airplanes to be in the air 8 hours a day, and they could not afford the cost out of the gasoline, maintenance, and operating funds which MATS has.

I expect we shall go along and be satisfied with an airlift that has never been tried under simulated combat conditions or that has never been tried so far as

supplying necessary equipment to support our troops as would be necessary if they had to be deployed in a trouble spot somewhere in the world.

It is my earnest hope that we can maintain conventional forces, and the airlift to deliver them, to provide an alternative both to doing nothing and to a hydrogen war. That is our choice today—to have nothing or to have a hydrogen bomb war—and I do not think America wants to make that choice.

America's airlift potential might be the determining force in peaceful settlement of the Berlin dispute. Yet we weaken our hand in the cold war for lack of the extra \$1 million which would have been required for extra gasoline, maintenance, and other operating costs.

The dominating position occupied by Khrushchev does not arise from the strength of any moral position, nor from any treaty rights. It arises from Russia's apparent superiority both in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles and of intermediate range ballistic missiles, and from their superiority in conventional ground forces in readiness.

For budgetary reasons we have taken a second place in the first category of weapons, and for manpower and budgetary reasons, a second place in conventional forces. Thus, we might be forced to a conference with the Communists at the real summit and the United States and free world in the valley.

We must not reduce our bargaining power further by continuing dangerous cuts in our military strength. By these economy moves, we run the risk of costs of millions of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars should our weakness lead to the outbreak of world war III.

The memory is too keen today of Munich and its disastrous results in accelerating, rather than preventing World War II, for us to follow the Chamberlain route and put a balanced budget ahead of balanced defense forces.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think the Senator from Oklahoma has made a great contribution in this important field. The Secretary of Defense, as I understood him, said that the Joint Chiefs of Staff felt that the airlift we now have is adequate. I look forward to questioning members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on that subject, as I do not believe that conclusion is accurate. Certainly, all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff do not think the airlift we now have available is adequate.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if it is not possible that one of the reasons why the Secretary of Defense was forced to fall back to the theory of massive retaliation, as he did in last Sunday's telecast, was that he knows that our Army is neither mobile nor modernized. By "mobile" I mean capable of being moved by air, with their combat equipment and their support. In effect, the Secretary is now admitting that the only thing we are probably in a position to do, if the Russians push their aggression with regard to

Berlin, would be to have a nuclear war. Is that what the Senator understood?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is exactly what I understood. The Secretary could not—and I was ashamed for him—tell Mr. Reston the number of divisions which would be available to NATO. If the Secretary of Defense does not know the number of divisions available to the free world, somebody ought to be doing night work and studying his lessons. If the Secretary of Defense does not know the small number of planes we have available for an airlift, somebody ought to be studying his lessons at night. If the Secretary does not know that the MATS organization has never been trained to move troops and equipment under emergency conditions, somebody ought to be studying at night and doing his lessons. America is in a distressing posture. We would go into a meeting in an even lower posture, whether it be a meeting of the foreign ministers or a meeting with Mr. Khrushchev, if we went to that meeting and had to look at two guns pointed at us, one being a deficiency in the missile field—which the Senator from Missouri has pointed out again and again—and the other gun being Russia's superiority in ground troops, with the capacity to have them in readiness.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke, made a talk in which he said that in all probability the next war would not be a nuclear war. The President of the United States went out of his way later on to single out that talk for praise. At least by implication, it would appear that he was agreeing with the statement of the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke, that the next war in all probability would not be nuclear war.

Last Sunday the Secretary of Defense implied that if there were a war in all probability it would be a nuclear war.

I should like to ask my friend from Oklahoma, who has had more experience in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States than most, does he think the American people have a right, as they approach these problems from the standpoint of "We will not give an inch" to at least be clear as to whether this administration believes we should have a nuclear war in case we have to live up to our commitments or believes we should not have a nuclear war in case we have to live up to our commitments?

Does the Senator agree that we should not have conflicting statements particularly on such vital matters emanating from high civilian and military authorities of the Government?

Mr. MONRONEY. It seems to me instead of confusing our opponents, the Communists, we are confusing ourselves. It depends upon which paper we read whether we are going to be ready and prepared for the beginning of world war III—for the beginning of the awful and catastrophic type of world war III

we have historically sought to prevent and, in the event of hostilities, have sought to limit.

I think the only implication we can take from the statement of the Secretary of Defense is that we are putting our loaded six-shooter on the table, when there is an argument about whether deuces were wild or were not wild on the last hand.

I certainly feel that this is no time to be creating an aura of uncertainty. The President in his press conference opposed the cries on the floor of the Senate for even a slight mobilization of our Reserves and for a discontinuance of the reduction of the Marine Corps, about which the able Senator from Missouri has spoken, as being saber rattling. I would rather rattle Marine Corps sabers than do atomic muscle flexing such as was done on the program by the distinguished Secretary of Defense. Which is the more dangerous? Is it more dangerous to call up a few Marines Reserves and to stop decimating those we have, or to have the Secretary of Defense so clearly imply—as I thought he did, and as I believe everyone who heard him to whom I have talked felt he did—that our reliance is on nuclear weapons if it becomes necessary to keep open the road to Berlin.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I concur with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and congratulate him for the clarity and soundness of the position he has taken this afternoon. Not too long ago one of the finest generals of the Army stated that we did not have half enough airlift capacity to handle a single local or limited defense action abroad. The general has now been retired from the Army. It is obvious that if we do not have half enough capacity to handle one problem in one place it would be relatively difficult to handle two or three problems in two or three places. Such a situation may well be what we shall soon face.

Mr. MONRONEY. And which the Secretary of Defense only Sunday said was a possibility we might face.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

I hope the able Senator from Oklahoma, who has been such a champion of military airlift, as well as a champion of an adequate civilian airlift, will continue to present this problem to the American people. In my opinion we are as short of airlift as we are of any other vitally needed defense equipment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague. I appreciate his leadership in this field as he has so ably demonstrated it in his support of the appropriation which was frozen.

Incidentally, while the armed services secured the \$140 million for airlift, it is said that we cannot afford to spend the money. We can afford, however, three \$5 million 707 jet planes which can be "pushed up" and used one for the President, one for the Secretary of State, and one in reserve.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me I should like to state it was the committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico which took the action to which I have referred. Thanks to the leadership of the Senator from New Mexico, the committee approved the \$140 million for the airlift. I was a junior member of that committee. Though the action had the full approval of the committee, not one cent of the money was expended. I believe that is a correct statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point I wanted to make. Someone is at fault, but surely it is not the Congress of the United States. The committee was not the only group to take that action. There was a unanimous judgment of the committee, and the Senate of the United States provided the airlift, which was supposed to be necessary.

Of course, all we can do is make the money available. We cannot make the administration spend the money, and it did not.

I feel that the Senator from Oklahoma is making a very great contribution. The best point is the fact that Congress itself has never been reluctant to proceed.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Congress is charged under the Constitution with the duty of raising armies and supporting them. That job has been done with the help of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Yet there is a production line at Long Beach, Calif., manufacturing the most modern cargo planes which our military people have today, operating on a half-time basis. The crisis in Berlin is not approaching us on a half-time basis; it is coming with the speed of sound. No one in the Pentagon, apparently, recognizes the present danger or is taking steps to meet it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to go a little further than the Senator is going in the present discussion. The Congress tried to provide, as was necessary, support for the National Guard. All the previous wars have been fought by men from the National Guard, from all the States of the country, and by men from the Reserves. So far as the Pentagon is concerned, those forces would be cut down, notwithstanding the fact that Congress provided enough money in the appropriation bill to take care of 400,000 National Guardsmen, whom the services are now trying to cut down to 370,000. The same is true with respect to the Reserve forces.

This not only affects missiles and airlift, but it affects the National Guard and the Reserves, which mean so much to the defense of our country, to our security, and the security of the individual States.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate very much what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has said. I only wish there were some way the Congress could make known the feeling which I believe is almost unanimous on both sides of the aisle, that this administration must

wake up; that it is later than we think; that America's danger is present, and upon us.

The best way to meet the problem is by beginning to at least get our muscles in a state of activity, so that we will have a position from which to bargain at the summit or at the foreign ministers' conference, instead of occupying a position of abject weakness.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. In line with the argument the Senator is making, I wonder if the Senator agrees we should seek to avoid having to be constantly threatening to engage in a thermonuclear war. Such a war is likely to be a war of complete extermination of both sides. For us to go along reducing our conventional strength, leaving ourselves in the position where we may have to resort to desperate means, constantly putting ourselves at a greater and greater disadvantage, may cause an aggressor to feel we are only bluffing. When we talk about engaging in the ultimate war of extermination between two nations, any person should be and would be extremely reluctant to take such a step as that, and that is true of the Soviet Union as well as of this country.

Mr. MONRONEY. Anyone who does that may be called upon to put up or shut up at some place in the discussion.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe that a religious country such as America, with the background of never having fired the first shot in a war, is going to be the first country to release the horror of the catastrophic deaths of tens of millions of people to keep the road open to Berlin. I should like to see us maintain a capacity to keep the road open to Berlin with conventional weapons and with an airlift, if necessary, because I would back up West Berlin. However, we fence ourselves in a corner from which there is no escape, when the Secretary of Defense talks about the overwhelming manpower superiority of the Sino-Russian group and admits our only weapon which might equal them is thermonuclear warfare.

Certainly Russia is not going to ignore the ability to put several divisions of good, well-equipped and well-prepared troops in the field, or to airlift other troops, equipped and ready to fight, in a Berlin emergency.

We do not have to go to the catastrophic route which would insure the outbreak of hydrogen world war III, but we have put more emphasis on a balanced budget than we have on a balanced national defense. Before it is too late, almost daily on the floor of the Senate I think we must call attention to the failures which we are experiencing, to keep this Nation strong enough to sit down with Khrushchev on a basis approaching equality, and bargain for the kind of open avenue to Berlin which will maintain treaty rights and the moral and ethical right we have to keep our troops there.

Mr. LONG. The Senator heard the President's state of the Union message,

as I did. I gathered that the logic of that message related to limited wars, and that the President was suggesting that we should try, if possible, to limit the size of any war which might break out. I hope he did not have in mind that the only way to limit it would be by our losing.

Mr. MONRONEY. Or by another Munich. This month is the 20th anniversary of Munich. We know from experience that when Chamberlain went to Munich, Hitler had the vision. He had an air corps. He had in being a tank corps, and Mr. Chamberlain and his umbrella made what he hoped would be "peace in our time." That was on September 30, 1938. Yet 6 months later, on March 15, Hitler completely abrogated the treaty of Munich and began his march.

We know that conferences are not won by weakness, and that no matter how great the diplomatic ability of our negotiators, when the chips are down, the question which is decisive is, "How many divisions have we? Can we get them there ready to fight at the point of attack?" I do not wish to rely, as the Secretary of Defense apparently does, on only one weapon, namely, the hydrogen bomb and the Strategic Air Command.

Mr. LONG. Is it not usually the case, in conferences between two contending sides as far apart as communism and capitalism happen to be, the side which wins the conference is the side which has the most power when it goes into the conference?

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree completely with my distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN FOR LIMITATION OF OIL IMPORTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the program announced by the President for limitation on the importation of petroleum and its products into the United States.

I read from a press dispatch which has recently been written:

President Eisenhower today ordered mandatory controls on imports of crude, unfinished, and finished oil products.

The new order replaces a system of voluntary import controls which expires at midnight. Domestic producers complained the voluntary program failed and forced them to cut back their own production.

Capt. Matthew V. Carson, who will administer the new program, said it provides that, starting tomorrow, no crude or unfinished oils may be imported into the United States unless by authorization of the Secretary of Interior.

Effective April 1, he said, no finished products, including residual oil used for burning, may be imported except by Government authorization.

Carson said finished products such as gasoline and jet fuel will be limited to 1957 levels. The program should substantially decrease the amount of oil and oil products imported into this country in the past.

The order was issued after the New York Stock Exchange had closed for the day.

The President said the great majority in the oil industry had cooperated with the Government in the voluntary quota system.

But some importers, he said, had made it necessary to apply mandatory controls.

"The new program," Eisenhower said, "is designed to insure a stable, healthy industry in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemisphere reserves to replace those being depleted."

The President said national security requirements made it necessary to adopt the controls. A surplus of oil, he said, has disrupted free world markets and would have spread to the United States except for the cutbacks in domestic production.

"Voluntary controls have been and a mandatory control will be flexibly administered with the twin aims of sharing our large and growing market on an equitable basis with other producing areas and avoiding disruption of normal patterns of international trade," Eisenhower said.

Carson said he did not believe the new program, of itself, would force price increases to motorists and consumers of fuel oil.

Eisenhower instructed the civil and defense mobilizer Leo Hoegh to advise him if price increases occur while the program is in effect and whether such increases are necessary to protect national security.

The new program announced by the President is the result of much study by the President's Cabinet Committee and has been concurred in by the President. I sincerely hope that it will work.

I hope that the industry and all concerned will make every effort to insure the success of the President's program. Certainly that will be my purpose.

If this program does not work, I believe the Congress itself must assume the responsibility to pass legislation that, by law, will limit total petroleum imports to the 1954 ratio between such imports and domestic production.

This program is in response to the authority and direction of the Congress on this subject first passed as an amendment to the extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1955. This act was further amended in the extension of 1958.

The Congress passed these two laws in lieu of proposals that were being made to the Congress for a more definite and specific restriction on these imports. I supported each of these proposals with the hope that, although they were not as specific as I had proposed, the solution to this problem could be accomplished through administrative effort.

I have been disappointed that the voluntary program established by the President did not accomplish this purpose. In fact, despite administration efforts, imports continued to increase under this system instead of decrease. As a matter of fact, currently imports are at an all-time high level.

At the time the first of the amendments attempting to establish this method was passed by the Congress in 1955, total imports were then in the neighborhood of 1¼ million barrels. Currently, total imports are more than 2 million barrels a day.

After a long and earnest study by the President's Cabinet Committee, resulting in a report in 1955, that Committee said imports in excess of their relationship to production that existed in 1954 would be harmful to the security of this country. Currently, imports are far in excess of this relationship.

Past experience has shown the voluntary approach is not effective. Thus, it

is encouraging that the President has made the program mandatory and included refined products.

It is being reported that there is great consternation in our Western Hemisphere neighbors over establishment of this program. It is argued that such a program would have seriously damaging effects on the petroleum industries of Canada and Venezuela and as a result bring about reduced revenues to these countries.

I would like to point out that the current program does not determine where a company may purchase its foreign crude. If a company which has been importing oil from the Middle East would decide to shift its source of supply to Canada or Venezuela, there would be nothing in the program to forbid him to do so.

During the past year, however, the trend has been in the opposite direction, not because of any program instigated by the United States, but because economic advantage dictated that the cheaper Eastern Hemisphere crudes be substituted for previous purchases of Canadian and Venezuelan oil.

In 1957 importing companies brought into the United States 151,000 barrels daily of crude oil from Canada. During the last few months, however, these imports have declined to around 65,000 barrels daily. This reduction in the amount of oil imported from Canada has a direct relationship to the price paid for Canadian oil and that imported from the Middle and Far East.

This preference for foreign crude oil other than from Canada is even more pronounced when you consider that in 1957 imports into the west coast from Canada totaled 95,000 barrels daily. In 1958, this total dropped to 25,000 barrels daily despite the fact the Government's crude oil allocation for companies in that area normally importing from Canada was more than 75,000 barrels daily. In the last quarter of 1958 imports from Canada into the west coast totaled only 11,000 barrels daily, more than 65,000 barrels daily below the allocation. This decline took place despite the fact two of the importing companies have pipelines from Canada to their refinery gates.

Correspondingly, imports of crude oil from Venezuela were 531,000 barrels daily in 1957 and 433,000 in 1958. Whereas such imports from the Eastern Hemisphere increased from 304,000 in 1957 to 407,000 barrels daily in 1958. During the last 2 years, imports of refined products have steadily increased from all foreign sources.

The domestic industry has very greatly deteriorated—in direct relationship to the increase in these excessive imports—until today the ability of the domestic producer to drill needed wells has been greatly restricted and the number of wells drilled has, during this period, been greatly reduced. The trend has been fewer and fewer wells each year at a time when our demand is increasing. In Kansas, alone, in 1958, 700 fewer wells were drilled than in 1954.

Mr. President, again I state I sincerely hope the program will work.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, can the Senator inform me how the present mandatory plan will compare, in the volume of the importation, with the 1954 ratio?

Mr. CARLSON. I regret to state that I cannot answer the Senator's question exactly. However, if I understand correctly, it goes back, according to the statement, to the 1954 level, with some exceptions.

Mr. LONG. As I understand, it would permit, according to the Senator's statement, a level of jet fuel and gasoline in line with the 1957 import quotas.

Mr. CARLSON. Finished products and jet fuels would be on the 1957 basis, but crude would go back to the 1954 level.

Mr. LONG. Ever since the plan to control imports was put into effect, as the Senator knows, the plan did not control finished products, and there were tremendous increases in the importation of finished products from that date forward. I wonder how the overall ratio would compare with the 1954 situation, and what percent the new mandatory plan would control.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to read the first sentence of the press release:

President Eisenhower today ordered mandatory controls on imports of crude, unfinished, and finished oil products.

Knowing the junior Senator from Louisiana and his interest in this subject, having served with him on the Committee on Finance, I can state that he and I are in accord on this matter. I certainly hope that the new program will take care of the problem.

Mr. LONG. I hope it is in line with what Congress has recommended and with what the President's Cabinet Committee has recommended.

Mr. CARLSON. I agree. He and I have discussed this subject both in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. I commend the Senator for his statement.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas. The administration has taken the right step in ordering mandatory controls. Many of us from States where the production of oil is a major industry have seen that industry decline and tens of thousands of people thrown out of employment by the flood of foreign oil importations. At first the administration put into effect some voluntary controls, which I believe was in the middle of 1957. As the distinguished Senator from Kansas has said, the voluntary import program did not work, because some oil companies did not voluntarily go along with the restrictions on their imports.

Does the Senator from Kansas have the figures showing how the imports will be limited?

Mr. CARLSON. No; I regret to state that I have just picked this statement off the ticker. Therefore I have no actual knowledge as to distribution of the

quotas. However, as has been stated in the colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana, I sincerely hope it will take care not only of the crude and finished and unfinished products, but that we will get back to somewhere near the 1954 basis.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I do not know of any person in an oil-producing State who wishes to cut off entirely the importation of oil, and thereby eliminate our trade with other nations. However, the importation of petroleum and petroleum products has gone forward at such an accelerated rate in the past 3 or 4 years, that the petroleum industry, particularly the independent producers, who have created the competitive situation in this country which permits American motorists to buy gasoline at 30 cents a gallon, whereas in Italy the motorist must pay 75 cents a gallon—and this in spite of the fact that the refineries are near the sources of supply in the Middle East—have been seriously injured by the flood of oil imports.

I wish to commend the administration for ordering mandatory controls. However, unless the mandatory controls are followed by restrictions on the domestic market, there will still be need to impose mandatory controls on the amount received from foreign producers; and as a cosponsor of the O'Mahoney bill I would urge the enactment of that bill to permit Congress to declare the degree of mandatory controls, unless the Executive order is enforced. Therefore, I believe it is still incumbent to pass a law to provide mandatory controls. Nevertheless the step the administration has taken is a step in the right direction, and is a step which many of us have long advocated. Therefore I commend the administration for taking this step. I hope the effect will be not to stop all foreign trade, but to cut the situation back to about to where it was 2 or 3 years ago before the tremendous flood of oil came into this country.

Mr. CARLSON. I thoroughly agree with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Texas. Personally I have always favored voluntary controls. I have always hoped that they would work. In view of the fact that apparently we must have mandatory controls, I hope that the mandatory controls will be effective, particularly for this reason, namely, that they can be changed under Executive order. If Congress acts, on the other hand—and it may well have to act in the matter—a change is more difficult to bring about. For that reason I hope we can have the cooperation of the oil companies with the Executive order.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to commend the Senator from Kansas for his statement on the proposed legislation, and to commend the President for acting in this situation.

This is a situation which all of us who live in oil-producing States know has been getting worse with the passing months. It is unfortunate that a com-

paratively few oil companies have thwarted the voluntary oil importation program, including that of finished products.

I believe the most significant statement in my opinion, and the one that I should like to underscore, if I may, with respect to this program, is the fact that during this period new exploration for oil and new wells drilled have dropped fantastically in the last 3 or 4 years. That situation is applicable not alone to the oil industry, but also to the mineral industry in general. The development of known reserves of minerals, and the searching out of mineral reserves and the finding of new reserves of minerals have fallen off, primarily because of the rather sick condition of our mineral industry in general. The same thing applies to the oil industry. I particularly underscore and applaud what the Senator has said with respect to the fact that the effect of all of this has not been just to make it hard on our independent oil companies to compete, and has made it hard on the whole oil industry, but that it has also served to stop exploration for new reserves in this country, which, in my opinion, is one of the worst effects it could possibly have.

Mr. CARLSON. I compliment the Senator from Colorado for the statement he has made. He is familiar with our problem in the Midwest, and we in the Midwest know how much the importation of oil has affected drilling, which is important not only for the future of the Nation but for our national defense as well. The Senator from Colorado has always taken a very active interest in this problem, and I commend him for it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas upon the excellent statement he has made. I should like to ask him if the Presidential order imposing mandatory quotas applies to the imports of residual oil.

Mr. CARLSON. I read from the release, which is all I have to speak from:

Effective April 1, no finished products, including residual oil used for burning, may be imported except by Government authorization.

That is all I have on the subject.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from Kansas has called to the attention of the Senate an important action by the President of the United States. I do not wish at the moment to express any view with respect to this action except to call to the attention of the Senator from Kansas the fact that the foreign tax credit operates as a subsidy to the processing and importation of oil from foreign sources. This tax loophole, this tax favoritism, is a subject to which Congress should give immedi-

ate attention. Not only does it affect oil; it affects the operations of many of our corporations in the foreign field.

The able Senator from Kansas and I serve on the Committee on Finance together. He and I together have learned of tax returns which show that some corporations have been making millions of dollars a year in foreign operations, but are paying not a single dollar to the United States Government in taxes. I hope this disclosure will serve to call attention to the unjustified treatment of profits earned in foreign countries.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee has brought up a subject which has received considerable discussion in the Committee on Finance. I assure him it will have more. The Senator from Tennessee is entitled to much credit for pursuing this matter diligently, not only in the committee but outside the committee. I commend him for it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I again commend the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas for his original report and for his comment on the situation, which is brought to the attention of the Senate again by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee.

We know the nature of the arrangement worked out in Saudi Arabia between the Arabian-American Oil Co. and the Government of Saudi Arabia. The company pays no royalties, but is taxed at the rate of 50 percent of its production. That 50 percent, by arrangement with the U.S. Government, is credited on the income tax in the United States. So although ordinary corporations in the United States pay a 52-percent tax on income; while domestic independent oil producers in the United States pay a 52-percent tax on their income; the tax on the income paid to the United States by Aramco is 2 percent.

We sent our Navy and Air Force to that region to protect the investment of Aramco, but their taxpayment to the U.S. Government, if anything, is not in excess of 2 percent. Is that not correct?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Texas has well expressed the situation. I assure him it will receive greater consideration in the committee.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Therein lies a great injustice. It works to the detriment of the small, independent companies in the United States. The companies producing oil in foreign countries are not paying their fair share of taxes to the United States. They are paying virtually no taxes to this country. It is an unfair condition. I hope Congress will remedy it before the end of the session.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I should like to join with those who have complimented the Senator from Kansas on his contribution to the solution of a problem which is important to many portions of our land and, I think, to the Nation as a whole.

In my State of Wyoming, where oil provides us with our largest single income, it is also critical in the State's economy. In the matter of the last 3 or 4 days, I have just learned, from a quick swing around the State, and can report first hand, if any more reporting is needed, that the independent producers in particular are suffering because of what has been the policy of the Government up to this time. We hope we can pursue this effort, because of what is suggested by implication in the mandatory policy outlined by the administration.

We compliment the Senator from Kansas for his presentation, and the administration for its stand on the problem.

I call attention to that which the Senator from Kansas knows even better than I; namely, that when the chips are down, as we say, we cannot, on the floor of the Senate, suddenly announce that we must have more oil, when we are cut off from our overseas supply of oil. Oil is brought in only after many years of exploration. For that reason, we must plan ahead.

We stress again the importance of projecting a farseeing policy which will not find us wanting or cut short in days of a more critical nature which may face us 2, 5, or 10 years from now.

I wish to associate myself with this meritorious action today.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Wyoming has very well described the situation which prevails in all the oil-producing States. In the interest of the welfare of the Nation and from the standpoint of its defense and economy it is important that we have a program which will permit continued exploration for oil.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] what is the parliamentary plan of the leadership for tonight?

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret to advise the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I have not discussed it with the leadership. Earlier in the day it was suggested by the leadership that it was hoped to conclude action on this bill today and to make the Hawaiian statehood bill the unfinished business. Whether that is still the plan of the leadership, I am not advised.

The Senator from Oregon can suggest the absence of a quorum, get the majority leader to the floor, confer with him and the leader of the minority, and perhaps obtain a more definitive statement of the aims and purposes of the leadership. I have not consulted with the leadership concerning how long it is planned to have the Senate remain in session this evening.

I apprehended, when I saw the podium placed over the desk of the Senator from Oregon, that it might take some little time longer to conclude action on the bill than I had hoped. I say that without disparaging the quality of the

Senator's remarks, which are always erudite and informative.

Mr. MORSE. I should be glad to accommodate the Senator from Georgia and have him listen to my speech tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think I can say with some authority that it was hoped to finish action on the draft bill today and to make the Hawaiian statehood bill the next order of business for tomorrow. The order to have the Senate convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow has already been agreed to.

Let me respectfully ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon whether he anticipates speaking at considerable length.

Mr. MORSE. Well, the word "considerable" is a very flexible one. I shall speak at some length.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask, with all proper deference, whether the Senator from Oregon will speak for more than 1 hour?

Mr. MORSE. At the present time I expect to speak for an hour, and I do not know how much longer. That will depend on what develops during that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator's remarks possibly last 2 hours?

Mr. MORSE. The best judgment I can give the Senator from Illinois is that my remarks will take at least 1 hour. But I want the Senator from Illinois to understand that I am not making any commitments or giving any assurances.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not want commitments or assurances; but I thought that, for the convenience of all Members, it might be well to have the Senator from Oregon state what he anticipates.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I said that, only for the convenience of the Members—since it is now 6 p.m.—the leadership might wish to have the action on the bill concluded tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from Oregon yield, without losing the floor, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum—in the hope that we can take a moment to dispose of this question?

Mr. MORSE. Only for future reference, because I have no expectation of participating in debate of that kind. But in order to avoid the establishment of a precedent which might be cited in the future, I should like to obtain a parliamentary ruling on the question of whether, if I yield at this point, what I have said thus far will count as one speech by me on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). That might be prevented by the giving of unanimous consent that it not be counted as one speech.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that the Senator from Illinois will ask unanimous consent that I not lose my right to the floor if I yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Let me make it perfectly clear that I do not intend to engage in a prolonged debate on this subject. But, Mr. President, in my 15 years in the Senate I

have never had as heavy a heart as I have when I speak tonight.

So far as I am concerned, it makes no whit or bit of difference to me how many Senators remain to listen to my remarks, because I shall be speaking for the RECORD. But, as the leadership knows, I always try to accommodate my colleagues, particularly when the hour is late.

Unless there is some reason why the bill must be voted on tonight, then, for the accommodation of my colleagues, I suggest that I make my speech tonight, and that the vote on the bill be taken tomorrow. I am always willing to enter into such an understanding.

But before any vote on the bill is taken, I wish to state, for the RECORD, some of the facets of the subject matter. I propose to raise them in the course of my speech tonight, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, because I believe the RECORD should show perfectly clearly that, at least, these points were raised before the vote on the bill was taken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Oregon may be permitted to let a quorum call intervene, and that he will not thereby lose the floor, and that such remarks as he has made and the fact that he has been recognized by the Chair will not constitute recognition for the purpose of one speech, under the Senate rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MORSE. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] desires to speak on the pending amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to this amendment. The Senate will also take a yeas-and-nays vote on the question of the passage of the bill.

I am informed that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will speak at some length.

Therefore, in view of the fact that there has already been entered an order for the Senate to convene at 10 a. m. tomorrow, I believe I should announce,

for the information of the Senate, that we do not expect to have any yeas-and-nays taken this evening. We expect to have the Senate vote as early as possible tomorrow on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and then to proceed with the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall proceed when there is order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

COMPARABLE ISSUES DEBATED IN 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said a few minutes ago, I speak with a heavier heart tonight than at any other time when I have risen on this floor for a discussion of any subject matter in my 15 years of service in the Senate.

In 1948 we also had before the Senate a bill for the extension of the draft. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all the excerpts from a series of three speeches which I made in 1948 in that debate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is present. I remember very well that I was sitting on his side of the aisle at that time. We discussed some of the same issues that I intend to raise in this debate in 1959, which present an interesting comparison, and also show, sadly enough, how little we have progressed in the field of this subject matter since 1948.

At that time, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I offered a series of amendments. The RECORD shows that in connection with the subject matter of some of those amendments, we reached some compromise positions here on the floor. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as the RECORD shows, was kind enough to express his gratitude and appreciation for my position and the help I sought to render in respect to some of the 1948 problems.

In order to save time from any lengthy reference now by way of quotations from the 1948 RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published as a part of this speech certain excerpts from the debate in 1948 on the issue of extending the draft at that time.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is a rather fitting background to the speech that I shall make tonight to take the Senate back to the RECORD of June 9, 1948, in the course of which speech I said:

I desire to say at the outset, Mr. President, that I hope I have made clear that I think a draft is necessary in order to meet an emergency in international affairs which I believe exists at the present time. Unless I were convinced that a serious emergency exists, I know of nothing that could possibly persuade me to vote for a draft in peacetime. I said a few moments ago in colloquy with the Senator from Maryland that I believe the draft bill should be put into effect now and that we should not wait for any future declaration of the President for putting it into effect, because after spending the weeks that those of us in the Armed Services Committee spent, both in public hearings and in executive conferences, with men high in our Government, including both civilian and military officials of our Government, I reached

the conclusion—and it was very difficult for me to reach it, for I would like wishfully to think that there is no real danger of war—that there is actually a great danger of war. If I did not think there was a great danger of war at the present time I would not vote for any draft bill.

I am inclined to think a great many millions of American people are enjoying a false sense of security in America tonight, because I am one who honestly believes that our defenses are so weak today that our national security demands their strengthening as rapidly as we can possibly strengthen them. Why do I say that, Mr. President? I say that because in my judgment the record of Soviet Russia since V-J Day is clearly a record of noncooperation with the United Nations in the interests of promoting world peace.

Furthermore, I think the record of Soviet Russia certainly raises the presumption that she does not have friendly intentions toward the United States. Therefore, it is my opinion that unless we proceed to make ourselves sufficiently strong to protect our national security and enforce the peace, if necessary, we may wake up in the not-too-distant future to discover that Russia is taking aggressive acts toward us that will force upon us a state of war.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I am convinced that if the American people will unite behind a program for the strengthening of our national security to the point that we can defend the peace, that will greatly alter Russia's attitude and policies in the field of international relations.

Therefore, I lay that down as the major premise of this speech. I reiterate it in this sentence: I am supporting a draft in peacetime because I am convinced that a strengthening of our national security is necessary in order to make perfectly clear to Russia that we shall remain united in a determination to resist any aggressive attitude or policies or acts on her part toward disrupting world peace.

The second premise to which I wish to move in this argument is that I am also cognizant of the fact that an emergency never remains in a status quo condition. Human events and international events do not stand still. I think we must face the fact most solemnly tonight that we are either going in the next 2 or 3 years to solve most of the problems that are endangering the peace of the world today or by the end of that time we shall find ourselves much nearer to war than we are even tonight.

I digress from the quotation to say that not long after that we were in the Korean war.

To continue from my speech of June 9, 1948:

I shall put that in a different way, because unless that viewpoint of mine is understood, it is impossible to understand my position on the pending bill or on the amendment. I restate it this way: I do not think that human events or international relations ever stand still. We are moving in the direction of something. We are going to move in the direction of something during the next 2 or 3 years so far as international relations are concerned, and that something is going to be either more peaceful relations with Soviet Russia or more warlike relations with Soviet Russia.

I do not take, and have never taken, the position that the full responsibility for working in the direction of peace at the present time rests upon Soviet Russia. I think we also have a great responsibility. I think it is too easy for us to see ourselves as we like to think we are, and it is too easy to see the Russians as we imagine them to be. I believe there are many things we must do in international conferences, in our relations with Russia, which we have been inclined

stubbornly to resist in some of our international conferences with Russia. I think we must get over the idea of giving to the American people the impression that we are completely right and Russia is completely wrong on all matters.

I am convinced that the record is perfectly clear that the overwhelming responsibility for the strained relations existing between those two great powers has been Russia's noncooperation in the United Nations and in international conferences in Europe. We have only to look to her negative attitude and the constant use of the veto to establish my point.

I think it is also clear that there is considerable evidence available to us at this time that was not available as short a time as 120 days ago. That is not a long time. The Russian leaders finally started to understand that they could push our country just so far until we would finally say, "that is as far as we shall go." I think Russia is beginning to read the stop signs which we have placed on the highway of international relations. I think one of those stop signs which has had a very persuasive and convincing effect upon the Russian leaders is the action we have already taken in the Congress of the United States in connection with national security. I believe Russia discovered that we meant business, so far as defending ourselves and strengthening ourselves so that we could defend the peace, when we voted appropriations for a great increase in the Air Force.

I think Russia read another stop sign when it learned we intended to vote the necessary appropriations for Navy improvement.

I think Russia read another stop sign, Mr. President, when it realized we were going to pass in this session of Congress substantial military manpower legislation.

I believe, Mr. President—and this is the third premise I want to lay down—that Russia will thoroughly understand that a draft bill passed at this session of Congress, with a provision in it that it will not be continued after 2 years, without affirmative action of the Congress, and that we shall not take men for more than 18 months, if my amendment should be adopted, will be a strong indication that we intend to remain united in support of an adequate national defense program, but at the same time, to frame a law and pass it in a form which also shows that we are working for peace and not for war.

That is why, Mr. President, I fought yesterday as hard as I did for the adoption of an amendment which would require affirmative action on the part of Congress after 2 years. I said in the course of my speech in support of that amendment that I felt a 2-year provision instead of a 5-year provision would serve clear notice not only on Russia, but on our friends in freedom-loving countries, that we do not have any intention to build up over a 5-year period or a longer period a powerful military machine, with the danger that once it is put into operation it may follow the course which military machines have so frequently followed in the course of history, of ultimately leading countries into war because of the power of the military machine itself. I said, in the course of my speech in support of that amendment, that in the United States we need to guard against the development of a military psychology. We need to recognize always that there is a clear line of distinction between preparedness to protect the national security of the Nation and preparedness to conduct a war. I want to repeat that, Mr. President, because that sentence, too, sheds a great deal of light on my thinking about our Military Establishment. There is a great difference between developing military preparedness necessary to protect the national security of the

country and developing a military preparedness program for war.

I think we must constantly recognize that our self-assurance that our ideals and objectives are peaceful is not always shared by peoples in other countries. We have only to go to other countries to hear disturbing and alarming discussions with reference to American imperialism and American military plans and objectives. We can travel in parts of Europe today and find people who are convinced that it is only a matter of time before they will be caught in the middle of a war between Russia and the United States. Although we know we seek only peace, that is not agreed to and accepted as a fact by a great many people, who are not in the satellite countries, but are in countries which are still free and friendly to the United States.

What I am trying to point out in this part of my remarks is that we have a duty, it seems to me, in the interest of peace, to develop a draft law which will strike that happy balance, giving to us the manpower protection we need to protect the national security and prepare us to defend ourselves in case of aggressive attack, and the type of manpower legislation which might create the impression, and would be inclined to create it, that our endeavor is not an endeavor to prepare for peace, but to prepare for war. There is quite a difference.

Mr. President, that was June 9, 1948. Those words are as applicable today.

In an analysis of some of the things which have and have not happened since 1948, there will be found at least part of the explanation as to why the world tonight is alarmed about the possibility of war.

There were other statements in the debate of 1948, which, under the agreement I have already obtained, Mr. President, I shall put in the Record later. I shall discuss them in the light of some of the things which have transpired in the last few weeks in the Congress, through the briefings we have received in the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. They give me great cause for concern as to whether America's policies will avoid war.

Now is the time to analyze America's policies, irrespective of the tempo of public opinion and disregarding the propaganda of America's Military Establishment, because on the shoulders of 98 Members of this body and on the shoulders of the Members of the House of Representatives, I believe, rests the greatest power for peace in our country and possibly in the world.

DEFENSE NEEDS REQUIRE CAREFUL STUDY,
NOT HASTE

But it calls for reflection by Congress. It calls for an insistence upon the adoption of a "stop, look, and examine" attitude on the part of the Members of Congress.

I think we have a bill before us tonight which calls for much more examination by the Members of the Senate before they vote than has been given to it up until this hour.

As this draft extension bill has proceeded rapidly through the legislative mill, I have regretfully come to the conclusion that once again we are being confronted with the ultimatum-type legislation. We are being told that we must pass a 4-year extension of the draft because the Berlin crisis threatens, and

the Congress must not show any signs of retreating in the face of force.

Yet, in extending the draft for 4 more years without change or correction of its critical inequities because of a crisis which threatens us momentarily, the Congress is, in effect, being stampeded. We are expected to write something into law for 4 more years because of conditions which prevail at the moment, and may or may not prevail for the next 3 months.

I find little in the hearing record placed upon our desks to justify the bill in its present form as an essential long-run component of America's national defense. In the House hearings the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower Personnel and Reserve, Mr. Finucane, was asked why the 4-year period was requested, rather than a shorter one of perhaps 2 years. He replied:

I think your question is a good one, sir. Historically, the draft has, in the wisdom of Congress, been extended for 4 years; and we would like, simply for conformity's sake, to carry on with the habits of the past.

I have come to expect that mental attitude from those in the Pentagon Building. But it should not prevail in the Senate. I am not interested in the extension of any legislation at any time for conformity's sake. Legislation should be extended on its merits, or it should not be extended at all.

We had this issue before us in 1948. Before concluding, I shall offer two amendments to the bill. The first leaves no question in regard to the termination date.

I now send to the desk the first amendment, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table, and be made available to Senators tomorrow. It is an amendment to House bill 2260, in line 6 on page 1, to strike out "1963" and insert "1961."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. The purpose of the amendment is to tie down with certainty the duty of the Congress to reexamine the draft law in 1961. I fought this fight in 1948, when the Senate approved my amendment reducing the extension to 2 years. I am satisfied that in the years ahead, as we look back over the record in support of a 2-year extension and a 2-year extension only, history will justify the recommendation I make tonight.

We have no stronger evidence than the record of the House Armed Services Committee from which it recommended a 4-year extension of the draft, with no review required by the Congress before 1963.

INDICATIONS ARE THAT DRAFT IS OBSOLETE

In my judgment, we are being asked to take a legislative course of action which is not in the best interests of peace nor in the best interests of the security of my country, nor in the best interests of the millions of young men who will be brought under an obsolete system of military manpower.

I am at a loss to understand why we have a proposal for a 4-year extension of the draft, when even the printed rec-

ord shows that the spokesman for the Pentagon, when asked why a 4-year extension was being requested, rather than a 2-year extension, replied:

I think your question is a good one, sir. Historically the draft has, in the wisdom of Congress, been extended for 4 years; and we would like, simply for conformity's sake, to carry on with the habits of the past.

That reason is not good enough for the senior Senator from Oregon, and I do not think it is good enough for the American people. We should do a better job of representing the American people and legislating for them than that kind of reasoning would premise.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator's proposal also include a manpower study commission during the 2-year period? I know that the proposal of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] relates to that subject; and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] addressed himself to the same subject matter. It had been my intention to suggest such a proposal. I have in my folder a draft of a proposed amendment. I am deeply moved by the evidence before the committee. I read the record of the hearings before the Senate committee, as well as the record of the hearings in the other body. There were extensive hearings in the House of Representatives.

I have been concerned over the use of manpower by the military, and by what are considered to be the inequities of the system, as well as the inadequacies of the system in terms of manpower utilization.

I believe, if I am correctly interpreting the purpose of the Senator from Oregon, that what he is recommending is that the draft be extended for 2 years, and that during that period of time there be a critical and constructive re-examination of the manpower policy relating to our national security. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is absolutely correct. That leads me to a subject which I did not intend to discuss at this time. I shall refer to it only briefly now, and discuss it later in my speech in greater detail.

My second amendment is an amendment to the Case substitute. The Senator from South Dakota has just offered a modifying amendment to his amendment, which in my judgment makes the amendment better, but not good enough. I shall offer an amendment—and I will put it in proper form to send to the desk later—to eliminate entirely from section (b) of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, which calls for the creation of a Commission on Military Manpower, and provides that certain members—six, I believe—are to be appointed from civilian life and confirmed by the Senate, the provision that one member shall be appointed from the Armed Forces in active military duty.

For reasons which shall be expressed in some detail later in this speech, I am opposed to the appointment of a

single member of the Commission on Military Manpower from those in active military duty. The job of those at the Pentagon Building is to carry out the policies of the Government, not to create them.

**CIVIL CONTROL OF MILITARY AND FOREIGN POLICY
SHOULD BE MAINTAINED**

As I shall show in greater detail later, I am greatly concerned about the degree to which, in this democracy, we are turning over policymaking to those in the Pentagon Building. Such a trend must be stopped, in my judgment, in the interest of self-government.

It must be stopped in the interest of preserving democratic procedures and processes. It must be stopped if we are to keep faith with the spirit and intent of the Constitution of the United States in regard to the place of the active military in the operation of this Government. I am very fearful that we are much further down the road toward undue military influence in operating the Government than is good or safe for democracy.

I will not support the extension until at least I have done my best to eliminate military policymaking from the organization of any manpower commission, because a manpower commission will use the Pentagon and its personnel for information and witnesses. They should not be given a vote in determining the policy of this Government while they are actively engaged in the military. I am not going to do it even to the extent of one member.

The Senator from South Dakota has greatly improved his proposal by changing it so that of the seven members of the Commission, only one will be an active military official. My amendment would eliminate that one, for reasons which I shall discuss later in my speech.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have listened to much of the presentation of the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I feel that the suggestion he is making, that is, the theme and the purpose of his Commission, is surely very creditable and desirable, and something that we should put into effect. As the Senator from Oregon has so well pointed out, the basic manpower policy relating to our national security, which goes deeper than merely the military, is something which ought to be decided by civilian authorities of the Government. In the instance of the Commission, it seems to me that at least the Commission ought to have full civilian orientation.

The Senator's amendment for a 2-year extension surely should be understood as being designed to provide adequate manpower for our defense. I would not want the Record in any way to indicate that the limitation of 2 years would in any way weaken our military strength. In fact, I believe that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota both agree that the military at the present time is inadequate to the responsibilities our Nation faces.

I regret that yesterday I was not on the floor of the Senate to associate my-

self with the remarks of some of our distinguished colleagues on the importance of having adequate plans for the forces in our Military Establishment, and the importance of the administration keeping the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force up to the strength authorized by Congress.

On the one hand, Congress lays down what it believes to be policies which are required for the defense of the Nation—and that is the prerogative of the Congress under the Constitution—and on the other hand, the President, acting through the Bureau of the Budget, cuts the military forces, even though Congress has determined, after extensive hearings, what the size of such forces must be for the national security.

I, for one, protest that kind of false economy, that kind of rationalization, that kind of economics in connection with our national security, and that kind of putting the so-called threat of inflation ahead of the threat of the power of the Communist military and economic machine.

It is deplorable and indefensible. I do not wish my remarks today, in support of the thesis and proposal of the Senator from Oregon, to be interpreted as anything but a desire basically to strengthen our manpower policies, rather than to weaken them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his constructive contribution to my discussion of the matter. The Senator from Minnesota knows me well enough to know that I completely share his point of view that whatever we do on the military manpower issue should be done with the objective in mind of strengthening the security of our country, not weakening it.

Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that the proposed amendments I am offering are offered on the basis of my very deep conviction that my amendments will give us a stronger security than we would have if we were to pass a bill which did not require a reexamination and affirmative action at the end of 2 years, and instead perpetuates an inadequate system for 4 more years.

When I get to that section of my speech I intend to say something about the proposals of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. In view of what the Senator from Minnesota has said about the comments of the Senator from South Dakota earlier this afternoon, I wish to say that I believe the Senator from South Dakota has made a great contribution on a high level of statesmanship in the debate on military manpower in his remarks today.

The proposal of the Senator from South Dakota for a Commission on Military Manpower has an objective which ought to receive the enthusiastic support of Congress. We may differ—as I have expressed my difference—on some procedural details for the establishment and the operation of the Commission, but I do not see how we can think of not adopting some such program, perfected, if we can perfect it, as recommended by the Senator from South Dakota.

In my judgment, the Senator's proposal ought to set a termination date for

the draft and require reaffirmation by Congress at the end of that termination date of 2 years.

On page 2 of his proposal the Senator from South Dakota states:

(h) The Commission may from time to time report to the President and shall, not later than January 31, 1961, submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall thereafter from time to time make such further reports and recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1963.

AMENDMENT FOR 2-YEAR EXTENSION

It may be said with some merit that obviously that language implies that on January 31, 1961, Congress will have before it at least the subject matter of the report which will make it easy for it to proceed to reexamine the draft. However, I much prefer that we get specific language into proposed legislation which automatically ends the draft, as the amendment I have sent to the desk would do, in modification of the bill before us, and then decide, at the end of that 2 years, what kind of manpower program we ought to have, taking into account the report of the Commission which the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota would create.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First of all, I should like to say that I appreciate the comments which the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota have made with respect to the purpose of my amendment. What bothered me about the consideration of the extension of the draft, both in the House and in the Senate, was that it seemed to me it was being moved forward without as much time as I should like to have seen devoted to the study of the subject in committee, and without allowing reaction time, so to speak, for the country to realize that this matter was being considered and presumably would be disposed of. Therefore I felt it was important to say something about the imperfections of the Draft Act in its operation and administration, with the view of at least getting an opportunity for the Senate to register an opinion that there ought to be an improvement and that we ought not merely affirm the need for improvement and the existence of errors or inequities in the administration, without taking some step toward correcting them.

Personally I have no objection to having the entire Commission a civilian Commission. The draft of the amendment originally, as I said, came from another member of the Committee on Armed Services, and in his form he proposed a Commission to consist of four civilian members and three military members from the Pentagon. In deference to the idea that he had in mind, and in the hope that perhaps it might develop a little more support, I felt that changing the composition of the Commission to six civilian to one military would be much better than a relationship of 4 to 3.

So far as I personally am concerned, I would prefer to see it an entirely civilian commission; and as to that portion of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Oregon, I would support it. However, I think in view of my discussion with some other Senators on the floor, I should leave the amendment as I now have it modified—6 to 1.

While I am on my feet, I should like to say also that I listened with interest to the first part of the Senator's discussion this evening, when he reviewed some of the things he said in 1948 concerning the wisdom of our taking a new look at the developing strength, the developing military intelligence, and the attitude of the Russians generally. I think we would have been wise had we heeded that advice at that time. I do think that some of our problems today are an outgrowth of our failure to recognize a development which was taking place in Russia—educational development, scientific development, and industrial development. Had we properly educated ourselves or recognized, perhaps, what was there for us to see at that time, some of our problems today would be small.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I should like to ask either the Senator from Oregon or the Senator from South Dakota: Did the Committee on Armed Services consider this proposal, and did they vote on it? The Senate has a unanimous report from the committee. I should like to know from the Senator from South Dakota if his proposal was considered and voted on by the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The matter was discussed within the committee. There were more than two members of the committee—perhaps 3 or 4 members, at least—who by discussion indicated some support for the idea. But the amendment was not put to a formal vote. It was not formally presented for a record vote or for a yeand-nay vote in the committee. I think the discussion indicated that it would not carry, and the person who brought up the matter decided not to present it formally in the committee for a vote.

Mr. McNAMARA. I think that was unfortunate, because there is a good chance that it might have been adopted had it been presented in the light in which it is now presented in the Senate. I for one certainly hope the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will consider accepting the amendment.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are rendering a service to the Senate and to the country in developing the subject of the continuation of the draft. I remember, in 1948, at about this time of the day, hearing the able Senator from Oregon speak eloquently upon this subject. On

that evening he expressed his concern that the Senate was coming to believe it inevitable that the draft should be continued.

I remember that I spoke that evening against an indeterminate draft period, saying that the draft was not a part of the American tradition. As I remember tonight, I voted with the Senator from Oregon to limit the extension of the draft to 2 years.

Today we are in a much more difficult world situation, but whatever my vote will be—and it must be for extension—the considerations which these two able Senators have brought before the Senate and the country this evening are important, for they bear on our total foreign policy. Whatever may be the outcome of the vote, whatever may be the gravity of our situation in the world today, I am glad that the Senators are rendering this service to our country.

Mr. MORSE. I remember very well the great contribution which the Senator from Kentucky made to the debate in 1948. I appreciated then, as always, his support on an issue which I felt was not fully understood within the Senate, and, therefore, at the moment was not very popular.

The Senator from Kentucky did support me in the position I took in 1948. I think our debate was helpful in many ways which do not show on the surface in connection with the military manpower policies of this country.

I quite agree with the implications in the statement of the Senator from Kentucky that when a question such as this one is raised, which is all mixed up with feelings about national security and the threat of Russia, it is very easy to be misunderstood. Therefore, his words of commendation for raising the issue tonight are very much appreciated by me.

The Senator from Kentucky is one of the fair-minded Members of this body, before whom I always feel I will get a hearing on the merits. He and I may end in complete disagreement on the merits; but I always feel that when the Senator from Kentucky listens, I am talking to an open mind which is perfectly willing to give fair consideration to the point of view I wish to express.

I am not sure but what we have already just about reached the point in our country where it is almost impossible to get reasoned judgment on the part of many of our people on an issue which is so pregnant with deep psychological reaction, namely, the matter of national security in relation to Russia. I shall say something about that general problem later, because these things are all intertwined.

The fact is that we have on the floor of the Senate tonight not only an armed service problem but a foreign policy problem, as well. We cannot separate the work of the Committee on Armed Services and the work of the Committee on Foreign Relations on at least 95 percent of the subject matters with which those two committees deal.

That is why now, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, with my background of experience as a mem-

ber of the Committee on Armed Services for a good many years, I want to try to focus attention on what I think are some of the interrelationships. Even in our era we can follow a course of action which will result in our winning a horrible war and losing our destiny. That is why I do not favor quick action on any of these subjects.

Returning to the bill, because of the crisis atmosphere in which the bill is being considered, it is proposed to freeze for 4 years a totally inadequate defense manpower situation.

Every careful study of national defense about which I know—at least, those we have been permitted to know about—has stressed the inadequacy of the present selective service program in furnishing the manpower which will be needed by our country over the next several decades.

The kind of manpower which we need is that which is highly skilled and trained in the complex instruments of modern warfare, and which is best furnished by career servicemen. The truth of the matter is that the draft has been a military manpower expediency crutch on which the country has been leaning for too long a time.

The cry is raised one must vote for this bill or be universally condemned as being soft on communism. I am surprised at the editorial slant of many of America's newspapers in the last several days.

STRONG DEFENSE NOT ACHIEVED BY DRAFT

Mr. President, it has reached the point where a Senator who disagrees with the policies recommended by the administration in the field of defense or in the field of foreign policy must expect to be hit with the charge that he must be soft on communism.

But the fact is that those of us who are asking for the most penetrating, critical analysis of the policies of the Government in respect to our armed services and our defense problems and our foreign relations are doing so because we want our country to be strong enough at all times to meet the Russian threat, and to be able to do so by means of a course of conduct which will strengthen the peace, and will not necessarily bring on a war.

I am very fearful that many of the policies of my Government do not at this time strengthen the chances of peace, but that, instead, they increase the danger of war. That is why I speak out.

Mr. President, I challenge the contention that those of us who raise questions about extension of the draft are soft on communism, because I do not think the needs for the national defense are being adequately served at all by the draft.

There is nothing wrong with those who are drafted; but there is a great deal wrong with a system which brings them into the military service at the lowest possible level, usually without regard to their skills, gives them the elements of military training—but not the kind of proficiency in modern warfare that the Nation really needs its Armed Forces to have—and at the end of 2 years returns them to civilian life, from which they have lost 2 valuable years, without even

making provision for their education and training following that service.

From the point of view of the young men who are involved, I think it is a sheer scandal to continue to draft men into the armed services without providing them with education and training benefits when they leave.

But from the point of view of the country and its long-range defense needs, I see in the bill, as it is now before us, provisions for a 4-year extension of a system which we shall rely on only at our peril, inasmuch as the bill makes it impossible to obtain, during those 4 years, a manpower program which will assure the Nation strong, well-trained Armed Forces capable of protecting the Nation and its interests over a period of many years, and probably decades, of Communist threat and menace.

What I want for our country's armed services is skill and expertise. But under the draft, such skill is not provided, because the drafted men serve for only 2 years. The proposed extension of the draft is, of course, a penny-pinching way of providing for the national defense. The military forces thus obtained can be obtained more cheaply than it is possible to obtain well-trained career forces of equal numbers.

It is no reflection on the young men we are discussing to point out that they could give the country better service as career soldiers than they can as drafted soldiers, to whom military service is but a duty to be performed and gotten out of the way as quickly as possible and as easily as possible.

The obsolescence of the draft should cause us to stop, look, and investigate, and to ask whether this is the time—at this hour of new emergencies arising on the international horizon—for us to do no more than extend the status quo, or to face up to the military manpower needs of the country, and to proceed with a proper program and the funds it requires, so as to obtain the skilled military personnel we shall need if we are to meet the continuous threat from Russia on the military front.

I think the story we find is a pitiful one, when we make a case study of the men drafted, and see what is done under the draft with the potential skills of those who are in our Military Establishment.

If we were to translate those losses into dollars—and, of course, they are subject to some evaluation from the standpoint of financial value and financial loss—I am satisfied that we would find that with each year's operation of the draft, we waste hundreds of millions of dollars in terms of lost personnel services in relation to the potential competency of those who are drafted. In many, many cases—in fact, in tens of thousands of them—the manpower drafted is not used where it should be used.

This criticism has been before us for years. It will be found in the 1948 debates. But the record of the Pentagon since 1948 is one of gross failure to bring about the reforms which should be made in respect to this problem.

We remember that in the 1956 campaign, a few of us discussed the need for

a great revision of the country's draft policy. Adlai Stevenson discussed it. I discussed it many, many times in the course of my campaign—as did other candidates in 1956. Of course, it was supposed to be impolitic, but I asked, "So, what?"

THE STATUS QUO IS NOT SUFFICIENT

It is a matter of vital concern to the people of the country and to the national welfare. But here we are in 1959; and what we have before us now is, to all intents and purposes, a proposal to continue the same errors—not a proposal that augurs well for any reform in our military manpower policy, but a proposal to continue the status quo.

A great paradox is to be found in the argument that we must do this because we must show Russia that we mean business. I have no doubt that the Russian leaders probably know better than most of the people in our country the shortcomings and inefficiencies and deficiencies of the American draft system. I am satisfied that if the draft is extended, tomorrow, for 4 years, no concern will be caused in Russia. Extension of our draft is not going to put Russia in any greater jeopardy than she is now, and I think Russia knows that perfectly well.

If we really want the Russian leaders to raise their eyebrows about America's military defense program let us proceed with a military manpower program, not with a draft, but one that will build up a skilled, career American military service of able technicians, well trained, on a career basis, for the development of our country's defenses. That is essential, because in the field of science those defenses are ever changing.

That kind of career military personnel would make some impression on the Russian leaders.

RECOMMENDATIONS BY EXPERTS SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED

All this talk in the debate as to how important this draft bill is, from the standpoint of Russia, is highly fallacious. I think it is, for the most part, a discussion that will lull the American people into a false sense of security. I do not think the 4-year extension of the draft is going to give the American people the security to which they are entitled; but the correction of our military manpower policies, which have been recommended now for some years by various experts who have gone into it, is the line of approach which I recommend to the Congress.

"Oh," it will be said, "Mr. Senator, why do you go along with any extension of the draft, then?" I would not if we had the manpower proposal before us that we ought to have before us, and which ought to have been prepared by now. I think the Commission called for by the Senator from South Dakota ought to have been established by now. Then we would be passing, tomorrow, on a military manpower bill that would really come to grips with the needs of this country's defenses so far as military manpower is concerned.

But certainly, Mr. President, I do not think we ought to extend the draft beyond the 2-year period. Instead, I

believe we should use the next 2 years to revamp our military manpower program, as called for in the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and put the recommendations into effect even before the end of the 2-year period, if possible.

Mr. President, under authority previously granted, at this point in my remarks I ask that there be printed a portion of my argument which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 6, page 7325. This is a summary statement of my position on my amendment at the time to limit to 2 years the extension of the draft legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to summarize my position on the amendment by briefly answering the major arguments used against my amendment this afternoon. They were rather interesting arguments, but if I were trying a case I would say most respectfully that most of them would fall under the objection of being irrelevant, immaterial, and inconsequential.

One of the arguments made earlier in the debate this afternoon was that 2 years from now might find us at the end of the session with such a congested calendar that we could not give careful consideration to the question of whether or not we should continue the draft. I think that is not a very sound argument, because I do not know how a bill could receive any more careful consideration or go through a longer hearing, or receive more hours of attention from committee members than we have given to this bill. I answer the argument that we may not have time 2 years hence to consider this problem, Mr. President, by offering a record of the Armed Services Committee over weeks and weeks of hearings on this bill in this crowded session of Congress as my exhibit A in complete rebuttal of that argument. We can take judicial notice that this issue will always receive thorough attention by Congress.

Second, I am privileged to say, because several Senators have said to me in the cloakroom they are inclined to go along with the committee report, that a good many members of the Armed Services Committee, of which I also am a member, have reconsidered very carefully the provision of the bill for a 5-year draft and have decided to vote for my amendment. I am privileged to say that at least five of us on the Armed Services Committee intended to vote for my amendment for a 2-year period instead of a 5-year period. I say that because I want the Members of this body to know that there has been a considerable amount of rethinking about the provision within the Armed Services Committee, and there is not on this provision, as there is on most sections of the bill, a unanimous report of the Armed Services Committee.

I want to see the obligation and responsibility placed upon the Congress to review at the end of 2 years the policy now being adopted, and at that time decide whether or not we want to continue the draft. I think it will be found that after 2 years our reserves will have been built up, and that we shall have done a pretty good job of educating the American people to an understanding of the need for supporting an adequate Military Establishment.

The last point is, my amendment is in line with action already taken by the House. The House voted a 2-year provision. I think, Mr. President, we should follow in this instance the action taken by the House, and adopt my amendment.

Following this statement of my position there appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 6, page 7326, the rollcall votes by which the Senate adopted my amendment limiting the extension of the draft to 2 years. It reads as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Baldwin], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Bricker], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Bushfield], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Jenner], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. White] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Baldwin] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Tobey] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Barkley], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Taylor] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. Downey], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Thomas], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Wagner] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Barkley] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—47

| | | |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| Alken | Ives | Pepper |
| Brooks | Johnson, Colo. | Revercomb |
| Buck | Johnston, S.C. | Robertson, Va. |
| Butler | Kem | Russell |
| Byrd | Kilgore | Sparkman |
| Capehart | Langer | Stewart |
| Chavez | McCarthy | Taft |
| Cooper | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Dworshak | Malone | Umstead |
| Eastland | Maybank | Watkins |
| Ferguson | Millikin | Wherry |
| Flanders | Moore | Wiley |
| Fulbright | Morse | Williams |
| George | Murray | Wilson |
| Hill | O'Connor | Young |
| Hoey | O'Daniel | |

NAYS—33

| | | |
|----------|--------------|-----------------|
| Ball | Hawkes | Martin |
| Brewster | Hayden | Myers |
| Cain | Hickenlooper | O'Mahoney |
| Capper | Holland | Reed |
| Cordon | Knowland | Robertson, Wyo. |
| Donnell | Lodge | Saltonstall |
| Easton | Lucas | Smith |
| Ellender | McFarland | Stennis |
| Feazel | McGrath | Thye |
| Green | McKellar | Tydings |
| Gurney | McMahon | Vandenberg |

NOT VOTING—16

| | | |
|-----------|----------|---------------|
| Baldwin | Downey | Thomas, Okla. |
| Barkley | Hatch | Tobey |
| Bricker | Jenner | Wagner |
| Bridges | McCarran | White |
| Bushfield | Magnuson | |
| Connally | Taylor | |

So Mr. MORSE's amendment lettered "G" was agreed to.

To continue, Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 6, page 7568, there appears the following exchange:

Mr. MORSE. I want to make one statement in connection with the remarks of the Sen-

ator from Maryland, because I know his devotion to accuracy. I think the comment he made concerning the reduction of the life of the bill by my amendment yesterday, from a 5-year to a 2-year basis, with the right of Congress at the end of the 2 years to vote to continue the draft if it was considered that an emergency existed at that time, seems to give the impression that the majority of the Armed Services Committee was against that amendment. The record is perfectly clear that 7 of the 13 members of the Armed Services Committee voted for the 2-year amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the House?

Mr. MORSE. No; in the Senate yesterday afternoon. A majority of the members of the committee, after thinking over the matter, decided to support the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I find the Senator from Oregon is correct in that statement. I had assumed before the Senator from Oregon corrected me that such was not the case. I find I was in error.

Mr. MORSE. I have talked also to those men, and they have told me that after thinking the whole thing through, with the right of the Congress to continue the draft after 2 years they thought the amendment was a good amendment. They represent a majority of the Armed Services Committee. The fact remains that a majority of the Armed Services Committee voted for the amendment.

To conclude the excerpts from the 1948 RECORD, Mr. President, I cite now, in part, my remarks which may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 6, pages 7579-7580, as follows:

I desire to say at the outset, Mr. President, that I hope I have made clear that I think a draft is necessary in order to meet an emergency in international affairs which I believe exists at the present time. Unless I were convinced that a serious emergency exists, I know of nothing that could possibly persuade me to vote for a draft in peacetime. I said a few moments ago in colloquy with the Senator from Maryland that I believe the draft bill should be put into effect now and that we should not wait for any future declaration of the President for putting it into effect, because after spending the weeks that those of us in the Armed Services Committee spent, both in public hearings and in executive conferences, with men high in our Government, including both civilian and military officials of our Government, I reached the conclusion—and it was very difficult for me to reach it, for I would like wishfully to think that there is no real danger of war—that there is in actually a great danger of war. If I did not think there was a great danger of war at the present time I would not vote for any draft bill.

I am inclined to think a great many millions of American people are "enjoying" a false sense of security in America tonight, because I am one who honestly believes that our defenses are so weak today that our national security demands their strengthening as rapidly as we can possibly strengthen them. Why do I say that, Mr. President? I say that because in my judgment the record of Soviet Russia since V-J Day is clearly a record of noncooperation with the United Nations in the interests of promoting world peace.

Furthermore, I think the record of Soviet Russia certainly raises the presumption that she does not have friendly intentions toward the United States. Therefore, it is my opinion that unless we proceed to make ourselves sufficiently strong to protect our national security and enforce the peace, if necessary, we may wake up in the not-too-distant future to discover that Russia is taking aggressive acts toward us that will force upon us a state of war.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I am convinced that if the American people will

unite behind a program for the strengthening of our national security to the point that we can defend the peace, that will greatly alter Russia's attitude and policies in the field of international relations.

Therefore, I lay that down as the major premise of this speech. I reiterate it in this sentence: I am supporting a draft in peacetime because I am convinced that a strengthening of our national security is necessary in order to make perfectly clear to Russia that we shall remain united in a determination to resist any aggressive attitude or policies or acts on her part toward disrupting world peace.

The second premise to which I wish to move in this argument is that I am also cognizant of the fact that an emergency never remains in a status quo condition. Human events and international events do not stand still. I think we must face the fact most solemnly tonight that we are either going in the next 2 or 3 years to solve most of the problems that are endangering the peace of the world today or by the end of that time we shall find ourselves much nearer to war than we are even tonight.

I shall put that in a different way, because unless that viewpoint of mine is understood, it is impossible to understand my position on the pending bill or on the amendment. I restate it this way: I do not think that human events or international relations ever stand still. We are moving in the direction of something. We are going to move in the direction of something during the next 2 or 3 years so far as international relations are concerned, and that something is going to be either more peaceful relations with Soviet Russia or more warlike relations with Soviet Russia.

I do not take, and have never taken, the position that the full responsibility for working in the direction of peace at the present time rests upon Soviet Russia. I think we also have a great responsibility. I think it is too easy for us to see ourselves as we like to think we are, and it is too easy to see the Russians as we imagine them to be. I believe there are many things we must do in international conferences, in our relations with Russia, which we have been inclined stubbornly to resist in some of our international conferences with Russia. I think we must get over the idea of giving to the American people the impression that we are completely right and Russia is completely wrong on all matters.

I am convinced that the record is perfectly clear that the overwhelming responsibility for the strained relations existing between those two great powers has been Russia's noncooperation in the United Nations and in international conferences in Europe. We have only to look to her negative attitude and the constant use of the veto to establish my point.

I think it is also clear that there is considerable evidence available to us at this time that was not available as short a time as 120 days ago. That is not a long time. The Russian leaders finally started to understand that they could push our country just so far until we would finally say, "That is as far as we shall go." I think Russia is beginning to read the stop signs which we have placed on the highway of international relations. I think one of those stop signs which has had a very persuasive and convincing effect upon the Russian leaders is the action we have already taken in the Congress of the United States in connection with national security. I believe Russia discovered that we meant business, so far as defending ourselves and strengthening ourselves so that we could defend the peace, when we voted appropriations for a great increase in the Air Force.

I think Russia read another stop sign when it learned we intended to vote the

necessary appropriations for Navy improvement.

I think Russia read another stop sign, Mr. President, when it realized we were going to pass in this session of Congress substantial military manpower legislation.

I believe, Mr. President—and this is the third premise I want to lay down—that Russia will thoroughly understand that a draft bill passed at this session of Congress, with a provision in it that it will not be continued after 2 years, without affirmative action of the Congress, and that we shall not take men for more than 18 months, if my amendment should be adopted, will be a strong indication that we intend to remain united in support of an adequate national-defense program, but at the same time, to frame a law and pass it in a form which also shows that we are working for peace and not for war.

That is why, Mr. President, I fought yesterday as hard as I did for the adoption of an amendment which would require affirmative action on the part of Congress after 2 years. I said in the course of my speech in support of that amendment that I felt a 2-year provision instead of a 5-year provision would serve clear notice not only on Russia, but on our friends in freedom-loving countries, that we do not have any intention to build up over a 5-year period or a longer period a powerful military machine, with the danger that once it is put into operation it may follow the course which military machines have so frequently followed in the course of history, of ultimately leading countries into war because of the power of the military machine itself. I said, in the course of my speech in support of that amendment, that in the United States we need to guard against the development of a military psychology. We need to recognize always that there is a clear line of distinction between preparedness to protect the national security of the Nation and preparedness to conduct a war. I want to repeat that, Mr. President, because that sentence, too, sheds a great deal of light on my thinking about our Military Establishment. There is a great difference between developing military preparedness necessary to protect the national security of the country and developing a military preparedness program for war.

I think we must constantly recognize that our self-assurance that our ideals and objectives are peaceful is not always shared by peoples in other countries. We have only to go to other countries to hear disturbing and alarming discussions with reference to American imperialism and American military plans and objectives. We can travel in parts of Europe today and find people who are convinced that it is only a matter of time before they will be caught in the middle of a war between Russia and the United States. Although we know we seek only peace, that is not agreed to and accepted as a fact by a great many people, who are not in the satellite countries, but are in countries which are still free and friendly to the United States.

What I am trying to point out in this part of my remarks is that we have a duty, it seems to me, in the interest of peace, to develop a draft law which will strike that happy balance, giving to us the manpower protection we need to protect the national security and prepare us to defend ourselves in case of aggressive attack, and the type of manpower legislation which might create the impression, and would be inclined to create it, that our endeavor is not an endeavor to prepare for peace, but to prepare for war. There is quite a difference.

With the precedent of 1948 as my background, Mr. President, I shall urge tomorrow the adoption of my similar

amendment this year to limit to 2 years the extension of the draft.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk another amendment, amending section (b) of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to H.R. 2260, and ask to have it printed and available to the Senate tomorrow. I will say to the gentlemen at the desk, that if it needs any perfecting, it will be understood that I shall do so when I close my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to offer his amendment?

Mr. MORSE. I do not want it called up; I want it printed and at the desk, ready to be called up tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, as modified will be received, printed, and lie on the desk.

CONGRESS LOSING ITS EXCLUSIVE WARMAKING POWER

Mr. MORSE. Now, Mr. President, I want to discuss this problem in relation to a broader facet, because I do not see how we can come to grips tomorrow with a military manpower piece of legislation and not give some thought to the relationship of it and our other defenses to present trends in American foreign policy.

Every Member of the Senate knows, but it ought to be restated and emphasized for the RECORD, that article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides the powers of Congress, and one of them is that Congress shall have the power to declare war. I am afraid, however, Mr. President, there is a great danger that that section of the Constitution may become a dead letter.

As I listen to witnesses from the Pentagon Building and witnesses from the State Department before the Foreign Relations Committee, I am filled more and more with the fearful thought that we have already reached the point in our history where there is a lack of full appreciation of the meaning of that section of article I, section 8, of the Constitution—that it is the Congress which has the power to declare war.

I am very fearful that there are forces of subterfuge at work in America today in regard to article I, section 8, of the Constitution. I am fearful that there is not a full appreciation, either at the Pentagon Building or in the State Department, or the White House, of the meaning and full implications of article I, section 8, of the Constitution—that the Congress shall have power to declare war.

That language becomes empty, Mr. President, if officials in the Pentagon Building and the State Department follow policies under which we shall wake up, some second, to discover we are at war, and that the Government comes to Congress only to ask Congress to make it official.

It has been said among my colleagues that war is inevitable. They have not said it for the RECORD yet, but I have heard colleagues take the position, as recently as this morning, that we are not entitled to know what the policies of the Pentagon Building and the State Department are in respect to the Berlin crisis.

Yet, those policies mean the difference between war and peace, and those policies can determine whether or not we will be at war at any given moment.

So long as I am in this body, I do not intend to remain silent when I believe any section of the Constitution is being defeated by subterfuge on the part of any executive agency of this Government. When I sit in the Foreign Relations Committee and listen to some of the testimony given in recent weeks by high officials of both the Pentagon Building and the State Department, I find it impossible to escape the conclusion that the American people ought to know. And the American people are not being told. But they will be the ones who will be dying by the millions if we get into a war through an administration's back door rather than as a result of open debate on the facts prevailing at the time consideration is given to a resolution for a declaration of war.

Of course, not one of us would fail to vote for a declaration of war after any horrendous act of aggression had been committed against us. We all know that.

But this is a different world from even the world of 1917. This is a different world from even the world of Pearl Harbor. We are now living in a time when one miscalculation by the generals at the Pentagon Building or by the State Department might place us in a war situation, so far as acts are concerned, and I think we have just about reached the point tonight where we are suffering from the bankruptcy of the massive retaliation policy of the Secretary of State.

Last Thursday in a speech in the Senate I said that no one could pray more sincerely than I for the recovery of the Secretary of State from his illness, because I wish no misfortune to any man. But, Mr. President, I am as much opposed to the policies of the Secretary of State in the field of foreign relations as I have ever been, and we are being treated now in the Berlin crisis to a part of the inevitable cost of that course of action. Time and time again his policies have been American unilateral policies. Those policies on the part of the United States time and time again have been policies circumventing the United Nations, and they have been policies, on some occasions, as I think history will show, outside the framework of international law.

WHOLE WORLD HAS A STAKE IN BERLIN

They have been policies which have alienated millions and millions of people throughout Asia and Africa, some of whom are beginning to make known their views.

Those people, too, have rights in Berlin. They do not have treaty rights, Mr. President, but they have rights to peace. They have rights to live, which the course of action which Russia and the Western Powers follow may very well take away from them.

I say to the leadership of India and the leadership of the free nations of Asia and Africa tonight, "Make your voices heard before it is too late. Raise your voices, and quickly, because the danger is that the leaders of the Western Powers and of Russia may take a course of

action in the next few weeks which history will record as the most immoral chapter in the history of mankind."

I weigh my words solemnly tonight, Mr. President. A nuclear war cannot be justified by my country or by Russia. It is immoral, and it cannot be squared with the Almighty's wishes. After all, the greatest allegiance we owe is to God, and the generals in the Pentagon Building of the United States have no right to follow an ungodlike course of action.

When I listened to an American general sit in a committee room and tell me and the other members of the committee that we should be more cynical about Russia, that we should recognize that it is impossible to negotiate, and that we must face up to the fact that sooner or later we shall probably have to drop everything we have—meaning, of course, our nuclear weapons—I was aghast. I replied to him, "If we follow that philosophy and that course of action, then the only group ahead in this great struggle will be the archeologists 1,000 years from today when they dig up the ruins of the sorry record we made in 1959."

Of course, I am for making clear to Russia, Mr. President, that we do not intend to be intimidated by her threats. I am for making clear to Russia that if she makes an attack upon us in connection with the Berlin crisis, we shall meet force with force. Although we have some shortcomings in our defenses, I want to say, in support of the generals at the Pentagon Building, that I think we are in a military posture where Russia is not going to win a war of any type, conventional or nuclear.

Of course, we will not win in one sense, either Mr. President, as I indicated the other day, when we are through with all the destruction, and when we shall have let loose the awful nuclear destruction in storage today, the resulting radiation will irreparably damage human life and animal life in a large part of the world—undoubtedly practically all of Russia, all of Europe, probably all of the United States and Canada and at least the north tier to the south of us, and part of Asia—for several thousand years.

NUCLEAR WAR IS A MORAL ISSUE

That raises the moral issue. That raises the question of the rights of the peoples of Asia and Africa. Those people are not involved in the dropping of those bombs, Mr. President.

They have a right to insist, I submit, that Russia and the Western Powers proceed now with a course of action which will reduce the danger of letting that terrible radiation loose on the face of this earth, which radiation will linger on, so the scientists say, for several thousand years doing damage to all forms of animal and plant life.

I do not know of any time when all of mankind was ever confronted with a moral issue of such proportions. So it raises, from a philosophical standpoint, the issue of sovereignty. Oh, how easy it is in our country for people to wrap our great flag around them or wave it to tatters, in a great, superpatriotic appeal about sovereignty. We had better recognize, before it is too late, that there is

really a greater sovereignty. I would call it the sovereignty involved in the reign of peace. Mankind has reached the point of scientific development where each individual owes it to society to follow a course of action that leads to peace, and not to war.

What is the position our Government takes today? Who knows? However, I think it is fair to say that the best we know is that we are going to play it by ear. We are going to consult with other Western Powers. We are going to be willing to negotiate; and we are going to give them the works if necessary.

The first atomic bomb that Russia or the United States, or any of the Western Powers drops will for centuries alienate the friendship of those who survive in Asia and Africa. That is why I say to the leaders of the nations not involved in Berlin, "Raise your voices now. Now is the time for you to speak out to the Western Powers and to Russia. Now is the time for you to make clear to the Western Powers and to Russia that they have no moral right to follow the policies they are already following in regard to Berlin."

In my judgment the Western Powers and Russia have no right to treat the Berlin crisis as their problem. It has become the problem of mankind. It has become the problem of all civilization.

UNITED STATES SHOULD HAVE PROGRAM FOR PEACE THROUGH UNITED NATIONS

When we speak with high officials in the State Department and respectfully ask, "What about the United Nations?" what reply do we receive? "Eventually we may get to the United Nations." My question is, "If eventually, why not now? Why not now?"

I think we have seen enough to know that the policy of brinkmanship is too dangerous when we wait upon the maneuverings between the Western Powers and Russia, because I believe that both Russia and the Western Powers are following a policy of brinkmanship; and it is slippery, dangerous business.

Incident after incident may occur. We cannot have this kind of jockeying; we cannot have this maneuvering for position; we cannot have armed forces in the air maneuvering as they are now maneuvering, without the danger of falling into the possible catastrophe which I heard the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, speak about in December 1957, in New Delhi, India, at the Parliamentary Conference of the Commonwealth Nations, when he pointed out, in a memorable speech, that one of those bombs may go off either by design, by reason of disobedience of orders, or by accident. But once one goes off, there will be no time to find the answer to the question "Why?" The nuclear war will be on, and Russia and the Western Powers for all of history will be convicted by their own mutual acts—inexcusable immorality and crime against mankind.

Neither the United States nor Russia can under any circumstances justify the dropping of an atomic bomb, in view of the nuclear power now in storage under the control of Russia and the United States. No moral nation can justify it;

and our people are both moral and deeply religious.

I say to the State Department that underneath this great crisis is a deep spiritual issue. It is an issue involving our faith and spiritual values. No man-made misbehavior, demonstrated through the official acts of any nation, can justify, on moral grounds, letting loose on the face of this globe nuclear radiation which for several thousand years would visit upon mankind the horrendous consequences about which I have spoken.

There is the spiritual problem. I know the kind of rebuttal to expect. But it will be a rebuttal of rationalization. It will be a rebuttal of moral escapism. It will not be a rebuttal that one can take into the confessional of his own conscience and, in the presence of his God, offer as either an excuse or an explanation for such an immoral course of conduct.

I apply this thesis to what is a great danger in my country tonight—that we have within this Government men who, I believe, think that a preventive war is unavoidable.

I do not propose to give such military officials any policymaking power. That is one of the reasons that I shall offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], to make any manpower commission 100 percent civilian. We must make clear to the American military, in the weeks of crisis immediately ahead, that this Government is to be controlled by civilian policies, not by military policies.

We must insist, in my judgment, that we be told more of the facts, if the military have any facts, in regard to what their plans may be in respect to meeting the Berlin crisis.

I suggest that a much more moral course of action than the one we are now taking would be one in which my Government would issue a call to the leaders of the world to put into operation immediately the procedures of the United Nations. We have a great opportunity to demonstrate to the millions in Asia and Africa who doubt our protestations of peace that we are now ready to submit the whole case to the United Nations. The procedures are available in the United Nations.

When officials of the State Department tell me that at some time in the future they may consider a step which takes into consideration the procedures of the United Nations, my answer is, "That is not good enough for my country."

Now is the time to use the procedures of the United Nations. It is said, "You must go through the procedural steps of the Security Council." Yes; that is correct. Let us go ahead and do it. We might be surprised, although I do not think so. However, let us get that behind us.

Let us get Russia into the position where she throws her veto on the Security Council. That will be of great value in the formulation of world opinion. Assuming that she does—and I believe in all probability she will, judging by the past record of Russia

walking out on her moral obligations time and time again as a member of the Security Council—we shall then have available the General Assembly and the peaceful procedures which the sections of the charter provide in relation to the workings of the General Assembly.

I believe that the best forum for the discussion of the Berlin crisis is not behind the closed doors of secret diplomacies, but out in the General Assembly of the United Nations, where other peoples from other countries have an opportunity to speak for peace in support of their rights.

INTERNATIONAL COURT SHOULD TRY BERLIN CASE

Then we have the judicial processes of the United Nations. When we are told by the State Department that international law supports our decision, they are right; it does. That is all the more reason, Mr. President, why we should use the judicial processes of the United Nations to pass judgment on such agreements, and proclaim to the world who it is that is violating the agreements in respect to Berlin.

Of course, Mr. President, when we stand before the bar of justice as a litigant or as a party advocate, we are in a somewhat different position than we are when we go into a closed-door session of international secret diplomacy and engage in an attempt to obtain from our opponent on the other side of the table an agreement affecting the entire world, without the rest of the world having a voice in the agreement which is worked out.

I believe that era of international negotiations has just about come to an end. The time when powerful nations—in this instance, to use an example involving the Berlin crisis, Russia, Great Britain, United States, France, and Germany—think they can get into a negotiation situation and enter into some kind of understanding which will affect millions of people who are not parties to that understanding, or, failing to reach such an agreement, breakdown in those negotiations and lead the world into nuclear war, is long past, and that idea has already been repudiated in history.

The world certainly is one in relation to the issue of war and peace, and no two nations can any longer fight unto themselves alone; nor will they.

FOREIGN POLICY PROGRAM FOR AMERICA

Therefore, I believe we should make clear that we do not propose to be intimidated by Russia. I also believe that we should make clear that we intend to lay this problem immediately before the United Nations for exercise of its procedures. We ought to make clear that we would welcome support for that approach from other nations. I am sorry that I think it is true—and it is true—that there are leaders in other nations who will remain reticent, who will hold back, and who will not make their views known so long as the United States and our Western Allies and Russia talk about trying to negotiate some understanding of the Berlin crisis.

But I think they would welcome an indication on the part of the Western Pow-

ers that their services for peace through the operation of their rights in the General Assembly of the United Nations would be appreciated.

My views on this subject can be summarized by saying that I believe the State Department has put the cart before the horse, so to speak, in regard to the approach it is making to the Berlin crisis. We are putting the last extremity, first, when the steps we ought to be taking now are United Nations steps.

Here we are illustrating once more that this great organization, which was chartered by its signatories to do what it could to prevent war and promote peace, is not being given primary consideration.

The appeal should be made to it now. It should not be kept in the background until the situation becomes so bad that no organization could save the peace. Then there would be those who would say, "You see, any association of nations for promoting peace is a mistake. No association can prevent war. It cannot prevent war." It is true that it cannot if the powers proceed with a course of action which will get us into war, in reality, through the back door before an appeal can be made to have the United Nations use its procedures, reach decisions, and place restrictions upon the wrongdoers.

FOUR-YEAR DRAFT EXTENSION OFFERS ONLY FALSE SECURITY

One more word, and I shall be through. What does this subject have to do with the draft bill? A great deal. I think the draft bill itself is being offered really as a part of a mistaken policy on the part of our country that war can be prevented by seeming to take warlike steps. But war will be prevented only when we carry out the great teaching of Arthur Vandenberg, who used to plead on the floor of the Senate for the establishment of an international system whereby the rule of law would settle our disputes.

I say frankly that up to this hour, my conclusion in regard to the attitude of both those in the Pentagon Building and those in the State Department is that they give only lip service to the idea of settling international disputes which threaten the peace by the application of a rule of law, because the State Department cannot point to a single instance in which the peace of the world has been threatened, and in which it has proposed and urged that the dispute be submitted to the judicial process of the United Nations for a binding determination for or against us, or even an advisory opinion.

That is one of the reasons why the leaders of the Asian and African nations to which I have referred tell us quite bluntly, and into our teeth, when we meet with them, that there is much difference between our record as a nation in the field of following the rule of law and our record in professing it.

Oh, Mr. President, if we followed such a course of action as I have suggested, who knows what system might be developed through the application of the rules of reason to Berlin?

I do not intend to discuss on this occasion, but shall on another, the national

psychological problems which are involved in such a crisis as this; the face-saving problems; the necessity for compromise; the part that a request for time and the adoption of a program based upon the passage of time plays in the ultimate settlement of international disputes.

All those practicalities exist, Mr. President, but I also know that when we get issues out into the open for public disclosure through a body which has jurisdiction, and when rules of reason can be applied to them, the chances of a settlement leading to peace are greatly improved.

So I offer as a hope, perhaps, that such an approach as I have suggested may eventually lead, for example, to the formation of a United Nations trusteeship—any other descriptive term may be used—for the administration of a tinderbox spot of the world, such as Berlin. We have missed too many great opportunities in our country in recent years to apply such a principle. That is why in 1955, together with former Senator Herbert Lehman, of New York, I made a plea for the application of such a program to Formosa. We had an opportunity then to propose the proper procedure for the administration of Formosa, with the United States undertaking the caretaker duty of defense until such time as the United Nations found it possible to displace with the trusteeship, whether it required 25, 50, 75, or even 100 years. I think we missed a great opportunity there, as we have in other parts of the world.

There has been such an accumulation of mistakes of that nature that now we may be confronted with our last opportunity to make a plea to the leaders of the nations of the world for the adoption of United Nations jurisdiction over all the countries involved in the Berlin crisis concerning their respective interests in Berlin.

But if we do not follow that course of action, and if what I consider to be the present mistaken policies of the State Department or the Pentagon continue, then I pray, at least, that we shall have heard the last of any talk in our country against the leaders of Russia and of the Western Powers getting together directly and personally with their foreign ministers to try to settle the dispute.

The other nations of the world are entitled at least to that privilege. The other nations of the world have certain rights of peace, to which I have alluded. To the head of state of my country and of any other Western Power and of Russia, I say that not a single one of them, alone or collectively, has the moral right to fail to sit down together in a meeting with their foreign ministers. I do not care whether it be called a summit conference or whatever else it may be termed. But they had better get together rather than waste precious time with international diplomatic maneuvering while all mankind is poised on the brink of a precipice from which, if it falls, most of civilization will fall with it.

Many of the thoughts which I have expressed in my speech tonight are inherent in any intelligent consideration of

the kind of military manpower bill which the Senate will pass tomorrow, because such legislation will be inseparably entwined, so far as its implications and effects are concerned, in the foreign policy of my country for the next few years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Although there are some points in the speech of the distinguished Senator from Oregon with which I might find myself in disagreement in some respects, I think the Senator has made a very outstanding contribution to the current debate upon the foreign policy of the United States and upon the debate, which is worldwide, on the subject of the future of civilization—certainly the future of peace in our time.

I regret that there was not a larger attendance at this time of the day to hear what the Senator from Oregon said. With his indulgence, and the indulgence of the employees of the Senate, who have patiently waited until this hour. I should like to make a few observations concerning some of the things which the Senator from Oregon has said.

Mr. MORSE. I will yield the floor, so that the Senator from South Dakota may proceed in his own way. I thank the Senator for listening to me until the end of my speech. As he knows, I never ask for agreement. It is not agreement that I ask, but that the American leaders and the American people, before it is too late, think about the problems which are involved, and about what I think is the greatest threat to my country which we have ever faced. This is how serious I think the situation is.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, first, in commenting on the direct issue presented by the Senator from Oregon, I wish to state that I am glad he raised the moral issue, for I, for one, agree completely with him that a moral issue is involved in the questions confronting the United States, Great Britain, France, Russia, and the other nations of the world.

I am also glad the Senator from Oregon pointed out that nations other than the so-called Big Four have a stake in the decisions made with respect to Berlin. I hope that those who are in a position to do so will convey to the leaders of those nations, such as India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and the countries of Africa, the point the Senator from Oregon has expressed tonight, namely, that they, too, have a stake in these issues and have a right to express their interests to the countries which are perhaps directly involved in the initial decisions made.

I believe a moral issue is presented, inasmuch as the world might be thrown into a nuclear war. I have that feeling not merely with respect to the Berlin crisis; I had the same feeling with respect to the Quemoy crisis of a few months ago. To me, it came as a distinct shock when I heard representatives of the Defense Establishment say that, under certain circumstances, the thing to do, if the shelling of Quemoy continued, would be to go all out in a nu-

clear war; that a conventional war would be merely a war of attrition which we might win or we might not win or, at least, we might not win decisively. Personally, I was shocked to hear the suggestion that the only thing to do at the outset would be to go into a nuclear war.

I do not know on what authority those whom I heard make that statement were speaking, or whether they were expressing only their own opinions. But, to me, it was unthinkable that we should unleash a nuclear war over Quemoy or over whatever Quemoy might represent in its relationship to Formosa, for I, too, agree that our country could never escape the moral judgment of this generation if our country were the first to use nuclear weapons at the present time, whether over Quemoy or over Berlin.

So I hope the moral implications of such a decision are kept in mind by whoever makes the decision in this instance.

Second, I wish to say this with respect to the leadership of Mr. Dulles: I am familiar with the statements the Senator from Oregon has made on prior occasions with respect to the policies followed by Mr. Dulles and those followed by the President of the United States in conducting our foreign policy. I wish to say that it should be to the everlasting credit of Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles that they took the position they did in the Suez crisis. I felt that those two gentlemen, as the leaders of our country responsible for our foreign policy, said, as it had never before been said, that the rule that territory taken by aggression should not be recognized should apply to our friends, as well as to those who have not been our friends. I think that is one of the landmarks in the development of international policy by justice and fair play.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Senator from South Dakota to know that I completely supported the position the President and the Secretary of State took on the Suez crisis. We remember that at that time they also pointed out to the then belligerents that they were acting outside their responsibilities in relation to the United Nations. I thought that position was unassailable. I only wish they had taken the same position in regard to some matters in which the United States was directly interested.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have the feeling that when the long story of man's attempt to establish in international relations the rule of law and the principles of justice is written, our policy in regard to the Suez crisis will be hailed as one of the great steps forward, and something from which future leaders can take encouragement.

Third, I wish to mention the policy of the President of our country. I am glad that Dwight D. Eisenhower, rather than some other persons I might men-

tion, is President of the United States, if chances of using nuclear weapons are involved in some of the decisions that are made.

Personally, I am convinced that he has shown more restraint than some others might have shown, or more than some others might use or show in future situations.

With regard to the Formosa resolution, I shared to some extent the feeling that we should have written into that resolution a more positive reliance upon the procedures of the United Nations. However, I recall that the night when we voted on the Formosa resolution, I stated that one reason why I would vote for the resolution was the letter the President had written, in which he stated that he would use the processes of the United Nations so far as possible in that connection.

Next I wish to mention the Berlin situation. I shall do so only briefly.

The able Senator from Oregon has made an interesting suggestion tonight, although not necessarily a new one; namely, that the procedures of the United Nations be applied to the Berlin problem. But certainly he has presented that matter in a more forceful way than I have heretofore heard it presented. By what I am about to say, I would not detract one iota from his presentation.

The Berlin situation cannot be considered entirely apart from the historic background in which it was created. The quadripartite administration of Germany, following World War II—the plan under which the land of Germany was divided into four zones, and the capital city of Berlin divided into four sectors, with one zone assigned, respectively to Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States, and one section of the city similarly assigned—cannot be wholly ignored; nor can the modification of that quadripartite agreement—namely, when Britain, France, and the United States decided to proceed with the recognition of West Germany, even though at that time Soviet Russia was not ready to enter into a peace treaty with East Germany—or the step toward solution taken with the abandonment of occupation by the Four Powers be wholly ignored.

However, after we made our unilateral decision—unilateral insofar as the West was concerned—Russia then made her decision to create the puppet government in East Germany. At that time we could hardly protest too much on that score, because we had already recognized the West German Government.

I may have an imperfect recollection in regard to the next phases of those matters—namely, the questions which in both instances were left undecided. Among those, my memory suggests that the status of Berlin, as such, was left undecided; and the unification of Germany or any method for its unification was left for future determination; and the question of how, and in what manner, communication between the West and the Western sectors of Berlin might be preserved was left for future determination.

Because a solution of the present Berlin problem hinges upon finding some answers to those questions which were unresolved at the time when West Germany and East Germany were established, it seems to me only natural that the State Department should initially seek to arrive at answers to those questions among the powers which, following World War II, were parties to the original Four-Power handling of the German question.

So I trust that the Senator from Oregon will not be too impatient if the first and initial exploration of a solution of the problem is sought among the Four Powers, rather than through a procedure of the United Nations. The problem was started within the Four-Power agreement, and it would be natural that the first solution should be sought there.

Reverting to the general theme of the major part of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon tonight, I wish to express a hope. It is that when the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan, comes to this country, the attitude, the climate of opinion in the United States will be receptive, and not hypercritical. I express the hope that when the Prime Minister comes here and gives us the benefit of his recent trip to Russia, we shall not take umbrage at the fact that a leader of another great power should have taken the initiative in making an exploratory trip to Russia.

I personally hope when he comes he can bring to the people with whom he will confer some information which has not appeared in the front pages or has not been publicly discussed, and that will indicate the avenues through which agreement and solution of the problems confronting the world at this time may be reached.

If it is not carrying the deep sentiment which I felt was expressed in reference to the moral issues involved too far, I should like, in connection with my reference to Mr. Macmillan, to recall that on an occasion in the history of England when people were disposed to think that the answers to problems should be found in politics and great navies, a poet philosopher of England wrote some words which, it seems to me, the world might well read today. I read them now. It was in the "Recessional" that Rudyard Kipling wrote:

God of our fathers, known of old—
Lord of our far-flung battle line—
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

The tumult and the shouting dies—
The Captains and the Kings depart—
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

Then this stanza, Mr. President:

Far-called our navies melt away—
On dune and headland sinks the fire—
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!
Judge of the nations, spare us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

To all who may hear or read in these days discussions about massive retalia-

tion and power politics, I recommend this stanza:

If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—
Such boastings as the Gentiles use,
Or lesser breeds without the Law—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

To those of us who may occasionally be a bit self-righteous and think that the only wisdom and the only concern of the world and of humanity rests with the so-called Christian nations, I read the final stanza:

For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard—
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding calls not Thee to guard
For frantic boast and foolish word,
Thy Mercy on Thy People, Lord!

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from South Dakota that if my remarks did no more than elicit from him the contribution he has made to the RECORD tonight, I shall be well repaid for the speech I have made. Such disagreement as I may have with the Senator from South Dakota in regard to the Berlin situation I think can be stated very simply as follows:

I am well aware of the fact that the misunderstandings or differences which have arisen among Russia, France, Great Britain, and the United States, and now Western Germany, grow out of the agreements which the powers entered into. Of course, it is understandable that an attempt should be made to resolve the disagreements which have arisen over the agreements. My point is that I think the parties have already reached the point where the rights of other nations now must be recognized and where other nations should intervene.

That is the reason for my suggestion that Russia, the United States, Great Britain, France, and West Germany should present their case now, on the basis of any agreements they can reach, to the only tribunal which, in my judgment, exists for the settlement of this dispute in the interest of peace, namely, the United Nations. Raising this question with the United Nations now would not prevent the leaders of Russia, Great Britain, France, West Germany, and the United States from reaching any new agreement they can.

Many of us have seen party litigants over a boundary dispute almost reach the point of carrying guns, unable to reach any agreement even with the aid of counsel, but in the judicial atmosphere of a courtroom, where they must appeal to the rule of reason and present evidence to support their case, we have often seen them reach a settlement. If the United Nations were to make it clear that it proposed to exercise jurisdiction, it might provide the greatest enhancement to the prospect of the party litigants themselves reaching agreement over the Berlin crisis.

Mr. President, I appreciate very much the fine contribution which the Senator from South Dakota has made. No greater reference in literature could be found than his reference to Kipling and

to the rich philosophy entailed in that beautiful piece of poetry.

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to extend a courtesy to the Senator from South Dakota and have him take the floor at this time, without my losing it, so he can modify his amendment, with the understanding that his statement will either follow or precede my statement in the RECORD.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered on my amendment, that my amendment may be modified in this respect:

In subparagraph (b), after the first word, "President," insert "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Then, in the same paragraph, to change "four" members to "six" members, and change the figure "3" to "1."

The effect of that modification is to make sure that six members of the Commission shall be appointed from civilian life, and only one from the Armed Forces, and that all seven members shall be subject to Senate confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the modification will be made, and the amendment, as modified, will be printed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I make that request at this time in order that my amendment, when printed tonight, may appear on the desks of Senators in its modified form.

I also ask unanimous consent that these remarks follow the colloquy with the Senator from Oregon.

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

PROMOTION OF MINING AND DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH FOR BERYL, CHROMITE, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM FROM DOMESTIC MINES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF THE BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from California (Mr. ENGLE) may be added as an additional cosponsor to the bill (S. 1245) to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines, introduced by me on March 2, 1959, the next time the bill is printed.

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

RECESS TO TOMORROW AT 10 O'CLOCK A.M.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under

the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 11, 1959, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received March 10 (legislative day of March 9), 1959:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ogden Rogers Reid, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel, vice Edward B. Lawson.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Cecil P. Milne, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

J. Allen Overton, Jr., of West Virginia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1962, vice Edgar Bernard Brossard, retiring.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights, vice J. Ernest Wilkins, deceased.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Henry J. Friendly, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge for the second circuit, vice Harold R. Medina, retired.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Lloyd F. MacMahon, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Lawrence E. Walsh, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 10 (legislative day of March 9), 1959:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Isaac Sewell Morris, O18806, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Christian Hudgins Clarke, Jr., O18213, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel 3d, O18655, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lyle Edward Seeman, O17082, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Jack William Schwartz, O17823, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Roy Tripp Evans, Jr., O19140, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Franklin Fearing Wing, Jr., O18107, U.S. Army.

Col. Clarence Renshaw, O17708, U.S. Army.

Col. William Warner Harris, O18170, U.S. Army.

Col. Chester William Clark, O41908, U.S. Army.

Col. Gines Perez, O30126, U.S. Army.

Col. Elmer Louis Littell, O29823, U.S. Army.

Col. Harvey Julius Jablonsky, O19390, U.S. Army.

Col. James Leslie Snyder, O19627, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. John Farnsworth Smoller, O19416, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, O12845, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, O15842, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, O17306, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officer to be assigned to position of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Samuel E. Anderson, 92A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be general

Gen. Edwin W. Rawlings, 95A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, he has nominated them for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Robert L. Dennison, U.S. Navy.

To be vice admirals

*Vice Adm. George C. Towner, U.S. Navy.

*Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. William R. Smedberg III, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

To be admiral

Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., U.S. Navy.

To be vice admiral

Adm. Byron H. Hanlon, U.S. Navy, retired.

NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates ad interim appointment issued.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

John said of Jesus—John 1: 3: *All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made.*

Most Holy God, creator of the universe, the world, and all that is in the world, keep us ever mindful of Thy omnipotence.

We know, dear Heavenly Father, that it took a miracle to put the stars in

space, and a supernatural act to put the worlds in place.

Dear God, as we realize Thy power, may we also appreciate the fact that Thou art a personal God—so personal as to one day wipe away every tear from our eyes.

May we be cognizant of Thy power and yet also realize that Thou art concerned with our well-being. May this knowledge keep us humble, whereby we do our best work.

This petition we make in Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WATERSHED WORK PLAN FOR LICK CREEK, TENN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

MARCH 6, 1959.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plan transmitted to you which was referred to the committee. The work plan involved is:

State: Tennessee.

Watershed: Lick Creek.

Executive communication No. 515.

Committee approval: March 4, 1959.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,

Member of Congress,

Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit today and tomorrow during general debate while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA MUST MOVE FAST IN TWO VITAL AREAS OF FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.